

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 12, 1950

FIVE CENTS

THE UAW'S GM CONTRACT

It Was a Victory, But — ... page 6

Which Pattern Will Be Set? ... page 6

The Dangers of the 5-Year Term ... page 7

Gideonse's Ax at Brooklyn College ... page 3

Summer Camp-School Coming!

The Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League are planning a camp and school between September 7 and 17 at Genoa City, Wis.

The camp will combine all the splendid features of last year's SYL camp with an even better series of lectures and classes. Sports of all kinds, relaxation, fine food, socialist education, a good time for all, are promised by the camp committee.

Reservations should be sent in at once to the Socialist Youth League, 333 West North Ave., Chicago, Ill. A \$5.00 deposit must accompany all reservations. Contribution for the ten days is \$40 per person. For seven days or less \$5.00 per day; for more than seven days, \$4.00 per day.

Send in your reservations now. First come, first served.

Supreme Court Hits Legal Jim Crow in 3 Decisions; Dodges Segregation Angle

FEPC Is Still on the Shelf!

By JESSE KAAREN and LARRY O'CONNOR

The Supreme Court last week dealt telling legal blows at Jim Crow practices in education and public transportation in the South in three major decisions.

In the case of G. W. McLaurin, a Negro attending the University of Oklahoma, the court ruled that he and 23 other Negro students, who are seated apart from their white classmates, must be admitted to regular classes with white students.

Similarly, in the Texas case where Hemon Marion Sweat of Houston demanded admission to the "white" law school in Austin, the court ruled that the Negro law school there is not the equivalent of the school provided for whites and that Sweat may rightfully claim a "legal education equivalent to that offered by the state to students of other races."

The third case was that of Jim Crow practices in the dining cars of railroads. Elmer W. Henderson, director of the American Council of Human Rights, was plaintiff against the Southern Railway Company. In writing the decision on this case, Justice Burton said: "Where a dining car is available to passengers holding tickets entitling them to use it, each such passenger is equally entitled to its facilities in accordance with reasonable regulations."

POLITICAL MOTIVE INVOLVED

In rendering these decisions the Supreme Court avoided committing itself on the principle that it is legal for Southern states to give Negroes "separate but equal facilities" laid down by the court in 1896. Instead the justices simply chose to recognize for the first time something which has been known to everyone, that the Jim Crow facilities offered Negroes are never "equal" to those provided for whites, and cannot, in the nature of the situation, be equal.

These decisions have struck one more legal blow at Jim Crow, and it is a powerful one. It is clear that the Supreme Court took into account the political and economic realities which face the government. The failure of Congress to pass a fair employment practices law, despite the fact that both

MacArthur Teaches Iron-Fist 'Democracy'

As its latest step in "teaching democracy" to the Japanese, the MacArthur military occupation in Japan has commanded the country's prime minister to expel democratically elected deputies from the parliament.

As an example of U. S. democracy abroad, it has done this on the ground that these deputies represent an "embryonic" threat of an "ultimate" negation of democracy through "lawlessness."

This extreme step in reaction to "lawlessness," furthermore, is taken in response to—a crowd scuffle with American occupation soldiers.

There is one justification given, and only one justification, for this authoritarian "lesson in democracy." There is one reason and only one reason why this iron-fist imperialism may not get the reaction it deserves from U. S. labor and liberals. The victims are Stalinists.

Yet, this latest step of the U. S. occupation can only result in awakening sympathy for the Japanese who resent the foreign iron fist, and redound to the political advantage of that anti-working-class, reactionary force which works for the Kremlin in Japan as elsewhere.

The official statement by MacArthur itself sufficiently (though unwittingly) makes clear the gulf between his military command and what is supposed to be the teachings of democracy. The U. S. decree ordered that all members of the Communist Party central committee be banned from public life. The heart of the reason is given in the following paragraph:

"To permit this incitation to lawlessness to continue unchecked, however embryonic it may at present appear, would be to risk the ultimate suppression of Japan's democratic institutions..."

There could be no cruder or clearer repudiation of the corner-

stone of the concept of civil liberties for dissident minorities; the U. S. Supreme Court's concept of the necessity of showing a "clear and present danger" of forcible overthrow before suppressing such minorities.

The MacArthur doctrine, on the other hand, is fit only to be the cornerstone of any totalitarian theory of government. The totalitarianism of both Stalin and Nazism is founded precisely on the idea of killing off any opposition whatsoever as an "embryonic" danger to the state, a "risk" to the status quo, and an "ultimate" threat to what the present rulers conceive of as the best form of government.

All of this, moreover, is ascribed to the Stalinists' "incitation" (Turn to last page)



Remington Case Shows New Turn Of the Screw in Truman Purge

Something new has been added to the government "loyalty" purge. An employee no longer has even to be considered a "red," "Communist" or "subversive" by his department head before being fired, with or without evidence. The CHARGE itself is enough!

This is the new twist which emerges from the Remington case in the Department of Commerce. Last Tuesday, June 6, Secretary of Commerce Sawyer virtually admitted publicly that such was the meaning of his latest move.

William W. Remington, Commerce Department employee, was originally charged with being a Russian agent by that notorious ex-Stalinist stoolpigeon, Elizabeth Bentley. Remington was cleared by the Civil Service Commission Loyalty Review Board; later he won a libel suit against her. Together with Michael J. Lee, his case has been reopened under the

pressure of congressional investigation and in the atmosphere created by the McCarthy smear campaign.

Thereupon Sawyer asked Remington and Lee to resign from their jobs on the ground that he wanted to avoid an investigation of the department. According to Lee, Sawyer told them that if they did not resign "voluntarily," they would be fired on grounds of being "incompetent and troublesome employees."

Last Tuesday, Secretary Sawyer openly tied his charge of "incompetence" to the loyalty witchhunt, thoroughly substantiating Lee's charge.

"William W. Remington's absence from work while defending his loyalty in the courts and Congress was cited today by the Commerce Department as grounds for his ouster," reported the N. Y. Post. Sawyer will stop his pay in

30 days.

In addition to time off Remington took to respond to subpoenas from the House Un-American Committee and the federal grand jury in New York, Sawyer also cited the time lost from work by superiors in testifying concerning him." He is given five days to answer the general charge that his retention was "impairing efficiency" and was "administratively unfeasible and impracticable."

If Remington did not respond to the subpoenas, he would of course have been subject to contempt charges. Since he did respond, he is "impairing" the efficiency of the department and becomes "incompetent." This is what the Truman government purge has come to, as of now.

Whether Remington is or is not, was or was not, a Stalinist—let alone a "Russian agent" in the es-

(Continued on page 3)

(Turn to last page)

MacArthur Teaches Iron-Fist 'Democracy'

(Continued from page 1)

tion to lawlessness." There is no need for doubting that the Japanese CP, as the agent of Moscow's policies, is all in favor of "lawlessness" against the occupation. Democracy, however, demands that people be punished for acts and not for wishes.

THE CP "ASSAULT"

The specific act which led to MacArthur's vicious decree is another story. It underlines the anti-democratic and brutal character of his latest "teach democracy" move.

The American army announced that it was going to hold a large Memorial Day parade in Tokyo. The Communist Party of Japan decided that this was a good occasion for a counter-demonstration, no doubt in the hope of playing on the feelings of families who had lost dear ones in the late imperialist conflict.

Japanese police, acting under orders from MacArthur's head-

quarters, forced a postponement of the demonstration until after the United States ceremony had been held.

Over 5,000 people assembled. While Michio Watanabe, Stalinist member of parliament, was speaking, demonstrators saw a Japanese plainclothesman taking notes. They snatched the notes from his hands. An American officer and three enlisted men recovered the notes, and explained that the Japanese detective was their interpreter.

So far, it would seem the "incident" was the normal kind of thing likely to happen at any mass demonstration. But at this point a Japanese policeman tried to arrest a demonstrator who, he said, criticized the occupation while he was being questioned.

It would seem that in the kind of "democracy" to which the Japanese are being "re-educated" criticism of the occupation (which is the real government) is sufficient cause for arrest!

Some of the demonstrators tried to protect their man from such "democracy." In the words of the New York Times dispatch for May 30, they "milled around the four United States servicemen and the Japanese, shoving them around. Two of the enlisted men were struck on the head by stones." (Pictures show that the soldiers wore steel helmets, so it can be presumed the stones did little real damage.) One American soldier was knocked down in the scuffle.

SAVAGE SENTENCES

It appears from the press dispatches that the Japanese involved escaped in the crowd, but eight Japanese were arrested later by United States military police. The arrests precipitated several other minor skirmishes.

The dispatches do not say that the eight men arrested were in any way connected with the original scuffle. It is quite possible that the police simply picked up eight known Stalinists. It would not be the first time police have proceeded in that manner. But whether or not the eight arrested were in fact involved in the "skirmishes" is fairly unimportant.

One of the rules of a democracy is that accused persons shall be brought to speedy trial. THIS rule was carried out, and with a vengeance! Just four days after the incidents described above, the eight Japanese were tried and convicted in an occupation court, and sentenced to from five to ten years imprisonment. The men who got the ten years sentence was designated by the prosecution not as the most violent assailant of the American soldiers, but as the "number one man among the defendants."

Defense counsel maintained that they had not had enough

time to prepare the defense, and stated they would appeal. The sentences are subject to review by Major General Walter L. Weible, commander of the headquarters group.

The Stalinists called nationwide protest meetings against the sentences, and a one-day "general strike" in which over 100,000 workers participated, according to government estimates.

TYPICAL SAHIB STUFF

One significance of this episode can only be understood from the savage sentences given the accused. The acts themselves were of such minor character, and so common to any large demonstration in which the police are taking a "tough" attitude, that normally one would expect sentences of sixty to ninety days in the county jail. It is only when masters are trying to show their complete supremacy, and to teach their underlings to stay "in their place" that they even dream of condemning men to five or ten years of jail for daring to lift their hands against them.

But this kind of procedure is typical of colonialist-IMPERIALIST behavior. As such, it must be condemned by everyone who is opposed to imperialism, including those who claim that what America is doing in Japan is not imperialism.

The immediate effect of these sentences has apparently been to cow the Stalinists somewhat. Yet anyone with an ounce of political understanding knows that if the sentences are carried out, the American occupation has handed them eight martyrs for future exploitation. It is thus that Stalinism feeds off the foolishness and brutality of capitalist imperialism. The cause of socialism and democracy can draw strength from the same source only if all

those who truly fight for freedom in America be the first and loudest to protest the imperialist practices of the American armed forces in the countries which they now occupy.

More Camps

A bill in Congress which has been recommended for passage by the House Judiciary Committee virtually calls for "setting up a permanent government concentration camp" for 3,278 aliens in the country whose deportation cases have been pending, some of the cases being many years old. (The denunciatory quote is from Representative Celler.)

"Under this measure, aliens ordered expelled would be imprisoned, without bond, until such time when they can be deported—no matter how long that may take. It's possible that might be for the duration of their lives," says Washington columnist Robert S. Allen.

His Name's Mud

N. Y. Post series on Westbrook Pegler reveals (May 26) that the anti-labor mud-slinging king was once well advanced on the Stalinist fellow-traveler road, in the mid-thirties, marked by an invitation to write for the New Masses and an interview in the Daily Worker. After exhuming some more skeletons from his past on the same order, writer Oliver Pilat remarks: "The point in recording these youthful deviations from modern Pegler principles is to remind you what Westbrook Pegler would do in 1950 to a victim pinned under his unfriendly scrutiny if he found such retroactive evidence about him. It would be murder."

Supreme Court - -

(Continued from page 1)

major parties are committed to such legislation, is leading to increasing unrest among the Negroes with the present political setup in the country. It was necessary to do something to alleviate their situation.

And the way in which the court chose to do it is designed to accomplish the job while creating a minimum of friction between Dixiecrats and the other capitalist parties.

Of course, the court's refusal to rule on the principle of "separate but equal" facilities is, like most political compromises, a deal made at the expense of the Negroes. While giving them elementary legal equality in the specific cases dealt with, it leaves vast areas of segregation untouched.

The Supreme Court no doubt feels strongly its responsibility at the bar of world public opinion. American Jim Crow practices must be ameliorated or it will be extremely difficult to combat Stalinist propaganda directed at American discriminatory practices, especially among the millions of non-whites in the East.

LONG WAY TO GO

Although these decisions are rightly celebrated by all who oppose discrimination of any kind, they are simply another step TOWARD legal equality in the midst of a sea of Jim Crow practices which neither the court nor the Republican or Democratic Parties have been willing to touch.

On the very day when the three decisions of the court were reported in the newspapers, there was also a story of a Negro minister in Little Rock, Ark., whose petition to become a candidate for city alderman was refused by the election board of that city. In the words of the Rev. J. H. Gatlin, the minister involved: "This kind of changes things a little. I know the folks in my congregation were stunned about it. They thought things were looking up."

On the very same day, A. Philip Randolph and Grant Reynolds, co-chairman of the Committee Against Jim Crow in Military Service and Training, denounced the Jim Crow provisions of the conscription bill proposed by the military.

They charged that the army brass "has bucked all attempts to change the pattern of segregation. Only a handful of Negro enlistees and officers have benefited from the few grudging changes already made." (This in face of the fact that Truman recently congratulated the military for the rapid advance made in eliminating Jim Crow.)

The committee recommends some elementary clauses in the draft bill such as outlawing seg-

regation in interstate travel for draftees in uniform; making mob violence against draftees a federal offense; giving all draftees the option not to serve in states with Jim Crow laws; and forbidding federal dictation of segregation in the National Guard. These clauses have almost no chance of being adopted in the forthcoming bill.

The Supreme Court decisions are an advance. This situation can and should be used by the Negroes and all enemies of discrimination to drive hard for FERC and against all prejudice.

PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION

ON POLICY FOR POLITICAL ACTION

By HAL DRAPER

Saul Berg's proposal for a policy different from either Shachtman's or Hall's illustrates a not infrequent tendency in discussions such as this. His conclusion is: Hall's criticism of Shachtman is correct in general, but we must allow for exceptions from Hall's position.

Advocacy of "making exceptions" may sound like advocacy of "flexibility," etc., but the advocate has to face a prior question. On what basis are these exceptions to be made?

A provision merely for making exceptions by itself merely opens the door to unprincipled free-wheeling. In these days particularly, when the pressure of bourgeois politics on the socialist movement (and of the labor bureaucracy on socialist thinking) is tremendous, comrades will do well to think their positions out to the full before jumping for a "new" line, out of a feeling of isolation.

Comrade Berg seems to realize this, for he asks "comment from elsewhere in the country" to work out his proposal "exactly enough." His own justifications for his conclusions are certainly not worked out.

(1) Berg bases much on the fact that a PAC club like Abner's, being under CIO discipline, could not act more independently than it did. What is the relevance of this to our policy—assuming that it is a fixed and unchanging fact?

In the first place, it means that the proposal twice put forward in LA in articles by Comrade Ferguson—that Abner's PAC now run him independently in the main election, as a result of his defeat in the primary—is meaningless.

Comrade Ferguson's proposal

is a good one. Berg negates it, perhaps without realizing the import of his argument. This is not fatal to Berg's view, but we wonder whether he has worked out the consequences of his view.

More important: Assuming that the club cannot run an independent candidate, how does Berg jump from this conjunctural fact to justification of socialists supporting candidates in primaries of the capitalist parties?

We hesitate to press the logic of Berg's point even one step further, since we are sure that Berg does not do so himself, but—what if CIO discipline also makes it impossible for any affiliated union or local to run or support independent candidates? (It can!) What does that do for Berg's distinction between policy for a PAC club and policy for a union?

CIO discipline cannot impose an unsocialist policy upon us. A proposal to support candidates in capitalist party primaries has to be justified on its own grounds, and not by considerations of opportunity.

Berg further claims that support of candidates in capitalist-party primaries is a necessary deduction from our advocacy of building PAC clubs into year-round functioning organizations. This is fantastic.

One of our points has been precisely that there are many political activities and tasks for the PAC besides its annual support of capitalist candidates, and that permanent consistent functioning will strengthen its independent moods.

But, asks Berg, suppose the only thing PAC clubs can do is follow CIO discipline? How then can it really become a year-round functioning organization without . . . what?

Here again the immediate con-

sequences of Berg's arguments must carry him beyond his own conclusion.

Berg himself proposes his tactic only for exceptional cases. Does this then mean that in most cases (that is, all other cases) it is meaningless to advocate building PAC clubs into functioning organizations? Or is it the other alternative: that in all the other cases, we must be led to support capitalist candidates not as an exception but as a rule?

Consider Berg's only generalized formulations: "It is only where the question arises of what the rank-and-file and secondary leaders should do with a genuine year-round political-action movement that they have built, that we must deviate from our labor-party position" in the way he proposes.

"Only"! Where does this stop? On the basis of Berg's general consideration, why stop merely with supporting candidates in capitalist primaries? That is where Berg is determined to stop, to be sure—right now—but once socialist analysis is traded for free-wheeling, politics asserts its own logic. The usual cries about "flexibility" and such do not stop it.

Berg wants to find a reason for supporting such campaigns as Abner's. He invites help in finding a reason. It would be wiser to try to draw conclusions from thought-out reasons, than to try to suck out a reason from a predetermined (or wished-for) conclusion. This method of approach to the question should be a danger sign to comrades who find themselves adopting it.

Most unthinking of all is Berg's final claim that his view must represent a "consensus," since it allows for support of Abner while

avoiding both the Hall and Shachtman positions. This is as big a jump as any in Berg's quite jumpy thinking on the question.

I can with no difficulty at all invent a half dozen other positions (all equally opportunist or worse) which allow for support of Abner while differing from Shachtman and Hall. Not any of them thereby becomes a consensus by virtue of that fact.

The vote of the NC majority on Abner took place on the statement of a specific conclusion, unmotivated by any general considerations. The proponents of "exceptionalism" have to work out a general motivation before they can even claim to have a "position," let alone one which is a "consensus."

The above is directed to Berg's discussion because, in my opinion, even more clearly than Shachtman he reflects a prevalent mood—the desire to find a shortcut to the stimulation of independent political action in the midst of a temporarily unfavorable situation. In the grip of such a mood, some comrades tend to find the simplest exercise of reason an offense to "flexibility."

In my opinion, Shachtman's resolution is an outgrowth of this mood—equally characterized by unwillingness to recognize the most immediate political consequences of his proposal, which are not essentially different from Berg's exceptionalism.

The situation from which it arises—the decline of labor-party sentiment following Truman's razzle-dazzle victory in 1948—is already beginning to pass. It is to be hoped that its further weakening will not find the socialist vanguard bogged down in the discrediting "realism" of pointing to the Democratic primaries as the road to independence!