

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 19, 1950

FIVE CENTS

SUPREME COURT AND JIM CROW:
The Politics of Its Decisions

... page 3

Norman Thomas Girds to Win SP

... page 2

Semanticists and Russia

... page 6

Teachers Fight O'Dwyer for Raise

... page 7

MacArthur Acts to Force Japan CP Underground

By LARRY O'CONNOR

General MacArthur is forcing the Communist Party of Japan to go underground. Twice during the past year he has urged the Japanese government to outlaw the Stalinists. It is now apparent that he has decided to outlaw the party in fact, whether or not the government accepts his "suggestion."

Using a fracas at a Stalinist demonstration on Memorial Day in which some American soldiers were mauled by the crowd as his take-off point, MacArthur has ordered the government to remove from public life the whole national committee of the Japanese CP and the editorial staff of its newspaper Akahata.

The government has followed up with police raids on a number of CP and front organization headquarters and arrests of large numbers of leaders on charges of circulating material which criticizes the occupying power.

The Japanese Communist Party, like its sister parties in all countries, is a totalitarian organization. It seeks to further the foreign interests of Stalin's slave state, and hopes one day to establish a totalitarian regime on the same pattern in Japan. But up till now it has proceeded with legal methods to try to win the support of the Japanese people.

(Continued on page 7)

He Criticized— Off with His Head!

Further evidence of MacArthur's "democracy" in Japan came to light last week when Frank Hawley, correspondent of the London Times charged that he had been declared undesirable because of articles which might "interfere" with the occupation.

Hawley charges that he was called in by General Almond, MacArthur's chief of staff, in connection with an article in which he had written that the Japanese government's ban on political demonstrations was unconstitutional.

Almond stated that the Japanese government could "ignore the constitution if such action was, in its opinion, in the interests of the Japanese people as a whole," according to Hawley.

Despite denials and all kinds of doubletalk on the part of MacArthur and his staff, it is clear that the American occupation brass will not tolerate any criticism of itself, even by British and American correspondents. In this respect it follows the pattern of most imperialist powers.

Labor Politics In Mid-Year: A Roundup

With primaries over in a number of states, and the 1950 elections warming up, LABOR ACTION asked its correspondents over the country to send in preliminary reports on the political situations in their areas, particularly on the relationship and role of the labor movement to politics.

The first three appear below.

LABOR ACTION will comment and summarize later, but one general characteristic is certainly clear.

What stands out is that labor already has the strength of a prime force in politics in this country. It could be a power, in its own right and in its own name, in its own party. The results of the 1950 elections may speed this end or they may further delay it. This is the over-all importance of this off-year election and of our survey.

BLP Blast at Europe Unity Plan Is NOT Socialist

By SAM FELIKS

Attlee Versus the Labor Party

Following the declaration of policy by the British Labor Party executive, Prime Minister Attlee announced in Parliament that the line of his government will not be governed by it. Understandably, the reaction on all sides has been one of bewilderment at the meaning of this. Doubletalk? A split in the leadership? In any case, on top of the party statement, this new complication will not help BLP prestige.

The British Labor Party, through a statement of policy by its Executive Committee, has flatly rejected the Schuman plan for a pool of steel and coal resources in Western Europe. More than that, it also clearly turned its back on any present perspective or program for the economic integration of the area.

While it was certain that the British would not join the Schuman Plan, the Labor Party statement was remarkable and unexpected in the extent to which its argumentation and conclusions pointed to even wider opposition to any other orientation along the lines of economic unity.

This move, said the N. Y. Times, was caused by pressure from the left in the party for a "socialist foreign policy." Such

(Continued on page 5)



Midway into 1950: Labor's Score in Politics

CALIFORNIA: Labor Props the Fair Deal

By A. GARBER

Labor, particularly the politically powerful AFL, intervened in the California primaries on June 6 and succeeded in propping up a factionally torn and almost defunct Democratic Party organization. Helen Gahagan Douglas, Fair Deal congresswoman, and James Roosevelt, state chairman of the Democratic Party, seeking endorsement as candidates for senator and governor respectively, thus won decisive victories on the Democratic ticket.

For the first time in eight years the Democrats wrested electoral control of their own party from the Warren-Knowland Republican machine. And for the first time in decades the Democrats have been lifted to the position of even challenging Republican supremacy in state politics.

Surprisingly enough, both Douglas and Roosevelt openly bucked the Democratic bosses of California—the Malone, Lucky, Pauley forces—to attain their victory. Douglas was endorsed by Truman and Eleanor Roosevelt, but she was bitterly opposed by all metropolitan and major daily newspapers in the state. The one Democratic paper, the Los Angeles Daily News, is owned by Democratic candidate for the Senate, Manchester Boddy, who inherited Senator Downey's machine, and who was Douglas's rival in the Democratic primary.

On the other hand, every trade-union paper and journal in California actively campaigned for Douglas be-

(Turn to last page)

NEW YORK CITY: Record of a Fair Dealer

By WILLIAM BARTON

NEW YORK, June 8—Nowhere is the blind alley of present-style labor politics more evident than in New York City, as a result of the kind of record that has been made in less than a year by the new form of the AFL-CIO-supported O'Dwyer administration.

The Liberal Party, based primarily on the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and the smaller Millinery Workers, had opposed O'Dwyer, to be sure—but in favor of the Republican-Fusion candidate Newbold Morris.

As a result, current city politics appears to be temporarily reversing a recent U. S. trend. For some time, the tendency has been more and more for local politics to become dependent upon national issues and national parties. Both LaGuardia and O'Dwyer, with different formal political affiliations, relied heavily on their ties with the national administration and its labor support to obtain their victories.

But in this year of congressional and state elections, the Democratic candidates, with large support for their national policies from the city electorate, are embarrassed by the discredit that can come from the actions of their re-elected city administration.

There is, of course, little doubt that most of them will receive the active support of all but the Stalinized sections of the labor movement. This is not merely a re-

(Turn to last page)

MICHIGAN: What's the Line, Walter?

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, June 4—The coming fall elections will find the United Auto Workers (CIO) more deeply engaged in political action than at any other time in its history. Its political work will develop along various lines, all of which combined give some indication of the future course of the vast industrial union in politics.

At the present time, in the Detroit-Wayne County area, the UAW is still fighting "Old Guard" Democratic elements for control of the congressional district clubs. The death of Congressman Lesinski in the 16th District sharpens this struggle, for now the question has been raised: Whom shall the UAW-CIO support as Lesinski's successor?

Perhaps by the time this article appears, the question will be answered. What makes it especially intriguing and important is the fact that the Reuther leadership is seriously considering running one of its own key persons for the Democratic Party nomination against some well-known Democratic Party regulars.

The very fact that this candidacy is being considered (and the name of the individual will certainly arouse comment) has created a furor within Democratic Party circles and also among CIO politicians who feel that no move should be made to antagonize the regular party people.

(Turn to last page)

Norman Thomas Girding to Reverse SP Convention Line on Elections

By WALTER JASON
DETROIT, June 10—The national convention of the Socialist Party, held here on June 3-4, furnished convincing evidence—if any were needed at this late stage—for the viewpoint that there is no room on the American political scene for any significant reformist movement apart from that of the trade-union movement. Its place has been usurped, and understandably so, by a variation of the classic social-democracy which may be described most accurately as "Reutherism."

What many of the 100 delegates at the SP convention were resisting, impotently and futilely, was this American phenomenon which had its origins in the Socialist Party and which is largely determining its course.

This was not understood at the SP convention, except by a handful of leaders who did not discuss the subject on the floor. This point was symbolized by the very fact that the convention was held in Detroit, where the only successful "socialists" live as powerful influences in the labor movement. We refer, of course, to the Reuther brothers.

Another point of departure for understanding the SP convention is to know that it was not supposed to take place in the manner, time and place that it did. It was held mainly because the great decision of the SP during the past year was not carried out—through no fault of the SP.

By now the SP was supposed to have found its place snugly in the arms of the old-line Social-Democrats (SDF). Even the name of the Socialist Call had been changed to The Call as a preparation for the event. But the SP was left waiting at the altar after the intervention of David Dubinsky, ILGWU president, who opposed the merger on the grounds that the SP members might not be ready, willing and happy to go along with the idea of supporting the Democratic Party candidates backed by labor.

STILL THINK IT'S A PARTY

Any socialist gathering which asks for serious and thoughtful consideration would begin with a realistic appraisal of the main decisions it made in its immediate past period. Nothing as embarrassing as that was done at this SP convention. Only by indirection, on the debate on political action, was this subject touched.

A second major basis for reappraisal would be a study of the organizational defects and losses and the political significance of the results of this study. This was another painful subject which was discussed only indirectly. The low SP vote in the presidential campaign of 1948 was used as material for pointing out that the old methods were not enough. (Norman Thomas received 139,521 votes in 1948 in contrast to 894,781 in 1952, when there were almost 10 million fewer voters.)

Having lost itself for years in the theory that electoral campaigns were the most decisive events in the life of a political organization, the SP delegates naturally limited their discussions around that threadworn axis. And these discussions were based on the gross and mistaken assumption that the SP was a party and could discuss this subject as a party, whereas the very size of the convention would speak against any such mistaken belief.

Now actually the decision to merge with the Social-Democrats themselves was a recognition of the fact that the SP today is no longer what it once claimed to be, a radical party of the American masses.

Norman Thomas, Maynard Kreuger and Tucker P. Smith recognize this new status of the SP by their insistence that the SP be mainly an educational force in the

labor movement, working within the framework of labor politics and giving up the idea of national presidential campaigns.

The position which these three leaders of the SP presented, which was rejected by a vote of 70 to 37, also contained an analysis of the Democratic Party as the lesser of two evils, which could only signify the readiness of these leaders to go along with present official CIO policy, as carried out by the Reuther leadership of the UAW-CIO. The need for organizational loyalty to liberal and labor organizations as outlined in the Thomas resolution was advance notice to the Reuthers and the Dubinskys that the SP would be good boys.

THOMAS PLEDGES REVERSAL

The key paragraph of the Thomas-Kreuger-Smith resolution sounds exactly like one of Walter Reuther's speeches: "It is no longer true that in America as a whole the differences between the rival parties and their candidates is always and everywhere merely the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. In part that is because in varying degrees, state and local parties and candidates had adopted and pushed forward many of our own socialist demands. In the achievement of a great many things for which socialists have worked, such as public housing, full employment and greater social security, the difference between better and worse is of enormous importance. In foreign policy it may mean the difference between inviting and averting a third world war."

With that point of view, it is not understandable that the Reuthers in the labor movement exert such powerful pressure on SP ranks, including Norman Thomas? From that viewpoint, it is not Reuther the only really successful and important "Socialist"?

IUE-CIO Wins Runoff Election At Pittsburgh Westinghouse

By JEFFERSON JOYCE

EAST PITTSBURGH, June 2—The CIO Electrical Union (IUE-CIO) squeezed through to victory over the Stalinist-led union (UE) today for control over the 13,000 workers in the Westinghouse plant here. With a bare 258 majority in this second election to determine which union shall represent the East Pittsburgh workers, the NLRB decided that the new CIO union shall be the bargaining unit that will deal with the Westinghouse Corporation.

Only a month ago in a similar election the NLRB declared the results inconclusive and called a new election. The IUE-CIO had won this first election by exactly 100 votes but 147 votes were challenged. Only 170 workers voted "no union" at that time and the second election therefore eliminated that choice from the ballots. The results of the new election were: IUE-CIO 5964; UE 5706.

The CIO victory at this plant now gives it the right to represent 41,000 workers in the Westinghouse plants throughout the country while the old UE will represent only 14,500 workers according to the units they have won.

From the conclusion of the first election here on April 25 until the second election was held yesterday, the campaigning was intensified to an even greater degree than it had been before. But neither side had anything new to add in the campaign, despite its intensity. Neither side changed its tactics, neither side had great effect on the previously set opinions of the workers.

And since that viewpoint did not carry a majority at the SP convention, is not the disappointment of the ex-Socialists in the Reuther camp very plain to grasp? And why the Thomas-Kreuger-Smith forces assure the ex-Socialists in the CIO bureaucracy that they'll do better the next time? No, this is not a figment of our imagination. We know that the ADA, the Jewish Labor Committee and the pro-Reuther forces pressed strongly for the victory of Norman Thomas, whose policies paved the way for all-out support for Reuther's political program, which includes in the next period trying to capture the Democratic Party wherever possible.

The revolt against this policy, which was indicated in the 70-37 votes against the Thomas resolution, after a vigorous but fruitless debate, was not, however, a rebellion of rank-and-file members determined to put the SP on a revolutionary course. Its main leaders came from the Jasper McLevy "Socialists" of Connecticut, the Reading (Pa.) Socialists, and five delegates whose views are a hangover of the old-center caucus of the SP.

These delegates wanted the SP to continue in business as usual. Unless the SP had national campaigns it was doomed. That is all that kept it together, these delegates argued, and with some point. But the decisive point—why should it be kept together?—was not discussed.

DELETE CLASS STRUGGLE

On the Marshall Plan, world disarmament and a dozen other political questions there were no important differences of opinion in substantial numbers. In all these matters the SP sounds not one bit different from Walter Reuther making one of his militant speeches.

But above all, the character of this opposition—and of the convention as a whole—was demonstrated by the debate, largely unreported in the press, of the question: Should the SP delete all reference to the class struggle from its membership applications? By overwhelming majority, this was done. (Which means that Reuther might sound radical to some of these delegates.)

Although this convention rejected Thomas' proposals, which would signify a rapidly increasing disintegration of the SP, it nevertheless passed a special resolution praising him as the main spokesman for socialism in America for the party. It elected a new national leadership in which the Thomas forces are a minority.

There was no crucial vote of split after the significant political action, but it is a fact that Thomas forces are determined to change the course of action adopted by the convention.

Furthermore, there exists so much confusion in the SP ranks on the nature of the dispute, its basic meaning and its portent of the future, that it is safe to say that the dispute will get sharper, and lines become more crossed up on a national scale. The sum total result can only be political impotence, in our opinion.

In short, here was a political tendency with a basic program not one whit different than the new American labor aristocracy. It is being torn apart by the conflicting pressures of its past, its traditions and the influence of the labor movement. It lacks a fundamental reason for independent existence because it lacks an independent class program. The process of SPers becoming ex-socialists and labor officeholders will continue apace, and its political history is already in the past.

that was infecting the whole body of Local 601. Now that the major operation is complete, the other ailments must be attended.

It would be wise for the union membership to begin to develop some new leaders for the local who are free from the reactionary influences of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists and its Father Rice on the one hand, and of the petty porkchopping attitude of others. The incompetents must be cleaned out and men and women who know how to fight a grievance or responsibly handle the affairs of the union put in their place. They must begin to operate a union now and stop putting men in office just because they swing votes to the ticket.

Unless some vital changes are made, the Stalinist machine will be back on the job trying to peddle its old swill and Local 601 will find itself controlled by the same CP people they just defeated. The workers have no faith in organizations that have senile officers, ACTU stooges on the executive board and porkchopping grievance men.

IUE-CIO Wins Election in Cleveland

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND, June 11—IUE-CIO won a victory over UE here on June 8, when it won the White Sewing Machine Corporation election with a vote of 1295 for IUE and 30 for "no union." UE had withdrawn from the ballot several weeks before, but had stayed in the fight by a strenuous campaign, urging workers to vote against IUE-CIO for "no union." It is in-

teresting to note that the "militant" UE would rather see the workers go without representation of any kind than to be represented by the CIO.

A runoff election in four General Electric plants here will be held on June 15. This is to settle the question of bargaining rights in those units where neither IUE nor UE had a clear majority in the previous nation-wide elections.

Michigan Suit Charges Detroit Bias In Housing

By JIMMIE LITTLE

DETROIT, June 10—Accusing the Detroit Housing Commission, Mayor Cobo and government agencies of discriminating against Negroes and following a policy of segregation in public housing, the Detroit branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People filed suit this week and demanded \$10,000 damages.

The suit, filed by NAACP president Edward M. Turner, asked the court to rule that the segregation policy violated the constitution. Negro and white applicants for low-cost housing are listed separately, the suit charged.

HOUSING RACKET

So you are new in Detroit and must find a place to live? Got a job in an auto plant and wish to bring your family up from Kentucky to be with you? Shouldn't be too hard. Let's see the ads in today's paper.

Here are seven flats listed for rent by various real-estate brokers. With your family you will need at least five rooms and here is a nice one listed for \$40 a month, with the telephone number to call.

"I'm calling about the flat you have listed in today's paper," you start off, but you are interrupted. "Which one did you have reference to?" a sweet young voice asks.

"The \$40 five-room flat. Are there others too?" you ask.

"I'm very sorry, that particular flat has been rented," you are informed, "but we have lots of others on file and more coming in daily. If you will just drop around to our office and register—registration fee is only \$25 for 60 days; I am sure you can find something during that time for you."

You soon find after calling each of the numbers listed that the same answer is given in each case, with no answer as to what happens after the 60 days are up and no place is still found. Of course, you can always pay another \$25 for re-listing.

CANADIAN CONTRACT

Under the new agreement signed Monday between the UAW-CIO and the Chrysler Corporation of Canada, the union has agreed to shelve its pension demands for five years.

The union said the new two-year contract would provide an 11½-cent package, including a six-cent hourly wage increase. The other 5½ cents cover company-paid hospital and medical insurance, increased life insurance, vacation pay and accident benefits.

Also included are 47 contract changes. The pact can be reopened for wage discussions after one year.

For the first time in the history of the UAW-CIO's Local 600, a Negro, Shelton Tappes, was appointed last week to membership on the local's grievance review board.

Profit Crops Up

Farmers who wonder why a corn picker which sold for \$635 in 1944 is now priced at \$1200 can find the answer in figures cited by the Iowa Union Farmer.

The profits of the farm machinery monopoly firms rose in 1949 by 24 per cent over the previous year, although production was 10 per cent lower. Employment went down 15 per cent, but the industry registered a 26.6 per cent boost in cash dividends paid out in 1949 as against 1948. International Harvester Company led the profit pa-

Political Meaning and Consequences of the Recent Decisions —

The Supreme Court and Jim Crow

By GORDON HASKELL

The Supreme Court's three decisions in cases involving the segregation of Negroes in the South has led to much comment and speculation throughout the nation. And although the real consequences of this judicial-political act cannot be gleaned from the immediate reactions to it by different groups, such reactions are of considerable importance.

The leading spokesmen of "white supremacy" in the South have run true to form. Herman Talmadge in Georgia has been stumping the state in his gubernatorial campaign. Playing on the ignorance and prejudices of the poor and not-so-poor whites in the farm areas, he proclaims that regardless of the Supreme Court Negroes will be segregated in the schools of Georgia as long as he is governor.

Ku Klux Klan leaders throughout the South also believe the court decisions will help them to recruit members to the Klan by inflaming racial prejudices.

The Southern liberals are, as usual, worried. These are "men of good will" who are caught in an impossible situation. They want "justice" for the Negroes, yet they are powerless to do anything but try to improve the lot of the Negro people in the South by providing them with better segregated facilities. They fear every governmental or non-governmental action which draws attention

Political Background of the Rulings

Yet the actual significance of the ruling will probably be much more far-reaching, and that is what arouses bellows of rage from Talmadge and his ilk. There is already one suit involving segregation pending against the University of North Carolina, and three in the public schools of the same state. Four suits are awaiting disposition in Louisiana where Negroes demand equal education in public schools. Six suits are pending against the University of Florida, and two demanding equality in public schools in Talmadge's own state.

Though no one can say what will be the outcome of any of these actions, it is clear that the court's decisions will greatly encourage those who have started them, and will stimulate individual Negroes and organizations to start suits in many other cases. For now there can be real hope that the courts will rule against segregation in individual cases, instead of falling back on the "separate but equal" fraud.

The fact that all these individual cases have to be fought, however, is a consequence of the Supreme Court's strategy. It is clear that there was no legal reason for the court's refusal to knock out the whole "separate but equal" fiction in its decisions.

This was a political decision calculated to give the Negroes an inch in the struggle against discrimination, and even then an inch which can be won only through prolonged and exhausting litigation and struggle.

This decision can only be understood if we keep in mind the politics which have been played with the civil-rights question over the past few years.

In his messages to the 80th and 81st Congresses, President Truman proposed a far-reaching civil-rights program. His proposals were based on the recommendations of the Presidents Committee on Civil Rights headed by Charles Wilson of the General Electric Corporation. The report stated that Jim Crow practices in America greatly weaken the international prestige of the United States in the cold war. It pointed out, further, that the cold war requires a maximum of national unity which

to the disgraceful treatment of the Negroes there. They themselves are afraid to oppose segregation as they are afraid to ally themselves with the Negroes in the South.

On the other hand, the reaction of the Negro organizations and of almost all others who oppose discrimination and segregation has also been significant.

Most of them have hailed the court's decisions, while pointing to their limitations. The general agreement is that while the court in no way solved the problem of segregation in education and transportation, it opened a wedge which will make possible much more rapid progress toward the solution of these problems than has been possible in the past.

As was pointed out in last week's LABOR ACTION, the court refused to rule on the general principle of segregation as laid down in the doctrine that rights of Negroes are not violated if they are provided with "separate but equal" facilities. It simply ruled that in the specific cases before it the Negroes involved could get equal treatment in fact only if they were not segregated.

For the great mass of Negroes, this ruling will have little immediate practical effect. As the decisions in the Texas and Oklahoma cases involved graduate schools of universities, this means that only a tiny fraction of the Negro population stands to benefit directly.

is endangered by the rampant discrimination against Negroes practiced throughout the country, and especially in the South.

The report insisted that aside from these considerations, American industry needs an expanded market in the South, and that such a market cannot be created as long as millions of Negroes are kept in a degraded social, political and economic position.

That is, American capitalism, in the opinion of the President's Committee, can't afford the luxury of Jim Crow as it is practiced today.

Yes despite this report and the president's messages, not a single bill proposed to put them into effect has been carried in two sessions of Congress. Every time the issue has come up, both political parties have ducked it. Each has tried to shy around the problem in such a way that the blame could be made to appear to lie on the other one.

The explanation for this is simple. Both the Democrats and the Republicans have been wooing the Dixiecrats. Yet they both want to hang on to the important Negro vote in the North and the increasingly important Negro vote in the South. Thus they talk for civil-rights legislation, but refuse to take any steps which might further alienate the racists who hold political power in the South.

And the labor movement has been willing to go along with the game. Although the labor leaders claim that the enactment of civil-rights legislation, and particularly a compulsory Fair Employment Practices Act, would greatly ease their job of organizing the workers in the South, they are determined to hang on to the shirt-tails of the Democratic politicians. Thus they also TALK about civil rights legislation, but do little if anything when their party lets it down the legislative drain.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other organizations which have as their chief aim the abolition of all forms of legal discrimination have done about the same as the labor organizations. They have pressed a strong propaganda for enactment of FEP

legislation, and have taken cases of discrimination and segregation to the courts. Although they denounce the political deals made by both Democrats and Republicans at the expense of the Negro people, they do not permit their indignation to go the length of cutting their political ties to the two capitalist parties, nor even of advocating a new party which would not make such deals.

When we take all factors into consideration, the Supreme Court's action becomes understandable. On the one hand Jim Crow is a burden to the political and economic role the United States seeks to play in the world. On the other hand, no major political force in the country is willing to risk a complete and final break with the powerful political and economic rulers of the South. So the court rules in such a way that the Negroes are prevented from losing hope of eventual justice, the Democrats can "point with pride," during the election campaign, to an achievement in the civil rights field, the labor

Will Encourage Negro Fight

That is one reason why Independent Socialists consider these decisions of the court a real step forward. At the same time, all should be fully aware of the fact that they avoided the main issue of the continued legality of "separate but equal" Jim Crow facilities for Negroes; that whatever meager concessions are made to the Negroes are granted in significant measure because of the imperialist ambitions of the American ruling class; and that the Negro people are still being riddled in the political deals made at their expense by the court or in Congress.

The important considerations are these: each small advance for the Negro people encourages the cryone who is honestly against discrimination to fight harder.

leaders can say that their alliance with the Democrats has paid off in the court decision, and the "white supremacy" ruling class in the South can put up a big howl while hanging on to the hope that it will take ten thousand court cases before legal segregation is ended in the schools.

Whatever may have been the calculations of the justices, it is clear that the Negro people are fully determined to press to the full the slight advantage they have gained. In the South it takes tremendous courage and determination to take advantage of even as restricted a legal victory as this is. But those qualities are not lacking among the Negro population. Every inch of advance encourages a thousand heads which have been bowed in hopeless resignation to lift up and look the oppressor in the eye. Every breach in the heretofore solid wall of terror and discrimination finds thousands eager to leap into it and hack away at the rest of the wall which still stands.

Each advance weakens the practice and ideology of Jim Crow in both the North and the South. Each advance undermines the unshakable position of reactionary politicians in the South, and increases the political weight of the Negro people who can and do play an overwhelmingly progressive role there. Thus each brings us closer to the day when the Negroes of the South will be able to join forces with the workers in all parts of the country in a united struggle against their common oppressors.

In rendering its decisions, the justices of the Supreme Court in all likelihood believed that they were cementing the political ties which bind the Negroes and the labor movement to the two capitalist parties. The immediate ef-

fect may well be what they desired. But the long-range effect of this aid given the Negro people in their struggle for complete political, economic and social equality will be to dissolve these ties. For the struggle intensifies with each success. And the more intense it becomes, the less likely is it that the majority of Negroes will be willing to confine themselves to a political alliance which always results in their getting only a token payment on the full equality which has been due them for over two hundred years.

As growing numbers of Negroes come to realize that their present political ties hold them back instead of advancing their interests, they will seek to form other ones. Already the leading Negro organizations have come to a growing appreciation of the fact that the labor movement is their most natural political ally. It would be unrealistic to expect the Negroes as a minority group to lead in the formation of such an independent political movement. But the political logic of their particular struggle is such that there is every reason to believe that once a strong sentiment develops for the formation of an independent labor party, large numbers of Negroes will quickly join it and play a leading part in it.

And this is true specially in the South. Today increasing numbers of Negroes are voting in Democratic primaries in a section of the country where the Democratic Party is openly and viciously anti-Negro. They do this simply because they believe there is no realistic alternative. If they could see such an alternative rising on a national scale, they would rush to embrace it. And this alone would guarantee a labor party a base in the South which would make compromise with Jim Crow as politically foolish as it is morally degrading.

Court Decision Still Means That Jim Crow Cases Get This Runaround!

SEPARATE IS NOT EQUAL, by Edna B. Kerin. (The Crisis, May)

This article in the magazine of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People details the case of Heman Marion Sweatt versus the University of Texas, one of the three cases which the Supreme Court has just acted on. A good section of it is devoted to tracing the steps in the process whereby the question was brought to the high court. In view of the fact that the court did not overthrow the "separate but equal" doctrine, thereby requiring decision of each case separately (and, we hope, equally), it illustrates what it takes before any result can be gained.

The case began in March 1946, after Sweatt was rejected by the university's School of Law. Incidentally, Sweatt's interest in studying law was aroused by the fact that he had been refused a civil-service job, for which he had qualified, through a legal runaround based on Jim Crow dodges. The case then went through the stages:

(1) The District Court of Travis County, where the NAACP first had to bring suit, ruled that the university's action was indeed a denial of equal protection under the laws. But it gave the school six months to provide "substantially equal" law training for Sweatt.

(2) At the end of these six months, the same court dismissed the NAACP-Sweatt case on the ground that the condition had been fulfilled. The very record showed, however, that no such law school had been established—the state had only promised the court that it would furnish the facilities in the future!

(3) The Court of Civil Appeals for Texas set aside the judgment of the lower court and remanded the case for further proceeding. This

meant that the question went back to the District Court.

(4) In anticipation of the trial, the state "had set up a makeshift three-room law school for Sweatt in the basement of a building in the downtown section of Austin... leased for a period from March 1 to August 31, 1947, at \$125 a month...."

(5) After the trial, in June 1947, the District Court held that the mock law school was "substantially equal" to the law school of the University of Texas—the latter with its 65,000-volume library, its 16 full-time and three part-time professors, modern buildings, prestige, etc., as well as a budget of several hundreds of thousands of dollars.

(6) The appeal went again to the Court of Civil Appeals for Texas, where the decision was affirmed.

(7) Appeal to the Supreme Court of Texas: this court refused to hear the case; it refused to give any opinion as to why it would not hear the case.

(8) Again anticipating the appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court, the state set to work to establish a "University of Texas for Negroes" at Houston with feverish attempts at dressing it up so that it could be passed off as "equal."

(9) The U. S. Supreme Court, four years after the case began, decided in favor of the NAACP suit.

Besides the opening wedge into Jim Crow pried by the court decision, the case itself had its side effects. As a direct result of the fight itself, for the first time a chapter of the NAACP was formed at the University of Texas—with an all-white membership, of course, since there are no Negroes at the lily-white school. This chapter was formed in April 1947, and it is now engaged in a membership drive and a vigorous campaign against Jim Crow restrictions.

Editorials

Poison for Labor

Two New York City departments under Mayor O'Dwyer have laid down a labor-busting precedent which is poison for the trade-union movement. The measure of O'Dwyer's New York labor supporters can be seen in the fact that there hasn't been a peep from them.

Anything goes—if the victims are Stalinists, as in this case. Specifically, the victims are the CP-dominated Teachers Union and United Public Workers.

The Board of Education formally decided to refuse all dealings with the latter, and Commissioner Hilliard won't talk to the latter in the social-service setup.

In both cases there are no bones made about it. Both organizations represent substantial sections of the working force. The city officials' decisions mean that these workers are unrepresented before them. As a matter of fact, more accurately, it means that these officials want to choose their representatives for them. It was made perfectly clear that the actions were taken on the ground of the politics of the union leaderships.

Because we are for smashing Stalinist influence inside the trade-union movement and ousting them from every vestige of control and influence, it is incumbent upon us—and every trade-unionist who thinks likewise—to denounce these steps of the administration.

It's an excellent example of how the poison of the loyalty purge works on and seeps into those who even began by fighting its first manifestations, and then retreat to safer ground. Do you remember how the labor movement unthinkingly denounced the "anti-Communist affidavits" of the Taft-Hartley Law on the ground that Congress was assuming the right to decide who was to lead a union and represent the workers?

That, of course, is clearly implicit in the T-H affidavits. But this vicious principle has been made explicit by Fair Dealer O'Dwyer. Where the reactionary law passed by Congress, which is still the symbol of anti-laborism for the whole trade-union movement, merely denied NLR rights to unions whose officials refused to sign, the Fair Deal administration of New York refuses outright to deal with them.

If New York Democratic Party "liberals," in their capacity as city employers, can refuse to deal with a union on the pretext of the political views of its leaders, will they deny that to a private employer? And by what principles of trade-unionism can that be stomachached by the AFL and CIO leaders who support the mayor—or by those who do not but who have not raised their voices against this foul position of the city heads?

The Fair Dealers, in and outside of Washington, have adopted as their very own more than one of the most hated precepts of Taft-Hartleyism. The most outstanding other example is Truman's insistence on the right to use the injunction to break strikes.

Labor and liberals remain silent, as long as one or both of the following are true: (1) if the vicious practice is that of a Fair Dealer, who must not be "embarrassed," or (2) if the first victims are Stalinists. That way lies suicide.

Statue of a Myth

The press has been making merry over a statue just unveiled in the Netherlands. For 77 years the Dutch have been telling American tourists that the story about the little boy who saved the city of Haarlem by plugging a dyke with his finger was a myth. But they still kept coming to see the "historic" spot. The new statue now commemorates the "event," and if the guide can't show the tourist where it "happened," he can now at least point to the monument, to give them something to rubberneck at.

But the Haarlem statue is not the only one in Europe erected to perpetuate a myth for the benefit of their rich uncles and aunts from America. Another was recently put up in Norway too.

It is a somewhat larger-than-life-size statue of President Roosevelt holding the "Atlantic Charter."

But it is now an historic fact that the "Atlantic Charter" was and is as much of a myth as the little Haarlem boy. It literally never existed, not even on paper, having been invented after the Roosevelt-Churchill meeting at sea to underline a piece of wartime propaganda about war aims.

But even that detail is inconsequential compared with the fact that every provision in it, not least of all, that for the right of people to self-determination—was trampled on by all the Allied war leaders during and since the war, from Europe to Asia and Africa and by Roosevelt himself in a multitude of deals before and after Yalta.

It was a monumental myth before the Norwegian monument was erected to it.

YOU and SCIENCE

Hidden Starvation and the Income Bracket

By CARL DARTON

The apologists for things-as-they-are tell us that hunger is one of those minor inconveniences that mankind has always had to suffer. The sciences of nutrition and food culture demonstrate that such a concept should be relegated to the scrapheap of history. One feels that, on this particular issue, the public is willing to cast its lot with scientific progress and against the status quo. But there is a big job to be done. Stark physical hunger still exists in the largest portion of the world; and even here in "prosperous" United States actual want of food exists more than most of us realize. Just as dangerous and more common than actual want of food is "hidden hunger," the evil of malnutrition.

The effect of malnutrition is difficult to measure in official mortality and morbidity tables. In the United States vital statistics list few deaths from starvation and undernourishment but the entries are there under the specific diseases which ravage the poorly fed. Certain anemias, much tuberculosis, some brain and nerve diseases, scurvy, rickets, pellagra, dental disorders, goiters, and certain types of heart diseases are attributed to "hidden hunger." Yearly there are additions to this list as the science of nutrition extends the scope of its investigations.

Most families with marginal incomes consume a large proportion of foods of the bulky and starchy type. These lower-cost foods enable most American workers to meet easily caloric standards above the actual physical hunger level but do not supply the other nutritional needs. The remedy does not lie in dietary education but in increased income which will permit the purchase of the higher-priced milk, eggs, fruits and fresh vegetables.

The Federal Security Agency report of September 1948 states that about 70 million people in the United States have an income insufficient to maintain an "American standard of living." This is reflected in the state of the nation's health. Concerning the nutritional aspect of low incomes the same report says: "Dietary-deficiency diseases in severe forms still exist particularly among children of low-income families. Many more children suffer from general malnutrition, which causes them to grow at less than normal rate and to have less than average resistance to infections."

"In some parts of the country, a recent survey showed, as many as 72 per cent of the pregnant women and 85 per cent of the children of early school age were suffering from secondary anemia."

The relation of economic status and morbidity is clearly shown in the following table taken from the federal government's National Health Survey:

Diagnosis	Ratio of Annual per Capita Volume of Disability in the United States, 1935			
	Relief	Income Status of Family Under \$1000	1000-1500	\$5000 & over
Tuberculosis	875	388	250	100
Orthopedic Impairments	420	283	175	100
Rheumatism	369	213	138	100
Digestive Diseases	340	180	114	100
Nervous Diseases	287	204	135	100
Degenerative Diseases	268	156	109	100
Respiratory Diseases	189	121	91	100
Infectious Diseases	124	93	93	100

There is another important reason why the worker and his family are ill fed. The various food industries compete desperately for the market without any consideration of the over-all nutritional need of the consumer. Sugar refiners promote the overconsumption of sugar in pastries, soft drinks, and candies. The flour-milling industry fosters a demand for white bread even though the flour used therein has been stripped of much of its nutrient. The list of similar crimes could be made almost endless.

To complete this picture of the inequitable and inadequate national diet, we must at least mention the government's policy of food subsidy which prices food out of the reach of the consumer, and simultaneously burns wheat and erects mountains of potatoes and powdered eggs.

Were it not for the findings of nutritional science, the American worker might be content with his dietary lot. He might be satisfied with reminders that we are the best-fed nation on the planet and that each successive generation is better fed, larger, and healthier than its ancestors. But science sets standards in excess of those which are, at the moment, within our grasp, albeit not beyond our reach. Science gives validity to the politics of discontent.

To many workers, the dietary needs of the Hottentot, the starvation of Indians on Western reservations, the limited fare of the colored and poor white in the South, and the underweight child of the city slums are not sufficient challenges to action. But when the worker is informed that "hidden hunger" strikes his home and that his own children suffer dietary diseases, then he will demand an adequate wage, a rational government food policy, and worker-welfare measures such as child endowments.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 25 June 19, 1950

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. GENERAL EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Reading from Left to Right

TELEVISION'S PERIL TO CULTURE, an Editorial, by R. W. Emerson, sec. (American Scholar, Spring 1950)

"Television may not be as dangerous to culture as the atomic bomb is to our civilization," says the editorialist, but he is not optimistic about it. "Each new development in the art of communication seems to have broadened the base of culture on the one hand and to have vulgarized the arts on the other..."

Such a dim view, he notes, could lead to an aristocratic and anti-democratic view of the relation between culture and the masses, but he puts the finger rather on a different line of thought.

"It is possible that some of the cultural defects of the mass media, revealed in the movies and radio and accentuated in television, can be cured if there is a less immediate relation between commercial and cultural interests. Americans are rather too uncritically proud of the advantages of the 'free enterprise system,' including the advantages of competition in radio and television programs. There are indeed some advantages if comparison is made with the programs of the British Broadcasting Corporation, for instance. But on the other hand there is nothing in American radio so consistently mature as the 'Third Program' of the BBC, which

is frankly designed for the more thoughtful tenth of the population. There is increasing evidence that a public service corporation of the type of the BBC will have a similar advantage in television, in furnishing adult entertainment for adults and mature discussions for mature minds....

"In any event, television can no more be left under the control of the special interest of advertisers than atomic energy can finally be left under the control of single nation-states. The anarchy of conflicting national interests threatens the life of our civilization in the one case; and the anarchy of competing commercial interests threatens the integrity of our culture in the other."

This conclusion would seem to counterpose government ownership to private enterprise, but by so doing it raises another problem: Can control of an important means of communication and education be left in the hands of a government which cannot be trusted with control of atomic energy? Certainly the case of Russia shows that corporate government ownership is no bargain per se! All of which raises the question of who (what class and what political ideology) controls the state, and it is this vital aspect which conditions the otherwise liberal thought of the editorial.

WORLD POLITICS

On the "Pro-Titoist Jag" Among the European Socialist Groups

By HENRY JUDD

The impact of the Tito split with the Comintern, sharp as it was when it first took place about two years ago, continues to grow and mount in significance.

In international politics, in labor affairs, in the internal development of the Stalinist movement, the birth and success of Titoism (for it has been surprisingly successful) is well known and requires no repetition. In a series of countries, Titoism—to one or another degree—has split the Stalinist movement wide open. The latest example is India, where a new Communist Party with definite leanings away from Moscow Stalinism and in the direction of Mao Tze-tung and Peiping has been formed. There is no telling what will be the latest development in this expanding revolt within the Stalinist circle.

It goes without saying that all groups and branches of the labor and socialist movement, internationally, have had to take cognizance of Titoism and the Yugoslavian events. The response and the various positions taken have varied considerably, particularly after it became clear that Titoism was no temporary phenomenon but one of the most dramatic and important developments since the war's end.

At first, the political and theoretical problems posed by the existence of the Tito regime and its bitter split with Stalinist imperialism were comparatively simple. The questions were essentially those of an internationalist character, revolving around the right of Yugoslavia to maintain its existence as a national entity against the threats of Stalinism. In the early days of the struggle, it appeared possible that Russia, in its desperate anxiety to crush Titoism before it could spread, would intervene directly and bluntly to destroy the Yugoslavian state. Revolutionary socialism, always conscious of its duty and obligation to defend the democratic rights of national existence, despite the character of the national state under threat, naturally came to the defense of Yugoslavia, proclaiming its views that if war came, socialism must be on the side of Yugoslavia and against Stalinist imperialism.

The history of Marxism is, of course, replete with many examples of a similar position—defense of Ethiopia against Italy; China against Japan; Viet-Minh against French imperialism and, in general, all national peoples against those seeking to destroy their national existence.

TITOIST JAG ON LEFT

To be sure, another factor of vital importance was involved—namely, how to analyze and what estimate to give to this split within the Stalinist world. LABOR ACTION and the ISL recognized the deep significance of the event, particularly the favorable fact (from a socialist viewpoint) that it represented a heavy blow at the hitherto solidarity of the world Stalinist movement. Any event tending to weaken and splinter Stalinism is in our favor. It would have been absurd for us to speak "against" the Tito split; on the contrary, whatever possible was to be done to encourage and amplify such splits in the ranks of Stalinism, regardless of one's political opinion and evaluation of the Titoist regime.

Other political groups and individuals reacted according to their own political perspective. Stalinists who were already uneasy and uncomfortable in the Moscow straitjacket were immediately attracted; political opportunists and adventurers of

all shades (the type who talk about fighting Stalin with his own weapons) were cynically hailing the new marshal for his amazing success and skill in defying the Kremlin; still other socialist groups and tendencies, weakened and isolated after long battles and discouragements, began to view the Yugoslavian events with anything but an objective political-eye.

The leaders of the Yugoslav one-party state, clever and highly educated in the ways of the political world, immediately began to build up throughout the world a modest but significant sector of supporters among the "socialist and radical left." This was the beginning of a pro-Titoist movement which has now become alarmingly large and demands its own analysis and answer. A veritable Titoist "jag," particularly in the socialist and revolutionary left of Western Europe, is on and promises to spread.

It must be noted that the issues involved have spread beyond the original questions posed, and have now tended to be replaced by another question: What kind of regime exists in Yugoslavia? Is it a socialist or workers' state? Has a new October Revolution occurred, which the workers must be mobilized to defend in the same sense that they defended the Russian Revolution? Any number of political groups in Western Europe and elsewhere, it appears, have arrived at such conclusions, to one or another degree. Nor does this concern only Yugoslavia, since it would also appear that various revolutionary groups in the Far East are rapidly developing similar opinions about the new Chinese regime! Surely the Yugoslavian question is now posed in an entirely different light than hitherto.

WHAT KIND OF STATE?

If it were only a matter of that miserable set of bankrupts who call themselves the "Fourth International," the matter would not be too serious. That this group would rush to liquidate its "independent" political and ideological existence at the first promising opportunity has been long clear. In any case, not only do the self-styled Trotskyists degrade themselves by the crassness and vulgarity of the way in which they now worship the Tito shrine, but they openly proclaim their desire and burning ambition to serve throughout the world in no other capacity than that of propagandists-in-chief for the marshal and his noble horde of one-party dictators. They may rest assured that Tito knows how to make proper use of them, provided no one asks him the question of what happened to the Yugoslavian Trotskyists, known now to have been liquidated (in Titoist, not Stalinist, fashion) in 1945. Unfortunately, however, genuine revolutionary socialist tendencies have been affected by the myth and illusion of a Titoist "socialist" regime.

A very specific and concrete question is at issue: Is this really a democratic regime, moving in the direction of socialism? In what ways does this express itself? Are the statements of the Titoist leaders, proclaiming their Leninism, their fidelity to socialism, their understanding of democracy, etc., to be accepted at their face value, as do the Trotskyists? In a word, what kind of a regime exists in Yugoslavia? In an article to follow we shall put into more concrete form our answers to these questions. Most important, we shall insist upon specific criteria by which one must measure this regime in order to pass a true and objective judgment upon it.

BLP Blast at Unity--

(Continued from page 1)

a comment is based on one of the reasons given by the BLP: They pointed to the impossibility of entering a Western European pool dominated by a capitalist majority without surrendering their own aims in organizing their own economy toward nationalization, and they argued that real international planning is impossible without national planning in the member countries.

This argument is well-based, but it does NOT make the BLP line a "socialist foreign policy." Nor is it a basic reason for the party's stand. Indicating the point: Lord Beaverbrook, notorious as a supporter of the empire above all else, praised the Labor Party for turning its back on Europe.

LOOKS TO EMPIRE

The party statement itself contains the reason for this praise and its justification. It argued that Britain, for its own advantage, preferred close ties with its own economic bloc, which is left of its empire, to European unity; with this, it argued specifically against the very notion of organizing Western Europe as a "third force" independent of both the U. S. and Russia. It counterposed to a Western European bloc

the economic side and the U. S. war bloc on the political side.

The seeming contradiction with its "socialist" argument is made possible by the narrow nationalist outlook that pervades all sections of the current leadership of the Labor Party. On the one hand the British working class and a policy of full employment, while at the same time it is tied to the cold-war policies of Washington and has planned its economic policy toward the Commonwealth and colonialism.

One of the reasons given by Labor Party Leader Hugh Dalton is that the Schuman Plan would create a supra-national body which "would have a permanent anti-socialist majority and would arouse the hostility of the European workers." That it would arouse the hostility of the European workers is certain; but why must there be a "permanent" anti-socialist majority?

This passing remark, in its own way, reflects the perspective of the Labor Party, not only of the right wing which is ready to accede to Washington pressure and engage in doubletalk about intergrating, but also unfortunately of the so-called left wing. It does not develop a program based on

strengthening the forces and parties of socialism in Western Europe, nor does it carry out a program that would enable them to grow. It rather ties itself to the hope of continued and expanding imperialist exploitation of the Commonwealth and its territories.

THE THIRD ROAD

At a time when an Independent Western Union is a crying economic and political necessity for Western Europe, the Labor Party turns its back on Western Europe and faces the Commonwealth. The initiative for unifying Western Europe in their own way has been seized by the capitalist governments in response to the demands of all social classes and is turning it into an arena for their inter-imperialist rivalries.

The Labor Party says that it "cannot see European unity as an overriding end in itself" and points to the necessity for close economic cooperation of all parts of the world. But it is only on the basis of the initiative supplied by an advanced industrial region such as Western Europe, unified

under the leadership of working-class governments, that this can be attained today.

It is only an Independent Western Union ready to plan production democratically and to disengage itself from the cold war that will be able to provide for worldwide economic cooperation and offer a political alternative to the two war blocs.

Instead of taking the leadership in the struggle for an integrated Western Europe and giving it a socialist content, and really providing a basis for the economic unity that is sought, the British Labor Party has in effect announced that it is banking on tying British imperialist interests to those of Washington. Its declaration is no more socialist than the Schuman Plan itself.

As against both the specific type of "national socialism" of the BLP and the capitalist integration outlook of the Continental governments, the socialist and internationalist road for the solution of the problem could be taken only if the Labor Party leaders adopted the aim of an Independent Western Union as their alternative to Schuman.

Not in the Headlines

Fair Deal All Around

In May President Truman's stock zoomed high with labor and liberal leaders when he vetoed the Kerr bill, which would have stolen millions of dollars from consumers in higher bills for natural gas.

At the end of May the stock crashed. Truman appointed Nelson Lee Smith to the Federal Power Commission for another five-year term, putting the administrative body in the hands of the same people who were plugging for the steel.

The UAW-CIO's monthly, the United Automobile Worker, had written that Smith's appointment "could still bring victory to the oil and gas industry. If reappointed, he probably could persuade a majority in FPC to let the big oil companies set their own prices for gas. But the president knows Smith's record. His reappointment would appear to be impossible."

ADA wired Truman: "Reappointment of Smith would give executive support to his ideas and would offset to a large extent the past work of Leland Olds and the veto of the Kerr bill."

The point is that what the gas interests wanted from the Kerr bill can in large measure be given to them by decision of a majority of the power commission. And now the commission is set up so that just that is likely to happen. Picture of a Fair Deal: the labor-liberal wing gets the Kerr bill veto; the gas interests get Smith. The consumer is likely to get it in the neck.

Morality

ADA has issued a hot blast against Reader's Digest. The magazine printed a condensed version of John T. Flynn's "The Road Ahead," now being pushed as the bible of every big-business and profascist outfit in this country, which vituperatively assails the liberal organization. The ADA sent a reply and Reader's Digest refused to print it.

Max Eastman, one of the editors of Reader's Digest, is still waxing indignant about the "immorality of the Bolsheviks" from which he saved himself only in the nick of time.

God Save the Queen

A Canadian Stalinist Mack writer has dissolved in tears of indignation at the unconscionable exploitation of workers practised by U. S. imperialism. The worker specifically bemoaned by Tom Mc-

Even the CP's Pacific Tribune

is—Queen Mary of England, who is patriotically going to auction off her hand-made carpet for dollars.

"It took the 82-year-old queen eight years to make it," he laments. "Had a Communist proposed this sordid exploitation of an aged queen, what a howl to high heaven would have gone up from the professional scribblers."

Defending U. S. imperialism is the last thought in our minds, but we expect that the poor queen will manage to get the full value of her labor in dollars. It is to be doubted that she needs a union.

Even Rankin

Even Representative John Rankin of Mississippi now has to protest that he is not a "red" and that "no man in either House of Congress has fought communism harder than I have."

The occasion for this avowal by the deep-dyed reactionary, anti-Semitic, labor-baiting and Negro-hating congressman are insinuations which have appeared in the Hearst press that Rankin favors "socialism"—because he is in favor of TVA.

Peep Into Future

Liberal columnist Marquis Childs, in the midst of an attack on "some" ex-Stalinists as still power-hungry characters, casually mentions that:

"At the outbreak of a third world war the 55,000 Communist Party members in this country would immediately be put away in camps or at any rate placed under strict surveillance. So would a certain number of Communist allies and fellow travelers."

Childs refers to this in so off-hand a manner only in order to make the point that "the exes, or some of them, would have the satisfaction of seeing their enemies behind barbed wire."

That's very nasty of "some" of the exes. Now how about the people who will be setting out the barbed wire?

Economy

Senator Forrest Donnell of Missouri is a rabid labor-hater and a fervent advocate of government economy. In both capacities he has been leading the Congressional Record with anti-labor articles from the reactionary press, 30 pages in one week.

That week's bill cost the government \$2500, just to print the foul stuff.

Semanticists and Russia

Lysenkoism Breeds Second Thoughts in the Movement

By DANIEL WELSH

One of the interesting characteristics of the Russian official mind is its virtually complete disregard for world public opinion, particularly among those intellectual circles which are frequently attracted to Stalinist causes and front groups in Western Europe and America. By carrying out systematic purges against "foreign" tendencies, the regime continually alienates fellow travelers who are not too interested in the political and social crimes of Stalinism but who react negatively against accepting Stalin's pronouncements as the ultimate in omniscience.

Some of the sidelights of the recent "discussion" among Russian biologists exemplify this. This discussion was of a type long familiar to victims of Stalinist argumentation and neither better nor worse than previous ones. The biological controversy, however, marked the first time that the party had seriously interfered in the natural sciences to the extent of making a certain scientific theory official state doctrine and proscribing all others as counter-revolutionary. Needless to say, such an attitude has nothing in common with the Marxist view of the role of science, nor with the practices of the Russian Revolution under Lenin.

The outcome of the controversy has been to elevate from obscurity the teachings of the Russian plant-breeder T. D. Lysenko and make them unassailable. The imposition of Lysenko's views on the whole of Russian science has served considerably to lower the latter's reputation in the eyes of non-political scientists in the capitalist countries. Some have utilized the opportunity to break their perhaps embarrassing ties with Russian scientific societies and journals. Others, less inhibited, have used this event to demonstrate "scientifically" that free science is incompatible with "socialism," that is, Stalinism.

Tended Toward Pro-Russian View

A more interesting development came to light in a recent issue of ETC, the official organ of the International Society for General Semantics.

General semantics, for those unfamiliar with this journal, may be briefly summarized as a doctrine designed to further scientific thinking about problems. This is combined with an emphasis on the correct use of language for the communication of meaning. Apart from the claims they make for their method, general semanticists have frequently succeeded in making quite interesting analyses of social doctrines and documents. For example, ETC's review of the President's Civil Rights Report of 1948 was a masterful exposé of the commission's whitewashing of Truman's responsibility for Jim Crow in the administrative apparatus.

We are not here concerned with a general critique of the political ideas of semanticism, except to note that for people who claim to think

scientifically, semanticists have always had difficulty in arriving at a very accurate picture of Stalinism. It would certainly not be correct to say that ETC was ever a Stalinist organ or the ISFGS a Stalinist front group, but the attitude of some prominent semanticists has certainly been equivocal.

S. I. Hayakawa, editor of ETC, has been a featured speaker at meetings of the Progressive Party. And two years ago the associate editor, Anatol Rapoport, wrote a critique of dialectical materialism in which he identified Stalinism with Marxism, crediting the former with the Russian Revolution and "a well-organized working class in the Continental countries which may still be able to resist the coming wave of reaction."

It was clear from this and other statements that Rapoport certainly did not look with any particular disfavor on Stalinism, in spite of the fact that he took dialectical materialism severely to task for insisting that "the principal theme of history has been and is a class struggle," and criticized Lenin for "misunderstanding" Marx, the intellectual grandfather of general semantics.

Lysenkoism Opens His Eyes

It took the "Lysenko controversy" to open the eyes of semanticist Rapoport to the defects of Stalinism, although to be perfectly fair he had indicated an awareness in his previous article of the existence of certain deficiencies in Russian life. In the Winter 1950 issue of ETC he contributes a lengthy review of Conway Zirble's *Death of a Science in Russia*, a collection of articles, speeches, etc., written while the discussion was in progress. He summarizes his conclusions as follows: Russian scientists "have decided (or were forced) to abandon the basic tenets of rational evaluation on which scientific method rests—open-mindedness, objectivity and the critical attitude."

It is not the outcome of the discussion which causes this harsh judgment, it is the manner in which it was carried out. Rapoport cites some of the characteristics of Stalinist argumentation which have now entered the field of scientific discussion.

(1) "Soviet biologists indulge in labeling proudly, profusely and recklessly and take all the intellectually disastrous consequences of such behavior. . . . This preoccupation with labels seems a natural consequence of an obsession to discredit rather than refute an opponent."

(2) The thing which quite rightly horrifies Rapoport the scientist is that "not a single report of a single controlled experiment was produced at the conference of the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Science to shed light on the question presumably under discussion. . . ." Instead, it appears, Lysenko exhibited a tomato plant bearing both red and yellow fruit and claimed that this was evidence for the hereditary transmission of acquired characteristics.

Anti-Stalinists Will Recognize This

(3) Next mentioned is the Stalinist penchant for citing questions from accepted authorities "whether the quotations have any bearing on the subject or not." (Emphasis Rapoport's.) Needless to say, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin figure prominently as authorities. Rapoport does a good job of ridiculing the practice of using Engel's arguments against Malthus to lend support to Lysenko's doctrine.

(4) Rapoport proceeds to dissect the manner in which emotional labels such as "saboteur" are invoked against opponents of Lysenko. Since the truth of Lysenko's doctrines would presumably increase by vast amounts the productivity of Russian agriculture, to oppose Lysenko is equated with opposing the expansion of agriculture. This is next in line with—

(5) Discrediting and disabling opponents by appeals to charges of immorality. In order to refute an opponent who had studied the effects of a war-ravished environment on the process of natural selection, Lysenko charged him with social irresponsibility "implying that during the

great cataclysm of war Professor Dubinin could be so indifferent to the emergency as to spend his time worrying about how the war affected the hereditary mechanism of fruit flies."

(6) Finally, Rapoport mentions that administrative measures of one kind or another appear to have been taken against scientific opponents of Lysenko's doctrine.

Political opponents of Stalinism will readily recognize the practices which Rapoport cites with such indignation as characteristic of Stalinism everywhere. Such a statement might appear to Professor Rapoport as an "unjustified generalization," yet trade unionists and others who have come into contact with them know that Stalinists are at all times prepared to resort to slander, misrepresentation, etc., in order to carry their viewpoint.

While Rapoport indicates some knowledge that "after the purges of 1937-38, virtually all free discussion of political matters ceased (at least in public)," he has not up to now considered this of sufficient importance to outweigh attempts to "bring about greater understanding" between Stalinism and capitalism. Indeed, in his previous article, he considered it desirable that the two systems continue to live side by side, and sought to accomplish this by "strengthening communication." It is obvious that it is this basic acceptance of the desirability of the status quo which allowed semanticists like Rapoport and Hayakawa to accept the political role of Stalinist fellow traveler, at least in its Wallaceite version.

"Semantic Cretinism"?

The Lysenko affair has served to prove to Rapoport that there is not much hope left for Russia. "The last hope of intellectual understanding with Russia, on the basis of objective, clearheaded rationality of science, is vanishing." Yet the conclusion which he draws is that "we may still try to establish communication with the non-Soviet Communist world," by which he means Stalinist China. It would seem that this is a case of what semanticists would call "not recognizing the proper delineations of propositions." Others might call it a case of "semantic cretinism."

We feel that there must be basic inadequacies in a theory which can be so wrong about the content of Stalinism. Yet in general semanticists, because they do believe in the rational procedures of science, have shown a willingness to discuss with others and subject their own ideas to criticism. More than that, they have shown themselves to be opposed to all political and social developments which tend to hamper the free development of scientific and political ideas. As such they can be real help in the fight for academic freedom and civil rights.

Insofar as Rapoport is representative of semanticists, he has shown that he can learn about Stalinism. It may be significant that the same issue which carried his recent article also pokes fun at the Stalinist Civil Rights Conference in New York for voting down a resolution calling for presidential pardon to the 18 defendants in the Minneapolis case. For their part, socialists owe to general semantics a more thorough treatment of the latter's viewpoint than they have yet undertaken.

Read the Socialist press abroad!

Confrontation Internationale

The International Marxist Discussion Review

La Batalla

The Newspaper of the Spanish POUM

The Socialist Leader

Weekly Organ of the British ILP

Vpered

Voice of the Ukrainian Anti-Stalinist Underground

Subscribe through Labor Action Book Service
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

N. Y. Teachers Fight for Pay Raises Against O'Dwyer—Get the Business and a Red Scare

"The meeting of the High School Teachers Association representatives on Friday [June 21] was one of the liveliest ever held by that group," reports the New York World-Telegram and Sun on June 5.

By a vote of 136 to 18 the representatives voted to "continue the cessation of voluntary after-school activities (which began on April 17) until their demand for a \$600 raise is granted."

More than a month has now passed since the headline-making news about the marches on City Hall staged by New York high school students. The charges then made that the students had been egged on by their teachers or misled by "subversive elements" have been forgotten or even (occasionally) repudiated by the very ones who made them. Nothing more has been heard of the "investigations" threatened, upon orders of the mayor, by the president of the Board of Education and the superintendent of schools.

A turning point, at least temporary, in their tactics came after an unprecedented brawl in the newspapers between board president Maximilian Moss and Superintendent William Jansen. On May 22 Moss, in what the New York Times described as an angry "rebuttal," declared that Jansen "should issue whatever direc-

Not a Single Blush

Mayor O'Dwyer, one of the nation's outstanding "Fair Deal" Democrats, thereupon rushed to the support of his mouthpiece Moss and regretted that he himself could not intervene in the crisis, since such action on his part would lead to charges of political interference. He observed that Moss serves on the board without pay and had merely been asking "the paid people to go to work." On the other hand, he saw no objection to allowing Jansen to try a little diplomacy with the teachers. If Jansen could get the teachers "to go to work by reasoning with them, this is a better way of doing it."

The effect on the teachers of this and a number of similar bright statements by the mayor and Moss may be imagined.

Within a few days Jansen's approach was given a try. Jansen, Moss, and O'Dwyer announced that if the teachers resumed all extracurricular activities immediately, a fact-finding committee would be appointed by the Board of Education; that this committee would consist of members of the board and "representative citizens"; that the committee would study salary adjustments AND the availability of funds.

Welched on Promises

Moss and Jansen stated that the mayor was in "sympathy with the teachers' problems and deplored the fact that the fiscal condition of the city prevented immediate relief. His proffered assistance for the future was indeed encouraging." In other words, the proposed fact-finding committee and the teachers were told in advance that facts could be found—but no money, at least not for the coming year.

The Teachers Guild (AFL) and the Teachers Union (a Stalinist-led unit of the United Public Workers) immediately urged teachers to reject this proposal. But Jansen was counting on the leaders of the High School Teachers Association. This organization has long been noted for its conservatism. It does not indulge in membership meetings but functions through a board of representatives chosen by members in the various high schools. According to all reports, few teachers are interested in becoming delegates, with the result that delegates are virtually self-appointed. As for the top officials of the organization, teachers generally look on them as persons who

are necessary to re-establish his control over the high schools."

The Times story continued: "The board president charged that the public would be shocked to learn the extent to which some of our high schools are run by committees of five. The committees to which Mr. Moss referred have been set up by the teachers in most schools to decide what constitutes extracurricular services and to determine what activities come under the ban."

Jansen promptly rallied the support of his eight associate superintendents and on the next day replied that he would not use his "administrative authority unless every other method of reaching a solution has failed." He explained his "soft" attitude by stating that "to be worth anything, extracurricular activities must be carried on by willing and enthusiastic teachers."

Moss promptly backed them, finding that he had no public support whatever. There were protests against his statement not only from organizations of teachers but also from such groups as the powerful United Parents Associations. So he explained that the statement had been made merely in the interest of "frank, open discussion" and not intended as "a rebuke—it was just a call to action."

But He's Sympathetic

There must have been protests from the audience, for the mayor said:

"I see a young lady saying that I raised my own salary [from \$25,000 to \$40,000]. I have no apologies for that. I have to live. I raised the salary to what I thought it ought to be. If you want service, you have to pay for it. I haven't a single blush for that one."

The effect on the teachers of this and a number of similar bright statements by the mayor and Moss may be imagined.

Within a few days Jansen's approach was given a try. Jansen, Moss, and O'Dwyer announced that if the teachers resumed all extracurricular activities immediately, a fact-finding committee would be appointed by the Board of Education; that this committee would consist of members of the board and "representative citizens"; that the committee would study salary adjustments AND the availability of funds.

Welched on Promises

Moss and Jansen stated that the mayor was in "sympathy with the teachers' problems and deplored the fact that the fiscal condition of the city prevented immediate relief. His proffered assistance for the future was indeed encouraging." In other words, the proposed fact-finding committee and the teachers were told in advance that facts could be found—but no money, at least not for the coming year.

The Teachers Guild (AFL) and the Teachers Union (a Stalinist-led unit of the United Public Workers) immediately urged teachers to reject this proposal. But Jansen was counting on the leaders of the High School Teachers Association. This organization has long been noted for its conservatism. It does not indulge in membership meetings but functions through a board of representatives chosen by members in the various high schools. According to all reports, few teachers are interested in becoming delegates, with the result that delegates are virtually self-appointed. As for the top officials of the organization, teachers generally look on them as persons who

go along with at least some kind of action. The teachers were clearly not appeased when the mayor retreated a little and took \$7,000,000 from the fund for school repairs in order to give high school teachers \$250 and others \$150.

(2) The high school teachers were particularly aggrieved. Before the war they were able, after 15 years of regular service, to reach the aristocratic salary of \$4500 a year. No increases at all were granted during the wartime years of mounting inflation. Between the middle of 1945 and the beginning of 1947, teachers finally achieved raises of \$900, giving high school teachers on maximum salary 20 per cent more than in 1939, as compared with a cost-of-living jump of about 70 per cent. Many teachers, especially men, took extra jobs after school.

Elementary and junior high school teachers, who before the war could reach maximums of \$3390 and \$3830 respectively, were granted practically the same maximums as high school teachers by a state law of 1947, which established the so-called single salary scale. These teachers, while they have passed many resolutions in favor of the single salary schedule and adequate increases for ALL teachers, are naturally less heated about the salary situation than the high school teachers.

(3) The high school teachers have in extracurricular activities a weapon which is available to other teachers to a far lesser degree (and sometimes not at all). This weapon had a trial run early in 1950 and was shown to possess some effectiveness. At that time many special teachers (health education, art, homemaking, etc.) were threatened with several extra teaching periods a week.

But He's Sympathetic

Thus the leaders of the HSTA have gathered a numerical membership and a degree of rank-and-file support that has not been theirs for years. But this support, however it may be criticized for viewing the struggle from a too narrow self-interest has been very militant and extremely suspicious of the HSTA leadership.

Jansen was counting on the leaders of the HSTA to put over his fact-finding proposal. They did try most earnestly, one of them even tearfully, according to newspaper and other accounts. The Times (June 3) reported,

"Scattered cries of 'sell-out' and derisive laughter were heard after . . . the association's legislative representative disclosed that . . . Mr. O'Dwyer had said that he was sympathetic with the teachers' salary demands."

"Mr. Saunders declared that Superintendent of Schools William Jansen 'also agrees with our case' but . . . did not see any possibility of an increase of more than \$300 this year and perhaps another

among those missing: (1) All teachers were resigned to accepting the Board of Education's meager proposal of a \$300 raise for everybody and were considerably jolted when the mayor eliminated it from the budget. (2) They were infuriated when board president Moss rushed into print, after the mayor had decided that \$150 and \$250 increases could be granted after all, to express on behalf of the teachers "heartfelt thanks" to the mayor for his benevolence. (3) Two days after this, Governor Dewey, with the prior assent of O'Dwyer, signed a bill fixing the salaries of all supervisors at a level 30 per cent above that of 1939. For the superintendent of schools this meant an increase of \$7,500—from \$25,000 to \$32,500.

The situation is, of course, extremely perilous for the teachers. They face the problems of (1) their own internal divisions, (2) the weakness of their leaders, (3) intimidation by the school authorities. But they have learned some lessons and taught some lessons already, and they will learn and teach some more.

In the midst of the salary fight, the Board of Education also launched an "anti-Communist" campaign, marked by the suspension of eight teachers on charges of Communism and by a board resolution refusing to have any further dealings with the Teachers Union as an organization. But the school officials have not succeeded in using a "red scare" against the teachers' drive. The witchhunt assault on academic freedom in the New York public school system has not worked for that purpose.

On the other hand, most teachers outside of the Teachers Union have not given credence to the Stalinists' claim that the board's steps are simply designed to eliminate the "best fighters" for the welfare of the teachers.

But in a recent election to the Teachers Retirement System, the Teachers Union candidate came very close to defeating his only opponent, an incumbent teacher representative on the System. The Union's man, although backed by no other organization, enjoyed a good reputation for his stand on pension problems. The other candidate had been active in backing O'Dwyer for re-election last fall and was considered not to have been very vigorous in defending the economic interests of teachers in pension matters. In the high schools, the union candidate had a clear majority.

Apparently the high school teachers of New York are asking themselves at this time, "What organizations and what candidates will get us the economic gains that we are after?" They then proceed to judge, each situation for itself and, given the lack of one strong organization embracing all the teachers, follow anybody who they think will get them what they want.

On the other hand, most teachers outside of the Teachers Union have not given credence to the Stalinists' claim that the board's steps are simply designed to eliminate the "best fighters" for the welfare of the teachers.

But in a recent election to the Teachers Retirement System, the Teachers Union candidate came very close to defeating his only opponent, an incumbent teacher representative on the System. The Union's man, although backed by no other organization, enjoyed a good reputation for his stand on pension problems. The other candidate had been active in backing O'Dwyer for re-election last fall and was considered not to have been very vigorous in defending the economic interests of teachers in pension matters. In the high schools, the union candidate had a clear majority.

Apparently the high school teachers of New York are asking themselves at this time, "What organizations and what candidates will get us the economic gains that we are after?" They then proceed to judge, each situation for itself and, given the lack of one strong organization embracing all the teachers, follow anybody who they think will get them what they want.

On the other hand, most teachers outside of the Teachers Union have not given credence to the Stalinists' claim that the board's steps are simply designed to eliminate the "best fighters" for the welfare of the teachers.

But in a recent election to the Teachers Retirement System, the Teachers Union candidate came very close to defeating his only opponent, an incumbent teacher representative on the System. The Union's man, although backed by no other organization, enjoyed a good reputation for his stand on pension problems. The other candidate had been active in backing O'Dwyer for re-election last fall and was considered not to have been very vigorous in defending the economic interests of teachers in pension matters. In the high schools, the union candidate had a clear majority.

Apparently the high school teachers of New York are asking themselves at this time, "What organizations and what candidates will get us the economic gains that we are after?" They then proceed to judge, each situation for itself and, given the lack of one strong organization embracing all the teachers, follow anybody who they think will get them what they want.

On the other hand, most teachers outside of the Teachers Union have not given credence to the Stalinists' claim that the board's steps are simply designed to eliminate the "best fighters" for the welfare of the teachers.

But in a recent election to the Teachers Retirement System, the Teachers Union candidate came very close to defeating his only opponent, an incumbent teacher representative on the System. The Union's man, although backed by no other organization, enjoyed a good reputation for his stand on pension problems. The other candidate had been active in backing O'Dwyer for re-election last fall and was considered not to have been very vigorous in defending the economic interests of teachers in pension matters. In the high schools, the union candidate had a clear majority.

Apparently the high school teachers of New York are asking themselves at this time, "What organizations and what candidates will get us the economic gains that we are after?" They then proceed to judge, each situation for itself and, given the lack of one strong organization embracing all the teachers, follow anybody who they think will get them what they want.

On the other hand, most teachers outside of the Teachers Union have not given credence to the Stalinists' claim that the board's steps are simply designed to eliminate the "best fighters" for the welfare of the teachers.

But in a recent election to the Teachers Retirement System, the Teachers Union candidate came very close to defeating his only opponent, an incumbent teacher representative on the System. The Union's man, although backed by no other organization, enjoyed a good reputation for his stand on pension problems. The other candidate had been active in backing O'Dwyer for re-election last fall and was considered not to have been very vigorous in defending the economic interests of teachers in pension matters. In the high schools, the union candidate had a clear majority.

Apparently the high school teachers of New York are asking themselves at this time, "What organizations and what candidates will get us the economic gains that we are after?" They then proceed to judge, each situation for itself and, given the lack of one strong organization embracing all the teachers, follow anybody who they think will get them what they want.

On the other hand, most teachers outside of the Teachers Union have not given credence to the Stalinists' claim that the board's steps are simply designed to eliminate the "best fighters" for the welfare of the teachers.

But in a recent election to the Teachers Retirement System, the Teachers Union candidate came very close to defeating his only opponent, an incumbent teacher representative on the System. The Union's man, although backed by no other organization, enjoyed a good reputation for his stand on pension problems. The other candidate had been active in backing O'Dwyer for re-election last fall and was considered not to have been very vigorous in defending the economic interests of teachers in pension matters. In the high schools, the union candidate had a clear majority.

Apparently the high school teachers of New York are asking themselves at this time, "What organizations and what candidates will get us the economic gains that we are after?" They then proceed to judge, each situation for itself and, given the lack of one strong organization embracing all the teachers, follow anybody who they think will get them what they want.

MacArthur and CP--

(Continued from page 1)

To drive it underground is to deprive a significant section of the Japanese nation of its elementary democratic rights.

Of course, it is a joke to speak of democracy as long as a country is ruled by a foreign armed force. Yet there are degrees even in jokes. In addition to making a real mockery of democracy through the repression of the Stalinists in Japan, it is not at all certain that MacArthur's policies will not work to their advantage in the long run.

Sooner or later more and more Japanese are bound to want an end to the occupation. But if the

Stalinists are the only ones who dare to denounce the occupation, whether legally or illegally, they will tend to gain the support of more sections of these people.

Democracy in Japan cannot be achieved by suppressing the Stalinist totalitarians. It cannot be achieved by an occupying army

which places the old ruling class back in power. It will be achieved by a democratic struggle of the Japanese people against the Stalinists, the ruling class and the occupation, or it will not be achieved at all.

All three are enemies of real democracy in Japan.

Get it EVERY week!
A sub to LABOR ACTION
is only \$2 for 1 year

If You're—

- Against capitalism
- Against Stalinism
- For a Socialist Democracy,

You belong with the—

INDEPENDENT
SOCIALIST LEAGUE

You should read—

Max Shachtman's
"THE FIGHT FOR
SOCIALISM"

For information and literature, write to:
Independent Socialist League
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

California: Labor Props Fair Deal --

(Continued from page 1)

cause of her record in Congress and her platform. She called for public housing, the 150 acre water limitation in the Central Valley, civil rights and civil liberties, and she opposed the Taft-Hartley Law.

Lack of support from her own party organization, which favored "Man of Distinction" Boddy, caused her campaign to bog down during the last month, but nevertheless Douglas captured the Democratic nomination over both Boddy and Republican Nixon by almost 300,000 votes. So strong was her labor support that in the five metropolitan countries—Los Angeles, San Francisco, Alameda, San Diego and Contra Costa—she polled up almost a 200,000 plurality. Then when every major agricultural county came out for her as well, her nomination on the Democratic ticket became overwhelming.

James Roosevelt, in challenging Warren's third-term bid for governor, faced even sterner opposition in the California Democratic Party. Supporting Fair Deal politics but refusing the aid of national Fair Deal politicians, Roosevelt's backing of Eisenhower in 1948 plagued him throughout the campaign.

His alleged deal with Truman not to run for the presidency in 1952 probably accounts for the absence of a real Democratic opponent in the California race. But at best the bosses only gave him cold comfort, the Malone forces in San Francisco reportedly sabo-

tagging the election entirely. Roosevelt's campaign also reached financial collapse in the pre-election weeks.

So Roosevelt too turned to labor. He plastered Warren's inept administration with a "do nothing" label, because it failed to meet rising unemployment, because it refused to back low-cost public housing, because it straddled on the 160-acre water limitation, and because it just mouthed words over FEPC. Roosevelt appealed to the unemployed by pointing to the State Employment Service as a police board rather than a job-finding agency. He tried to corral the thousands of California pension votes by calling for \$100 per month old-age pension. He attempted to win veteran support by a vague and at times demagogic veterans' program.

In all he succeeded by winning the California trade-union movement, which found itself in the difficult spot of having endorsed Warren for governor in 1946 and then having repudiated him two years later as a vice-presidential candidate.

The state leaders of the labor movement thus met Roosevelt half way, and they endorsed him officially, although Lundeberg of the Sailors Union of the Pacific, the Kearny forces in the CIO Longshoremen's Union and other local union organizations continued to play ball with Warren. Roosevelt's Democratic victory, therefore, was not as marked as Douglas's, his majority being somewhat over 200,000. San Francisco County alone of the union concentration

areas failed to give him a majority and only two major agricultural counties went to Warren on the Democratic ticket.

California primaries carry more political weight than those in most states, for in California "cross" or "double" filing by candidates is permitted. Many politicians, usually incumbents, have thus been able to become nominees for two or more parties, and the need for a general election has to that extent been minimized. Candidates listed as incumbents on several party ballots without showing their party platform responsibilities have therefore held a distinct advantage over challengers.

CASE OF HOWSER

Most of the other labor-supported candidates also were victorious, the outstanding one being John Shelley, former head of the State Federation of Labor, who won the Democratic and Republican nominations for congressman in the Fifth District (San Francisco). An effort was made by the AFL in the Seventh District (Alameda County) to defeat reactionary Congressman Allen and resulted in preventing a cross-filed victory for Allen by nominating Cook on the Democratic ticket.

The necessity of the trade-union movement to select and endorse its own candidates on an independent labor ticket became most obvious in the case of Attorney General Fred Howser.

Howser, whose record since he entered office in 1946 revealed ties with state-wide tideland oil companies, liquor interests, gam-

bling interests and other racketeers, was defeated on both the Democratic and Republican tickets. But not before he received a state trade-union endorsement! So disreputable was this action on the part of the State Federation of Labor that local labor councils in some instances were compelled to steer away from Howser to support Pat Brown, the Democratic candidate, who was nominated.

Since 1936 California has been viewed as a Democratic state because in each of the four national elections the state supported a Democratic presidential candidate. Moreover, California registration totals show more Democrats than Republicans. For example, the figures stand now at approximately three million Democrats to two million Republicans.

Yet for the past fifty years Republican governors have ruled the State House backed by Republican Legislatures. The only exception was during the years 1938-42, when the lone Democratic governor, Olson, won, but was confronted by a hostile Assembly and Senate and was ousted four years later. The fact that leading state offices come up for election in the off-years when national presidential elections do not occur has been of immeasurable aid to dominant Republicans.

This year, however, factionalism has begun to seep into the Republican Party. After the primaries Warren was openly criticized by the Republican San Francisco Chronicle for not campaigning properly to defeat his opponent, Lieutenant Governor Knight, right-wing Republican mogul, now threatens to sit out the November election. Labor organizations which previously threw all or most of their weight to the Republicans have shifted away. Consequently the strong popular returns for Republican candidates in the June 6 primary may not be as indicative as they appear.

LABOR SAVED IT

The November election will significantly put Douglas, who stands opposed to the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities, against one of the witch-hunting authors of the Mundt-Nixon bill and a member of that committee. Nixon, who won the Republican nomination for Senator hands down, amassed an approximate fifty thousand greater combined vote than Douglas. But the likelihood of a Douglas victory in November is great, particularly if labor continues to intervene and actively undertakes a push-bell

New York: Fair Dealer's Record --

(Continued from page 1)

sult of habit; the New York City congressional delegation is mostly strongly pro-Fair Deal and thus in almost complete agreement with the current political program of the labor movement. Senator Lehman, up for re-election for a full term, has become one of the special prizes of the labor press since he took his place on Capitol Hill this year.

Yet the Democratic strength is weaker in New York City than for some time. The record of the new O'Dwyer administration is remarkably bad—which does not prevent the continued, but less warm, allegiance to it of all branches of the labor movement except those affiliated with the Liberal Party or the Stalinists. The recent racket and gambling exposure have hurt a little, but such items are minor. The inventory of the acts of the O'Dwyer administration, as best represented by its chieftain, provides an obvious explanation of why last November's strength has undoubtedly been sapped.

CITY WORKERS SOAKED

O'Dwyer received probably his most active original support from one union, Michael Quill's CIO Transport Workers. Since the election, all of this union's demands for wage increases, working-condition changes, etc., have been turned down; an investigating committee has recently recommended a "compromise" on the union demands, to be met by a fare increase for surface transportation. But the memory of O'Dwyer's casual attitude toward the transport workers remains, and it is likely not to be forgotten even by Quill.

The O'Dwyer administration flatly refused any raises for most city employees, while voting handsome salary increases for top administrators. To make it that much worse, O'Dwyer personally defended both acts in the most blatant and vulgar fashion, claiming that he and his colleagues would regard it as a personal affront if they did not get their raises. Welfare Commissioner Hilliard cut individual relief allotments, followed by a

cheap burlesque of how he and his family could "get along" on what was given the relievers. As some observer explained, his little play-acting scheme did not include any mention of the large liquor supply in his closet.

Most dramatic of all was the O'Dwyer attitude toward the teachers. He offered them a very small salary increase, far below their demands; understandably, all teachers' organizations rejected it. When high school teachers announced they would not contribute to school extracurricular activities without a pay raise, many high school students participated in the well known demonstrations at City Hall, for which they were alternately attacked as "subversives" and "hoodlums."

As part of the struggle with the teachers, the leaders of the Stalinist Teachers Union, the most powerful of the teacher unions in the city, are being driven out of the school system. One of its members was dropped from her job because she was identified as a CP member a few days before she would have completed her probation, which would have compelled a formal trial. Now many of the leaders of the union, with full tenure, are up on dismissal charges for "insubordination" because they refused to answer questions on CP affiliation. This is not just another part of the cold-war drive against the Stalinists. It comes too close to the running battle of the city administration with all the teachers organizations to fail to appear as a convenient method for hitting the most vulnerable of them.

O'Dwyer's political associates will be backed for election to Washington and Albany by the labor movement, even by the ILGWU and the Millinery Union, despite the call of the President of the latter, Alex Rose, for a new political formation. Most of them have "perfect" Fair Deal records, and even O'Dwyer can claim the same type of politics. It is therefore assured that the Democratic delegation to both Houses of Congress from this area will be at least as large as

last time. In addition, there may again be a Democratic governor in the state, whether Dewey runs or does not. The labor movement will see to all of this.

But the actions of the local administration present a promise for the future. The break with the Democratic Party may exist in miniature on a local level soon, even if not too officially. The Liberal Party is in a perfect spot to utilize the growing antagonism toward O'Dwyer and company, and it has done so. But, its type of independent criticism of the Democratic machine is vitiated by the fact that it so completely allies itself with the national and state organizations. It is to be hoped that the local break will logically lead to a national schism within the near future.

Michigan: What's the Line? --

(Continued from page 1)

Outside of this deviation from the normal political activity of the UAW-CIO, which consists of supporting Fair Deal Democrats, the coming elections will see the UAW putting out maximum efforts to re-elect Governor "Soapy" Williams. His popularity with labor was again recently demonstrated when he appeared at the Michigan CIO convention. The 800 delegates showed their only enthusiasm at the convention during Williams' appearance. Since Williams must buck a powerful Republican majority in both houses of the state legislature, his task of appearing as the champion of the workingman and the small farmer is relatively easy to fulfill.

Although even the AFL of Detroit and Michigan supports Williams, his re-election was not expected because of the inner-party Democratic Party struggle (Williams is considered a Johnny-Come-Lately of the ADA variety) and because of the reaction to the Chrysler strike. But the GM contract has eased up the criticism of the UAW in small-business circles and in the counties, and things look better for Williams.

Condensed from a talk delivered by radio news commentator A. Garber over radio station KPFA-FM (Berkeley, Calif.). Garber may be heard by residents of the San Francisco Bay area over this station every Thursday evening at 7:45-10:45 megacycles.

door to door campaign as it did in 1948.

Roosevelt, too, although five hundred thousand votes behind the combined popular total for Warren, stands a fair chance of entering the governor's mansion. If Roosevelt in addition to maintaining and increasing his labor support makes his peace with Truman and active Democratic support comes to California, the Warren-Knowland forces will have a neck and neck race on hand.

More important than all these maneuvers on top is the fact that city and agricultural workers are beginning to show signs of political unrest and are seeking some vague solution to unemployment, excessive taxes, lower living standards and general insecurity.

Labor's bolstering of a dying Democratic Party—in view of this last circumstance—carries with it heavy political meaning. Without trade union support in this last primary, the Democratic Party would have gone down to an ignominious defeat worse than in 1946. Republican crossfiling would have ripped it to splinters.

If, on top of that, the labor movement had proclaimed its own independent political organization, the Democratic Party in California would have died completely, its right wing passing silently over to the Republicans and its liberals willy-nilly having to support labor's choice.

No other state trade-union movement had the opportunity of creating a clean-cut two party system dividing capital and labor in this same way. By one bold sweeping political stroke labor could have recreated the situation on a statewide scale that existed in England just prior to May 1945. It still will have this chance in the next few years.

As it is the Democratic Party can only get along as a thin coalition of Fair Dealers, conservatives and reactionaries which only electoral strength is given to it by the mass of mobilized labor. The tragedy in California politics is that everybody but the trade-union leaders knows that the Democratic Party lives only by labor's sufferance.

lessons, but that's what the line has been.

On the other hand, the choice of Democrats in the 16th District (Lesinski's) is such that the futility of supporting one of them in terms of having a labor spokesman in Congress stares everyone in the face. Thus the discussion for a UAW man to run for Congress.

Lest anyone think that this picture of Michigan labor politics which we outline is somewhat confusing, we can only say that this is precisely how it is. And our estimate is that it will get more confusing before it clarifies itself. For the essence of the Reuther policy in this period is to probe around, by way of crassly opportunistic maneuvers, to find a formula which will increase the political strength of the UAW and the national prestige of the Reuther leadership. It goes without saying that any major moves for a third party based on labor are out, at least for the coming period. At the same time, with economic struggles pushed into the background by the long-term contracts, involvement into more and more politics has become an inexorable process.