

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 21, 1952

FIVE CENTS

**THE ATOMIC ENERGY INDUSTRY:
ITS IMPACT ON CAPITALISM**

... page 6

The Socialist Party's Dilemma

... page 5

The 82nd Congress Dribbles Out

... page 2

UAW Political Strategists In Search of a Coat-Tail

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, July 13—The selection of General Dwight Eisenhower and Russell Nixon as Republican candidates in the presidential election came as a distinct surprise and disappointment to labor leaders here, notably in the United Automobile Workers (CIO). For it upset their political calculations and estimates and served to emphasize the weakness of their political position.

As a matter of public record, Emil Mazey, UAW secretary-treasurer, speaking before a CIO state convention, had assured the union movement that Eisenhower could not beat the "old guard." As late as last Tuesday visitors to Solidarity House, UAW international headquarters, were given the view that Taft would win in Chicago.

It was another case of the wish being the father of the thought. For the selection of Taft by the Republicans would have "solved" the political problem for the CIO leadership this fall. There is no question but that genuine rank-and-file enthusiasm, not to speak of fervor among the leaders, would have pre-

vailed in the anti-Taft campaign—something that the auto industrialists knew as well as anyone—and this was not the least of the reasons why C. E. Wilson and Henry Ford and part of the Chrysler crowd began wearing "I Like Ike" buttons four months ago.

Once Liked Ike

Parenthetically, about the only persons who took the neutrality of the Michigan Republican delegates seriously were some desperate Taft managers. The Republican Party here is controlled lock, stock and barrel by the auto companies, and its delegates from Summerfield down depend on the auto industry for their living.

(Continued on page 4)

CHANGING OF THE GUARD AT THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

Ike Choice Leaves GOP Party of U.S. Reaction

By MARY BELL

Never in history has a political convention received so much publicity in all the media that reach eye and ear as the one which nominated General Eisenhower for the presidency of the United States and Senator Richard Nixon as his second in command. We do not doubt that as much or more attention will be centered on the Democratic convention.

One of the reasons was the big factional controversy. Another was the appeal of the new medium, television, which had been used to such political advantage in the Senate Crime Committee hearings and which became an issue between the contending factions of Republicans.

More important, however, was the new role of the U. S. in world affairs as leader of one of the two contending blocs of nations for world power and influence. Thus international attention was centered, as it had never been before, on a U. S. political convention.

What gave an added emphasis was a widespread feeling engendered by the newspapers—which nevertheless now have a solid reputation of reflecting accurately the sentiments of the nation's electorate—that this might be the year for the Republicans. With Truman's decision not to run, the corruption scandals that have rocked his administration,

the reactionary political mood of a large section of the country, the choice by one faction of the Republicans of a popular national hero as their candidate, and the last-ditch determination of Senator Taft, it looks as though the Republicans have a greater chance this year than in the past few elections. Of course, the Republicans have looked rather good in the recent two elections up until the time of balloting.

This was the first time that a credentials committee hearing, if barred to television, had nevertheless been made public to the press. If Americans and the world saw and heard more of this election than any previous, it still did not see and hear the essence of things; that which determined which way the delegates would cast their votes, even though most people are now aware that this essence is the smoke in \$100-a-day suites in the Hilton Hotel, where the political bosses bargain over power, patronage, office and the spoils of office, jobs, careers and influence.

DEWEY SQUEEZE

The "Texas Steal" made front-page headlines because the Eisenhower men cleverly chose it as an issue, trapped the Taft machine with it and fought it on the convention floor to victory. It revealed the bureaucratic, steam-roller antics of the Taft forces adequately, exposed the stand-pat policies of his faction and helped him to lose the nomination. Even so, Eisenhower was able to win because he had a powerful machine on his side.

It is known that Eisenhower's supporter, Governor Dewey, reminded his New York state delegation of his "long memory" plus his two and one-half years to go in office. Privately he said much more. According to the Alsops in the N. Y. Herald Tribune, "He pointed out to them exactly how many jobs had been allocated to each of their districts. He did not trouble to point out that these jobs were mainly occupied by their friends, co-workers or even relatives, because they knew this already. He just told them, in plain terms, that there would be new job-holders in those jobs within two days after his return to Albany if the dissident delegates went on being dissident. That way, he held New York (Turn to last page)



EISENHOWER

Anti-Franco NY Mass Rally On Tuesday

NEW YORK—An anti-Franco mass meeting, on the anniversary of the outbreak of the Spanish civil war in 1936, has been called by the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims in New York City.

"For sixteen years the Spanish people have not ceased fighting fascism," the committee reminds us in its announcement of the rally.

Our protests can win, it points out. "At a court-martial of 27 unionists held in Barcelona on July 4, the court refused to impose the heavy sentences demanded by the prosecutor, who said: 'We mean to continue to defend our regime whether they like it outside Spain or not.' This incident, reported in a Reuters dispatch, proves that our protests are bearing fruit. But they must continue if the terror is to be halted."

The mass meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 22, at 8 p. m., at Labor Temple, 242 East 14 Street (near Second Avenue).

Among the speakers so far announced are A. J. Muste, Michael Harrington of the Catholic Worker group, Samuel Friedman of the Socialist Party, General Asencio of the Spanish Republicans, and Roland Watts of the Workers Defense League.

The Revolution Comes to Whippany

The Township Committee of Whippany, N. J., has got the shoe on the other foot, and it's pinching. The metaphor is as confused as the town elders feel.

They feel, in fact, as if they've gone Through the Looking Glass with Alice, and everything is turned rightside left.

For example, everyone knows that when there's a strike on, the police commissioner is supposed to give the strikers the butt end of the club and protect the scabs down to their last tear-gas bomb.

But what happens when the police commissioner is not only one of the strikers but a chief steward in the union local?

To go back to the beginning of this story, there's a strike on in Whippany by the CIO Paper Workers. Nine hundred men walked out of the Whippany Paper Board Company last August. Police Commissioner Alfred Ellis (head of the 5-man police force) is chief steward of Local 297.

Police Commissioner-Chief Steward Ellis has stoutly defended himself against the charge that he favors his union. "Since the strike started I haven't picketed once," he said. "I've been strictly on the sidelines."

That's just the trouble, say the town fathers in effect. It seems that they'd even prefer to see him on the picket line. From his police sidelines (they say), Ellis stopped ten scabs from entering the plant and then "stood idly by" while the strikers educated the men who were only trying to do their patriotic duty by taking the bread out of the mouths of the unionists.

After that, Ellis (since he was dutifully staying away from the picket line) took the

scabs to the county jail and held them there several hours without charges. This is against the rules. Only strikers are supposed to be cooled off without charges.

Furthermore: while the scabs were being held, Chief (of Police and Stewards) Ellis spent his sideline time investigating the origin of a pistol which he had found in the middle of the road at the plant. The town stepfathers thought he was overdoing this middle-of-the-road business.

Sheriffs also are supposed to uphold Law and Order. Instead, say the paper company and the Township Committee, the local sheriff has "consistently been friendly with the strikers." They even accuse him in an affidavit of "aiding and abetting the strikers."

This clearly undermines the very foundations of the American Home and Family. Everybody knows that sheriffs are supposed to be friendly with paper mill owners. The sheriff, it seems, is quite A. Ladd—to be exact, Arnold B. Ladd.

To round out the picture of a peace-loving community fearfully beset by the forces of subversion, the township committee even has a Fifth Columnist, none other than its own chairman. He's brother-in-law to the union local president.

So the embattled Township Committee has called on the governor to provide state troopers for the peace and protection of all law-abiding members of the community who own paper mills and who turn down demands for a 16-cent wage raise.

For the sake of All That We Hold Dear, let us hope and pray that the state troopers do not turn out to be Police Commissioner Ellis's nephews.

"COMMUNIST" CHARGE USED AS—

UAW Bars Five From 600 Ballot

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, July 10—The top leadership of the United Auto Workers (CIO) this week barred five minor officials of Ford Local 600 from running in unit elections on the grounds that they were "members of the Communist Party or subservient to the Communist Party."

A spokesman for the five, which includes Paul Boatin and Nelson Davis, charged that Walter P. Reuther was a "dictator" for the action, and said he would appeal the decision to the next convention of the union. The spokesman, Dave Moore, is a well-known Negro in Ford Local 600 who defends the CP viewpoint on all occasions.

The UAW executive board took the action under a constitutional provision which bars CPers from holding union office. There is no question of the constitutionality of the action. This will undoubtedly be the chief argument in support of the Reuther leadership's actions in barring the five officials from running for office. After all, the officers of the international union are sworn to uphold the constitution, aren't they? But the same constitutional provision was allowed to remain a dead letter for ten years!

The local union itself had once turned down a report of the local union trial committee charging these five with being Communists.

Sign of Weakness

The action of the Reuther leadership, viewed from more basic grounds, is a sign of weakness in Ford Local 600. In spite of an administrator-ship of nearly three months, the Reuther forces have not been able to make a serious dent in the anti-Reuther character of Ford Local 600. Very few informed persons in UAW circles doubt that a general election would result in another triumph for the anti-Reuther forces, no matter what position Carl Stellato, incumbent president, took. He is today still the recognized symbol of the anti-Reuther forces.

Once upon a time, the militant and dynamic qualities of the Reuther leadership would have won any serious contest for the votes of the rank and

file in local union elections. How times are changing is illustrated not only by the situation in Ford Local 600—which remains strongly anti-Reuther—but in a victory that the Reuther forces won.

At Briggs Local 212, the stronghold of Emil Mazey, the pro-Reuther slate headed by Ken Morris won every post. But what surprised UAW circles was the fact that a virtual unknown, Joe Williams, polled 5,500 votes to Morris' 7,000-odd votes. And the Mazey forces barely squeezed a majority on the executive board of that local union.

Court Reverses State Dep't Passport Policy

An important victory against the State Department's passport curtain was scored in a federal district court last Wednesday, July 9, when a three-judge decision ruled that the government can revoke a passport only after a hearing.

The State Department has consistently maintained that it possesses completely arbitrary and uncheckable powers over the granting of passports to American citizens who wish to go abroad. A number of recent cases have thrown a grim spotlight on the extent to which this claimed power has been used to shut the doors on some prominent personalities, as well as ordinary people. The specific case decided by the court in Washington, D. C. was that of Anne Bauer, a writer. Her passport was revoked after she had already sailed. As usual, the State Department authorities gave no explanation, except that her "activities are contrary to the best interests of the United States." This is the usual formula. Miss Bauer fled suit, from abroad, arguing that she had been denied due process of law and attacking the constitutionality of the passport law.

The court upheld the constitutionality of the law but ruled that the State Department had misused it. It ordered the government either to renew the passport or give Miss Bauer a full hearing on why it was revoked.

BACKDOWN ON PAULING
Since the text of the decision is not yet available, an important point is not yet entirely clear:

"Forum"

A new issue of *Forum*, discussion and information bulletin of the Independent Socialist League, is out. It contains an article by William Stanley and James Thompson, of Berkeley, entitled "The Leninist and Shachtman Positions on Imperialist War." *Forum* may be obtained through the offices of the ISL, at 15 cents a copy.

By L. G. SMITH

The 82nd Congress has finally gone into history. It remained true to its nature to the very end. In a frenzied rush in its closing hours it went down the line for the big lobbies, while killing just about any and all measures which might benefit the people. Perhaps the only exception to this was the passage of a bill which raises pensions for the aged by \$5 a month and makes certain other minor improvements in social security legislation.

A run-down, which appeared in the *Michigan CIO News* for July 10, on what Congress did and didn't do appears in the accompanying box.

Of course, the CIO newspaper confines its comment on the foreign policy record of Congress to the paragraph headed "Mutual Security Program." Although it is true that Congress materially slashed the funds which had been requested by the administration for its various foreign projects, the one field in which it has more or less carried out the administration's program is that of foreign relations. During the past year the Senate has ratified both the Japanese peace treaty and the contractual agreements with Western Germany. In general, it has backed the military and allied programs of the administration all over the world.

whether the decision would apply not only to cases of revocation but also of denial of passports. Initial summaries of the decision would indicate that this distinction would not be involved. Since the court based its finding on the lack of a hearing, its argument would apply also in case no passport is granted at all.

The American Civil Liberties Union hailed the decision warmly, and urged Secretary of State Acheson immediately to revise the procedure of his department to conform with it.

There need be little doubt that it was because of this court decision that the State Department, a week later, reversed its stand on denying a passport to Dr. Linus Pauling, the head of the Chemistry Department at Caltech. It has now granted him a "limited passport," limited to Britain and France and with a deadline, but even this only after demanding a non-Communist affidavit.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, published July 23:

- A World Apart, by Gustav Herling. Mentor, 256 pages, 35 cents.
- Southways, by Erskine Caldwell. Signet, 144 pages, 25 cents.
- Sabotage, by Cleve F. Adams. Signet, 144 pages, 25 cents.
- A Grove of Fever Trees, by Daphne Rooke. Signet, 176 pages, 25 cents.
- The Young Lovers, by Meyer Levin. Signet, 144 pages, 25 cents.
- The Loved and the Lost, by Morley Callaghan. Signet, 192 pages, 25 cents.
- The Green Hills of Earth by Robert A. Heinlein. Signet, 176 pages, 25 cents.

Don't miss a single week of **LABOR ACTION**
A sub is only \$2 a year!

Congress: A Record of Reaction Everything for the Rich, Nothing for the People

Only the famous "Point Four" program has remained a starved orphan of congressional action, despite the fact that the labor movement has insisted that this is the "positive" line which America must take in fighting Stalinism abroad.

ORPHANS

Further, this Congress has spent more time and money investigating various matters than perhaps any previous one. And the same general reactionary tendency displayed in its legislative record was naturally also evident in most of its investigations. Both the House and the Senate have had investigations going full blast, the major effect of which

has been to raise the "anti-red" hysteria in the country to new heights.

It is true that these committees confined themselves primarily to uncovering Stalinist influence in various sectors of American society. Actually, however, their major effect has been to add to the atmosphere of intolerance on the one hand and to the intimidation of all dissenting opinion on the other.

The record of the 82nd Congress is not a pretty one. The whole labor movement is unanimous in denouncing it. But such are its own political policies that it can do very little to ensure that the 83rd Congress will be any better.

The 82nd Congress

What It Did—

PRICE CONTROLS

Passed a "fraud on consumers" economic controls bill that guarantees still higher profits through further inflation of prices to business while keeping wages frozen. The inflated prices brought on by the Capehart, Herlong and Butler-Hope Amendments enacted in 1951 are estimated to cost consumers more than \$35 million.

HOUSING

Virtually wiped out the public housing program by reducing the number of units authorized from 75,000 to 35,000 for all succeeding years, despite urgent needs of defense workers. At the same time lifted federal rent controls from all but areas declared "critical."

TAXES

Passed a "tax-the-needy, spare-the-greedy" tax law that places big tax increases on low incomes and lets incomes over \$50,000 and corporations off with small hikes. After voting only a 5 per cent increase in the normal and surtax rates of corporation profits (individual income taxes under \$50,000 went up at least 11 per cent), it gave the corporations back most of this hike by making an unprecedented "gift" exempting them from paying the higher rate during the first three months of the year.

BUDGET

Despite record tax hike on poor and needy. Congress wrote so many loopholes into the tax law that it didn't raise enough to balance the budget and the government went in the red for the first time since 1946. It used phony cries of "economy" and grandstand hatchet slashes on key appropriations bills to cover up the fact that its favoritism to the rich and corporate interests meant it couldn't balance the books.

IMMIGRATION

Passed over President Truman's veto "Iron Curtain" immigration bill which imposes new restrictions on aliens and citizens alike, subjects them to thought control, and will work undue hardship on millions.

TIDELANDS

Voted to give to three states, and through them to the oil and gas interests, rich natural gas and oil deposits belonging to all the American people and worth more than \$40-billion. In doing so it rejected proposals that the income from this resource be used by the federal government to improve educational facilities in all 48 states.

And Didn't Do

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Failed to provide adequate funds to permit the U. S. to live up to commitments made at the Lisbon Conference for the building up of military and economic resources of friendly nations abroad. At the same time, slashed appropriations for U. S. armed forces to a point where military leaders say American security is threatened.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Passed up what is probably its last opportunity to participate with Canada in developing the St. Lawrence Seaway, despite the fact that the joint project would have cost taxpayers nothing and brought untold benefits to the nation.

MONOPOLY

Took no steps to check widespread growth of monopoly which both the Federal Trade Commission and congressional committees warned was one of the dangerous results of defense spending. Continued many legislative loopholes benefiting big corporations despite corporation profits after taxes last year of nearly double the average for 1942-45.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Took no action on FEPC, anti-lynching, anti-poll-tax or anti-filibuster proposals, and shelved proposals for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska and home rule for the District of Columbia on racist grounds, despite the fact that congress knew Communist cold war propaganda would make effective use of its failure to act.

LABOR

Did not repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, which the American people repudiated when they elected the 81st congress to replace the 80th which enacted it, but voted instead to recommend that the President use T-H against the CIO Steelworkers, despite the fact that the union voluntarily postponed its strike longer than the 80-day period specified in the law.

FLOOD CONTROL AND CONSERVATION

Did nothing to promote the Missouri and Columbia Valley Authorities, despite serious floods along the former and a critical Northwest power shortage caused by a dry spell along the latter. Instead, merely poured hundreds of millions of dollars more into the patch work program on emergency repair and piece-meal dam construction.

NAACP Lays Plans to Mobilize Negro Vote

By KATE LEONARD

Around 500 delegates, a goodly number of them representing Southern branches, attended the 43rd annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People which was held in Oklahoma City, June 24 through June 29.

As reported in our last article in LABOR ACTION (July 7) the main item on the agenda of the convention was the organization's consideration of its political activity for the coming year, with the coming presidential election looming large.

The NAACP announced that this election year is "the year for penalizing and throwing out of office those who have been poor custodians of the public welfare." As a result of this stand taken by the NAACP some heads will certainly fall in local elections in the Northern states, come the November elections. However, at the national level, the NAACP is in no position to carve a deep and long-to-be-remembered notch in the civil-rights gun.

The organization is adamant that it will lend support only to a candidate whose record and program are "straight" on civil-rights issues, and it is putting pressure upon the Democratic Party to run a Fair Deal candidate upon a Fair Deal platform. The convention showed that the association is prepared to support the Democratic Party nationally in the presidential election, provided only that the party does not retreat from its civil-rights platform of 1948.

This will not properly repay the do-practically-nothing 82nd Congress, nor will it repay the current administration which betrays so flagrantly in public the fact that it moves not one whit farther or faster than it is forced to move on "this hottest of domestic issues," the civil rights program.

CRITICAL WORDS

The NAACP convention buried the hatchet against President Truman, not of course that they had ever really unshathed it against the president. The association in the last 2 years has leveled criticism against the Dixiecrats, he cottoned to the Dixiecrats, he took his own sweet time, etc. The 43rd convention was quite protective about him. Just in case President Truman again runs for office, his candidacy would be more than acceptable to the NAACP.

Notwithstanding, the convention called upon President Truman to restrict the loyalty program to "the security-sensitive agencies of the government." Also in the report upon the NAACP's campaign in the field of housing, the federal government itself came in for sharp criticism. Roy Wilkins accused banks and mortgage companies of being major blocks in the drive for nonsegregated housing and accused the federal government of directly encouraging them with U. S. funds in their discriminatory policies.

One aspect of the organization's political activity as reported to the convention is heartening. The NAACP has played a significant role in the campaign to increase the Negro vote within the South.

THE 2 MILLION

As of this year, the vote in the South is approaching 2,000,000. As yet for the most part, the Negroes in the South can only choose between Democrats, but this does not altogether nullify their vote. Quite correctly, the NAACP has stressed the importance of voting as a tool in improving local conditions. Also, the right to vote—a basic democratic right—can be established in the South only by voting, a courageous act, and in sections of the South a defiant act. This year's convention added a new note to the propaganda for registering and voting.

Speaking to this point on the agenda, Clarence Mitchell, head of the NAACP's Washington Bureau, illustrated the impor-

importance of increasing the Negro vote as follows: "In four of the seven counties of Alabama's First Congressional District, the colored people outnumber the white population. In one of the four, colored people outnumber whites, 9 to 1." The ratio of Negroes to white people in the South is the basic reason for disfranchisement. It also explains the present-day Tillmans and Vardamans, and the ease with which they and their kins' kin are returned to office, ad infinitum.

OUTSTANDING JOB

The small electorate also explains the low level of Southern political life, and that strange phenomenon, the "Southern liberal" who has such difficulty in passing for a liberal out yonder. Mitchell's words were a refreshing public treatment of a phase of Southern political life which is usually given the hush-hush treatment. The Talmadges can read the threat contained therein. The threat is for them, but for no one else.

LONDON LETTER

Yalu Issue Cuts into Ranks of Attlee Group

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, July 8—Two very important developments took place within the precincts of Westminster last week which may have some bearing on the outcome of the great debate on foreign policy which is now engaging the ranks of the Labor Party.

The first was, of course, the debate on the Yalu bombing raids. The reaction of the Labor members of Parliament to the timid motion of censure drawn up by the party's front bench was very strong. It appears that the Morrison-Attlee wing is now in a weaker position than ever.

Little prominence has been given in the press to the interesting realignment of personalities within Parliament on the Yalu issue. Among those who voted with Bevan were Michael Stewart, former parliamentary secretary to the Ministry of Supply, and Blenkinsop, former parliamentary secretary to the Ministry of Health. Both of these men are right-wingers, and their defection marks the weakening of the Attlee-Morrison "reign" within the Labor Party.

The *Daily Telegraph* of last week noted with concern the large number of abstentions on the vote within the parliamentary group of the Labor Party; it commented on the new current belief that Attlee will be resigning at the end of the parliamentary session from the leadership of the party.

STRACHEY ON YALU

The second development arose out of Lord Alexander's "indiscretions" at the Canada Club about the conduct of the Korean war. Shinwell, of the Labor Party, made a fiery attack on the Tory front benches, denouncing Lord Alexander's implied affront to Parliament in that he had deemed it fit to express an opinion to the Canada Club which Parliament had no claims upon. It seems that the Tory cabinet is top-heavy with lords who can't keep their mouths shut. Over the weekend, John Strachey publicly associated himself

Both the NAACP report for 1951 and the convention stressed that the outstanding work of the last year was the campaign against segregation in education, climaxed by the court cases involving the elementary public schools in Clarendon County, S. C., Prince Edward County, Virginia, Topeka, Kansas, and Wilmington, Delaware. Just prior to the convention the U. S. Supreme Court agreed that in the fall of 1952 it would hear arguments on two of these cases, the Clarendon County case and the Topeka case. In bringing these school cases the NAACP raises the question whether segregation of white and Negro children is constitutional, basing themselves upon the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

WEDGE

There are distinct advantages for the NAACP in the fact that these two cases have finally reached the hearing stage in the Supreme Court. In the Topeka school system segregated schools exist only from the sixth grade down. This fact is an entering wedge. In the Clarendon County case in a lower court, Judge Waring dissented from the majority decision that segregation was not unconstitutional. (The Virginia case was similar to the South Carolina case, but with no dissenting opinion.) At the same time, the NAACP is testing in

the federal courts Georgia's law that if the Supreme Court or any other court orders the admission of Negroes to the school system, all state educational funds will be cut off. This case is the petition of Horace T. Ward, seeking admission to the University of Georgia Law School.

PRO-LABOR

The outcome of these cases will determine the association's tactics in the fight against segregation in education and temporarily the NAACP proposes to tread water in this area. One reason for this must be that the cases as presented cover the legal technicalities well. Another, of course, is that legal attack is costly, and test cases therefore must be limited in number. The convention announced that the organization plans to push ahead in its legal attack against segregation in transportation, public gatherings, recreation.

The convention passed the usual progressive resolutions, involving rent and price controls, government health insurance, an increase in the federal minimum wage to \$1 an hour, etc. The NAACP has registered in the liberal pro-labor column for a long time now.

Walter Reuther, UAW president and vice-president of the CIO, addressed the convention. Basically the labor movement in the U. S., on this question of civil

rights is at the same place as it was following the publication of the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, *To Secure These Rights*. At that time American labor was in the position of having to say, "This is our report, too—Carey was on the committee." Labor men of the future looking back on these days will say, "What an opportunity lost! Couldn't they see that they muffed the ball?" Had *To Secure These Rights* indeed been labor's independent program for the nation, we today would be nearer to those men of the future, and the movement for civil rights today would be stronger, wider, deeper.

NOBLE PROMISES

Such are the facts of life that Reuther at this convention was pretty much limited to saying, "The moral issue in the 1952 presidential campaign must be the mobilization of every decent American in an all-out crusade to square American democracy's day-to-day practice with its noble promises in the field of civil rights."

If every last union in the U. S. had its house in order on the race question, these words would be more effective. Had Reuther spoken in the name of a labor party—not yet on the scene in 1952—his speech would have been just fine.

a classical socialist society. So runs his argument.

ISSUES FOR OCTOBER

This point of view is now becoming fashionable in certain circles. The mixed economy is here to stay; all that is needed is a bit of patchwork here and there when we, the Labor Party, return to power. What these people seem to forget is this: It is all very well to have a "mixed" economy, as Bevan rightly pointed out at the Fifeley rally, but what we have to be sure about, is who is doing the mixing.

The Labor Party conference in October will grapple with these many issues. The first issue is that of the fundamental basis of Labor thinking. Is it to be founded on a class approach or a nondescript "ethical" approach? Are we to have "good Anglo-American relations," or are we to have good relations with the labor movements of the world? and finally, if we are to have a mixed economy during a transition period, how much of the mixture is to be socialist and who is to do the mixing?

The answers to these questions will not necessarily be given by Aneurin Bevan. These questions, however, will find the proper context in which they should be posed, as they get linked up with the Bevanite wing of the Labor Party. "Bevanism" as a movement is the road back to power for the British workers. "Bevanism" is also the track along which British Labor will have to march if it is to make certain that we have socialism in our time, in Britain, Europe and the world.

The BEST recent book on the labor movement—

"The UAW and Walter Reuther"

by Irving Howe and B. J. Wildick \$3.00 Random House

Order from: Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

Marxism in the United States

By LEON TROTSKY

35 Cents. Order from Independent Socialist Press 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed, or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

INTERESTED? Get Acquainted

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE.....

STATE TEL.....

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00

One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

NEW RENEWAL

Bill me. Payment enclosed.

NAME

ADDRESS

APT.

CITY

ZONE STATE.....

CONTRAST

TORIES POINT UP DIFFERENCE FROM U. S. ANTI-RED HYSTERIA

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The Tory government in Britain has set an example with regard to the civil liberties of Stalinists which might well be pondered and copied by the liberals in this country.

The case involves Dr. Hewlett Johnson, the so-called "Red" Dean of Canterbury. Johnson has just returned from one of his regular trips to Stalinland. He has infuriated all non-Stalinist sections of British opinion by proclaiming that the charge that the United Nations forces in Korea have resorted to bacteriological warfare has been proved to the hilt. Petitions were circulated to remove him from his post, or at least to institute a parliamentary investigation looking toward his removal.

The leaders of the Conservative Party in both houses of Parliament have rejected these proposals as a danger to civil liberties. Lord Salisbury, Tory leader in the House of Lords, made a pointed comparison with the way such matters are being handled in the United States when he said that prosecution of the dean might do more harm than good, that the government could not contemplate special legislation that might lend color to the Stalinist charges that the dean was being persecuted, or "encourage that type of witch-hunt which we have seen to our regret in other countries recently."

The Archbishop of Canterbury also rejected any action against Johnson on the grounds that he was neither guilty of heresy nor of any illegal action. He asserted that the dean is "free to hold what view he likes." He said that the dean must be endured until he breaks some law or becomes a menace to public safety. Now he is not a menace, but "a public nuisance."

Speaking along the same lines, Lord Salisbury pointed out that the dean has violated no law of the country or of the church. "He has not been drunk in the pulpit, he has not pawned the church vessels and he has not been guilty of an immoral action," he said.

Speaking in the House of Commons, Churchill took a similar stand. "Free speech," he said, "carries with it the evils of all the fool-

ish, unpleasant, venomous things that are said but on the whole we would rather lump them than do away with it."

The contrast between this attitude and the practices which are accepted in the United States by many liberals and conservatives alike is striking indeed. It must be remembered that, since the Church of England is an "established church," he could be removed by action of Parliament.

In this country it has become the accepted practice to remove from office both in public and private employment people who can be identified as Stalinists. Resistance to this practice still exists as far as certain sectors of private employment are concerned. Recently the United Automobile Workers handled the grievance of two auto workers who had been fired subsequent to the congressional investigation of Stalinist activity in the auto industry held in Detroit. The two workers were reinstated by a decision of a referee.

NO HYSTERIA

This action was certainly to the credit of the UAW. But it stands out as an exception to the prevailing practice. As far as government employment is concerned, the Truman administration has instituted the "loyalty" and "security" program under which it is sufficient to demonstrate that there is a "reasonable doubt" as to the "loyalty" of any government employee for him to be fired from his job. And the definition of "disloyalty" who has been stretched to apply to anyone who has been a member of or "sympathetically associated" with organizations or members of organizations on the notorious attorney general's list of subversive organizations.

Hewlett Johnson is an open, avowed, vocal Stalinist sympathizer. He has used his office to advocate the Stalinist line on almost every question imaginable. He has been a considerable asset to the world Stalinist movement due to his influence among well-meaning, religiously-inclined, middle-headed people. The Tory government is not defending his civil liberties because they have any sympathy with his views. It has taken its present stand because the U. S. type of anti-red hysteria is still alien to the British people.

Get ALL your books from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

We specialize in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement and Marxism.

Write for our free book list: all the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky; labor history; socialist fundamentals; economics of capitalism; Stalinism and Stalinist Russia, etc.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 29 July 21, 1952

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of **LABOR ACTION** at that address: Telephone: WATKINS 4-2222.

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, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL
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.

WORLD POLITICS

SPECIAL CONVENTION OF INDIAN SOCIALISTS ON POLICY

A special convention of the Socialist Party of India, held at Pachmarhi on May 23-27, adopted a new policy resolution on the basis of the experience of the last national election.

The first section deals with relations with other parties. "This Special Convention of the Socialist Party affirms that the party shall not confuse its identity by coalitions or fronts with the Congress [Nehru's party] and Communist Parties and directs its members so to behave that its features become sharply distinguishable and the message of socialism is clearly heard."

While opposing such "unprincipled alliances," it projects the possibility of alliances with semi-

radical groups among the many that exist on the Indian political scene. It rejects, however, "parties that base themselves on communalism." I. e., Moslem-Hindu antagonism.

Special attention is given in another section to the problem of land for the peasants. Clearly the Socialists have been concerned by successes of the Communist Party in attracting support from peasants through their campaigns. They demand the equitable distribution of the land, but emphasize that they favor only non-violent action in a "nation-wide peaceful movement in order to achieve as soon as possible this objective." Gandhi's ideology is still very powerful in Indian SP thinking.

At other points, side by side with this emphasis on non-violence, the policy statement seeks to stress the need for militant and radical action.

The Special Convention particularly hailed "the decision to hold the first Preliminary Congress of the Asian Socialist Parties at Rangoon in November 1952." It expressed the hope that "this coming together of Asia on the popular level will usher in an era of united effort to build up a new civilization of social and spiritual equality, democracy and freedom, and decentralized economic and political power, and will give an organized expression to the ideology and policy of the Third Force."

UAW Strategists

(Continued from page 1)

The selection of Eisenhower creates a more embarrassing and complex situation for the CIO leaders. On record is the fulsome praise of top CIO leaders to Eisenhower when he spoke at their convention a few years ago. On record is the fact that Walter Reuther joined the "Draft Ike" movement against Harry S. Truman before the 1948 election, something the Republicans remember.

Boomerang

There is the difficulty of basic agreement, or more exactly of servility, of the labor leaders on foreign policy. Reuther's plea as a CIO spokesman to the Republican platform committee that they oppose "isolationism" and understand that "the price of freedom is high," is something Eisenhower doesn't have to be educated about. He was a main architect of the Truman foreign policy in Europe.

Weathervane

But that was yesterday or the day before. Since then it seems that the national CIO, through the influence of New York CIO officials and with the encouragement of President Truman, has begun to swing itself behind Harriman.

This past week he returned to Detroit and got the full-course treatment of a real People's Choice. He mixed with the students at the FDR-CIO summer camp. The Michigan CIO president Gus Scholle came out for him, and he met with Reuther, the ADA people and got the endorsement of the biggest part of the AFL here.

In each case the UAW has been acting like a weathervane, shifting with the prevailing wind.

Harriman left Detroit with as close to a public blessing as Reuther could give. (After all, maybe he won't get the final nod and better not antagonize the other candidates.)

As a demonstration of his militancy Reuther furthermore did not rule out the possibility of a bolt from the Democratic Party if an unacceptable man is nominated or the wrong positions taken.

Tail End

Since the Michigan Democratic delegation is committed to Governor G. Mennen Williams and the UAW is part of that delegation, bound to follow Williams, Reuther's threat is not likely to frighten any Democratic Party bosses, especially since they know the UAW is by official action committed all the way down the line to the Democratic Party candidates in Michigan already.

If the rest of the CIO leadership is operating like the UAW leaders, the role of the CIO in the Democratic Party may be described for what it really is—the tail end. Their only difficulty right now is not knowing quite what coat-tail to cling to, until Truman gives the word.

The reason for this state of affairs is quite evident too. Both the CIO leaders and the Democratic Party leaders know that labor, with no independent party of its own, has nowhere else to go, no matter what happens at the Chicago convention; at worst they can sulk in their tents during the election fight. Committed to the lesser-evil policy, they are merely hoping for the best lesser evil. The great political weight which American labor possesses potentially will be mainly immobilized on the sidelines as the Democratic politicians choose "labor's friend" for it.

POSTSCRIPT ON THE SOCIALIST PARTY CONVENTION—

The Dilemma Before the SP: Clarification or Disintegration

By BERNARD CRAMER

A postscript on the recent Socialist Party convention (discussed in last week's **LABOR ACTION**) was provided on July 7 by the announcement of Maynard Krueger that he was resigning from the SP.

Krueger, at least up until recently, has been prominent in the leadership of the party; he was its national chairman from 1942 to 1946 and was its vice-presidential candidate in 1940. Perhaps more important, he has been very close to Norman Thomas. In this connection Professor Krueger informed his Town Hall audience (before whom he saw fit to reveal the news) that Thomas is of mind similar to his own, more or less.

Of course, Krueger does not speak for Thomas directly, and his action by no means necessarily indicates that Thomas will also formally resign at this time, or even after the presidential election in which the SP is running Hoopes and Friedman on its ticket. But it has also been no great secret, least of all to Socialist Party members, that Thomas' frame of mind is not very different from Krueger's as far as political views are concerned.

It was significant, for example, that when the party convention met in Cleveland, Thomas "went fishing"—that is, was on his trip through the Far East. It is not altogether likely that this was merely an unfortunate conflict in dates. Krueger did not attend the convention either.

Like Thomas, Krueger has been opposed to the party's running independent electoral tickets. He now makes it clear that what he is really opposed to is the party's existence. He thinks socialists should stop fooling around with their own organizations and associate themselves with the "liberal-labor coalition inside and just outside the Democratic Party." He wishes to liquidate the socialist movement into the Fair Deal.

Now it has been pretty obvious that this has been behind the sharp discussion in SP ranks on the question of electoral action. Formally it has been over "proper tactics." Actually it is over the party's existence.

PARTY AS ELECTORAL MACHINE

The fact that the debate over liquidation of the party takes this particular form in the SP is peculiar to that party. Electoral action becomes the central question in this regard because so many of the party members (including, it must be said, so many of them who consider themselves left-wingers in the present conjuncture) think of the Socialist Party as primarily an electoral device for pushing socialism.

On both sides of the question, the proponents find it hard to envisage a Socialist Party which does not run candidates. In agreement on this view of the party, the pros insist that candidates must be run, regardless; while the cons, having come to the conclusion that participation in elections on anything like the former scale is not worthwhile, simultaneously also come to the conclusion that there is no point to maintaining a Socialist Party.

This view of a socialist party as being nothing if not an electoral machine, albeit a socialist electoral machine, is one of the hallmarks of social-democratic reformism. Abstractly there is no reason why a genuine left-winger in the Socialist Party might not also be of the opinion that a presidential campaign should not be run; this truly is a matter of tactics and not of principle, the justice of the view depending on a concrete examination of what is to be gained in either case.

Less abstractly, there are two difficulties that a left-winger would face in coming to this conclusion. One is that the question has been subordinated to that of liquidation or preservation of the party, and an objective judgment, even if it could be made, is hard. The other is that any such conclusion would immediately raise the larger question to proportions that would require an immediate solution: If not electoral

activity, what then? Or even more accurately: If the Socialist Party does not "justify its existence" by running candidates, how WILL it justify its existence?

The answer to this question doesn't really depend upon elections at all: a socialist movement "justifies its existence" by its program and its propaganda and organization for that program, and this is just as true if one runs candidates or if one does not. The rub is this: without the electoral work, what would become completely intolerable is the big yawning vacuum where the SP program should be. The question of program would become unpostponable, immediate.

THE NORMAN THOMAS PROBLEM

It may well be that there is good reason for the Socialist Party militants to place their present valuation on electoral campaigns—the present writer has no opinion on that score—but the fetishism of electoral campaigns among some of the left-wing elements in the party is another matter.

Not only in the last analysis but—in the case of the SP—in the much shorter run, the fate of the SP will be decided on the basis of whether it has a distinctive program of its own, a genuinely socialist program on the questions of war and peace, and it cannot really continue to exist in any form for very long without it. From this point of view the departure of Krueger for greener fields is also a postscript on the recent SP convention.

We discussed last week the compromise at the convention which left it with virtually no position on the basic questions of war policy today. We mentioned that the compromise took the form of scarcely giving a mention to the Korean war, in order not to take a position. (Incidentally, a new installment of the SP platform, printed in the *Reading Labor Advocate* this week, shows another glaring recognition of the fact that there's a war on: it proposes "international control and formulation of policy on Korea and the Korean peace," but no view about the war.)

We understand that in the minds of some of the anti-war delegates (just how many there's no telling) this compromise on no-position is justified by the thought that it is better to let the Thomas pro-war wing drop away by sheer inanition than to "push them out" by insisting on a forthright position. A clear anti-war stand, they argue, might cause them to resign with a bang and a splurge, and it is particularly Thomas they have in mind, we suppose. Let us gloss it over this time again; they are on their way out anyway; let them slip away; we left-wingers will then take over; and then we can proceed to refurbishing the party program.

We are afraid that this approach to party politics, shrewd as it may seem to those who haven't tried it before, won't work. It doesn't work because, in the subsequent race between disintegration and clarification, the former is more than likely to win out. Elements like Krueger drop out; others of his mind hang on; more elements like Krueger drop out; but at what point does the Big Step take place? The result is more likely to be a gradual sliding downhill, without even the advantage of a clearer program as a compensation for defections.

HARD CHOICE

It would be easier for the Socialist Party to stand defections which take place because it has taken a meaningful position on something than to stand a disintegration which takes place on the background of political ineffectuality as well as organization losses. As Heine said in verse to a girl friend, "All this has happened before."

As in so many other cases, it is not a question of "political intransigence" for the sake of being merely "pure" and "principled" for its own sake. Arguments about "flexibility" and "tactics" would be quite out of place in this regard. Often enough, in the history of the movement, there has been good reason to make compromises on party positions. The collapse of the left-wingers at the SP convention was a mistake because it left them between two stools; and such a course, continued, will only mean: no program AND no party.

We are ready to believe that the big specter that stares the SP militants in the face, and stuns them, is the prospect of a thumping break with the party by Norman Thomas, because of the adoption of an anti-war line (if that is still possible); and that they do not want to seem to be responsible for precipitating such a break. It is a hard choice to make. We do not wish to seem to be cavalier about it; but it would be wise to fix some attention on the inevitable consequences of trying to string Thomas along by stringing along with Thomas.

The bigger danger for the SP right now is not the loss of Thomas but simply wasting away—not with a bang but a whimper." The mere adoption of an anti-war policy would by no means be a guarantee even of continued life; it could be a first step toward a new realignment of socialist forces with something to say to the people, unlike the Socialist Party at the present time.

Not in the Headlines

Recession?

The CIO's *Economic Outlook* says that an economic recession is likely in 1953 an 1954.

Production and employment will fall off, predicts the current issue, if consumer spending does not rise enough to offset the expected leveling-off in military spending and the decline in construction of new plants and equipment.

"There is no widespread backlog of pent-up consumer demand now as there was after World War II," the CIO said. "Consumers do not have any substantial liquid savings, as they did on V-J Day."

"There is no indication that business will change its pricing policies—to reduce prices that produce lower profit margins per unit—as a basic means of bolstering consumer buying power. And Congress has shown a disregard for price control despite the possibility of pressure on prices."

Love and Irony

A Los Angeles banker, just back from a European tour to contact foreign banks, has disconcerting news to report.

"We are loved and wanted as long as we sent money," the less money, the less love," said Paul E. Neuschaefer, vice-president of Union Bank & Trust (Los Angeles Daily News, July 11).

In Britain, if an election were held right now the Churchill government would be unseated by Labor, he predicted.

"The final bit of irony Neuschaefer noted... was that Americans are better received by their former enemies—Germany and Italy—than by their World War II allies," writes the interviewer.

SCREEN THE NEWS with LABOR ACTION
A sub is \$2 a year—Subscribe now!

S. F. Bay Area

LABOR ACTION Public Forum

Friday evening at 8 p.m. AUGUST 1

A Socialist Looks at the Republican and Democratic Conventions

Norway Hall, 3829 Piedmont Avenue (rear entrance)

OAKLAND

Admission free. Refreshments served

The New Atomic Energy Industry: Its Impact on Capitalist Economy

By V. H. DOVE

It is high time to study the impact of America's atomic-energy program on the economic structure of capitalism in this country.

Understandably, the main emphasis has been placed in the attention of the public, and also of socialists, on the significance of the atom bomb for the questions of war and peace, and it is right that this be so. The A-bomb shadows all foreign policy in the world and threatens the peoples with fantastic destruction in the war that is looming between the rival imperialisms of the Western and Stalinist war camps.

But behind the piling up of atom bombs in the United States is a new-born atomic-energy industry, developing with new forms and new consequences. A study of it, important as it is at this time, is made difficult and tentative by two considerations: it is, of course, young and just beginning; and it is shrouded in secrecy, so that the source materials are very limited.

Even so, some interesting phenomena are already apparent.

1. Acme of Monopoly

Congress, as well as the leading economic, military and political circles of the country, was evidently more or less aware of the significance of the discovery of atomic energy for American social life, and of the possible far-reaching consequences upon it, when the discussions began on atomic legislation.

Testimony given before the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy indicated the opinion of public officials that "we are standing on the threshold of a new and more far-reaching economic revolution than we have ever experienced," that atomic energy "carries with [itself] the potentialities for creating an entirely new standard of living for all mankind." [The Implications of Atomic Energy. Essays. St. John's University, 1950, pages 62-3. All italics in quotations are added.]

Dr. Arpad F. Kovacs of St. John's University evaluated the situation in the following way:

"There were two possibilities: If international control could be set up, then the immense energy now at the disposal of mankind could be used to develop the peaceful application of atomic power; if, on the other hand, international agreement could not be reached, then Congress had to legislate secrecy and monopoly into the act which was to regulate atomic energy. In the former case atomic fuel manufactured in the large war plants of the United States could be soon used to produce power in regions where other sources of power were non-existent, at great distances, or the difficulties of transportation made them unavailable. In the last case the deep-seated traditions of free enterprise and open competition of the American economy had to be disregarded, and a monopolistic, secret, socialistic island established in an economy termed and praised as the most liberal and most capitalistic in the world." [Ibid., page 100.]

"Profound Changes"

We need not discuss here why international control was not set up, and why the first course was closed. It was the second that prevailed, and congressional legislation was directed toward establishing that "island" in the economy of which Dr. Kovacs speaks. There is nothing "socialistic" about it, of course—except for people, like Dr. Kovacs and others to the right and left of him, who simply identify government control or monopoly with "socialism"—but it is certainly true that "deep-seated traditions" of capitalism have been affected.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 officially introduced

the new factor into the American economy with the following general statement:

"Research and experimentation in the field of nuclear chain reaction have attained the stage at which the release of atomic energy on a large scale is practical. The significance of the atomic bomb for military purposes is evident. The effect of the use of atomic energy for civilian purposes upon the social, economic, and political structures of today cannot now be determined. It is a field in which unknown factors are involved. Therefore, any legislation will necessarily be subject to revision from time to time. It is reasonable to anticipate, however, that tapping this new source of energy will cause profound changes in our present way of life." [Sec. 1-a of the act. The full text is available in James R. Newman and Byron S. Miller's *The Control of Atomic Energy*, McGraw-Hill, 1948, Appendix A.]

The act established the Atomic Energy Commission as a powerful government agency to enter the American economy with virtually unlimited monopolistic powers. It consists of five members, appointed by the president with the consent of the Senate. Their term is for 5 years and they are subject to removal "only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office." These commissioners determine policies and program. Their principal executive officer is a general manager, also appointed by the president.

Org Chart

There are six operating divisions of the AEC: Research, Production, Engineering, Military Application, Reactor Development, and Biology and Medicine. The staff divisions and officers are the following: Security, Organization and Personnel, Finance, Public and Technical Information Service, and the General Counsel. Much of the administrative work is delegated to the district managers of operations. There are at present about 8 managerial districts of operations.

In addition, three permanent committees function with the AEC: (1) a General Advisory Committee, of 9 members appointed by the president, advises the AEC on technical and scientific matters; (2) a Military Liaison Committee, of 8 members; (3) the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

This organizational chart indicates the picture of a centralized authoritative government agency with vast powers. It is completely independent in its decision-making from any direct public control; it is obliged to submit some regular reports about its decisions only to the president and the congressional Joint Committee; it is furthermore wrapped in secrecy.

And this institution, with this setup and character, is, by the very nature of its purposes and activities, an ECONOMIC institution.

In general, it deals directly with the production of atomic energy, and all the factors in this production—capital, labor, land, markets, prices, raw materials, etc. Besides, and this is most important among its characteristics, the AEC is the only owner of the means of production of atomic energy as well as of the product itself.

The economic powers of the AEC are:

- (1) All fissionable material is owned by the commission.
- (2) It owns all means of production of fissionable material.
- (3) It has under its sole jurisdiction all exportation and import of fissionable materials outside of the U. S.
- (4) None but the AEC may manufacture or utilize fissionable materials, except for their use in research or medical therapy.
- (5) Only the AEC may issue licenses for industrial, commercial or other non-military uses of atomic energy on a non-exclusive basis.
- (6) It is the only supplier of fissionable material and atomic energy.

Add to this two other considerations: it is financed directly and (up to now) only by the government; and it is the only customer interested in the supply of the specific raw material, i.e., uranium ores, and in this field it has no real competition.

Big Business

The AEC is, then, a complete economic monopoly, horizontally and vertically. It is, as we shall see further along, a unique and very peculiar monopoly.

In the hands of this monopoly is concentrated the power over "this new source of energy [which] will cause profound changes in our present way of life."

The AEC started business in August 1946 with an already solid foundation. The act of Congress transferred to it all the possessions of the so-called Manhattan Project, which had operated during the war under the War Department to produce the atom bomb. It thus gained three well-equipped plants and several laboratories; the plants were the Oak Ridge K-25 plant, which produced fissionable Uranium 234 by separation from U-238; the Hanford plant in Washington producing fissionable plu-

onium; and the Los Alamos plant in New Mexico producing the A-bombs.

From this beginning, by the middle of 1951 it had reached the following size: It had already spent close to \$4½ billion and intended to spend \$1½ billion more; directly and through contracts it employed a labor force of 309,000 people; it ordered the construction of three additional plants to produce fissionable material at Aiken, S. C., at Paducah, Ky., and at Amarillo, Tex., with a total investment of about \$2 billion.

Because of the complexity of the technological processes, the AEC has hired the largest and best staff of scientists and engineers in America. But this monopolistic industry is working under conditions of the strictest military secrecy, with concomitant internal discipline and authoritarian controls. These conditions overshadow the whole organization and the whole process of its development, and, as we shall see later, constitute a considerable obstacle for it.

This is particularly true for the scientist who is caught in the gears of this process. The scientist "must depend on the recognition of a very limited group and on the approval of his administrative bosses of the AEC, most of whom are not scientists. . . . Some of the leading U. S. men of science worry about the future, when the AEC may grow to be a clumsy bureaucracy in which the scientific elite will be over-all atmosphere which is predominant in the AEC's industry."

2. New System of Control

In practice, almost all of the operations of the atomic monopoly, which Dr. Kovacs mislabeled a "socialistic" island in the economy, are carried out by private industrial concerns and institutions which are under contract with the AEC.

The interrelations between the government monopoly and the private contractors represent one of the most interesting problems of the whole study, and point to some very significant changes in the economy.

First is the problem of financial control.

Given the fact that almost all of the operations of the atomic industry are carried out by private businesses, we can picture the AEC as an institution which stands on top of a structure of private industrial institutions and is united with them by legal agreements in the form of contracts. Contracts are not the only such links but they are the first and most formal. Through them the AEC manages, directs and controls the processes of production and other activities of the contractors.

Over 90 percent of all AEC expenditures go to the contractor operations. How does the AEC organize the distribution of this money among the contractors and how does it control the allocation of this capital by them?

On this subject we have the following official statement:

"A review of earlier financial conditions made it clear that the type of controls that sufficed for an emergency war undertaking or for a typical government service agency would not meet the needs of the atomic-energy program."

"The commission [AEC] has therefore undertaken to weld industry accounting and auditing methods with government budgetary and fiscal procedures. This is something new on the scale required for the atomic-energy program. Such a system provides tighter controls. It is designed to provide financial records that will assist the commission in gauging whether contractors are using materials economically, operating efficiently, and performing the tasks for which they were engaged." [U. S. AEC: *Atomic Energy and the Life Sciences*, U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1949, page 137.]

This statement tells us that one of the first consequences of the introduction of atomic energy into the economic life of the country has been to produce a new system of financial controls, hitherto unknown on such a scale under democratic capitalism. This system is not only a welding-together of the accounting methods used in governmental and private industrial procedures but, as we shall see, rather a system of subordination of private business to the government institution.

This system of financial control brought about a splitting-up of the unity of financial records of private businesses, which in its turn means at least a partial loss of financial control of private businesses over their own domain of independent industrial production. It is a direct interference by the governmental institutions in the terrain of private capital.

Something Different

Here is what the AEC officially says about the practical operations of its financial control system:

"Ninety-five percent of the commission's major cost-type contractors have set up accounts for their contracts that are integrated with the commission's accounting system. All accounts kept for the atomic-energy industry will be part of a single compre-

hensive system. . . . The integrated accounts and supporting documents maintained by contractors now record and control all funds and property used in the operation of their contracts and are completely divorced from the records of the contractors' other activities." [Ibid., page 138.]

The tightness of AEC's financial control can be judged from the following:

"The contractor is now financed by a monthly cash advance to provide working funds for the ensuing month. The contractor then submits reimbursement vouchers periodically which, instead of being supported by the conventional voluminous copies of vouchers and payrolls, merely refer to specific accounting records which are subjected to public-accounting-type audit at the site by AEC auditors. . . . This broader type of audit entails the examination and verification of the contractors' assets, liabilities, income, expenses and cost distribution as well as cash receipts and disbursements." [Ibid., page 138.]

This system of financing and auditing through book-keeping, as a matter of fact, is very similar to the system used in the state industry of Russia. Another aspect of this analogy can be seen if we recall the well-known Russian provisions for "protection of socialized property," as compared with the practices of private U. S. industry (during the war, for example) when charged with the operation of government property. In the latter case, no one could really control their accounting of costs or depreciation. Something different happens in the Atomic Age. The AEC reports:

"Substantial progress has been made in setting up financial controls over government-owned property as part of the new accounting system. The new property accounts replace the duplicate detailed records of property and materials formerly maintained without accounting control by the government and by the contractor. The contractor who has custody of the property is responsible for keeping property accounts, which are subject to the commission's audit. . . . The new industrial accounting methods which take into account depreciation and obsolescence of established capital assets will for the first time provide reasonably accurate costs of various atomic-energy activities and programs." [Ibid., page 139-40.]

This system of financial control by the AEC actually goes beyond the framework of the previous relations between government and contractor, beyond the mere framework of the contract. Something new is superimposed upon it.

3. The Planned Market

In the U. S. uranium ore has been discovered in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah. For 1939—the latest year for which there are such data—only 6,256 short tons of ore were produced. And only 59,269 pounds of pure uranium were extracted from this ore. [Newman & Miller, *op. cit.*, page 331.]

The demand for uranium jumped tremendously with the beginning of mass production in atomic fissionable materials. During World War II large sums of American capital were invested in the production of uranium ore in Canada and the Belgian Congo.

This export of capital, however, did not take place because the uranium resources of the U. S. were scarce. The first reason was the cheap colonial labor of the Congo. Big profits were made not only for the Americans but also for Belgium—which, because of these uranium profits, can still remain the country with the highest national income per capita in Europe. As for Canada, in addition to cheaper labor the reason was also the higher quality of the ore.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 gave the AEC full powers to stimulate and control the supply of the raw material. It did not expressly authorize the AEC to engage directly in the mining of uranium. This was presumably left to private business. But it was authorized to purchase or condemn real property containing deposits and "otherwise" to acquire supplies. The Senate Special Committee report stated that it was intended that the AEC should not "engage in mining operations in competition with private mining activity unless such operations are necessary to insure to the commission a supply of source materials adequate for carrying out its duties and responsibilities under the provisions of the bill."

In addition, the AEC "is authorized to conduct and enter into contracts for the conduct of exploratory operations, investigations, and inspections to determine the location, extent, mode of occurrence, use, or conditions of deposits or supplies of source materials, making just compensation for any damage or injury occasioned thereby." However, the act of Congress assumed that the "exploratory operations" may be conducted by the AEC "only with the consent of the owner" of the lands, whereas "investigations and inspections" may be conducted "with or without such consent."

One Buyer

This language, quoted by Newman & Miller, *op. cit.*, would seem to be unclear on the actual distinction, but it does not turn out to be important. Later on, the authors

state definitively that "nonetheless, in view of the tremendous importance of source material, the commission is given power to seize, by requisition or condemnation, any source material in the United States or any lands bearing deposits of source material." [Page 101.]

Thus the AEC really has full control over the sources of raw material. But the mining still remains in private hands. And so here is another problem of AEC control:

Is there an internal market for uranium? Does competition and the law of supply and demand operate at all to determine its prices?

There is something of a market for uranium, which is still used in certain alloy steels and in the ceramic and glass industries, but there is simply no comparison between the quantities used for these purposes and the quantities used for atomic-energy production. To all intents and purposes there is only one buyer in the uranium market—the AEC.

The AEC thus has monopolistic control over its suppliers too, and it is able to eliminate the economic functions of the market in its industry, virtually completely. This cannot even be called a "controlled market" such as we have in the case of an oligopolistic sector of industry. It is a planned market, planned through artificial prices established by the AEC. By this means the AEC plans the operations of uranium mining firms and organizes its own supply.

4. Managers and Labor

We have mentioned that the AEC employs somewhat over 300,000 people directly and through contractors. Those directly employed are mostly the managerial staff and some scientists.

It is still very difficult to note any specific trends in the relations between the commission and its executive managers, because the AEC as an institution is still very young, and besides there is the previously mentioned scarcity of information. But some noteworthy changes have already occurred.

Business Week reported in 1948 that "six months or so ago it would have been necessary to report that atomic development work was in a state of near-stagnation." This happened because of "engineering and personnel difficulties," "low morale," "many technical people were leaving," "weapon research was operated in a vacuum, without guidance from either the military or AEC," "vacillation and indecision in AEC," etc. But in the autumn of 1947 "things somewhat changed. . . . Today [1948] the situation is still spotty" but a very significant organizational reform took place: "Regional administrators . . . were granted a large measure of autonomy. At Hanford and Oak Ridge, for instance, the local men can OK expenditures up to \$5 million without reference to Washington; this is almost unprecedented in government." [April 10, 1948.]

We share *Business Week's* surprise. It would seem that the highly centralized bureaucratic organization of the AEC underwent a crisis; the result was the measure of decentralization granting autonomy to the eight managerial operational districts, the executives of which received a very important share of power.

But the most important personnel problem of the AEC is that of control over its worker force. While the powers of management were broadened, the rights of the workers were narrowed.

On September 3, 1948, the president appointed a special Commission on Labor Relations in Atomic Energy Commission Installations, "to make a special study of the problems of peaceful and orderly settlement of labor disputes in government-owned, privately operated atomic energy installations." This special commission prepared a report with the following recommendations:

"(1) That management and labor in all government-owned privately operated atomic energy installations, recognizing that the atomic-energy program includes vital operations which must not be interrupted, wholeheartedly accept a special responsibility to seek in every way by voluntary procedures and mutual agreement peaceful and orderly settlement of disputes affecting such vital operations and, within the limits of Paragraph 5 below, to forego all resort to strikes, lockouts, or other interruptions of any such operations.

"(2) That on all matters of security at all government-owned, privately operated atomic energy installations the Atomic Energy Commission has absolute and final authority, and neither the security rules nor their administration are matters for collective bargaining between management and labor."

Trend of Policy

On their recommendation also, the president appointed (April 1949) a three-man Atomic Energy Labor Relations Panel. The commission had said: "The principal thing is that the Panel should have full freedom of action to make whatever suggestions and take whatever steps may seem appropriate at the particular time in view of the particular situation."

The Panel fully utilized its powers. On April 25, 1949,

for instance, the U. S. District Court in Washington, D. C. dismissed a suit brought by the United Electrical Workers against the AEC and its contractor, the General Electric Company, seeking damages and a restraining order against the commission's directive to GE to withhold recognition of the UE as collective-bargaining agent for Schenectady workers on atomic-energy projects. The UE's appeal was again dismissed a year later, and the Panel finally adopted a ruling to bar the UE from representing workers in this field.

But as late as 1950, after all, the National Labor Relations Board allowed atomic workers to join unions! Several ballots were held and the workers were divided between the AFL and CIO. These unions wholeheartedly supported the recommendations of the labor-relations commission and completely subjected themselves to the AEC's Panel. This policy resulted in several wildcat strikes in atomic works, with the workers demanding wage increases and safety regulations. Many strikers were fired; in some other cases a compromise was reached.

But obviously the Panel was not able to handle the situation and therefore the NLRB has more recently decreed that it will handle labor cases "even if the employer's business is a local one." [*Business Week*, March 17, 1951.] Thus the AEC became an exception to the rule that the NLRB does not handle local cases, indicating the seriousness of labor-employer relations in the atomic industry.

Clearly, the AEC's labor policies and aims are to eliminate all possibility of strikes and stoppages in the atomic industry. To this end the legal rights of the UE are overridden on ground of political unreliability. This, at any rate, augurs the extent of control of the AEC over its labor force. Also involved is its control over the individual worker.

When hired, the worker in the atomic industry undergoes a special and thorough examination and investigation of his previous activities and political reliability. This checkup is made by the FBI. Every worker takes a "non-Communist" loyalty oath and submits to several other legal bureaucratic procedures. Later on, in the course of his employment, he is constantly watched by FBI agents. Besides, the so-called "atomic towns" are built for him; he is obliged to live there.

Secrecy vs. Law

But besides all these restrictions, there is now also danger that the individual worker can be deprived of one of the most important of his rights: the right to defend himself legally. This problem was raised some time ago, and then obviously forgotten, by the *Tennessee Law Review*, a professional journal.

The editors of the *Law Review* went through the records of some local courts and disclosed that there was a "recent filing of a number of lawsuits against manufacturers of the atomic bomb." The suits were filed by individual workers who had lost their capacity for labor as a result of unsafe labor conditions in atomic plants, and were seeking compensation from their employers. This was the case in *Ed Houser v. Tennessee Eastman Corporation*, in *Walter Edwards v. Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corporation*, etc., the corporations named being contractors and operators of AEC's atomic plants.

The *Tennessee Law Review* pointed out that, in the course of the testimony of the injured workers, many details were disclosed which impaired the secrecy of the production of atomic weapons. Examples were printed in the same magazine. It posed the problem: Should we entrust our judges and lawyers with secrets of A-bomb production? Or should we prohibit this kind of lawsuit altogether? It is obvious that in order to press his case the injured worker has to explain the details of his conditions of work; but this contradicts the legislation on A-bomb security, Espionage Laws, etc. The *Tennessee Law Review* did not give any solution of the problem. [See *Tennessee Law Review*, June 1946, "Disclosure of Atomic Secrets Through Litigation."]

This problem is not one of mere jurisprudence. It has its roots in the economy and is determined by the social relations existing in American society at the present time. The impact of the atomic energy industry on the economy has brought these new problems into actual life. The solution, provided that America is not going to change its present socio-economic system, seems to be quite clear: to change the existing system of justice in accordance with the changes which occur in the economy. In other words, to prohibit the worker in atomic industry from using the usual instruments to defend himself legally against his employer; to legalize the existing trend in the AEC's industry toward total control of the labor force. This, no doubt, would serve to achieve the much-demanded security, secrecy and obedience.

(Concluded next week)

Next Week: The AEC and the Corporations

Republican Convention —

(Continued from page 1)

as an almost monolithic solid front against Senator Taft."

The same source reveals the deals made in relation to the Pennsylvania delegation of Governor Fine, who took so long to make his mind up. Sen. James Duff, an Eisenhower man, forewent his normal influences over Pennsylvania to swing it his way and Eisenhower is to "clear" things with Fine in return for the latter's support.

In Michigan, the Alsops tell us, the battle was fought among three industrial corporations: the Chrysler Company which favored Taft and the executives of Ford and General Motors who favored Eisenhower. "In the end, Mr. Summerfield became an important Eisenhower leader, while Senator Ferguson, normally inclined to Senator Taft, kept unhappily silent."

VERY CURIOUS

The Alsops point out another interesting fact to be filed beside Taft's bleats about "real Republicans" in the disputes over Southern delegations. That is that the Taft-sponsored Roscoe Pickett delegation from Georgia "owes its existence to an alliance between Pickett and Governor Eugene Talmadge," so that they may be accurately classified as "Talmadge Republicans."

The columnists conclude that "the process by which presidential nominees are chosen in America often seems to have very little to do with the democratic process."

Yet they write, "The curious thing is how much of real conviction, and even of real idealism, creeps into this queer convention process. And the other curious thing is how often it produces an excellent result."

It may not be so curious that rule by political bosses produces results considered excellent by the writers of the capitalist press, much as they may dislike the bosses' methods.

Dorothy Schiff, publisher of the liberal N. Y. Post, wrote in her post-convention column: "Those who are in the know will not be surprised if two more district leaders, totally unqualified for the jobs, will be appointed to judgeships at the tax-payers' expense. This same manager [her source—M.B.] explained that it was easier to buy some delegates than others. All you have to do is pay their railroad fares to Chicago, take care of their expenses while they attend the convention and see that they have a good time while they are there."

"CRUSADERS"

The Tribune on the whole is unsatisfied with the Republican platform, but along with the New York Times which also supports Eisenhower, believes a great victory has been won. The Times calls it a "people's victory. General Eisenhower is the candidate whom the people chose by their own free acclaim. . . . His nomination was the product of a great popular expression of confidence."

There is no doubt that Eisenhower is a popular personality, and that personality plays a great role in the selection of candidates. The slogan "I like Ike" typifies this sentiment. Yet the convention delegates who chose Ike are twice, thrice and many more times removed from the American voters. Within the confines of the aims of the more conservative of the two major parties of American capitalism, they no doubt tried to serve up a candidate who could win. And winning, just simple victory, was a large motive in the minds of the patronage-and-power-hungry party.

Taft in a limited sense was the real "crusader" as against Eisenhower, representing the more distinct features and traditions of the Republicans as against the Democrats. It was felt by too many, that Taft just couldn't win the election.

But Eisenhower has been presented and Eisenhower has an-

nounced that he will lead a great "crusade" after the manner of the military victories won under his leadership. His acceptance speech wherein he launched his "crusade" was a masterpiece of ambiguous generalities designed to offend no one. Likable!

As a matter of fact, Ike was so likable a few years ago that he could have the endorsement of the Democrats and the labor movement. He appeared at the CIO convention in 1946 in Atlantic City, where Murray pinned a speakers' badge on him. He did come out against federal aid for education in 1948, a rather snide thing to do since the General was largely educated at federal expense, as John Gunther reminds everyone.

Ike has already made a number of other "unfortunate" public statements without the aid of his mentors, ghost writers or brother Milton, the "brains of the family." He came out for use of the Taft-Hartley Law in the steel strike. "If all Americans want is security, they can go to prison," is ascribed to him. His outburst to the Nebraskans against French atheism as contributory to the "moral degeneration" of that nation has not caused the downfall of the French government, as reported by the Democrats.

Aside from his likability and idiosyncrasies, Eisenhower does have the Dulles political platform, which he is presumably running on. The platform took days to compose in order to be acceptable to the varied coalition of interests which made up the warring factions in the party, one hour to

read to the convention and two minutes to adopt. Although the General does not agree with all of the sections on foreign policy, since it was drawn to suit both Taft and himself, he finds it good enough!

PLATFORM VERBIAGE

The Tribune insists that the platform could be shorter. Its long preamble spells out the Republican grievances against the administration: "Seizing powers . . . national socialism . . . class strife . . . crushing taxation . . . waste and extravagance . . . war crises . . . weakened self government . . . bureaucrats . . . corruption in high places . . ."

In its foreign-policy plank, the most important for the U. S. and the world today, the platform manages to reconcile both the "Asia Firsters" and the "Europe Firsters." It scores Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam, issues which the Republicans did not make so much of a few years ago and which certainly Eisenhower, so closely identified with these decisions, never raised before.

While blaming the Korean war on the administration, the platform stands for the UN, which Republican Senator McCarthy deems almost as subversive as he does the State Department. (Senator McCarthy has already made his political call on Eisenhower and the latter has not repudiated his support.)

The platform is for the elimination of "discriminatory practices against our exports such as preferential tariffs, monetary license restrictions, and other arbitrary devices." On the other

hand, it promises to enter reciprocal trade agreements "to safeguard our domestic enterprises and the payrolls of our workers [to say nothing of the profits of our industrialists] against unfair import competition." (This trap is baited with cheese, of the imported variety.)

On the question of national defense, the Herbert Hoover notion of a "retaliatory force" which could strike like a rattlesnake, based upon air power emphasis, has been toned down at the insistence of Eisenhower. It sounded a little too much like the "Fortress America," isolated from foreign entanglements, and the Republicans are committed in their platform to "collective security."

The platform also attacks the administration for permitting "Communists" to infiltrate, pledges to encourage small business, promises to administer anti-monopoly laws fairly, encourages farm supports, soil conservation, flood control and rural electrification (where necessary). It is for the right to establish a "union shop," amendment of Taft-Hartley, restoration of tidelands resources to the states, public works, aid to veterans, extension of social security and adequate health agencies without federal interference.

As a Negro spokesman pointed out to the convention, if federal legislation against discrimination were enacted, it would still be 176 years too late, that is, 176 years after the Declaration of Independence. The civil-rights plank of the party that still takes Lincoln's name in vain is inferior to its 1944 platform, which favored a federal

Fair Employment Practices Commission. The party retreated to a vague promise of such legislation in 1948. In the current platform, it comes out for "states' rights," favoring federal legislation toward equitable treatment only in employment practices. It does not come out forthrightly for an anti-lynch law or an anti-poll-tax law. Such is the result of the sell-out to the lily-white Southern vote by both the Taft and Eisenhower forces.

THE DINOSAURS

Now the Republicans are hoping that the Democrats will save them on this issue by imitating their performance.

Despite the platform compromises in the field of foreign policy and despite Eisenhower's ineptitudes in his unguided forays into this field, there is little doubt that the decisive struggle between the Democratic candidate and Eisenhower will not be primarily over this question. That old Asia hand, MacArthur, did not triumph at the convention, but it is Nixon, the pal of the senator from Formosa, who is Eisenhower's running mate. The MacArthur-Knowlton influences have made themselves felt, however. And now even Governor Dewey, in his recent book on Asia, has discovered that "millions of Chinese . . . idolize Chiang Kai-shek!"

Domestically, both platform and nominee stand to the right of the administration, although we cannot in the interests of accuracy describe their program as "naked reaction" in the words of an administration-supporting liberal. Remember that the New Deal, Fair Deal and "welfare state" concepts have left their mark on the Republicans. They too, are for a number of measures of federal aid in various fields, but measurably less so than the Democrats. Aside from the matter of personal popularity, the "internationalist" wing of the Republican corresponds more closely to the administration Democrats.

However, most notably absent are planks relating to price control, rent control, government housing, federal aid to education, and similar issues on which the Fair Dealers will undoubtedly go to town.

It remains to be seen how Ike can campaign to retain the support of all the dissident elements among the Republicans and still put forward a popular enough program to muster the support of the people. It is anticipated that the support of the die-hard Taftites will be lukewarm at its hottest. Colonel McCormick will not support this "socialist." Time, Life, Look, Quick, the N. Y. Times and Tribune and the "rather nice" millionnaires like the Jock Whitneys, Alfred Vanderbilts, Henry Fords, and "enlightened businessmen," much of the middle-class, younger-generation Republicans, and AFL dinosaurs will.

Walter Lippman speaks of the paradox whereby Eisenhower won the nomination but nearly destroyed himself. He is speaking of the efforts of the general to make himself liked by the conservative section of the Republicans. We doubt his ability to make himself liked, as a political personality, by all sections of the electorate. And we doubt especially his ability to put himself over with the labor movement, the large city populations, the Negroes and minority groups who have been throwing their support to the Democrats for many years. The Democrats will make the most of the Republican convention—its general conservatism, the political backwardness, ineptitude and inexperience of its candidate, and its feeble domestic program.

Is it not indicative of the times when even Senator Richard Russell of Georgia says he can beat Eisenhower?

For living Marxism—read
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

AS DEMOCRATIC SHOW OPENS IN CHICAGO—

Labor Has No Say on Candidate

By GORDON HASKELL

With the Republican convention scarcely out of the way, Chicago is rapidly preparing to play host to the Democrats, and the nation as a whole looks forward to another political slugfest. Although the stakes are very high, the average American citizen has no more say in the outcome than he does in the athletic contests which vie with the conventions for his attention on the radio and television screen.

As the Democratic convention approaches, the number of aspiring candidates seems to be increasing rather than diminishing. Kerr of Oklahoma, Russell of Georgia, and Rayburn of Texas are put forward as candidates acceptable to various groups of Southern and some conservative Northern Democratic politicians. Senator Kefauver of Tennessee has put himself forward on the plea that his candidacy would take the curse off the corruption charge against the Democrats because of his work in exposing organized crime in the country, and that he would also be acceptable to the men who control the Democratic Party in the South.

HORSE-RACE

Vice-President Barkeley has also just openly announced his intention to fight for the nomination. Like Kefauver, he would presumably run as a "Fair Dealer" who nevertheless is "safe" as far as the South and the more conservative wing of the party is concerned. Only Harriman of New York has so far conducted his pre-nomination campaign as a 100 per cent Fair Dealer on all questions, including the vital one of a civil-rights program at least as liberal as that put into the 1948 Democratic platform.

Until the convention gets under way, it will not be clear just what is the line-up of forces behind each of these candidates or other still to be announced. During the last frenzied week of the Republican convention, President

Truman quietly held a number of White House conferences with leading Democrats which certainly had the presidential nomination as one of their chief topics. It is now said that although Governor Adlai Stevenson was Truman's first choice for the job, his continued reluctance to declare himself a candidate has soured Truman on him.

Of course, if principle were the deciding factor, Harriman would have the inside track for Truman's support. But to date, at least, it appears that Harriman has not been able to muster the kind of support among the men who control the party that would recommend him as a strong and reliable candidate.

It appears that if any major issue rocks the Democratic convention, it will again be the issue of equal rights for Negroes which split off the Divicrats in 1948. The Republicans have written their civil-rights plank in such a way as to make possible an appeal to the race hatred which still dominates the men who control affairs in the South. It is designed equally to make possible a Republican victory in such states as Texas and to open the door to any Democratic faction which might bolt the convention over this issue.

COMPROMISE IN AIR

The evasive Republican plank on this issue may give weight to the arguments of the conservative wing of the Democratic Party which is also seeking a "compromise" at the expense of the Negroes. Their argument runs that a "compromise" FEPC plank would not lose the Negro vote in the North to the Republicans in view of their stand on the issue, while it is essential to keep the South or parts of it from bolting to the opposition.

Actually, it does not appear that the Jim Crow element in the Democratic Party needs to insist on having its way on a civil-rights platform or even a candidate who takes its position on the

question. They might safely ignore this aspect of the program, as they have done since 1948, and count on their legislative coalition with the Republicans to block any significant action during the next four years.

Although today everyone agrees that the 1948 victory was a result of the solid support of three major groups in the population, labor, the farmers, and minorities, none of these groups has any significant, organized voice in setting the platform or choosing the candidate of the Democratic Party in 1952.

DEMS NOT BOUND

About 110 CIO members will be delegates to the Democratic convention, and the AFL will probably have even more. But these labor leaders will not appear as a bloc fighting for the interests of their own people; they will appear as sections of the political machines from their various states. The same will be true of the Negro delegates and the small farmers.

And equally important, whoever the candidate may be, and whatever the final form of the platform on which he will run, it will be clearly recognized that the Democratic Party as an entity is not and cannot be bound to actually carry out the platform or put into practice the announced views of the candidate (unless he is someone like Russell). The nomination of a 100 per cent Fair Dealer will mean either that enough of the big state and local machines have been able to combine on such a man as their best "compromise," or that the majority of the convention feels that such a man can win the election for them.

This is a recognition of the progressive desires of the American people. But neither labor, nor the Negroes and other minorities, nor the farmers, nor all of them put together can make these desires into a reality as long as they remain chained to the coalition which is known as the Democratic Party.