

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 13, 1956

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

Washed Out

One of the most vicious extensions of the witchhunt based on the attorney general's "list of subversive organizations" went out of effect when the Justice Department told the Public Housing Administration on August 3 that tenants of federally aided low-rent housing projects would no longer be required to sign loyalty oaths.

The Justice Department's decision was based on an opinion that the legislation requiring such oaths had lapsed two years ago.

During the struggle against this "loyalty" purge in housing, which started in 1952, some two dozen court tests went against the government. Twice the government brought cases to the Supreme Court, which in both instances refused to review lower courts which had found against the government.

Vindictiveness

There is, it appears, no act too petty or vindictive for the government in its persecution of political opponents of capitalism.

First, the Veterans Administration attempted to cancel the pension of James Kutcher, Socialist Workers Party militant who lost both legs in World War II in Italy. Then, the Social Security office tried to cancel old-age payments to elderly Stalinists convicted under the Smith Act. Now the Veterans Administration, at the highest appeal level, has canceled the \$30.50 monthly disability pension of Robert G. Thompson, Communist Party leader who is also serving a Smith Act sentence.

Thompson was highly decorated for bravery in the Pacific in World War II. He now has what the government describes as an "arrested" case of tuberculosis, contracted during the war. The reason the Veterans Administration's Board of Appeals gave for its decision to cancel Thompson's pension was that he "gave aid to the enemy" in the Korean war by his political speeches.

Thus, once again the government is seeking to establish a precedent for making pension payments contingent on political behavior.

Free Press

The Chinese totalitarian regime has issued visas to permit American newspapermen to visit China, without any conditions. The State Department has announced that it will not permit them to go there. Reason: because the U. S. has no diplomatic relations with Peiping; because the Chinese hold American prisoners; and perhaps others equally irrelevant to the simple fact that Washington is preventing newsmen from going

(Continued on page 4)

TOMORROW'S NEGRO A Handbook on Jim Crow's Impact

... page 6

Can A-Power Plants Go Out of Control?

... page 4

The New Labor Movement of North Africa

... page 7

A Footnote to Senate Liberalism

... page 2

What the Colonialist Powers Fear in the Suez Canal Crisis

By HAL DRAPER

In the second week of the Suez crisis, the Anglo-French-U. S. imperialist combine inaugurated an open drive to re-establish colonialist supremacy not only over the Suez Canal but over the vital oil resources of the Middle East, to intimidate Egypt with the crudest display of threats of armed intervention seen since the end of the Second World War, and to provoke President Nasser into giving them some excuse to reoccupy the Suez Canal Zone, and perhaps Egypt itself, with their troops.

The danger of war loomed; it would be a war which would draw the line in the world between the imperialist states of Europe and America on the one hand, and on the other virtually all of the colonial and ex-colonial world (either in action or in sympathy), with the totalitarian Russian bloc naturally seizing the opportunity to make hay with the anti-imperialist bloc.

Washington fervently hopes that armed force will not be necessary, if only because this is an election year; and so Dulles says that the U.S. is "not committed," but he has not ruled it out.

The imperialists gone frenzied with

chauvinism who are threatening to light the fires of this war are the British and French in the first place. Having aligned the U. S. with their side at the London conference of the Three, these two governments are flaunting their preparations for military action to force their ultimatum down Egypt's throat.

Britain calls up its reserves, troop ships are dispatched to the Mediterranean, paratroopers are sent off with hysterical-chauvinist hoopla, army releases are canceled, the queen is trotted out to lend her royal aura to a war-mongering decree; the French, led by Guy Mollet, barely restrain their disappointment that Dulles counsels against a military adventure right off the bat without waiting for the 24-nation show-conference decided on in London.

The U. S., though advising against

immediate armed force, joins in the game by sending its Sixth Fleet, on "routine maneuvers," into the Mediterranean to add its guns to Britain's.

The gun-brandishing preparations are so blatant that they will be difficult to reverse, at the best, if and when Nasser refuses to yield to the revolver pointed at his head. In the name of "sanctity of treaties," "international morality" and other nice things, Britain and France are doing their best to live up to the "old-fashioned" picture of imperialist gangsters ruthlessly squeezing weaker nations to the wall. No one can be sure just how much bluff there is in all this.

To hide the obvious ultimatum of the three leading imperialist states, the expedient of a 24-nation conference was decided on by the Three in London. This conference is to give the hold-up operation its "internationalist" dress. Not too much effort has been made to cloak it, however.

Else why is the conference called for London, the center of hysterical anti-Egyptian frenzy, instead of for a neutral place? The composition of the conference has been handpicked by the Three to en-

(Continued on page 3)

Civil Rights or Dem Party Unity: Which Will Labor Fight For?

By GORDON HASKELL

On the eve of the Democratic national convention, the smell of compromise fills the air on the key social and political issue which faces the country. The leading spokesmen of the Democratic Party, from its New Dealish wing (Douglas of Illinois) through its center (Adlai Stevenson) to its right wing of White Supremacy (the South), all talk of "unity" and "agreement" on the issue of civil rights.

On the struggle for civil rights itself, the struggle of the Negro people and their allies for full economic, political and social equality in the United States, there will be and can be no compromise. This struggle will go on, and will increase in intensity in the months and years ahead, because the Negroes in the South can and will accept no "compromise" which leaves them in a position of degradation and subordination.

If the Democratic convention concludes its sessions in an atmosphere of harmony or even a truce on this issue, it will simply mean that this party, and with it the

whole bipartisan organization of American politics, has once again demonstrated its built-in inability to serve the interests of the vast majority of the American people.

WHO WILL PUSH?

Representatives of the mass organizations of the common people of America, the NAACP and the AFL-CIO, are scheduled to present their views on civil rights to the platform committee of the Democratic Party after this issue of LABOR ACTION has gone to press. From the positions taken by their leaders in recent weeks, it can be expected that they will forcefully urge a series of planks which, if

adopted, would put the party on record for the kind of fight for civil rights which would make impossible the maintenance of party unity.

But all indications are that in appearing before the Platform Committee they will be strong voices calling in the wilderness, rather than leaders of a movement organized for the purpose of forcing the convention to revolve around the key issue for which they speak.

Stevenson, to be sure, has now shifted his compromising attitude a bit towards civil rights, now that Kefauver is out of the Democratic race and it is a question of undercutting Harriman's demagoguery (as well as appealing to the Negro vote); and so he has come out with a statement in favor of at least approving the Supreme Court decision in the party platform. It is a paper concession, but some Southern Democrats claim to be angry with him; and one cannot predict how mulish the Dixie racists can be. In any case, such lip-service cannot possibly sat-

(Turn to last page)

A Footnote to Senate Liberalism

By SAM TAYLOR

The Democratic 84th Congress ended with a dismal and shameful record on civil rights. This Congress, as well as every Congress in the past two decades, has been ruled by the same coalition. The added feature of this Congress is that the usual Dixiecrat-Republican coalition was joined by most of what remains of the Senate liberals in effectively throttling civil-rights legislation.

Civil rights and elementary democratic rights for Negroes as well as all of the American people were sacrificed—callously and cynically—upon the block of political expediency. The presidential fever caught up with the Senate liberals; civil-rights legislation was scuttled, but the question was how to maneuver the Negro people and those with any democratic conscience into believing that both parties were really for civil rights.

There was little doubt that the House of Representatives would pass the minimum civil-rights bills which were before it. Every Congressman in The House is up for election this year and besides the House was never the real stumbling block. Therefore the House, both Democratic and Republican, gave a wide margin—276 to 126—to the bills.

But what their motives were is a different matter. Nothing was contained in these bills which was not already in force in most Northern and Western states. Therefore the effect on these areas would be minimal. Therefore a vote for civil rights would not be any skin off their backs.

However, many Republicans who in the past have sat on their hands came out and voted for these bills. It was scarcely because of a new-found love for democracy. The Republicans are determined to utilize the Supreme Court decision on desegregation as "proof" that the Republican Party is the "friend" of the Negro people.

A favorable vote in the House would "prove" this, especially since everyone knew that it would be killed by the Senate. It would also serve to emphasize the division inside of the Democratic Party.

They were right on what would happen when civil rights came before the Senate. It was as if a bomb were dropped in the midst of the "greatest deliberative body in the world." The senators scattered in all directions. Only three senators stood up and even raised the issue—Lehman of New York, Douglas of Illinois and Hennings of Missouri.

STONEWALL JOHNSON

After the House passed these bills, the tactic of the Senate leadership in cahoots with the rest of the Democratic Party (with the exception of the above three) was to tuck civil rights safely away into the tender care of the Senate Judiciary Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator James Eastland of Mississippi. Nothing could budge Eastland to release these bills, especially since he has been sitting on similar bills for almost the entire session.

The efforts of the three senators to get civil rights on the floor ran into the stone wall of the Lyndon Johnson leadership of the Democratic Party, ably supported by the rest of the senators. Johnson resorted to the preliminary maneuver of refusing to adjourn the Senate in order to prevent the bills from getting onto the floor for discussion.

When Senator Douglas—up to now not a particularly vigorous advocate of action for civil rights, but he is up for election this year—tried to get the bills out of the Eastland committee, Senator Johnson made it an issue between his "leadership" of the Senate Democrats or that of Douglas. Once again the same three Democrats stood against him, supported by three Republicans—Ives of New York, Bender of Ohio (up for election) and the maverick Langer of North Dakota.

The flimsy justification for the majority action was the plea that the Senate was coming close to adjournment and there were important issues still on the agenda. The need for the housing and

social-security bills were cited as the main business that could not be put off. In the coming months the passage of a more liberalized social-security bill affecting a couple of hundred thousand people will be falsely held up as the reason for denying millions of American citizens their rights.

Senator George of Georgia, in his swan song before the Senate, spoke up vigorously on the need for social security and editorials have appeared in many papers, including the labor press, praising him for his progressive stand. But in the reality of the situation in the Senate, Senator George (who till his final moment in the Senate stood as one of the leaders of the conservative Southern Democrats) was not in effect speaking in favor of social security but against civil rights.

This is the same Senator George who is resigning his Senate seat at the end of this session so that the racist Herman Talmadge, his successor, will get seniority ahead of all new senators elected this November. This is the same Senator George who voted against the social-security law when it was first enacted.

HUMPHREY'S COMFORT

But the "best" example of cringing self-justification came from the former leader of what is known as the liberal bloc, Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota. On July 28 he found it necessary to make a statement of the reasons why he opposed doing anything about civil rights. His reasons are embellished with the liberalism for which he is noted. For Humphrey, "unity" with the Dixiecrats and the Southern conservatives is more important than civil rights.

Humphrey outlined his role in the 1948 Democratic convention when he pushed the civil-rights plank which forced the Dixiecrats out of the party; he recited his actions as mayor of Minneapolis; he gave out with liberal rhetoric on the need for better schools, minimum-wage legislation, better housing and full citizenship for all Americans;

But after it was said and done, Humphrey drew one element of solace from the record of the 84th Congress; it was one that could serve as well for the political epitaph of this liberaloid politician: "Our behavior this week will only be a footnote in history."

A footnote to this footnote is also in order.

Senator Hubert Humphrey's speech on civil rights ended with the following dialogue between him and Democratic leader Johnson:

SENATOR HUMPHREY: "I make a plea to my colleagues—North and South—Democrats and Republicans, to join in a serious and sincere effort to find a formula for a legislative program which will end the bitterness and emotionalism which surrounds the civil rights issue... Further delay can only produce further frustration, which, if continued, leads to irrational response. In the words of the Prophet Isaiah: 'Come, let us reason together.' It will be in that spirit that the junior Senator from Minnesota, in the next session of the 85th Congress, will appeal to his colleagues on the basis of reason and fairness for constructive action."

SENATOR JOHNSON: "Mr. President, I will say to my friend from Minnesota that he will find the Senator from Texas available every day to reason with him on any subject of importance to the American people."

SENATOR HUMPHREY: "I always have."

SENATOR JOHNSON: "I thank my friend."

With this pious exchange of sentiment, the Northern liberal and the Southern right-winger voted together to kill the civil-rights bill.

LABOR SCOPE

Marx Lewis on Labor Party... Steel & Chanel No. 5

By BEN HALL

Marx Lewis, general secretary-treasurer of the United Hatters Union comments briefly on our June 25 issue on "Labor and the Democrats." He writes:

"I am sorry that due largely to the pressure of business I have delayed replying to a letter you sent me recently calling attention to an article on labor in the Democratic Party, and asking whether I would care to comment on it."

"As one who has favored and worked for the idea that labor ought to consider political action as a major means of realizing its objectives, and who thought that labor could be most effective along these lines if it acted independently of the old parties, I should favor a third party of, by, and for labor. There is nothing in the policies pursued in the last session of Congress that should create any enthusiasm for the Democratic Party as a medium through which labor can act effectively as an instrument for its own advancement."

"I believe, however, that under the present circumstances the question of a third party is an academic one. Such a third party might be the means of defeating such friends as labor now has in the Democratic Party and retarding the labor movement politically by perpetuating reactionary domination of Government. Its immediate effect might be [to] punish our friends and reward our enemies, the very opposite of what Samuel Gompers advocated. Leaders of American labor have made it clear that they are not opposed to a third party in principle, but that they could not advocate it as a practical measure now. At best it would be an abortive move and might postpone rather than hasten its realization. I share that view."

"With best wishes, I am... Fraternal yours, MARX LEWIS."

Brother Lewis presents his view succinctly, so I shall not discuss it at length. In sum, he speaks as a man who is for a labor party but feels that now is not the time. Regrettably, when he explains why it is not practical now, he offers arguments that can be advanced any time, anywhere, under virtually any conditions. No one can guarantee immediate electoral triumph for a new party; if we are not ready if necessary to go through the formative years and early political realignments we can never have a labor party. And so, for a whole generation which saw the rise of a new modern labor movement, labor continues on the old political path.

How explain this paradox: Labor's economic and industrial power is at an all-time peak; its political influence has declined; its juridical position has deteriorated; and its "friends" have been disappearing in and out of Congress.

Answer: as long as labor remains peacefully tied to the Democratic Party, the drift will be to the right.

But let that be; labor will probably remain with the Democratic Party, more diffident and more complaining than before. In our issue on Labor and the Democrats we raised the question of what to do NOW, inside the Democratic Party, for those who are not convinced that labor must form its own party.

At least this is required: a fight to the end against the signers of the Southern Manifesto, a fight to drive out Eastland and his co-thinkers. Will the Democratic liberals, the "friends" of labor, begin such a fight at the coming convention? If not, what is to be labor's attitude to them?

This is the immediate practical question. We are glad to receive Brother Lewis' views on a labor party; we regret that he did not comment on what to do now.

STEEL AND OTHER STRIKES

Just before the steel strike was settled, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported on "Work Stoppages in June 1956," announcing that "all measures of strike activity were lower in June 1956 than in any June since 1951." Just when the class struggle was about to be counted out in statistics, 650,000 steel workers were compelled to restore it to life.

If not for that, we might have entered

YOU CAN HELP THE KOHLER STRIKERS

Union men gathered around the graves of Lee Wakefield and Henry Engelman in Sheboygan, Wisconsin. These two men had been shot to death on July 27, 1934 by Kohler Company special police, during the strike that year. For 22 years, veterans of the old AFL Federal Local No. 18545, destroyed by Kohler guns and clubs, have conducted graveside services.

This year they were joined by a new generation of Kohler strikers. UAW Local 833 has been on strike against Kohler since April 5, 1954, a total of two years and four months, and the strike is continuing, supplemented by a nationwide boycott of Kohler products.

Life goes on. Two-year-old children, whose dads have been on strike during the whole of their lives, need clothing. The Kohler strikers have appealed for donations of clothing for their children. You may send contributions directly to the local at 527-A North 8 Street, Sheboygan, Wis. Or if you prefer you can bring packages to the ISL hall at 114 West 14th St., New York City.

a new, new era of labor peace. Perhaps those who eternally predict the coming of class harmony will now be satisfied with dreams of strikeless Junes.

In *Labor's Daily*, Sid Lens writes about the atmosphere of good-feeling that was supposed to surround the steel strike and concludes:

"Yes, they're not shooting steel workers this year and they're not organizing back-to-work movements. They've put on a glove on the mailed fist and sprayed it with Chanel Number Five. But those babies of U. S. Steel, Bethlehem and Republic are unconstructed advocates of the theory of 'class struggle.'"

There are places where strikes go on in a grim atmosphere:

- We remember the Kohler strike in Sheboygan.

- At the Reuping Leather Co. in Fond Du Lac, Wisconsin, a strike was broken and lost after 45 weeks of idleness by 360 members of the Meat Cutters Union, Local 360. An injunction limited strike activity.

- For five months, 500 members of the Glass Workers Union have been on strike against the Blue Ridge Glass Corporation in Kingsport, Tenn.

- In Birmingham, Alabama, a stoppage of over 10,000 workers continued through June at the U. S. Steel Corporation, Tennessee Coal and Iron Division.

- In Chapman and Greenville, Alabama, the International Woodworkers' Union has been out for more than two years in a strike against the W. T. Smith Lumber Company, involving 2600 workers.

- The strike at the Republic Aviation Corporation, which was settled the first week in June, had lasted 108 days, involving 12,000 members of the International Association of Machinists.

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter columns of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

NEW YORK
LABOR ACTION FORUM

THURSDAYS at 9 p.m.

Aug. 16—Stan Grey

THE SUPREME COURT
AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

Aug. 23—Sam Weiner

(Libertarian League)

WHAT IS
ANARCHISM TODAY?

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Coolie Wage Bill for Guam Sneaks Through Congress

Hidden in the last-minute rush of bills passed by Congress before adjournment was an administration-sponsored act discriminating against native labor on Guam. It represents a policy similar to, and typified by, the colonialist attitude taken by U. S. authorities and interests in Okinawa.

A letter to the N. Y. Times (Aug. 6) summarizes the facts in the case, calling on the president to veto the bill:

"In 1951 Congress enacted and President Truman approved the legislation which gave self-government to the people of Guam and conferred American citizenship upon the people of Guam. The Legislature specifically provided then that certain federal laws, including those establishing minimum wages, would be applicable in Guam, as well as to other American dependencies, including Hawaii and Samoa.

"Despite this extension of coverage of the Minimum Wage Law to Guam, American contracting companies working on defense contracts on Guam have failed to comply with its requirements. For several years past they employed not only Guamanians, but also many Filipinos at wages substantially less than those required under the Minimum Wage Law. Mainland em-

ployees doing the same work on Guam are paid wages complying with the law. This discrimination has existed despite the fact that since 1951 the people of Guam have been American citizens.

Instead of seeking to obtain compliance on the part of these contractors with the law, the Defense Department and other agencies of the Administration have sponsored legislation which would withdraw the coverage and protection of the Minimum Wage Laws from Guam and other American dependencies.

"The Legislature of Guam, whose members are elected by the population of the island, have vigorously opposed such action and the legislative leaders have appeared before Congressional committees in Washington to oppose such proposals as being destructive of Guamanian economy and as being discriminatory against the people of Guam and treating them, as well as the Filipinos engaged in this work, as second-class citizens."

The letter writer, Richard H. Wels, quotes a protest against this legislation by General Romulo, Philippine ambassador to the U. S. who expresses the fear that "enemies of democracy" will "misrepresent" and "distort" it "as a desire of the U. S. to perpetuate what they will undoubtedly brand as coolie labor."

SENATE LIBERALS AND THE SMITH ACT

The following is Murray Kempton's column from the N. Y. Post of August 1.

Three weeks ago come Friday the Senate of the United States unanimously passed a law setting the penalty for conspiracy to advocate the overthrow of the United States at 20 years' imprisonment or \$20,000 fine or both.

Conspiracy to advocate the overthrow of the government has of course been the basic charge in the melancholy history of the conviction of Communists under the Smith Act. The new law makes the penalties four times stiffer. And what search of soul did the United States Senate bring to the Smith Act, about which the national conscience was already not entirely at ease and which the Supreme Court had already scheduled as the subject for full scale review next fall?

The record shows that on the morning of April 19, the bill to quadruple the Smith Act's penalties was first put before the Senate. There was an objection that it was not accompanied by a committee report. Within what appears to be approximately an hour, it was again

put on the floor with the necessary report, which, excluding title and a minor amendment, ran to two paragraphs.

Those paragraphs argued that five years' imprisonment was an insufficient deterrent to conspiracy to advocate revolution, and that the penalty should therefore be raised to 20 years.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is in agreeing to the committee amendment."

"The amendment was agreed to."

"The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time."

"The bill was read the third time and passed."

There exists no proper record of who was on the floor during this searching discussion. But some 20 minutes before, there had been a roll call at which every substantial Senate liberal but Estes Kefauver was present and voting. The names of such present and recorded included: Douglas of Illinois, Morse of Oregon, Fulbright of Arkansas, Hennings of Missouri, Humphrey of Minnesota, Lehman of New York, Murray of Montana, and Neuberger of Oregon.

They were all there to stand against that ancient devil, Bricker of Ohio. Bricker was chipping away at the International Labor Organization and had introduced an amendment drastically limiting American contributions to its work if the Russians are admitted as voting members of the International Labor Organization. The liberals were united against Bricker in this case, which seems a little odd. Bricker's amendment seems much more defensible than the Smith Act; the Russians' system is based on speedups and strikebreaking; I'd have a hard time arguing with anyone who suggested that we cease paying dues to an outfit which invited the representatives of the Soviets to vote on matters involving the well-being of workmen.

But, in any case, the Senate liberals exhausted themselves dancing on this pinpoint and in a few minutes voted, whether by voice or silence there is no way of knowing, for the elaboration of the Smith Act which a number of them privately deplore.

On July 13, the bill came back from the House and, upon motion of Lyndon Johnson, it was accepted unanimously. The Senate then voted \$10,000 more to Jim Eastland's judiciary committee. Senator Flanders then made a speech of why we should accept some aspects of the Soviet's Unions's latest disarmament proposals.

The President, of course, signed the bill; and now we are safe because we can send old men and women to prison for 20 years for conspiracy to advocate. I am perhaps a narrow man, but it is hard to look at this senseless, unanimous cruelty and be excessively conscious of the difference between Wayne Morse and Douglas McKay or Ralph Flanders and Joe McCarthy. Someday, somebody is going to have to arise on the floor of the Senate and stand alone for that difference. Until someone does, we shall have to be ashamed of them all.

Witchhunt

On July 31, in another installment of the Smith Act witchhunt, six additional Communist Party leaders were convicted in New York's Foley Square district courthouse under the "conspiracy" clause. As we noted June 25, in giving some details of this case, the lightning of the atmosphere attendant on McCarthy's personal eclipse has not deterred the Justice Department's thought-control drive.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

Suez Canal Crisis — —

(Continued from page 1)

dorse their position, though there is bound to be a strong minority perhaps even a bloc strong enough to cool off the Anglo-French.

Egyptian spokesmen are plainly justified in exposing the pseudo-judicial role of this conference when it is called and organized in the atmosphere of such open threats of armed intervention and military arm-twisting.

"The picture given by these official disclosures [of military moves in London] is the preparation of an assault, invasion and occupation force. It is understood that if force is to be used as a last resort, the canal zone is the primary target. Plans are reportedly prepared for the occupation of other parts of Egypt, such as Cairo and Alexandria, and the seizure of Egyptian government leaders as incidental to the reoccupation of the canal area if such measures should prove necessary." (N. Y. Times, Aug. 3, dispatch from London.)

So far-reaching are the plans, showing how phony are the claims that Britain and France are interested only in ensuring free shipping through the canal.

"Privately, however, many ranking [British] officials make it clear that they would not regard Egyptian provocation as an unalloyed tragedy. They would in fact like an excuse for a showdown with Colonel Nasser.

"The British dislike the Egyptian leader's expressed ambition to create an 'Arab empire from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf.'

"They resent his persistence in fomenting anti-British feeling in Jordan and other Arab states formerly friendly to Britain. They fear the success of his anti-British radio propaganda into British Africa and throughout the Moslem world." (N. Y. Times, Aug. 5, from London.)

These are indeed frightened imperialists, who have already been pushed out of one area of exploitation after another. They realize that, one after the other, each remaining colonial area will burn under their feet.

France's feet are already seared up to the ankles in Algeria, and Premier Mallet finds it impossible to make a single speech or statement about Nasser's "crimes" without swinging into the litany about France's destiny in North Africa. Britain is clinging to Cyprus with harsh terror.

IT MAY SPREAD

In these circumstances, Nasser's defiant nationalization of the Suez Canal has pre-

cipitated London and Paris into a dither of desperation: "Smash him now or else everybody else will throw off our exploitation too."

This is a reality. Not only Britain and France but other European imperialists fear they will go down in the common ruin of colonialism. Washington goes into a flutter when Lebanon dares to impose an income tax on foreign companies previously exempted. The Dutch link their denunciation of that terrible Nasser with their denunciation of Indonesia for repudiating an alleged billion dollars in debts to them which had resulted from the war and post-war revolution.

Press dispatches lament that there is "wild" talk in Iraq of nationalizing the Iraq Petroleum Co., which by coincidence belongs to the same three powers who met in London to defend International Morality. "The word 'nationalization' has been popping up in all the Arab countries in the last week. In those that have no oil, the talk is of 'nationalizing' pipelines that traverse their territory."

In the French Chamber, an MRP deputy exhorts his fellows: "if we give way [to Nasser], the fellaghas [Algerian guerrillas] will be convinced they are in the right. . . . We must prove that France is still a force."

The exhortation that now-is-the-time-for-all-imperialists-to-stand-together is echoed in London:

"The Arabs respect success," said a British official. "If Nasser can flout the Western world over Suez it will be the quick end to our remaining influence in Jordan, in Iraq, and possibly in Turkey. The Baghdad Pact will be fatally weakened. Even the oil states in the Persian Gulf will begin to move closer to Egypt." (N. Y. Times, Aug. 5, from London.)

According to this dispatch, Labor Party right-wing leader Hugh Gaitskell, in the full tradition of Laborite social-imperialism, is another echo of this sentiment; but the Bevanite weekly Tribune denounces "This Suez Madness" and accuses Britain of "seventy years of cheating and bullying the Egyptian people."

But the desperate measures work in another way not to break Egypt away from other Arab states and other small states, but to solidify sentiment for Nasser, even to build him up as this military dictator does not deserve. The Arab world is being unified as never before (more even than against Israel) by the British drive.

The two Arab states previously most friendly to the Baghdad Pact camp, Iraq and Lebanon have staunchly aligned themselves with Egypt on the issue. The

Arab League, which seemed dead, has gotten a new lease on life. The imperialist Three are wondering if Syria will cut the oil pipelines that cross it, in case of an assault on Egypt. Jordan hastens to attend the Arab League meeting.

BACK TO THE WALL

And not only in the Arab world. "The reports [received by Washington] showed that nearly all Asian governments east of Turkey and west of Japan were in varying degrees supporting Egypt in the Suez Canal dispute. . . . This applied to countries closely allied to the U. S., such as Pakistan and the Philippines, as much as to the neutralists." (N. Y. Times, Aug. 7.)

In the UN Economic and Social Council meeting in Geneva, August 3, British and French blackmailers shook the economic stick at the small countries. "The underdeveloped countries were warned . . . that if they followed the example of Egypt . . . they could not expect much help from Western investors." Sir Alec Randall of Britain threatened that Nasser's nationalization "must cause the most serious apprehension . . . to all those nations who have been seeking to attract foreign capital."

The imperialists feel their back against the wall. They cannot wait even to agree on what their exact pretext shall be. They must provoke a showdown.

To this end, Britain and France are refusing to pay ship tolls to Egypt, hoping that Nasser will therefore stop their ships, so that they can yell, "We told you so—Nasser is interfering with our sovereign and sanctified right to ship through the canal without paying Egypt."

The French National Assembly adopts a resolution labeling Nasser a "permanent menace to peace"—i.e., to French peace of mind in North Africa—which means that he must be overthrown by force and violence.

To this end the projected international conference is staged with provocative and well-publicized naval and troop movements going on all about, so as to squeeze Egypt between two choices: either go along with the rigged conference and suffer a setback and loss of prestige (they hope), or else reject the conference and give a pretext for highly sanctified foreign intervention to uphold the sanctity of treaties and of the \$40 million profit a year from the canal.

But Western colonialism cannot win in this crisis, whatever the outcome. It is truly exposing itself before the whole world. The essential issues are too clear.

CAN ATOM-POWER PLANTS GO OUT OF CONTROL?

By PHILIP COBEN

One of the least known dangers of the atomic era made one of its rare appearances in the open, this week, when a public hassle broke out over the projected construction of a nuclear-power plant not far from Detroit and Toledo.

For a change, the question does not involve the use of atomic energy for H-bombs or other war purposes, but, on the contrary, for peacetime industrial purposes. One of the very few places where this issue has been brought out and explained was in the April 12, 1954 issue of Labor Action, in a feature article "The Present Danger of Atomic Radiation in the United States." Outbreak of the present argument over the Lagoona Beach (Mich.) plant confirms the essential warning there given.

In a nutshell the issue is this: Will the development of nuclear power plants by private capitalist interests be carried on in such a way as to endanger the areas in which they exist, by neglecting safety considerations in favor of profitmaking? and will the government go along with such neglect of the safety factor or will it give it priority?

The specter that looms is a repetition in new radioactive terms of what happened in the industrial countries when, with the Industrial Revolution, smokestacks began pouring smoke and soot to the skies and chemical or garbage wastes into the rivers. This air and water pollution was a long-range menace to health. In the case of atomic energy, of course, radioactive pollution is more deadly and more persistent—qualitatively different from mere industrial filth.

This question, long systematically hushed up by the Atomic Energy Committee, emerged into the public press on August 4 under the following circumstances.

PROTESTS

The AEC announced that it was granting a "conditional" permit for the construction of a "fast neutron breeder type" of nuclear power plant at Lagoona Beach, which lies at the western end of Lake Erie between the population concentrations of Detroit and Toledo. This permit was issued to a company, called the Power Reactor Development Corporation, set up by a combine of the Detroit Edison Company, a number of public-utility companies and other industrial corporations.

At least two prominent congressmen, members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, the watchdog of the program, issued a public alarm. Senator Anderson, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee, and Rep. Chet Holifield (D., Cal.) made an appeal to the governor of Michigan to block construction of the plant by legal action. Holifield held a news conference to stimulate public opinion. Telegrams were sent to President Eisenhower.

In a telegram to Michigan Governor Williams, Chairman Anderson made a serious accusation against the AEC, one which will not astonish anyone who has been following the attitude of that body on such matters. He charged that the AEC had held a "star chamber proceeding" in which

it had disregarded "grave doubts as to the safety of the reactor" that had been raised by the report of its own advisory committee.

Perhaps taking account of these warnings, the AEC, in announcing the construction permit, stressed that it allowed only the building of the plant and not its actual operation. Before an operating permit is issued, the commission said, it "must be thoroughly satisfied that the reactor can be operated without undue risk to the health and safety of the public."

But it is hard to envision permitting the expenditure of \$40½ million on the construction of the plant if the operation permit were really seriously in doubt. The financial combine behind the project would not put up the money, and in any case such a procedure would be fantastic.

MELT-DOWN

Now, what is the danger of which the congressmen (and presumably the advisory committee) are warning?

The Washington dispatch in the N. Y. Times (Aug. 5) is sketchy on this point: "The Californian [Holifield] said the proposed plant would menace the lives of thousands of people in neighboring communities. . . ."

"Mr. Holifield asserted that there was great danger of 'melt-down' (the building up of heat of such intensity as to dissolve the heating elements upon which the operation depends) that would release radioactive elements into the atmosphere, rivers and lakes near the station.

"A small experimental operation of a fast-breeder type reactor 'melted down' in Arco, Idaho, last November," he added. "There was no serious reaction because the operation was only a tiny laboratory experimental type but it was an 'accidental' melt-down from causes not foreseen. As far as we know the same thing could happen at the 100,000-kilowatt plant AEC has approved for Michigan."

That leaves a great deal to be desired in the way of more information, but there is an important background to tie it up with, and to fill in some of the context.

RUNAWAY ATOMS

The first known case of a nuclear-power reactor which went wild—ran out of control—occurred in December 1952, in the atomic plant at Chalk River, Canada. This was definitely not the first case. At the time he announced the Chalk River accident, Canadian Minister of Trade C. D. Howe also stated that similar accidents had already occurred previously at Chalk River itself and at "other reactors" unnamed.

The Chalk River disaster was, however, the first case that was made public. This was for one thing because it occurred in Canada; U. S. laws would have kept this knowledge from public view.

What happened at Chalk River? "The reactor had been shut down," reported the technical magazine *Nucleonics* in January 1953, "and the flow of cooling water was considerably lower than that for full operation. Because of a misunderstanding [not further explained—P. C.], all the control rods were suddenly pulled out, and the power in the reactor built up very rapidly. This rapid build-up of power, combined with the small flow of water, caused at least one of the fuel rods to vaporize, and many thousands of curies of radioactive gases were carried up the exhaust stack."

Chalk River is a remote locality. It was evacuated. The reactor was shut down, and experts came in to decontam-

inate, and also to try to learn what had happened.

Maybe they learned something and maybe they didn't; we don't know. At the time it was perfectly clear that the authorities did not know just what had happened; as for the effects, the official statements blamed the "unusual atmospheric conditions" for concentrating the radioactive gases and dust on the plant itself, instead of dispersing them more widely. (This complaint is not likely to make Detroit and Toledo feel better.)

In any case, the type of reactor involved in the Chalk River case was different from the breeder reactor that "melted down" in Arco and from the one proposed for Lagoona Beach. It is clear that the experimenters do not know just what happened in the Arco melt-down. Even if they did, that does not mean by a long shot that they know (or even think they know) what all the "bugs" in the new type of reactor are. The question is whether they have a right to experiment with the population of that area where Ohio and Michigan meet the southern tip of Canada.

"MORE DANGEROUS"

In January 1953, soon after the Chalk River affair, the AEC issued a statement which attempted to minimize the possibility of nuclear-power disasters, but which also contained the following statement:

"If any of these reactors [at Hanford—also a different type] ever go completely out of control, dangerous amounts of radioactivity may be released to the atmosphere. The reactors cannot explode like a bomb, but, under the worst possible conditions, they could produce so much heat that the fuel elements would melt, thus releasing a very dense and highly radioactive cloud—more dangerous than the cloud produced by an atomic bomb explosion."

In September 1953, speaking at a Berkeley conference on nuclear engineering, the same topic was broached by Edward Teller, the nuclear scientist whose friends have tried to crown him with the title "father of the H-bomb," and whose tone was that of poohpoohing the dangers of atomic blowouts. But he also said:

"If a reactor blows up and gaseous fission products escape, there will be considerable danger. The reactor is a self-destructive mechanism that could kill an extremely great number of people if fission products were released. A runaway reactor can be relatively more dangerous than an atomic bomb producing the same radioactivity. Fission-product gases can't be detected by the senses. If a reactor accident occurs in which fewer bystanders are hurt than in conventional accidents, an exceedingly great number of people will become worried because of this."

POSITIVE PROPOSAL

In the account of the Chalk River accident, one of the phrases hinted at a human failure (the "misunderstanding") as the cause, or as one cause. This consideration has to be added on to the fact that the possible dangers of the reactor are not yet understood and therefore cannot be guarded against with sufficient certainty to put it into the midst of a population-complex.

The comments of a British scientist are relevant to this question. In October 1953 a New York business-sponsored conference on atomic energy in industry heard such discussion from a top man in the British atomic-energy program, Sir Christopher Hinton.

Referring to the fact that a Hanford-type (water-cooled) reactor was not "inherently safe" but could be made putatively safe only by the "gadget approach" to safety, he pointed out that "it can, under unfavorable circumstances, explode and scatter dangerous fission products over the countryside."

He went on to say: "The magnitude of disaster in the

event of such an accident is so great that no responsible engineer or industrialist could contemplate taking the responsibility for it. . . .

"Accidents almost invariably happen to all plants and machines that break into pioneering fields. . . . Our trouble in the design of reactors is that engineers learn from their mistakes rather than from their successes, and in the case of a nuclear reactor the penalty for failure is so great that the responsible engineer dare not risk it. . . .

"It is, to my mind, unsatisfactory to suggest that a reactor that is inherently unsafe can be made safe by the application of mechanical controls and gadgets; all of these can fail. . . ."

H. D. Smyth of the AEC, who replied, did not attempt to grapple with this fundamental objection.

Now, one of the British scientist's proposals had to do with the type of reactor to be used. Another was less technical.

He proposed that the U. S. authorities, for the cost of a single test-shot of an A-bomb, conduct controlled experiments in runaway reactors "in a remote place." This has never been seriously considered by the AEC. In fact, some time before, it is known, AEC chairman Gordon Dean had specifically referred to the idea but had stated that it had been rejected because they didn't want to spend the money.

WHOSE PRESSURE?

In effect, the experimental work will be done at the projected Lagoona Beach plant, instead of "in a remote place." The surrounding population has a right to wonder whether the cost of a real experimental plant would be exorbitant.

Moreover, even if there occurs one of the mistakes from which (said Hinton) engineers learn, it is also true that the amount learned will be fortuitous, since it will be a matter of determining the causes of an accident after it has happened and the set-up has been vaporized.

There are other questions that arise. (For example, is the plant to be located at Lagoona Beach so that the waters of Lake Erie can be used for disposal of the radioactive wastes produced? If so, are there any new methods proposed to prevent the deadly pollution of the water, which washes the shores also of Cleveland and Buffalo, not to speak of Canada and numberless other towns along the lakefront?)

But the charges made by the committee chairman Anderson show that the AEC has barged ahead with the Lagoona Beach program without even giving adequate consideration to its own advisory committee, let alone the independent warnings of other atomic scientists whose enlightened alarmism on the whole subject has been far better borne out than the AEC's record of official tut-tutting. Is it more responsive to pressure from the public-utility combine than from these scientific spokesmen?

The fatal crash of two modern ocean liners in open waters, protected though they were by all kinds of gadgets like radar, shows that safety cannot be left merely to the "human factor" in those cases where "the magnitude of the disaster in the event of such an accident is so great." By turning over the development of industrial nuclear power to private capitalist interests, without even compelling far-reaching (and unprofitable) precautions and preliminary work, the government is playing with the lives of millions.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

somewhere to see for themselves and tell the American people what they saw, if anything.

Obviously behind this is the deadly fear of the administration that if it does anything to offend Chiang Kai-shek, the China Lobby will get mad. But this is one of these cases where it is not enough to explain it as reactionary politics; it is one of the heights of stupidity reached by a government which is going for a world record.



LABOR ACTION

August 13, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 33

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATkins 4-4222—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.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Associate Editors:
GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Young
Socialist

CHALLENGE

August 13, 1956

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

Militarism Wins in the McKeon Verdict

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The incredible dénouement of the case of Marine Sergeant McKeon has been played out. Almost.

All of the major charges against McKeon were dismissed after a brilliant, grandstanding defense by the sergeant's lawyer, Emile Zola Berman, and the unprecedented appearance of two Marine generals, one of them the commandant of the Corps, as witnesses for the defense. Once the verdict was delivered, all prophesied a light sentence. The prosecuting officer noted that they "never" give discharges for cases of simple negligence and anticipated a sentence of six months or under, possibly even freedom.

Then the court spoke: nine months at hard labor, reduction in rank to private, a bad conduct discharge.

This, in itself, would make the McKeon affair a storybook case. But more is obviously to come. There is an automatic review by the secretary of the Navy and the possibility of appeal to another court. And already, pressure is being generated among McKeon's sympathizers to see to it that there is a reduction in sentence.

And indeed the sentence against McKeon, the individual, is almost irrelevant. The court-martial made it clear where the real guilt lies: in the Marine Corps.

And the victims, the six dead Marine boots, are beyond any help now. The system which brought them to their tragic end has been vindicated in the most fantastic of fashions. By the end of the trial, practically everybody—defense, Marine Corps, prosecution and court—had come to an agreement, and made it impossible to do anything about the real problem.

TURNING-POINT

The case itself breaks down into two broad divisions; the turning point was in the attitude of the Marine Corps itself.

When the story broke, General Pate stormed and raged, obviously fearful of public opinion. McKeon was more or less pre-judged. He was put under wraps, confined to base, told to keep his mouth

shut. All kinds of charges were then leveled at him, among them that he had been drunk on the night of the fatal march.

The tone of the Corps at this point was apologetic, evasive (as pointed out in Sam Taylor's July 30 *Challenge* article). It had been hurt not too long ago by a simple *Life* article detailing the techniques of drill instruction at Parris Island, and this was something more: there were six dead recruits to account for in this case.

But then Berman, through skillful legal and publicity maneuvering, made it plain that he was going to defend McKeon on the basis of the fact that the sergeant was simply carrying out standard Marine Corps practice. He called for ex-Marines to come and testify on their training; he demanded that the questionnaire which the Corps had sent out on training methods be made public; he spoke of calling two hundred or more witnesses.

CHANGED CLIMATE

And here, it was undoubtedly the response which Berman got to his defense that began to change the Corps' official mind. Many ex-Marines wrote in that they were willing to testify; there were testimonials to McKeon himself from men who had served under him in Korea; there were editorials coming out and agreeing with the Berman position. And, to be sure, there was a tremendous truth in Berman's argument: that it was not McKeon but the Marine's training methods which were on trial.

A vocal section of the public did more than accept this truism: they also accepted the proposition that there was nothing wrong with these methods, that they were necessary to train Marines for combat, and that the six dead boots had

to be offered up on the altar of some kind of military necessity, every bit as much as if they had been killed in combat.

One can gauge the significance of this reaction easily by projecting it back, say fifteen years ago. At any time before World War II, would this have been the attitude of the American public? An indigenous, anti-militarist tradition would have spoken out at almost any time before then, demanded an investigation, changes, even a general here or there to be retired.

But World War II and the Korean War have done a lot to change America. There is a certain sophistication which has been acquired in the days of the garrison state. And the result was that the official Marine Corps mind listened and changed. The commandant agreed to take the stand as a witness for the defense. Even Hollywood would pause before it would film such a situation, but here it was.

PATE AND PULLER

The general, who had been storming and raging about getting to the bottom of the whole thing, arrived at Parris Island and confronted the sergeant. I'm here to help you, son, he said. And then, in a mood which the press described as one of almost good-humor, he took the stand and said that he thought the sergeant who had led the march into the boondocks should . . . lose a stripe!

The prosecution warned the officers of the court not to be swayed by the solution of the commanding general of the Corps (on the verdict, they were swayed; on the sentence, they apparently were not), and the stage was set for the next scene in the fantastic drama.

Enter General "Chesty" Puller, a sort of Marine edition of George Patton, all blood and guts and for hard traing methods, and ready to take the stand for the defense. He spoke his piece, as the court convened a little late the next day so that he could review the troops at Parris Island. (What were they thinking as they marched before "Chesty"?)

By the time the two generals were finished, the whole question had shifted: now it appeared that no one was on trial at all; McKeon deserved to lose a stripe, that's all; the Corps was not in the wrong; and there was only the fact of the six dead recruits remaining to remind one that anything had happened at all.

Now there's to be a review by the secretary of the Navy, and perhaps a completely happing ending with McKeon's sentence reduced by the greater part. Maybe Pate's suggestion will carry the day and the whole thing can be resolved by that symbolic loss of a Marine stripe.

SACRED COW

No one can doubt that training young men for combat is a serious process (though one can certainly doubt the system that has kept American youth at this training for a decade and a half). That is not the issue. It is rather that the Marine Corps, in the name of its elite psychology, has been allowed almost unlimited license to set up its petty tyrannies in the hands of incompetents, misfits, and unwilling drill instructors (that characterization, a harsh one, developed out of the evidence in the early, pre-Pate-and-Puller days), and to set over the whole shooting-match a general like Pate who switches his position and testifies in a mood of well-being and good-humor about a tragedy involving the death of six men.

Indeed, the public-relations job that has been done reminds one of the publicity for the FBI. With an aura of secrecy and cloak-and-dagger, Hoover's

high position as chief of the secret police has made him more or less immune from political criticism, investigation, or questioning about appropriations. Now the Marine Corps is added to the list.

This is not a simple justification of hard training methods, but a *carte blanche*. There is no other explanation for a situation in which there is hardly any reaction to the suggestion that the death of the six boots calls for the loss of a stripe.

INDEX TO CORROSION

But more than this, the McKeon case marks the decisive reversal of a process which began immediately after World War II and has been under attack ever since. That was the move to "democratize" the army.

Immediately after the war (while millions of men had the memory of their army service fresh in mind) there was all kinds of talk, and some action, about reform. There were some changes made in court-martial procedure, most of them now lost, allowing for enlisted men to sit on courts judging enlisted men, etc. There were also directives about officers and non-coms not talking "harshly" to the men under their command, and the like.

But then, under the impact of the Korean War, much of this began to change. General S. L. A. Marshall published his now-famous *Colliers* piece on the non-firers, calling for the defeat of the inhibitions of the troops through mass psychology, constructing notions of group ethics, making the officer a "father-figure," and the like. The professionals began to bear down hard on the reforms.

Actually, of course, the "democratization" was not that at all. It was simply an attempt to soften, not change, some of the aspects of the service's authoritarian set-up. There was not a single move in the direction of army democracy (a technique which, incidentally, had been used by some army elite groupings during the Second World War). But now even the fluff of the reform is over.

The McKeon case is a terrible index to the corrosion of the psychology of the garrison state into the popular consciousness. In no other time would such an argument have succeeded so well.

Get the Challenge

every week — by subscribing to
Labor Action. A student sub is
only \$1 a year!

THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

Psychopathology of an Occupation Army

The most recent news from Germany tells of a series of violent outbreaks on the part of American troops there. The problem has become serious enough to bring German requests for curfew, analyses on the part of the American military, and so on.

One soldier, for example, tossed a hand grenade into a Munich bar. Nine Germans and eight American soldiers were wounded.

Another soldier murdered a ferryboat operator and then attacked a girl on the boat.

In Rosenheim, a soldier was arrested for killing a German civilian; the next day, another soldier was arrested for threatening a woman, and four soldiers were charged with wrecking a beer hall.

Various explanations for the situation have been advanced. Some Army officers, of course, blame it on the Germans, specifically on the prostitutes and bartenders. Other observers blame the army. They hold that the army's system of rotating troops in large groups—up to divisions—means that a mass of strangers with no experience in Europe are put down all at once into unfamiliar surroundings. According to *U.S. News and World Report*, the army is now trying to tighten up its regulations, placing

bars off limits, discharging "subcaliber" men (*U.S. News'* phrase), screening applicants for reenlistment, etc.

In the American accounts of the problem, one underlying cause is significantly not discussed. It is the whole psychology produced in an army which has the job of "occupying" (or now, in NATO parlance, "defending") a country. This becomes particularly true when the occupying army, as in the case of the American troops, are peacetime conscripts, uneducated to the reason for their service, given a job which is more for the satisfaction of the paper dreams of NATO than anything else.

This point has not appeared in American discussions, as we noted. But it has not been lost on the Germans. *U.S. News and World Report* makes this apparent in a tangential way when it comments that the outbreak of violence was a factor in the German debate on conscription and compulsory military training. For the American magazine this meant that the issue had been magnified by partisan politics.

But one wonders: Could it be that the conduct of the American troops has given the Germans an insight into the whole demoralizing, fairy-tale-like structure of NATO?

TOMORROW'S NEGRO

A Handbook on 'The Negro Potential' Given Emancipation from Jim Crow

By BETTY PERKINS

THE NEGRO POTENTIAL is one of a series of reports by the Conservation of Human Resources Project, of which Dr. Ginzberg, Professor of Economics, Graduate School of Business at Columbia, is the director. This project was established at Columbia University in 1950 by its then president, General Eisenhower, and this report is its second major product.

The book is divided into four main sections: reports on the Negro on the job, in school and in the army, and a final section of forecasts and conclusions.

It is in the three main chapters that socialists and trade unionists will be particularly interested, as the information presented forms a valuable handbook on the effect of segregation.

Dr. Ginzberg, a liberal, begins his economic discussion with the thought that American culture and family life are based on economic opportunity and income. The total elimination of the color barrier would not immediately improve the lot of the Negro—it takes time to take advantage of the opportunity to get a better education and a better job.

The economic life of the Negro can be divided into three broad sections: his opportunities in the rural South, the urban South and the urban North.

The rural South has been a depressed area since the Civil War, and this has led to a large migration out. In 1900 the rural Negro constituted 75 per cent of all Negroes (90 per cent of all Negroes lived in the South) while the white population was only 60 per cent rural. By 1950 only 40 per cent of all Negroes remained in rural areas (same as the white percentage), while the Southern Negro as a whole comprised only 68 per cent of all Negroes, a migration not only from the rural areas but also from the urban South.

Only 20 per cent of the Negro farmers (as against 60 per cent of white farmers) lived in medium- or high-income areas, while 80 per cent occupied the poorest section. This is also verified by the fact that the Negro farmer in the South saw only one half as much cash as the white farmer in the South and only one-third as much as the average white farmer in the South and only one-third as much as the average white farmer in the United States.

With the high birth rate of these poor farmers, there are only three practical suggestions for improving this area: continued migration, improvement in agriculture (the Negro with little education or capital stands small chance here), or increasing small industry in rural areas (comparatively few jobs have opened for Negroes in Southern industry in the past).

SCOPE OF OPPORTUNITY

The number of Negroes in urban areas of the South has increased but the percentage has decreased (40 per cent in 1900 to 25 per cent in 1950) due to migration north for the better jobs and schools there. What new jobs have opened in the urban South have usually been the result of the economic growth of the Negro community.

Only 6 per cent of Negroes held professional, managerial or clerical jobs as against 31 per cent of the whites in the South and 13 per cent of the Northern Negroes. Negro skilled workers numbered only 6 per cent also, as against 18 per cent of white workers and 11 per cent of Northern Negroes. Operatives, service workers and laborers account for 53 per cent of Negro labor in the South, and only 28 per cent of white labor, while 74 per cent of Northern Negroes are in these brackets.

If at first the ratio of 53 per cent to 74 per cent seems to deny the existence of "better conditions" in the North, a glance at statistics for the Negro farmer (2 per cent in the North versus 34 per cent in the South) explains the large

THE NEGRO POTENTIAL, by Eli Ginzberg and Others—Columbia University Press, New York, 1956, 144 pages, \$3.

number of Northern Negroes in unskilled but non-farm jobs.

Even these minor advances do not reflect much widening of opportunity for the Negro. Two-thirds of the professional jobs were as clergymen or teachers; most managers were owners of small stores or bars; and most operatives were in the most unpleasant industries (one-third truck drivers, others in lumber mills, mines, laundries, food plants, foundries, power plants).

What industrial integration has taken place has usually been in federal installations or in branches of Northern companies.

Little improvement has been made in jobs for women, 64 per cent of whom were in service in 1940. By 1950 the number had been reduced to 56 per cent, although there had been a big shift into non-household service, such as waitresses.

MAKING THEIR WAY

The total percentage of Negroes increased 17 per cent between 1940 and 1950. At the same time, the percentage of Negroes in the North increased 52 per cent, in the West 234 per cent, and in the South 3 per cent. The Negro population of New York City went from 500,000 to 750,000; Chicago, 300,000 to 500,000; Detroit, 150,000 to 300,000; Los Angeles, 100,000 to 210,000; and San Francisco, 46,000 to 136,000.

This migration has taken place, of course, because it is easier in the North (or West) for a Negro to find a better job at a higher wage and with no rigid segregation. There is a wider range of opportunity in the top jobs (only one-fourth of the professional jobs are as teachers or clergymen). Skilled jobs are easier to find (not as craftmen in building trades but in industry) and where unions are integrated, as in the automobile industry, promotion is a result of seniority, not of color.

The Negro woman is much better off than in the South—only one-third were in private service in 1950 as against two-thirds in 1940. She has also a better chance at a job as a machine operator or in clerical work.

In recent years the North has become committed in principle to equality of opportunity for Negroes. This has been spurred by various FEPC laws and by the Negro's acceptance into industrial unions.

Negro college graduates are beginning to be hired by large companies for scientific and technical work, and the returns for such work are increasing. (In 1940, the average Negro college graduate earned less than whites who had not graduated from the eighth grade. By 1950 the average Negro college graduate had progressed to a salary a little less than whites who had not graduated from high school!)

EDUCATION PICTURE

Educational problems involving the Negro stem from his position in the South and the general backwardness of the whole region.

Today 66 per cent of all Negroes live in the South and 16 per cent of the Northern Negroes were born in the South, and their inadequate preparation

reflects the low standard of Southern education, particularly the elementary school, on which all further education must be based.

Of Negroes born in 1905, 9 per cent never went to school and 40 per cent never completed the fourth grade. Of those born in 1930, 2 per cent never attended school and 17 per cent went no further than the fourth grade. To all intents, these people were illiterate and, as such, not eligible for jobs in industry or the armed forces (except in wartime).

The importance of elementary schooling becomes even more apparent when we find that only an additional 42 per cent of Negroes in the South finish the fifth-to-eighth grades, while 22 per cent of Northern Negroes do so.

To summarize, of the men of the 1930 generation, 61 per cent of Southern Negroes and 27 per cent of Northern Negroes went to less than the eighth grade. Of the same white generation, 31 per cent in the South and 16 per cent in the North never went further or as far as the eighth grade.

In other words, 16 per cent of white students in the North went to the eighth grade, or less, but twice as many Southern whites and Northern Negroes got this meager education and four times as many Southern Negroes completed only 0-8 grades.

THE MISSING PERCENTAGES

Using the same birth dates (1905 and 1930) we find high school graduates increasing greatly but still accounting only for low percentages. The number of Southern Negro high school graduates increased from 5 per cent to 15 per cent, while in the case of the Northern Negro this figure increased from 14 per cent to 31 per cent. The increase in white high school graduates was not as great, but the percentages are more substantial: from 24 per cent to 42 per cent in the South and from 30 per cent to 56 per cent in the North.

Of the 15 per cent of Southern Negroes who finished high school in 1950, only 6 per cent were likely to enter college and only 2 per cent were likely to graduate. Of the 31 per cent in the North, only 10 per cent would enter college and 3 per cent graduate.

Of the 42 per cent of white high school graduates in the South, 20 per cent would go to college and 9 per cent graduate, while of the 56 per cent of Northern white high school graduates, 24 per cent would go to college and 11 per cent would graduate.

The Negro women in both the North and the South are far ahead of Negro men in almost every level of schooling, but far behind white women.

In 1950 there were 64,800 Negro high school graduates in the United States and 9400 college graduates. If all Negroes were raised to the educational level of the Northern Negro, we would have 93,800 high school and 9800 college graduates. If their education were raised to the level of Southern whites, there would be 117,650 high school and 20,800 college graduates. And if education were raised to the level of the Northern whites, there would be 157,800 high school and 23,200 college graduates among the Negroes.

"A DISGRACE"

This is a good indication of the Negro potential now being missed by inadequate schooling.

Not only is Negro education too little, but it is also inadequate in quality. A Speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives says:

"Negro education in Georgia is a disgrace. What the white child gets in the third grade, the Negro gets in the sixth."

A president of the Southern Negro College claims that a high proportion of Negro high school graduates cannot cope with college instruction unless provided

with from six months to a year of special training.

Of the men screened for military service, the whites averaged twelve years of school, the Negro eight years; yet 75 per cent of the whites had scores in group III (average) or above, while only a little over 25 per cent of the Negroes ranked here. The difference is greater than the difference in schooling warrants. The average freshman in a Negro college scores only slightly higher than the lowest-ranking freshman of the average college. Of 6000 candidates taking college entrance exams in 1953, only 6 per cent from the Southern Negro high school did as well or better than the average student.

Northern Negro schools are also inferior. Northern schools are often segregated in fact, if not by law, due to residential segregation. Schools in such neighborhoods are often in disrepair, with inadequate facilities and inexperienced teachers preoccupied with discipline maintenance.

DOUBLE HANDICAP

The formal qualifications of the Negro teacher are usually the same as the white teacher, but the teachers themselves are usually much less able, handicapped as they are by poor schooling in their turn and by deprived backgrounds.

Test scores of teacher-trainees in Southern colleges show that the average white freshman was exceeded by 65 per cent of freshmen throughout the country, and future Negro teachers were exceeded by 95 per cent of all freshmen. Rural students planning to teach in rural areas ranked lowest of all.

In summary, Dr. Ginzberg says:

"The Negro population labors under a double educational handicap. Since the Negro goes to school for fewer years than do whites, he receives far less preparation for life and work. What schooling he does receive is of inferior quality and therefore has less value than the schooling received by whites. A major weakness of Northern education is the poor preparation of Negro teachers. It has not been possible under segregation to break the cycle of poorly prepared Negro teachers teaching severely handicapped Negro students. Significant improvement will probably have to wait for progress in integration. This was surely a major concern of the Supreme Court when it handed down its epoch-making decision to end segregation in public education."

ARMY MYTHS

Negro soldiers in the segregated army of World War II had to fight three misconceptions of the army officials dating from World War I:

(1) The myth that Negroes as a race score poorly on mental tests. The first such tests had been made by the army in 1917-18. Naturally, Negroes, with poorer education, scored low, but the fact that poor whites from the same areas did badly too, or that Negroes in the North did better than whites from the isolated South, was not so obvious to army observers.

(2) The myth that the Negro is not a good fighter, a misconception for which there was inconclusive evidence gained from limited use of two divisions.

(3) The myth that avoidance of any trouble in an emergency meant that the army had to practice segregation.

Between wars four Negro regiments had been established, but only one Negro graduated from West Point.

At the outbreak of World War II, the army wished (1) to take as few Negroes as possible, (2) these mostly from the North, and (3) into segregated labor battalions. To a large degree it succeeded in the last two aims, but the urgent need of manpower meant that the army took almost 10 per cent of its draftees from the Negroes, which is roughly the same proportion of Negroes as in the general population.

The same need for manpower led the army to educate, within limits, its poorer personnel, and to open more opportunities to the better-educated Negro.

Of the 18 million men examined for army service, 700,000 were refused for educational deficiency (45 per cent of these Negro) and 400,000 illiterates were inducted (40 per cent of these Negro). Regardless of their handicaps, only 5 per cent of the Negroes (50,000) were discharged for lack of requisite aptitude in wartime. These differences in mental

(Turn to last page)

The New Labor Movement In Algeria and North Africa

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

Paris, July 28

At its last meeting, early this month in Brussels, the Executive Committee of the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions took a decision of major importance: it voted to admit to membership the Union Générale des Travailleurs Algériens (UGTA), one of the two recently constituted independent trade-union bodies in Algeria, as "the most representative organization" of Algerian workers.

At the same time, the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions decided to send an investigating commission to Algeria, composed of its president (Omer Bécu), its secretary general (Oldenbroeck), a representative of the British TUC (Geddes), and a representative of the AFL-CIO (Irving Brown); to protest against the arrest of Algerian trade-unionists and, if the protest should remain without effect, to lodge a complaint against the French government with the International Labor Organization for violating trade-union rights in Algeria.

Finally, the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions Executive stated that the solution to the Algerian problem was principally political, and urged the French government to begin negotiations with the representatives of the Algerian people.

In taking these decisions, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has given an official expression to its determination to act within a framework of Algerian independence, and has committed itself to the support of the Algerian nationalist demands. This decisive step is the outcome of several months of struggle against the "socialist" government of France and against the French trade-unions, particularly against the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions affiliate in France, Ouvrière.

TWO FEDERATIONS

The last phase of this struggle began early this year (February 20) when the "Messalist" nationalists (MNA) founded the USTA, the first independent trade-union movement ever to exist in Algeria.

In its first public statements, the USTA declared itself open to all workers regardless of ethnic origin, political opinion or religion; it proclaimed its determination to organize the agricultural workers, who form the bulk of the proletariat in Algeria and who had been neglected by the old trade-union bodies, which are dominated by a European workers' aristocracy. The USTA also announced its intention to fight for a free Algeria and to coordinate its "foreign policy" with the Moroccan UMT and the Tunisian UGTT. This orientation was further confirmed by its application for membership in the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions.

Ten day later (March 2) the right wing of the Algerian nationalist movement (FLN) also entered a bid for working-class support by organizing the UGTA, a rival independent trade-union body. The new organization claimed to be based on the same principles as the

USTA, but did not apply for membership in any international organization until a month and a half later, when it published a statement mentioning that it too had applied for membership in the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions.

Little can be said about the action of either union, as immediate repression paralyzed both almost since their founding. The leaders of both USTA and UGTA have been arrested, deported to France or sent to concentration camps several times over; their press has been suppressed as soon as it was published; in short, both organizations have been forced to operate under conditions of semi-legality.

LACOSTE AT WORK

When the USTA was founded, the correspondent of *Le Monde* in Algiers wrote: "One fears that the probable enthusiasm of the Moslem agricultural workers for the new organization will give the latter a considerable strength, which it will use to make trouble for Algerian agriculture, and that this action will legally supplement the terroristic action of the outlaws."

"The Governor General of Algeria, Robert Lacoste, a leading member of the French SP and a former trade-unionist, saw to it that these fears would remain groundless. He lost no time in denouncing the "dangers" of a union of the three North African independent trade unions, and stated that "Force Ouvrière" would "veto the admission of an independent Algerian union to the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions."

In May, after suppressing USTA and UGTA, Lacoste proceeded to bar the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions observer Irving Brown from Algeria, accusing him of being "a master of corruption" and of "engaging in activities contrary to French interests."

While it is true that Irving Brown's methods and political approach have been highly objectionable in general, this was one occasion where he was carrying out a perfectly legitimate and justified mission on behalf of the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions: investigating the application for membership of the new Algerian unions, and checking on the state of trade-union rights in Algeria. His debarment from Algeria was tantamount to an admission by Lacoste that he had suppressed all such rights and that he was going to defend, also in this respect, the interests of the Algerian colonialists. Lacoste, of all people, was the last person qualified to point an accusing finger at Irving Brown.

This episode has now been settled by the decision of the International Confederation Of Trade Unions Executive, overriding the opposition of the corrupt leadership of French social-democracy.

ICFTU's MOTIVES

However, the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions decision leaves a number of other questions open. The most important is, why was the UGTA accepted instead of the USTA? Or why were not both unions accepted until such a time as each could prove its strength under legal conditions? The ostensible reason given (greater representativeness) does not hold water as nobody can tell, under the present circumstances, which union has the greatest support.

The real reasons are different. For one thing, there is the support of the UGTA by the Moroccan and Tunisian unions, which was decisive. Both UMT and UGTT have only recently and timidly begun to differentiate themselves from the leadership of the nationalist parties in their country; the latter have traditions and aims that bring them closer to the FLN than to the MNA, which stands alone as practically the only pro-

letarian and revolutionary party in North Africa. For these reasons, the UMT and UGTT leadership has so far supported the FLN and, on the trade-union level, the UGTA.

Secondly, the UGTA was able to use the Stalinist blackmail. As France-Observateur put it, "the question of the international affiliation of the UGTA has been discussed at great length from top to bottom. Most of the national organizers are former secretaries of the CGT and, as such, were in contact with the WFTU; however, the establishment of a united North African front has led the Algerians to the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions, to which the sister-organizations of Tunisia and Morocco already belong." Also, it appears that the UGTA has received, informally, some help from the Stalinist CGT (called UGSA in Algeria), in line with the Stalinist support of the FLN (in early June, the Stalinist underground organization "Combattants de la Liberté" announced its dissolution and directed its groups to join the resistance movement of the FLN). This does not mean that the leaders of the UGTA are Stalinists or Stalinist-influenced in any sense; it only means that they were in a position to opportunistically play one side against the other, and to threaten affiliation with the WFTU if the application of the USTA had been accepted by the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions.

The USTA, on the other hand, like the MNA, relies on the Algerian workers alone, having no ties with the Arab League, the Stalinists or any other source of outside support. In view of this situation, it is not surprising to hear that the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions Executive reached its decision only after a long and stormy debate.

A CHOICE

At the present time, two courses are open to the cadres of the USTA: they can either maintain their union as an independent body until legal activity is again possible in Algeria, or they can dissolve the USTA and join the UGTA, to fight for the leadership of the organization which now benefits from official International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions support.

In the latter case, their prospects are not unfavorable. Contrary to the FLN, which has tended to impose itself as "valid negotiation partner," the MNA has relied for its future on the verdict of the Algerian people in free elections. In trade-union matters also, the last word will be spoken by the Algerian workers themselves. The ordainment of the present UGTA leadership as "representative" by the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions is subject to ratification by the Algerian workers and, in France alone, almost all of the 300,000 Algerian workers solidly support the MNA.

In spite of its ill-advised choice, the admission by the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions of an independent Algerian trade-union is bound to have far-reaching and positive consequences not only in Algeria but also in a more general context.

It is certain to affect in some way the situation of the labor movement in France: what will be the attitude of the present and future UGTA leadership towards the CGT? Will the 300,000 Algerian workers in France, who are now mostly members of the CGT, challenge the Stalinist leadership of this organization? Under one form or another, it is very likely that they will.

STALINIST ROLE

Consequences will also be felt in Africa. The Algerian war has already had profound repercussions in all of Tropical Africa under French rule, where nationalist currents are moving toward greater independence, militancy and

unity. This development has taken place most markedly on the trade-union level.

Early this year, a group of West African trade-unionists left the CGT, which is led by Stalinists but includes a large mass of militant workers who are not Stalinists in any sense. The dissident group, followed by about half of the old CGT, set up an independent trade-union organization, the "Confédération Générale des Travailleurs Africains" (CGTA).

At its constitutive congress last April, the CGTA was found to include also formerly unaffiliated unions as well as former elements from FO. *Le Monde*, which had hopefully predicted that the new union would show greater moderation than the CGT, had to report that, on the contrary, it was raising more radical demands than the old unions ever had.

To illustrate this development by its reverse side, so to speak, the evolution of the Stalinist trade-union movement should also be considered here.

The rise of independent trade-unions under nationalist leadership, in all African territories, has met with three successive reactions from the Stalinist organizations: first undisguised hostility; then adjustment, in the form of severing formal ties with the French CGT and acting as a homegrown and independent movement; finally dissolution and entry into the nationalist organization.

DECLINE OF CP

In Morocco, this last stage was reached as early as December 1955, when the CGT dissolved and directed its members to join the UMT. In Tunisia, the small USTT decided to dissolve last month, and also sent its members into the UGTT, with CP Blessings.

In Algeria, the transformation of the CGT into the "independent" UGSA, the publication by this organization of a new paper advertised as "the only voice of the working masses" (also suppressed by Lacoste, incidentally) corresponds to the second stage, but the support given by the Stalinists to the FLN and the UGTA suggests that here too the Stalinist organization will dissolve as soon as the UGTA gets stronger.

In Tropical Africa, the CGT declared last month that it too was severing all connections with the French CGT and simultaneously issued a call for a unity conference of all African trade-union federations.

While it is true that this policy of dissolution and merger is an application in colonial territories of the present Stalinist unity policy, it is much more important that the Stalinists could not maintain separate organizations even if they wanted to. Their unions have dissolved after a steady loss of strength and, in great part, to mask the disintegration that would have become obvious had they tried to continue a policy of direct opposition to the nationalist organizations.

TOWARD SOLIDARITY

Especially in the field of labor action, the movement for independence has swept away all obstacles to a united movement imposed by foreign traditions and interests. Also the unions with a Catholic origin have been compelled to sever their ties with the French CFTC and to organize themselves as independent unions of "believing" — not specifically Christian — workers; at the same time, FO is rapidly disappearing in most African territories.

The entrance of the UGTA into the International Confederation Of Free Trade Unions will undoubtedly encourage and strengthen this trend toward independence and union. A united front of North African unions exists already, notwithstanding Mr. Lacoste.

In a joint statement published after the International Confederation Of Trade Unions decision, the UMT and UGTA expressed their intention of permanent cooperation in order to prosecute together the struggle for "a regime of freedom and of economic and social democracy" in Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco. On the other hand, one of the first steps of the West African CGTA was to establish contacts with the North African unions, and plans are now being made, largely on the initiative of the UMT and the UGTT leadership, to call an all-African Trade-Union Conference, including also unions in territories under British rule.

In this way, the future unifying and leading force of the whole African continent is now beginning to take an organized shape.

Correction

A typographical error on page 6 of last week's LABOR ACTION changed the meaning of a sentence in André Giacometti's "Introducing Claude Gerard." The word treasonably should have appeared instead of reasonably in the reference, to "this woman, who is taking terrible risks to do her duty as a democrat and as a human being while so many others, with greater liberal and radical pretense, behave treasonably towards the peoples of France and Algeria."

Civil Rights or Dem Unity — —

(Continued from page 1)

isfy labor and the Negroes on this question.

On the eve of the Democratic convention, Robert Oliver, co-director of the AFL-CIO's Legislative Committee, announced that this committee had placed civil rights "at the top of the list of legislation to be sought in Congress next year." Oliver then went on to describe in some detail the tortuous tactics by which his committee thinks such legislation might be passed in the next Congress, including breaking two filibusters in the Senate led by Democrats, and getting the votes of three Republican members of the House Rules Committee who "might back a mild bill."

Although *Labor's Daily* for August 3 headlined Oliver's statement, even on the face of it it contains so many "ifs" and "buts" that no one in his right political senses can regard it as the way in which the Negro people are going to win their rights in America.

"THE MAJOR ISSUE"?

It should be clear that if the labor movement really plans to make civil rights the key political issue in 1957, the time to start is by fighting the racists tooth and nail at the Democratic convention, and fighting them tooth and nail during the electoral campaign which will follow it. Once the electoral die is cast, and cast on the basis of a "compromise" which leaves the Negroes to carry on the struggle with no greater help than they had before the elections, the opportunity of this campaign will have been totally missed.

Herbert Hill NAACP labor secretary, told more than 300 trade-union leaders attending the AFL-CIO Rutgers Labor Institute that civil rights will be "the major issue of morality and conscience in the 1956 presidential and congressional election."

"The matter of school desegregation and compliance with other Supreme Court rulings," Hill continued, "will be the No. 1 domestic issue at the party nominating conventions and at the ballot box. The time is now passed when violence, cross burnings and intimidation can prevent large numbers of Negroes from entering the voter's booth. In the light of the magnificent courage of Southern Negroes who are insisting on their right to vote, the paralysis of the federal government in securing law enforcement has helped create a new political consciousness among Negro voters which will be sharply expressed at the polls in the coming election."

That civil rights is the "major issue of morality and conscience" which faces the nation is clear. The difficulty is that it appears that everything possible is going to be done by the effective leadership of the Democratic Party to avoid doing anything but giving the minimum possible lip-service to this issue during the campaign in the interest of party unity, while the Republicans cynically seek to warp it to their own partisan advantage.

And despite the sincerity with which the leaders of the NAACP and their allies in the labor movement approach the issue, it is evident that they have not yet drawn the full practical political conclusions from the current political situation.

ARE THEY PREPARED?

The point is that however strongly they may urge their views on civil rights on the Platform Committee of the Democratic Party, they do not appear to have prepared the groundwork for a real battle over the issue at the Democratic convention. For instance, it does not appear that the labor movement has conducted a real campaign, in those areas where it is strongly entrenched in the Democratic Party on a state and

local level, to commit delegates to the convention (and party leaders who depend on it for support) to an all-out fight on this issue at the convention.

That is the minimum they could have done, given their commitment to the Democratic Party, to make civil rights the key dividing issue at this convention.

And they certainly have not done the maximum: to prepare themselves and the masses who follow them for a practical political alternative in the event the convention achieves party harmony over the backs of the Negroes of the country.

It is in the nature of the present political atmosphere in the country that the leaders of the Democratic Party should try to play down the civil-rights issue, which is dynamite for party unity. There is no absolute certainty that they will achieve their purpose in Chicago, for the issue itself is so explosive that their well-laid plans could crash on the rocks of Southern intransigence, the unprincipled opportunism of a Harriman, or other unforeseen contingencies. The greater pressure the NAACP-labor-movement-ADA coalition can bring to bear on the convention, the greater the likelihood this will happen.

But the lack of an alternative to support of the candidates of the Democratic Party, regardless of how completely they compromise the civil-rights issue, deprive the NAACP and the labor movement of the strongest instrument by which to pressure the Democratic convention and to affect the electoral campaign which will follow it. Such an alternative would be a declaration that unless the Democratic Party at least ousts the Southern racists from its ranks and leadership, the NAACP and the labor movement will lay the foundations of a new party which will really fight for civil rights "the major issue of morality and conscience" in 1956 and thereafter.

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!

Tomorrow's Negro — —

(Continued from page 6)

ability are obviously not innate but reflect the inadequate education offered to Negroes.

The impression existed among officers that the Negro would offer extreme emotional and behavior problems. Actually, of the 9.2 million whites inducted, 16,000 got dishonorable discharges, 39,000 got other than honorable discharges, and 250,000 got medical discharges on a psychoneurotic basis. Of 930,000 Negroes inducted, 4000 got dishonorable discharges, 11,000 other than honorable,

and 26,000 psychoneurotic discharges.

The rejection rate of Negroes and whites on a psychoneurotic basis was the same (although the Negro rate might have been higher except for the large number disqualified because of education), and most of the other discharges were not behavioral but due to the lack of enough education to cope with the complex rules and duties demanded by a highly organized army.

Complete integration was made necessary by manpower needs in the Korean War while General Matthew Ridgway was in command. To congressional objectors, the army asked: Do you want to excuse the Negro from fighting? While demagogic, the appeal worked.

At the end of World War II only 18 per cent of the Negroes were in the top three non-commissioned officer ranks, but by 1955 28 per cent of the Negro men ranked here, as against only 26 per cent of the white. Statistics for further comparison will be difficult to get in the future, as the army ceases to keep records on a segregated basis.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

In assisting the Negro toward better preparation for work, Dr. Ginsberg cites (in addition to the vital influences offered by a good education and an integrated army experience) the necessary cooperation of the community and the home in providing motivation and guidance to the younger generations.

Dr. Ginsberg advises that the leaders of the Negro community must inform the young Negro where there is the most demand for his talent: in the skilled factory job and in the professions, especially science and engineering, and other opportunities as they develop. More scholarship aid must be provided to young scholars by the community, and Negro colleges must be more adequately financed.

Most important of all, residential segregation must be broken down, in order to provide the community integration which alone can allow the Negro to take

full advantage of any opened opportunity.

Dr. Ginsberg takes a prophetic look at the future and points out some likely possibilities: schools will benefit from the increased anxiety throughout the nation which is leading to the acceptance of federal aid to education; agencies such as the Supreme Court and the Interstate Commerce Commission will continue to rule out the vestiges of the "separate but equal" doctrine; Fair Employment laws or practices will spread, as will integration in government housing; and the Reserve Officers Training Corps and the National Guard will do away with segregation.

ECONOMIC FORCES

The Negro needs prosperity to get full advantage of seniority and job security. Dr. Ginsberg foresees the likelihood of a "period of reduced business activity which will probably be much more moderate than the great depression of 1929-33" and sees hope in the fact that both major parties are committed to government intervention to maintain economic health.

He cites the needs of the rural South as noted by the Eisenhower Joint Committee on the Economic Report: encourage rural industry, assist migration to sections where jobs are available, and make available more training in non-farm activities, but he mentions no immediate activity toward these aims.

The report also points out that the rapid industrialization of the South must bring a better use of Negro manpower, which is 25 per cent of its population. The South cannot afford to have its best Negroes move out, nor can it support segregation in industry. To meet competition it must renounce its expensive and inefficient system.

"The maintenance of a system of segregation is reinforced by the specific returns that the dominant group derives from the practice. Some of them are easy to recognize. Less apparent are the substantial costs that the dominant group pays for maintaining segregation. Those

Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

who take advantage of their fellow man pay a high price."

What has caused the improvement in the condition of the Negro? Dr. Ginsberg mentions in passing the international policy of the United States, which is endangered by unfair treatment of a minority, but his conclusive statement on the subject is:

"The first and perhaps most significant finding emerging from this study is that improvements in the position of the Negro occurred primarily as the direct outgrowth and consequence of forces unleashed in the marketplace."

Dr. Ginsberg lightly touches on Southern reactionaries, as we noted, without prolonged discussion, but his economic analysis of the effects of segregation presents a damning picture. The mine of information presented proves incontestably the tragic cost to Negro and white, to the whole country, of the obsolete and inhuman system of Jim Crow.

READERS TAKE THE FLOOR

A Theory

To the Editor:

All public-spirited American patriots must deplore the failure of the government to make an even superficially plausible case against your obviously treasonable conspiracy.

The only logical explanation I can imagine for this failure is that the Department of Justice has been infiltrated by ISL agents who purposely saw to it that low-grade attorneys and experts (God, who is on our side, forbid that they be representative of the average talent in the department) were used to uphold the government's contentions.

The masterstroke, for which your infiltrators should be given extra bonuses next May Day, was the calling of James Burnham as an "expert." In openly admitting to the Machiavellian ethic he violated one of that philosophy's prime principles. What a fool! His main trouble is that he's an educated fool. (Fortunately, our great president's mind has not been strained by too much education and he therefore doesn't even realize he's a Machiavellian—which makes for the best kind of Machiavellian.)

AMERICAN (1000%)