

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 9, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**SCHLESINGER VS. SCHLESINGER:
THE 'VITAL CENTER' WILTS**

... page 6

The NAACP Meets in the South

... page 2

The Strikes and Riots in Poland

... page 3

Washington: Capital of Jim Crow

... page 5

Franco Is Tottering: AFL Report

The Franco fascist regime in Spain is tottering on its last legs.

Only U. S. aid is keeping it alive.

That is the meaning of the report to the AFL by its European representative, made known in the press on Thursday, July 5.

With an eye to influencing U. S. policy, the report to the AFL by Irving Brown puts the emphasis on the crumbling of support for Franco from within the ruling circles of Spain. He reports that generals of the Spanish army, commanding large areas of the country, are cooperating with a "National Committee" uniting "the extreme right and left wing in the fight against Franco." This committee, he says, is headed by General Antonio Aranda, one of the leading fascist generals in the civil war who is now in retirement.

NO "ASSET"

Information on this committee and on the tendencies and personalities included in

(Turn to last page)



Big Business Gets Pork Barrel Bill With Dem Assist

By SAM FELIKS

The defeat of the attempt to strengthen the Defense Production Act is a sign that the Big Bonanza is on in Washington. Whatever present hope the United Labor Policy Committee may have had for an "equality of sacrifice" program has passed, in favor of a victory for the profit-grabbing of big business. The one-month extension of the act passed will give more time to the reactionary 82nd Congress to frame an even weaker "anti-inflation" law.

Aside from the setback to general consumer interests through the weakening of the price-control features of the act, there is the lesson to the labor movement that this defeat was set up by the leadership of the Democratic Party as well as the Republicans.

It is the Truman administration that has failed to stop the profit surge of the giant corporations which has reached the fabulous level of \$51 billions before taxes, and not only the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition.

The fight over the Defense Production Act took place amid relative consumer apathy, which to a great content reflected the slow-down in the rising cost of living and the lack of effective organization of the great majority of workers. Consumer resistance to high prices, together with the resulting increase of inventories

and the recent "price-war," tended to create the impression that the cost of living would not rise much higher.

However, this present period is merely a transition until the full effect of the war economy begins. Whether or not there is a cessation of fighting in Korea the military expenditures will continue at an even higher rate than at present.

The fact is that the effect of military spending has scarcely been felt at all: the quarterly report of Director of Defense Mobilization Charles E. Wilson points out that, of the \$32 billion of military orders already placed,

(Continued on page 7)

AS THE CEASE-FIRE IN KOREA LOOMS CLOSER—

It's a Breathing Spell for Labor's Fight Too

By GORDON HASKELL

The quick acceptance of the formal United States truce proposed by the Stalinist military command makes it appear quite likely that a truce of some duration will be concluded in Korea. The military stalemate can no longer serve the interests of either of the imperialist blocs struggling over the prostrate body of the Korean nation. Thus it appears that a "peace" will break out in which the same political aims will be pursued by means other than war.

The lull in the fighting in Korea is accompanied by a lull in the political battle over foreign policy in this country. At this writing, not one of the Republican leaders has denounced the truce proposal as another piece of State Department "treachery" or "appeasement." Senators McCarthy and Taft have let it be known that they think this truce represents a success for the Stalinists, but they have not demanded that General Ridgway be ordered to fight on to the Yalu river. Even

the otherwise noisy General MacArthur has kept whatever thoughts he may have on the matter discreetly to himself.

The cease-fire discussions have been met with such an overwhelming expression of satisfaction and relief on the part of the American people that every one of these

gentlemen knows that to oppose the truce would be to commit political hara-kiri. And this universal feeling of relief comes soon after the wild welcome accorded MacArthur on his return that it is quite evident that these demonstrations in no way signified a popular acceptance of his aggressive political and military proposals.

IN BRITAIN

The political repercussions of the cease-fire talks are by no means confined to the United States. In Britain they have aroused the hope that the armament program will be slowed up, and that the prospect of a further drastic reduction in the standard of living of the people will be postponed. A cease-fire would certainly strengthen left-wing opposition to the Labor leadership's program of cutting down social service in favor of guns.

This feeling is particularly sig-

nificant because of the conflict inside the Labor Party which was touched off by the resignation of Aneurin Bevan. Bevan's chief point had been that the size of the military budget was "unrealistic," and that the distribution of its burdens was unequal, falling with greatest weight on the working people. His stand is strengthened, if anything, by the feeling that the government was pushing ahead much too rapidly on the armament program.

At any rate, a military truce should give the membership of the Labor Party a breathing spell during which they can discuss and re-evaluate the political problems which confront them.

The lull in the fighting could also be an appropriate time for the U. S. labor movement to take stock of its attitude to the Korean war and to the foreign policy of the government in general. To date, the labor leadership has offered no alternative to the policy

which has taken the United States through what has been perhaps the most completely futile war in the history of the country. And even as a truce in this conflict is being approached, it is quite evident that the Stalinists retain the political initiative on a world scale, and that the cold war will continue to build up to another inevitable crisis which next time may not be "solved" short of an all-out war.

IN THE U.S.

The workers of America face a difficult and even perilous position on the home front. The two parties whose foreign policy the labor leaders support have united their forces to kill measures which could retard inflation and give the working people some protection against the tremendous economic burdens and dislocations which the militarized economy will impose on

(Turn to last page)

NAACP Brings Militant Attack on Jim Crow To Heart of South at Atlanta Convention

By KATE LEONARD

The 42nd annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People met in Atlanta, Georgia, June 26 through July first. The NAACP's last trip to Atlanta was in 1920.

Mary White Ovington, in her book *The Walls Came Tumbling Down*, tells a story about the 1920 convention which shows that these two gatherings were farther apart than the 31 years which separate them in time. During that convention, at a small meeting arranged for the NAACP by the local Interracial Committee, Florence Kelley broke the taboo against unsegregated seating by sitting down beside William Pickens. Committee members arriving later, both whites and blacks, "looked perplexed, not knowing where to sit." This type of thing was not to be lightly done in Atlanta in 1920.

Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, director of the United Nations Trusteeship Council, arriving in Atlanta to address the 42nd convention, was escorted from the airport to the mayor's office by a cavalcade of 50 automobiles. One swallow does not make a summer, nor does one cavalcade even herald the millennium in race relations. However, the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize who refuses to live and work in Jim Crow Washington was given public honor in Atlanta similar to the recognition he has received in the country as a whole, all the way from Harvard to Los Angeles.

Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, director of the United Nations Trusteeship Council, arriving in Atlanta to address the 42nd convention, was escorted from the airport to the mayor's office by a cavalcade of 50 automobiles. One swallow does not make a summer, nor does one cavalcade even herald the millennium in race relations. However, the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize who refuses to live and work in Jim Crow Washington was given public honor in Atlanta similar to the recognition he has received in the country as a whole, all the way from Harvard to Los Angeles.

it is stressed that this is a tool in improving local conditions in the South. (Two million Negro voters in the South are predicted by 1956.)

Dr. Mays said that "since World War I the American Negro has developed a world view, and that the more he fights for freedom in all parts of the world, the more determined he is to achieve first-class citizenship at home."

Among the things which Dr. Bunche said are that his abhorrence of racism was so great at this crucial point in the country's history that he felt it necessary to confine his remarks to that subject. He asked that "all fair-minded Americans mark well those members of the U. S. Senate who talk of having us risk a world war, but refuse to embrace the proposals for civil-rights guarantees for Negro citizens."

PAUL: The production (of meat) that was gained during the war (World War II) was because of a very determined effort . . . to raise more meat. . . . We did raise more meat and farmers raised more hogs and more cattle, to win the war.

MULTER: And you did it as a patriotic effort, because we were in a war and we needed more beef?

PAUL: Yes, sir.

MULTER: And you did it despite the controls?

PAUL: They did it because of patriotic urge. Today there is no patriotic urge.

MULTER: Are you here talking now for your industry, or for yourself and your company?

PAUL: I am talking for my industry, and I am talking for my company too.

Curtain.

Since you've been reading Fourth of July speeches about democracy and free enterprise, now read what the profiteers say the rest of the year. Here are some winged words made public in recent months:

"Universal suffrage . . . has debauched each political party into outbidding the other for the large reservoir of purchasable votes thus provided."—Arthur Glasgow, in pamphlet published by the big business "Committee for Constitutional Government."

"I do not believe in democracy. I think it stinks."—Herbert Nelson, executive v-p of the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

"I do not believe in democracy, but I am perfectly willing to admit that it provides the only really amusing form of government ever endured by mankind."—Emerson Schmidt, economic research director of U. S. Chamber of Commerce, quoting H. L. Mencken.

All countries in the Atlantic Pact are equal but, as everyone knows, some countries are more equal than others.

The New York Times for May 30 reported that Denmark had lengthened her term of compulsory military service from 10 to 12 months as a result of U. S. pressure. Washington had asked that it be made 18 months. General Eisenhower had put on the heat.

But don't get us wrong—Denmark is an independent sovereign state.

But the whole weight of this war preparation falls on the shoulders of the workers and peasants in the first place and of the entire people in general. The ministerial council has decreed the suspension of the 8-hour working day in "case of state emergency." This has been liquidated the main conquest of the working class from the days of national independence.

This measure was directed principally against the mine workers in Dombrowa and Silesia, because Russia had ordered an increase in coal production to 100 million tons and the actual rise in 1950 was only by 4 per cent.

The exasperation of the workers was expressed in a great spontaneous strike in the mines of Dombrowa and Silesia, especially in Czeladz, Saturn and Piaski. It is very significant that these mine areas were the traditional strongholds of Rosa Luxemburg's party (the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania) and later of the early Communist Party, and that here the workers have always demonstrated high revolutionary consciousness, as this writer can personally confirm for the great miners' strike of 1929-30, etc.

The miners' strike provoked a panic among the Stalinist bosses; it was suppressed only with the aid of thousands of police, and thousands of workers were arrested by the Bespieka. It is the first big strike since the great strike which was usurped by Stalin.

The government had imposed a tax increase of 15 per cent on grain. Of course, this move was directed toward the general expropriation of the peasants by the Stalinist "magnates" and toward their incorporation into the kolkhozes, which are virtually slave camps for forced peasant labor.

All of these movements against the Russian invaders and their quislings have a strictly spontaneous character and were not organized by any political underground party or movement. They are manifestations of the permanent resistance of the Polish people—the workers, in the first place—against Stalinist exploitation and oppression. They are clear proof that the crushing of resistance in Poland and the other satellite countries will be far more difficult than in Russia under Stetin. The masters lack the prestige of the Bolshevik Party which was usurped by Stalin.

Of course, such spontaneous resistance is not likely to develop to significant heights without the leadership of the political underground opposition of the PPS (Socialist Party), Peasant Party and Nationalists. The Polish people will not suffer in the interests of American foreign policy, which delivered Poland into Stalin's hands.

The resistance in Poland could be a signal for insurrection by all the satellite peoples. But the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

when presenting the Spingarn medal to Mrs. Mabel Keaton Staupers, president of the dissolved National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses, Dr. Bunche addressing the nation—all played upon this theme.

Willkie, in urging support of the civil-rights legislation introduced in the Senate on June 25, said: "In an 'atom-bomb' race there is no time." He also said that in the struggle against world domination by Russia, "we need the support and friendship of the 1,500,000,000 non-white peoples. If we lose them, we must live indefinitely in a garrison state in which we will be stripped of most of our historical liberties and freedoms."

Dr. Mays said that "since World War I the American Negro has developed a world view, and that the more he fights for freedom in all parts of the world, the more determined he is to achieve first-class citizenship at home."

Among the things which Dr. Bunche said are that his abhorrence of racism was so great at this crucial point in the country's history that he felt it necessary to confine his remarks to that subject. He asked that "all fair-minded Americans mark well those members of the U. S. Senate who talk of having us risk a world war, but refuse to embrace the proposals for civil-rights guarantees for Negro citizens."

PAUL: The production (of meat) that was gained during the war (World War II) was because of a very determined effort . . . to raise more meat. . . . We did raise more meat and farmers raised more hogs and more cattle, to win the war.

MULTER: And you did it as a patriotic effort, because we were in a war and we needed more beef?

PAUL: Yes, sir.

MULTER: And you did it despite the controls?

PAUL: They did it because of patriotic urge. Today there is no patriotic urge.

MULTER: Are you here talking now for your industry, or for yourself and your company?

PAUL: I am talking for my industry, and I am talking for my company too.

Curtain.

Since you've been reading Fourth of July speeches about democracy and free enterprise, now read what the profiteers say the rest of the year. Here are some winged words made public in recent months:

"Universal suffrage . . . has debauched each political party into outbidding the other for the large reservoir of purchasable votes thus provided."—Arthur Glasgow, in pamphlet published by the big business "Committee for Constitutional Government."

"I do not believe in democracy. I think it stinks."—Herbert Nelson, executive v-p of the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

"I do not believe in democracy, but I am perfectly willing to admit that it provides the only really amusing form of government ever endured by mankind."—Emerson Schmidt, economic research director of U. S. Chamber of Commerce, quoting H. L. Mencken.

All countries in the Atlantic Pact are equal but, as everyone knows, some countries are more equal than others.

The New York Times for May 30 reported that Denmark had lengthened her term of compulsory military service from 10 to 12 months as a result of U. S. pressure. Washington had asked that it be made 18 months. General Eisenhower had put on the heat.

But don't get us wrong—Denmark is an independent sovereign state.

But the whole weight of this war preparation falls on the shoulders of the workers and peasants in the first place and of the entire people in general. The ministerial council has decreed the suspension of the 8-hour working day in "case of state emergency." This has been liquidated the main conquest of the working class from the days of national independence.

This measure was directed principally against the mine workers in Dombrowa and Silesia, because Russia had ordered an increase in coal production to 100 million tons and the actual rise in 1950 was only by 4 per cent.

The exasperation of the workers was expressed in a great spontaneous strike in the mines of Dombrowa and Silesia, especially in Czeladz, Saturn and Piaski. It is very significant that these mine areas were the traditional strongholds of Rosa Luxemburg's party (the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania) and later of the early Communist Party, and that here the workers have always demonstrated high revolutionary consciousness, as this writer can personally confirm for the great miners' strike of 1929-30, etc.

The miners' strike provoked a panic among the Stalinist bosses; it was suppressed only with the aid of thousands of police, and thousands of workers were arrested by the Bespieka. It is the first big strike since the great strike which was usurped by Stalin.

The government had imposed a tax increase of 15 per cent on grain. Of course, this move was directed toward the general expropriation of the peasants by the Stalinist "magnates" and toward their incorporation into the kolkhozes, which are virtually slave camps for forced peasant labor.

All of these movements against the Russian invaders and their quislings have a strictly spontaneous character and were not organized by any political underground party or movement. They are manifestations of the permanent resistance of the Polish people—the workers, in the first place—against Stalinist exploitation and oppression. They are clear proof that the crushing of resistance in Poland and the other satellite countries will be far more difficult than in Russia under Stetin. The masters lack the prestige of the Bolshevik Party which was usurped by Stalin.

Of course, such spontaneous resistance is not likely to develop to significant heights without the leadership of the political underground opposition of the PPS (Socialist Party), Peasant Party and Nationalists. The Polish people will not suffer in the interests of American foreign policy, which delivered Poland into Stalin's hands.

The resistance in Poland could be a signal for insurrection by all the satellite peoples. But the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

Not in the Headlines

The Old Urge Is Gone

The place: House Banking Committee room.

The time: May 22, 1951.

The examiner: Rep. Abraham Multer (D, N. Y.).

The witness: Vice President Ray Paul of the Rath Packing Co., Waterloo, Iowa, representing the American Meat Institute. The Institute consists of organizations that process 80 per cent of the meat produced in the U. S.

PAUL: The production (of meat) that was gained during the war (World War II) was because of a very determined effort . . . to raise more meat. . . . We did raise more meat and farmers raised more hogs and more cattle, to win the war.

MULTER: And you did it as a patriotic effort, because we were in a war and we needed more beef?

PAUL: Yes, sir.

MULTER: And you did it despite the controls?

PAUL: They did it because of patriotic urge. Today there is no patriotic urge.

MULTER: Are you here talking now for your industry, or for yourself and your company?

PAUL: I am talking for my industry, and I am talking for my company too.

Curtain.

Since you've been reading Fourth of July speeches about democracy and free enterprise, now read what the profiteers say the rest of the year. Here are some winged words made public in recent months:

"Universal suffrage . . . has debauched each political party into outbidding the other for the large reservoir of purchasable votes thus provided."—Arthur Glasgow, in pamphlet published by the big business "Committee for Constitutional Government."

"I do not believe in democracy. I think it stinks."—Herbert Nelson, executive v-p of the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

"I do not believe in democracy, but I am perfectly willing to admit that it provides the only really amusing form of government ever endured by mankind."—Emerson Schmidt, economic research director of U. S. Chamber of Commerce, quoting H. L. Mencken.

All countries in the Atlantic Pact are equal but, as everyone knows, some countries are more equal than others.

The New York Times for May 30 reported that Denmark had lengthened her term of compulsory military service from 10 to 12 months as a result of U. S. pressure. Washington had asked that it be made 18 months. General Eisenhower had put on the heat.

But don't get us wrong—Denmark is an independent sovereign state.

But the whole weight of this war preparation falls on the shoulders of the workers and peasants in the first place and of the entire people in general. The ministerial council has decreed the suspension of the 8-hour working day in "case of state emergency." This has been liquidated the main conquest of the working class from the days of national independence.

This measure was directed principally against the mine workers in Dombrowa and Silesia, because Russia had ordered an increase in coal production to 100 million tons and the actual rise in 1950 was only by 4 per cent.

The exasperation of the workers was expressed in a great spontaneous strike in the mines of Dombrowa and Silesia, especially in Czeladz, Saturn and Piaski. It is very significant that these mine areas were the traditional strongholds of Rosa Luxemburg's party (the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania) and later of the early Communist Party, and that here the workers have always demonstrated high revolutionary consciousness, as this writer can personally confirm for the great miners' strike of 1929-30, etc.

The miners' strike provoked a panic among the Stalinist bosses; it was suppressed only with the aid of thousands of police, and thousands of workers were arrested by the Bespieka. It is the first big strike since the great strike which was usurped by Stalin.

The government had imposed a tax increase of 15 per cent on grain. Of course, this move was directed toward the general expropriation of the peasants by the Stalinist "magnates" and toward their incorporation into the kolkhozes, which are virtually slave camps for forced peasant labor.

All of these movements against the Russian invaders and their quislings have a strictly spontaneous character and were not organized by any political underground party or movement. They are manifestations of the permanent resistance of the Polish people—the workers, in the first place—against Stalinist exploitation and oppression. They are clear proof that the crushing of resistance in Poland and the other satellite countries will be far more difficult than in Russia under Stetin. The masters lack the prestige of the Bolshevik Party which was usurped by Stalin.

Of course, such spontaneous resistance is not likely to develop to significant heights without the leadership of the political underground opposition of the PPS (Socialist Party), Peasant Party and Nationalists. The Polish people will not suffer in the interests of American foreign policy, which delivered Poland into Stalin's hands.

The resistance in Poland could be a signal for insurrection by all the satellite peoples. But the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Polish Workers and Peasants Fight In Strikes and Anti-Russian Rioting

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Cold figures show how the Russian masters are fleeing their Polish satellite, and the Polish workers know it. Poland's six-year plan looks forward to an increase of 70.3 per cent of the national economy by 1951, according to the declaration of Jedrychowski, president of the state planning commission. From 1949 to 1950, industry rose by 30.9 per cent, according to Minister of Industry and Commerce Hilary-Minc. But the increase in the national income was only 21 per cent, increase in retail trade only 13 per cent, and increase in workers' wages only 6 per cent.

Light industry grew by 23 per cent, agricultural and consumers-goods industry by 29 per cent, factory production under the Industry Ministry by 56 per cent. Total investment rose 53 per cent. The state budget for 1951 represented an increase of 59 billion zlotys (which are officially 4 to a dollar).

If industrial production went up 30 per cent, and commodity turnover only 13 per cent, in spite of a 17 per cent increase in the number of industrial workers and a 6 per cent rise in wages, where are Polish butter, bacon, coal, shoes, etc. going to?

The answer is very easy: Polish production is going to Russia—where production increase is only 23 per cent, growth in national income only 21 per cent, but commodity turnover has increased by 30 per cent.

As in the days of the czar, Poland is a factory for Russia. Therefore it is that the Polish workers do not have shoes, clothing, food, and coal for the winter. Poland's productive surplus is being swallowed up in the Russian maw.

MINERS HIT

The increase of 53 per cent in investment is earmarked for raising war industrial production, in the first place steel, arms and especially tanks. Near Cracow a giant steel factory has been built; in Radom and Czestochowa also, big armaments plants have sprung up. Giant underground depots for arms have been built in Zurawica, not far from Przemysl, and in Regny in central Poland.

The strength of Marshal Rokossovsky's army has risen from 250,000 to 600,000, according to the calculations of Polish military circles in emigration. The Stalinist party and President Bierut are proclaiming a "national emergency" for "defense against the Anglo-American imperialists" and beating the drums for a "national front" to defend the "endangered recovered territories," meaning Silesia and Pomerania.

But the whole weight of this war preparation falls on the shoulders of the workers and peasants in the first place and of the entire people in general. The ministerial council has decreed the suspension of the 8-hour working day in "case of state emergency." This has been liquidated the main conquest of the working class from the days of national independence.

This measure was directed principally against the mine workers in Dombrowa and Silesia, because Russia had ordered an increase in coal production to 100 million tons and the actual rise in 1950 was only by 4 per cent.

SZCZECIN RIOT

The exasperation of the workers was expressed in a great spontaneous strike in the mines of Dombrowa and Silesia, especially in Czeladz, Saturn and Piaski. It is very significant that these mine areas were the traditional strongholds of Rosa Luxemburg's party (the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania) and later of the early Communist Party, and that here the workers have always demonstrated high revolutionary consciousness, as this writer can personally confirm for the great miners' strike of 1929-30, etc.

The miners' strike provoked a panic among the Stalinist bosses; it was suppressed only with the aid of thousands of police, and thousands of workers were arrested by the Bespieka. It is the first big strike since the great strike which was usurped by Stalin.

The government had imposed a tax increase of 15 per cent on grain. Of course, this move was directed toward the general expropriation of the peasants by the Stalinist "magnates" and toward their incorporation into the kolkhozes, which are virtually slave camps for forced peasant labor.

All of these movements against the Russian invaders and their quislings have a strictly spontaneous character and were not organized by any political underground party or movement. They are manifestations of the permanent resistance of the Polish people—the workers, in the first place—against Stalinist exploitation and oppression. They are clear proof that the crushing of resistance in Poland and the other satellite countries will be far more difficult than in Russia under Stetin. The masters lack the prestige of the Bolshevik Party which was usurped by Stalin.

Of course, such spontaneous resistance is not likely to develop to significant heights without the leadership of the political underground opposition of the PPS (Socialist Party), Peasant Party and Nationalists. The Polish people will not suffer in the interests of American foreign policy, which delivered Poland into Stalin's hands.

The resistance in Poland could be a signal for insurrection by all the satellite peoples. But the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

the old Polish nobility in the past, without warranty that the free Poland which would arise from under the Russian yoke will have the conditions for free national development and those frontiers which can assure its free economic and social progress—not its submission to a new German or all-powerful American imperialism. And this warranty can be given the Polish people only by a free socialist Europe and a democratic socialist workers' government in the United States.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Polish people will not go in for adventurist insurrection, as did

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 world-wide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

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

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

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

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th 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 _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____
State _____ Tel. _____

YOU and SCIENCE

Population Dispersal and the Atom Bomb

By CARL DARTON

Announcement was made on May 25 of the successful completion of atomic-weapons tests at Eniwetok. Much of the information in the fields of biology, medicine, and on blast and thermal effects on structures will be declassified and released. It has also been disclosed that either an A-bomb or H-bomb will be soon exploded in the Aleutian Islands at a depth of 300 feet with an ensuing immense shower of radioactively contaminated soil. These new tests will surely stimulate further discussion of atomic defense, particularly of the proposal for dispersal of the cities, as we raised it last week in this column.

In evaluating these proposals it is necessary to keep in mind several well-established facts. The atom bomb is an indiscriminate killer and destroyer over a wide area. Secondly, the A-bomb is a very expensive weapon and therefore it must be dropped so as to cause the greatest destruction to the victim nation's industrial potential. Now if we add the third fact that most of the nation's industries and much of its population are crammed into the great cities we can easily see why the proposal for decentralization of cities is the only defensive measure which appears effective.

Apart from considerations of vulnerability to atomic bombing there are many reasons for socialists to wish for decentralization of the metropolitan areas. Perhaps the main ones are: obsolete, dangerous and inadequate housing; the difficulty of obtaining pure and sufficient water supply; atmospheric pollution, lack of sunshine and fresh air; transportation bottlenecks and hazards. The modern city is truly one of the greatest curses of our industrial development.

Among the concrete proposals for decentralization have been the building of new cities in the sparsely populated interior of the country and the creation of S-shaped chains of towns to replace the global clusters of the existing metropolitan areas. Such planned communities would provide the cultural advantages of people grouped together, yet allow individual freedom and healthful living.

It is conceivable that a rational government democratically controlled by the people could plan decentralization of industry and population without resorting to compulsory displacement and without curtailment of civil rights. But such is not the government in Washington today and as result the only relocation of industry has been purely profit-motivated.

The Unions Have Something to Say

There has been a general movement from the Northeast to the South and West but mostly to seek low-wage areas and to be closer to sources of raw material. On the other hand, such are the contradictions of capitalism, the steel industry, because of selfish economic reasons, has built new steel centers in the vulnerable and crowded Baltimore and Philadelphia areas.

What should be the program for socialists in this period? As business and the government makes feeble attempts toward orderly relocation of industry we should raise demands in unions and labor circles that new industry should locate:

- (1) without regard to wage differentials;
- (2) in areas of chronic unemployment;
- (3) away from already congested areas;
- (4) so as to augment or complement other industries in a region.

As the danger of atomic attack becomes more acute, or following the actual dropping of the bombs there may be rapid moves toward totalitarian-type controls under the guise of atomic defense. Under such conditions there may be a stampede from the cities to the countryside with the government using harsh measures to prevent the emptying of the cities and factories and resulting drop in production. It is impossible for the American people to visualize even now the extent of the social chaos which will result under such conditions.

It is equally difficult for socialists to outline now the best program for such a period. But we can be sure that their efforts, then as now, will be directed toward the maintenance of democratic and civil rights. Above all, then and now, we will continue to point toward the socialist society as the only means of preventing war and atomic destruction. In such a society cities and factories will be planned and located to serve the people's wishes and welfare and not to reduce the probability of atomic vaporization. Thus, for socialists true atomic defense is a political task.

NOT IN THE HEADLINES...

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, minority groups, national and world politics—\$2 a year.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 28

July 9, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

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

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

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

CHAOS IN BULGARIAN KOLKHOZES, by J. K.—
East Europe (London), June 14.

"The Bulgarian government and the Communist Party have taken over the direction of the collective and the statefarms, and of the machine tractor stations, because they were threatened with chaos. The peasants, who form the majority of the Bulgarian population, have already given much trouble to Premier Vulko Chervenkov. By now, their dissatisfaction verges on rebellion...."

"No other of the East European satellites has stated as plainly as Bulgaria the need for a special political organization to supervise the life of collectivized peasants. The reason is that, for the last two years in Bulgaria, collectivization has progressed in a very tense atmosphere. In the first period, party and administrative

organizations brought pressure to bear on the peasants to join the kolkhozes in a body. As a result of this, the peasantry became so disoriented that at the party congress, Premier Chervenkov admitted that the voluntary principle in joining the kolkhozes had been violated. Several party and local officials were sacked and the peasants were promised that in future they would be 'persuaded' to join.

"As a result of these promises, an exodus from the kolkhozes began. Then 'persuasion' took the form of economic pressure, and discriminatory deliveries were imposed on kulaks and individual peasants. Within a year, Chervenkov had once more to denounce excesses and punish party and local officials. But peasant discontent is still growing in Bulgaria. The decree of June 3 is the third attempt by the administration to get the better of the rebellious peasant masses."

WORLD POLITICS

IRAN HIGHLIGHTS A GENERAL WORLD-WIDE PROBLEM

By RICHARD TROY

The dramatic and still explosive oil dispute in Iran brings into focus a global development of widespread importance. The disintegration of the great imperial structures of yesterday poses many serious problems; the situation in Iran highlights one of the central ones.

The whole complex question of the impact of growing nationalist movements among backward countries, movements which often culminate in nationalization of foreign properties, is brought to the fore with telling force. Iran is, of course, by no means alone in this development.

Recently a report appeared in the newspapers divulging the highly significant results of a poll taken among Venezuelan oil workers. Eighty per cent of the oil workers questioned agreed that the American-run oil companies were well-directed, that they paid adequate wages, and that their treatment of the native population was all that could be asked. Yet approximately the same proportion—eighty per cent—stated that they favored nationalization of the oil properties by the Venezuelan government!

The government of Iraq continues to forbid the British and American oil companies the use of existing pipelines which formerly carried oil to the Israeli port of Haifa because of Iraq's resentment of the "intrusion" of the Jewish state into formerly Arab territory. And this is in spite of the fact that the granting of such permission would give the Iraq government considerable extra revenue.

Syrian leaders—as related in a recent issue of LABOR ACTION—are on the point of refusing Point Four Aid for fear that it would interfere with native capitalist—and French—control of their country. For considerable time now a serious movement in Egypt has been agitating for expulsion of the British from control of the Suez Canal, although, from the purely technical point of view, no one could more efficiently manage the canal than the British.

WILLING TO RISK IT

Moreover—in spite of the absolute defenselessness of the entire Middle East—Arab leaders are increasingly antagonistic toward any attempted incorporation into the vast international military agreements being constructed by the U. S.—agreements, incidentally, which might supply them with great quantities of arms. None of these instances is isolated; they fit into a general pattern.

In each case the local population appears to be so imbued with its own nationalist awakening that

it is willing to risk—as Iran has done—the general prosperity of their own economy simply in order to assert their own passionately wanted sovereignty. They want to see the name and emblem of their own country instead of the oil company's letterhead; if they are to be bossed, they want to be bossed by their own countrymen; they want vengeance for generations of subservience.

However, as everyone knows by now, the implementation of these aspirations is not so simple. None of these countries has the technical skill or capital resources with which to maintain the huge enterprises which have been constructed on its soil. These essential factors of modern industry can only be found among the advanced countries. Therefore, the mere act of nationalization, if not followed up by a new arrangement, leaves the backward nations with an industry that is no longer viable.

This has become so apparent to the Iranian leaders that, in the past week, a split has developed in their ranks. One group wants to continue the drive to oust the British and another group—realizing that it might mean the disruption of the complex and lucrative oil business—seeks some sort of compromise with them.

THEY CAN WIN

On the whole this problem has been handled by American commentators in a most superficial manner. For them there are only two resolutions to the conflict: a "victory" for the Iranians resulting in the expulsion of the British and the immediate ceasing of oil operations, or a capitulation on the part of the Iranians resulting in a "compromise" with the British (say, a 50-50 split on the profits.) Consequently, their general sympathies lie with the

"moderate" wing which wants to cooperate with the British; and they praise the U. S. State Department for cooperating with the British in the attempt to bring the Iranian government to its knees by preventing any other oil companies from making an arrangement with the Iranians which might suit them better than the Anglo-Iranian one (and help them save face).

This conception of the alternatives in the Iranian case—aside from serving the interests of the imperial concept as a whole—is a mistaken one. The general weakening of capitalism in the world today and the imperialist antagonisms in the cold war give the backward little states new opportunities to assert their will to sovereignty.

The West must continue to tap these huge petroleum resources or else, in the long run, reduce its oil consumption. But there is little likelihood that the Iranian people will stand for any type of sellout. Their desire to feel that the oil properties are, lock, stock and barrel, "theirs" is profound and cannot long be suppressed—except possibly by armed force which, however, no imperialist power can exert today for a number of obvious reasons (the nature of the cold war being one big one).

In general, Western imperialism has not become any more "benevolent" as its activities in various parts of the world show, but it can no longer get away with as much as it used to. It would be unnecessary to emphasize that there are numberless ways in which the U. S. bloc can twist the Iranians' arms. It is only our purpose to point out that the alternatives of capitulation or compromise are not the only necessary ones in the crisis.

For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

114 W. 14th St.
New York 11, N. Y.

- I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.
- I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____ ZONE _____ STATE _____
SCHOOL (IF STUDENT) _____

Washington: Capital of Jim Crow

This Is the Picture Under Truman's Nose

The excerpts in these columns are from the pamphlet "Segregation in Washington," published by the National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital. This committee is composed of prominent persons, conservative-liberal in composition, including its chairman, President George Shuster of Hunter College, and Senator Humphrey, Philip Murray, Walter White, Ordway Tead, Charles P. Taft, Eleanor Roosevelt, Bruce Bliven, and many others.

In spite of all its principles and all its professions, its executive orders and directives, the U. S. government is systematically denying the colored citizens of the capital equal opportunity in employment, and is setting an example of racial discrimination to the city and nation.

The color bar has not always been honored by the American government. . . . Colored employees were not segregated in the federal agencies from the time of the Civil War down through the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. During the last term of Grover Cleveland, when Southern Democrats held positions of leadership in both Houses of Congress, the number of Negro clerical jobs actually increased. . . . But segregation did not become general government policy until the presidency of Woodrow Wilson. His election in 1912 brought to power in Washington a new kind of Southern congressman, politicians who had won office on the pledge to maintain and extend "white supremacy." Immediately they set about putting the Negro "in his place" in the capital.

An organization known as the "Democratic Fair Play Association" was formed for this purpose. . . . President Wilson was made an honorary member. . . .

In the Bureau of Engraving, Negro and white employees were isolated from each other at lunch time. Separate lavatories were installed in the Treasury Department. In 1914 the Civil Service Commission adopted a rule requiring all job applicants to submit a photograph, and stopped calling Negroes for the higher clerical jobs. [Etc.] . . .

"One of my acquaintances, a Swede, expressed well my opinion when he asked: 'Cannot you Americans even make your capital city into a model of what your nation professes to be?'—A visitor from Denmark.

The colored people of Washington have never recovered from the blow that struck them in the time of Woodrow Wilson. Although sporadic anti-discrimination measures have been sponsored by succeeding administrations, the example set by the government has been one of exclusion and segregation in menial jobs.

As late as 1938, 90 per cent of all the government's Negro employees were confined to the lowest custodial-labor status. During the labor shortage of World War II, real gains were made by Negroes in federal service, and at one time only 40 per cent of them were in the lowest category. Now, however, the percentage is rising again.

Only in time of emergency, when the government can't help itself, is the Negro given much chance to show what he can do in the service of his country.

"The capital of a nation . . . must be in a very true sense a city that is set on a hill and which cannot be hid. . . . Whether we will it or not, it will become a symbol—a symbol of the great Republic whose visible throne is here."—Justice Stafford of the D. C. Supreme Court, 1913.

On occasion, the State Department has sent vigorous protests to certain nations which attempt to restrict the movements of our representatives abroad. But Washington is the only major capital in the world where it is necessary to chaperon foreign guests to protect them from insult on account of color. . . .

Most of the capital's stores and eating places are alert to the importance of distinguishing between American Negroes and foreigners of dark complexion, so as to treat the latter like white persons. . . .

Often an alien Negro will be allowed to eat sitting down at a lunch counter if he has a diplomatic pass or some other means of proving that he is not an American Negro. . . .

To avoid humiliations on account of their color, many foreign visitors stay indoors and avoid public places. Occasionally, however, subterfuges are employed. These include the conspicuous use of a foreign language to avoid being identified as an American Negro. . . .

"I would rather be an Untouchable in the Hindu caste system than a Negro in Washington."—A visitor from India, 1948.

Some people say that the time is not ripe for colored people to have equal rights as citizens in the nation's capital, and that white people are "not ready" to give them such rights.

But in 1872, during the brief period when all the people in the capital could vote, the popularly elected Assembly of the District passed a law giving Negroes equal rights in restaurants, hotels, barber shops, and other places of public accommodation. Stiff penalties were provided for violation.

As late as 1904 this civil rights law was familiar to the correspondent of the New York Times. But around the turn of the century it mysteriously disappeared from the compiled statutes of the District, and it cannot be found in present codes. Since there is no record of its repeal, some lawyers speculate that it may still be technically in full force and effect.

The Canon of Washington Cathedral (Episcopal) has appealed to the nations for funds to complete a building program, saying that the capital possesses no physical "symbol for the sovereignty of God." But inside the largest churches, Protestant as well as Catholic, visitors are made unwelcome on account of color. Segregation is the public policy of such Christian organizations as the YMCA.

But now the exclusion of Negroes from places of public accommodation has become so rigid that many honest restaurant men believe they would go bankrupt if they were to serve colored people. . . . In the capital today, the least tolerant white people are the ones who determine whether a colored person can eat in a restaurant, see a show, get a room in a hotel. . . .

It has reached the place in the capital where a dog cemetery has erected a color bar against the burial of dogs belonging to colored people. In announcing this policy, the owner stated that he assumed the dogs would not object, but he was afraid his white customers would. . . .

The segregation of Negroes is worse than it was 60 years ago. . . . Now a fourth of the 12 private hospitals exclude Negroes altogether, and the remainder allot them a limited number of beds in segregated wards. How rigid this color bar can be discovered on a cold winter morning of 1945 by a young woman in childbirth.

Unable to reach the city hospital in time, she was rushed to a church-supported hospital. But admission was refused, and the baby was delivered on the sidewalk in front of the door. The staff supplied a sheet to cover the mother and child until the city ambulance arrived to take them away.

Washington Real Estate Board Code of Ethics, 1948: "No property in a white section should ever be sold, rented, advertised, or offered to colored people. . . ."

Among the active members of the Real Estate Board, and subscribing to its "code of ethics," are 25 banks, insurance and title companies, and building and loan associations. Because of the absence of heavy industry, these groups hold a position of unchallenged leadership in the economic life of the community. . . .

Because the areas in which Negroes can live are artificially limited, they must pay more for the same housing than white people. . . . As a result, the same real-estate interests that make money by excluding colored people from new subdivisions are able to collect inflated rentals from the slums into which they are driven. A profit is made on the Negro going and coming.

"No one wishes more than I do to see such proofs as you exhibit, that Nature has given to our black brethren talents equal to those of other colors of men, and that the appearance of a want of them is owing only to the degraded condition of their existence, both in Africa and America. . . ."—Thomas Jefferson to Benj. Banneker.

Until 1947 . . . the FHA Underwriter's Manual required that deeds in bi-racial areas include: "Prohibition of the occupancy of properties except by the race for which they are intended." In other words, the segregation of the Negro in the capital was the only condition under which FHA would approve a loan.

As a result of public criticism, racial conditions have been deleted from the new FHA Manual. But in Washington, the bankers themselves insist on segregation. As long as they are permitted to make this condition in issuing government-insured loans, government money is being used to insure that Negroes are penned in racial enclosures. . . .

Unable to cope with the power of the real-estate lobby, the government housing authority has accepted the mass segregation of Negroes as the only basis on which it will be permitted to build any housing for the low-income residents of the capital.

"All Nazi laws which . . . established discrimination on grounds of race, creed or political opinion shall be abolished."—Berlin Agreement of the occupying powers, 1945.

"Race segregation here is a 'natural state,' and certain groups which agitate against it are 'unscrupulous' and 'un-American.'"—President of Fed. of Citizens Associations, Washington, D. C., quoted by Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1947.

Just as a Negro is expected to eat standing up at downtown lunch counters, so he is expected to work standing up, or in a kneeling position, or in some job that tags him as a servant to the white man. In 1940, three-fourths of all Negro job holders were employed as laborers, domestics, or service workers, while only one eighth of white employees were in these categories.

Even the city government forces colored people to accept a servant status. . . .

Thus Negroes are condemned by color to chronic unemployment. In the abnormally good year of 1947, 6 per cent were out of jobs and looking for work—compared to 2 per cent of whites. In the better-than-average year of 1940, 17 per cent were unemployed, and only 7 per cent of whites. During the last depression, Negro unemployment rose above 40 per cent. . . .

In the days of slavery, many skilled Negroes were able to buy their freedom and that of their kinfolk. . . . "There were many skilled carpenters, bricklayers, shoemakers, stonemasons, wheelwrights, blacksmiths, plasterers, printers, cabinetmakers, cab drivers and draymen." . . . But since the Emancipation Proclamation, they have been losing out in the skilled trades. . . .

A Colored Girl's story [in a Washington government office]:

"In this office, I was the only Negro. . . . Everybody in the office was eager to help me. . . . They finally realized I was human, too. I have come to the conclusion that white people are just unbelievably ignorant about Negroes. . . ."

"One girl went to the beach and came back with a nice dark coat of tan. I put my arm beside hers and said: 'Now see all the trouble you go through to get your skin the same color as mine?' And one of them piped up: 'Janet, can you get sunburned?' I said: 'Don't you suppose the sun affects your skin the same as it does mine?' Then, one day a group of us were downtown and we all got weighed. I took a little time on the scale, and one of them said: 'Get off that scale, girl, and let me on.' And she pulled my arm to get me off. Then she stopped. I surprised and said: 'Why, your arm is soft!'"

"After a while, I guess all of us were a little conscious of what was happening. One day when three of us were riding home from work together, one said: 'Here's a Catholic, and a Jew, and a Negro, and we LIKE each other. Isn't that terrible!' The questions became less frequent, and we did more things together, and we talked about more ordinary things, the many things we really had in common by then."

Schlesinger vs. Schlesinger: The 'Vital Center' Wilts Under Fair-Dealism

By HAL DRAPER

Two years ago Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. published a book which was widely acclaimed as a "bible of liberalism." It was *The Vital Center*. He became a recognized leader of liberalism as it exists in this country today, one of its spokesmen and formulators.

For liberal sneers at "Marxist bibles" have always stemmed from nothing but their envy; they themselves have always been uncomfortable in face of their lack of any formulation of their beliefs, their lack of any spokesman who dared to set down on paper what liberalism is anyway. Three quarters of the enthusiasm that greeted *The Vital Center* from virtually every shade of liberalism was generated by admiration and gratitude for his sheer daring.

The more timid souls among the liberals who would never dare try to define the framework of their ideas have reason to congratulate themselves on their circumspection. Today, only a short two years later, Schlesinger has made a scrap of paper out of the most vital chapter of his *Vital Center*. The others can still go on talking about liberalism in the same old muddy way. Schlesinger has repudiated himself.

The subtitle of *The Vital Center* (on the jacket) was: "Our purposes and perils on the tightrope of American Liberalism." Our daring liberal leader has now fallen off his own tight-rope.

The most vital chapter of this "bible of liberalism" was that on civil liberties. In it Schlesinger went out on the tightrope with a closely reasoned and forthright position on democracy in this age of witchhunts and heresy hunts in which the victim is the Communist Party. He faced up to the question: *This Stalinist movement which we hate and oppose for its totalitarian ideology—are we justified in undermining our own civil liberties in order to strike at it?*

It was this chapter which was the main positive feature of the book, just as it is defense of civil liberties which has always been the main positive contribution of liberalism, its strongest point, its most vigorously defended fortress, its best reason for existence. To be sure, Schlesinger's discussion had its glaring inadequacies even on this point: he somehow managed to write the chapter without a single reference to (let alone criticism of) the fact that it was the Fair Deal administration which was riddling and destroying the liberal concepts which he was restating so vigorously. This was quite a feat in view of the fact that in his conception the Fair Deal was a bastion of liberalism, and that his book has much to say on other current events. But otherwise, his outspokenness was laudable.

"Criminal Conspiracy"

Now this same Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. has come out for the outlawry of the Communist Party as a "criminal conspiracy."

In-between this step and the publication of his book amid a blaring of liberal trumpets, the Fair Deal administration has intensified its loyalty witchhunt, lined up the Supreme Court for the Smith Act, arrested the leaders of the CP in one big prosecution and then moved for the general roundup of CP leaders which is now going on. Schlesinger has been pulled apart between his loyalty to Trumanism and the principles which he expounded in his book. It was his principles that went down the drain.

He has announced this in his weekly column (for the N. Y. Post, July 1) dealing with the arrest of the CP's "second team." He is still opposed to the Smith Act itself because it is "a threat to our most precious possession—our freedom—and it hardly meets the [Stalinist] threat head-on." But he wants to achieve the government's results without the Smith Act. "Is there no way out of this dilemma?" he asks.

He has now been converted to the views of Justice Jackson and Judge Charles Wyzanski, he says:

"Both Jackson and Wyzanski lay hold of the fact that the Communist Party is, above all, a

criminal conspiracy, employing espionage and perjury as official and approved tactics. . . .

"Justice Douglas in his dissent made a brief but unconvincing attack on Jackson's invocation of the conspiracy doctrine. I myself find the Jackson and Wyzanski arguments impressive. Would not the best solution to our present difficulties be to get rid of the Smith Act, which imports new and dangerous ideas into our policy toward free speech, and, if the situation seems to warrant it, replace it by an act along the lines suggested by Wyzanski specifically naming the Communist Party as a criminal conspiracy?"

They Had a Word for It

Two minor but not unimportant thoughts leap to the mind immediately. One is the fact that a federal law which named the CP as a criminal conspiracy would be precisely such a bill of attainder as is prohibited in the Bill of Rights. The framers of the Bill of Rights anticipated Schlesinger's attempt to sneak around behind them; and it is well known that the Bill of Rights was the concession made by the Constitution's "founding fathers" to the justified fears of the people that the powers vested in the government might be used to perpetuate the power of a social and economic oligarchy.

The prohibition of bills of attainder in the Bill of Rights was designed to force Congress to DEFINE a crime before outlawing it, and left it to "due process of law" to determine whether a specifically named defendant did or did not come under the law. Schlesinger's proposal is designed to make it unnecessary to define the crime adequately—by naming the defendant in advance! That this maneuver was known and feared in the time of King George III is sufficient commentary on our current leader of liberalism.

He thinks he can take the curse off the Smith Act by replacing it with an even grosser violation of the Bill of Rights, provided that this grosser violation is limited to the CP.

Matter of Evidence

Secondly, there is the little matter of evidence. The reader must understand that no new law is necessary if the government can prove now that the CP, as such, is a "criminal conspiracy." If Attorney General McGrath thought that he could prove this in a court even to the satisfaction of a judge-in-uniform who is ready to click his heels before an FBI witness, there would have been no Foley Square trial and the Supreme Court would not have had to bathe the Smith Act in rose water. The Smith Act was necessary because the government hasn't the slightest notion of being able to prove "criminal conspiracy."

Because no such evidence can be adduced, therefore Schlesinger proposes that Congress name the CP as a "criminal conspiracy!"

One can see why the prohibition of bills of attainder was among the fundamental freedoms which the rightly suspicious American people forced into the Constitution.

As Schlesinger explained fully in *The Vital Center*, the question is not whether he or anyone else is "morally certain" that the CP is, at least in part, an apparatus through which some kind of conspiring for the future takes place. Because he is equally morally certain that this is true for a wide variety of proto-fascist outfits in this country—not merely fly-by-night rabble-rousers but in fact that group which has one of the biggest lobbies in Washington, the so-called Committee for Constitutional Government, its many transmission belts and its notorious Merwin K. Hart. It is a question of "personal guilt" and "due process of law" that is the heart of civil liberties, he tells us in his "bible."

It is these fundamental ideas on, and approaches to, the vexed questions of civil liberties that Schlesinger put forward two years ago and which he is now dumping. Let us permit the Schlesinger of 1949 to give a proper characterization of the Schlesinger of 1951.

"The first test in the Supreme Court's attitude toward curtailment of free speech is consequently that of 'due process of law'—the guarantee, that is, of substantive

legal rights and of fair and orderly judicial procedure. This requirement assures each individual of the full support of the Anglo-Saxon tradition of personal justice. It is the essence of the institutions of liberty, as Charles Evans Hughes declared in comment on the New York Socialist case, that 'guilt is personal and cannot be attributed to the holding of opinion or to mere intent in the absence of overt acts.'"

Schlesinger-1949 based himself, of course, on the famous "clear and present danger" doctrine of Holmes and Brandeis, but a mere reference to this doctrine has now become meaningless, since the recent Vinson decision of the Supreme Court. Vinson, with less skill than a high school debater arguing a proposition that has been handed to him by the teacher, argued the phrase into meaninglessness. Vinson embraced the doctrine, but when it emerged from his lethal bear-hug it was tenderly consigned to the grave with flowers.

Schlesinger based himself on those ideas of Holmes and Brandeis which gave the phrase its meaning. They had said "clear and present danger" and he quotes Brandeis:

"If there be time to expose through discussion the falsehoods and fallacies, to avert the evil by the processes of education, the remedy to be applied is more speech, not enforced silence. Only an emergency can justify repression."

Acts, Not Thoughts

This is noble language, but the trouble is: our liberals who are being swept away by the witch-hunt have their belly full of their own noble language. Liberalism has lived so long by noble language alone that, in this present period of its futility and helplessness, its would-be "hard-headed" representatives have tended to become more cynical about noble language than even a backroom politician.

But Schlesinger-1949 went behind the noble language, and the italics are his own:

"What does 'clear and present danger' mean? . . . The danger was the danger of what Holmes called 'substantive evils'—that is, of acts in violation of law, and especially acts which will destroy the whole climate of reason and discussion. . . . 'Acts, not thoughts. . . .'

Schlesinger-1951 now advocates the suppression of the CP by a special law because he cannot prove any such acts.

His book quoted Brandeis again at this point: Brandeis warned that "In order to support a finding of clear and present danger it must be shown either that immediate serious violence was to be expected or was advocated, or that the past conduct furnished reason to believe that such advocacy was then contemplated." And he interprets for himself:

"We must tolerate dangerous opinions, Holmes and Brandeis were saying, even when their eventual tendency, should they win out by democratic methods, would be to extinguish freedom. But we must draw the line at opinion which results in the immediate and violent obliteration of the conditions of subsequent free discussion.

"This is the traditional American answer to those who say that people who would destroy liberty for others should have none of their own. . . . the curtailment of civil liberties in advance of many 'clear and present danger' has simply given overwhelming power to the champions of the existing order—whether the cop on the corner, the local businessman or political boss or the attorney general of the United States."

Why the Switch?

Over and over he stresses immediate, imminent threat: "I think," he quotes Holmes, "that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death, unless they so imminently threaten immediate interference with the lawful and pressing purposes of the law that an immediate check is required to save the country."

McCarthy might claim that, but does Schlesinger now believe that the smashing of the CP by police-state methods is immediately required to "save the country"?

Here is what he wrote on that when his center was still a bit vital:

"We should stick to the last possible moment to the traditional Anglo-Saxon view that guilt is personal and not by association. But the First Amendment does not bestow upon the Communist Party the constitutional

(Continued on page 7)

Big Business Gets Its Bill — —

(Continued from page 1)

only \$4 billion have been delivered, and that it will soon be expanded to the rate of \$65 billion in military orders a year.

In such a situation, the inflationary pressures will be strong, and the need for a strong control program to protect the standard of living of the great majority of the American people greater. The prospect of a recession or a depression under these circumstances is practically nil, for (as U. S. News puts it) "Spending for arms is to be the pump-priming mechanism of the future."

WEAK CONTROL BILL

Instead of passing a strong control law, a stopgap bill was passed which extended the present Defense Production Act for one month with two weakening amendments. One was to prevent the government from placing a ceiling price on any manufactured item not now controlled, and the other prevents any rollback on any commodity.

It is these two amendments which indicate the nature of the more permanent bill that will be passed. The cost to the consumers for the rises in prices has been estimated at about \$17 billion by both government and non-government sources, and the failure to set up price rollbacks will cost another \$12 billion, and these price boosts roll right into the pockets of the giant corporate profits.

The indications are that the future bill will raise rents 20 per cent in non-defense areas and ease up on credit restrictions as well as prevent price rollbacks. Although the tax bill will not be enacted now, the straws are in the wind that it will come down even heavier on the low-income groups.

The leading Democratic and Republican members of the Congressional Finance Committees are talking about the "limits" that have been reached on the taxation of the upper income groups and corporations. What is left is a gen-

eral excise tax, or as it is more popularly known, a sales tax, when the administration asks for another tax increase early in 1952.

The responsibility for the fact that the cost of living has gone up almost 9 per cent in the last year rests primarily with the Truman administration. Last summer when the Defense Production Act was passed, it gave the administration more power than it wished for, and through most of the past year Truman has insisted that it had the power to control this inflationary movement. Yet it was only recently that steps were begun in the direction of rolling back prices. But even on the beef rollback, Pres. Truman was reported at his June 8 press conference to be willing to make a deal with the beef growers and packers. While the price ceilings have more often than not permitted price increases.

FAIR DEAL SCANDALS

On a level with the scandalous actions of Congress has been the scandal inside the Truman administration over favoritism to large corporations.

One of the juiciest plums yet picked up by big business has been the tax write-off scheme whereby a corporation can get a special speedup tax schedule of 5 years instead of the normal 20 or 25 years when it builds a new factory. This enables the corporation to reduce its taxes by setting aside a larger depreciation fund against its profits. During all of World War II, the total amount of accelerated tax plans granted was \$7 billion, and already in the past year the Truman administration has granted \$7.5 billion. The practical effect of this scheme is that the public pays for the plant because of the reduction in the corporation's taxes.

The power of the large corporations has been further increased by the distribution of war contracts. The House Small Business Committee reports that in the first nine months of the Korean war one fourth of all government

military orders went to ten corporations, with General Motors top; and that the first fifty corporations received 48.2 per cent of all orders.

However, aside from this, there has been the usual favoritism among the "dollar-a-year" men toward the corporations with which they were formerly connected. The most recent case (of someone getting caught at it) was that of a bureaucrat-on-loan who awarded a contract for building locomotives to General Motors after "losing" the bids of the other four leading manufacturers in the industry.

NO FRIEND OF LABOR

The reason that labor is losing its fight for its "equality of sacrifice" program is that it is depending upon the Democratic Party to lead the way. But the plain truth of the matter is that the Democratic Party does not stand for "equality of sacrifice." On the administrative level it is loaded down with loaned representatives of big business who channel favors to their respective corporations. And in the determination of policy, the United Labor Policy Committee has no more real power than it did at the time it walked off the Wage Stabilization Board.

Most of the bureaucrats in positions of influence, like Charles E. Wilson, Leon Keyserling, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, and Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder, are in favor of "equality of sacrifice" only if it does not cause too much opposition by the large corporations. They regard their first task as speeding up war production, and consequently they are prepared to give all kinds of special privileges to the giant corporations, which in turn strengthen these corporations and their domination of the American economy.

The success of the lobbyists during the past few months in Washington indicates that both parties have fundamentally the same approach as Wilson, Keyserling and Snyder. The lobbyists were so numerous and effective

that they even evoked special comment from such a conservative reporter as Arthur Krock of the N. Y. Times. Among the leaders of the parade of spokesmen for money moguls and manufacturers were two former U. S. senators, Scott Lucas and Francis Myers. At the last session of Congress they were Democratic majority leader and majority whip respectively, "leading" the fight for controls. Today they are back in Congress, this time as lobbyists trying to kill controls.

AGAINST CONTROLS

It is not merely that the Democratic Party contains Southern reactionaries and Dixiecrats, but that the leaders themselves are not believers in controls. No better example of this can be seen than in this session's fight over controls where the Democratic senatorial leaders did not wait till they were out of Congress to become spokesmen for finance and industry. Majority Leader McFarland and Majority Whip Johnson both repeatedly voted against a stronger control bill on the Senate floor.

How can it be said that the Democratic Party put up a real fight for "equality of sacrifice" when even such supporters of the administration as Senators Douglas, Fulbright and Sparkman did not even bother to show up for committee hearings on the bill?

At the Senate Finance Committee hearings Emil Rieve of the Textile Workers and the United Labor Policy Committee threatened that if a strong anti-inflation and control bill is not passed labor would once again walk out of the government agencies. Labor should once again stop serving as window dressing on these committees, but this time permanently. But more important it should walk out of the Democratic Party and form its own political party.

Doris Fleeson, the Washington columnist, writing on the actions of the Democratic senatorial leadership pointed out: "It is not the first time that he [Truman] has been caught short by his re-

fusal to recognize he can't have his Fair Deal without Fair Dealers."

It is now time for the labor leadership to recognize that it can't have a real Fair Deal without organizing its own party. The Truman Fair Deal serves as window-dressing for the basically anti-labor nature of the Democratic Party, for the fact that it too is more concerned with the welfare of the giant corporations and monopolies than it is with the welfare of the people.

Lesson on New Deal

An illuminating observation by Washington columnist Peter Edson casts some light on the belief that Fair-Dealish enthusiasm for controls is "progressive" per se: "One of the surprising things is what happens to rock-ribbed Republican business bigshots who come to town to take top government defense jobs," Edson says.

"They are immediately thrown up against tough international or domestic problems. Scarcities, foreign supply and demand, trade balances, dollar shortages are involved. All seem to call for economic controls.

"It is traditional that all business men hate government interference with the normal practices of the free enterprise system. Yet what happens, nine times out of 10 or even oftener, is that the business executives temporarily turned bureaucrats come up with the same answers that the economic planners and the New Dealers would propose."

Edson intended this as a defense of New-Dealism and Fair-Dealism, but can it mean that both deals are fundamentally in the best long-range interests of the "rock-ribbed Republican business bigshots"?

Schlesinger vs. Schlesinger — —

(Continued from page 6)

right, for example, to be a clandestine network for purposes of espionage or subversion. It would not justify Mr. Dennis [CP leader] in organizing a party militia. If such acts become really threatening and the party apparatus can be shown to be involved, the existence of the Communist Party itself may become a source of clear and present danger. Then it could be outlawed.

" . . . It may well be, for example, that the Communist Parties of France and Italy are already committing a multitude of overt acts which would justify their suppression today. But we have plainly not reached that point in the United States. Until the party is outlawed, its members are entitled to the protection of American laws—and are liable to prosecution for breaking those laws—just as any other citizens are."

It is clear and present knowledge that Schlesinger has not found any such acts or evidence since writing the above.

On Lerner and Rogge

One of the most interesting aspects of Schlesinger-1949 was his polemic against the views of Max Lerner and O. John Rogge in 1943-45. These two gentlemen, then more or less fellow-traveling with the Stalinists, had opened up an attack on the clear-and-present-danger doctrine in order to justify government action against fascist sympathizers.

Schlesinger twists the knife in their backs:

"O. John Rogge led the attack on the doctrine of personal guilt, demanding in its place a much extended doctrine of conspiracy in which guilt by association would play a conspicuous role. . . ."

" . . . Liberals sat by and applauded while a wildly expanded doctrine of conspiracy ran berserk under Rogge's guidance in the fantastic mass sedition trial of 1944-45. . . ."

And he quotes from the articles of that time

by Max Lerner with deadly and telling effect:

"These critics [like Lerner] argued that in an age of fifth columns, psychological war and mass espionage, the traditional civil-liberty doctrine only tied the hands of democracy. 'It is becoming increasingly clear,' Lerner wrote, 'that the government which waits until propaganda has reached the point of clearly threatening the immediate survival of the nation is likely to wait until it is too late, and will probably never have the strength to strike when the time comes. . . . I am increasingly convinced,' observed Lerner in concluding a powerful assault on the Holmes-Brandeis doctrine, 'that a realistic legal policy would modify the clear-and-present-danger doctrine in the direction of an "intellectual trading with the enemy" standard, which sought to find substantial propaganda connections with the enemy and the existence of an actual intent to play the enemies' propaganda game.'"

Wry Joke

With justifiable maliciousness, Schlesinger noted: "A few years later, the Department of Justice, preparing its brief against the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee for its refusal to open its records to the Un-American Activities Committee, would cite Lerner among its authorities. Indeed, a more unscrupulous regime might achieve interesting results by employing Rogge's 1944 methods against his present associates."

And he added:

"What have been the consequences in a time like the present of replacing 'personal guilt' by 'guilt by association' and of letting the 'clear and present danger' test retreat before an 'intellectual trading with the enemy' standard? . . . We stand, in other words, in the precise situation where excess has led to repentance before; and the departure from 'personal guilt' and 'clear and present danger' invites excess today."

That is precisely where Schlesinger stands today in 1951, as he invokes roughly the same kind of ideas which Lerner and Rogge had done in the years when Russia was "our noble ally."

And today Max Lerner (we haven't heard about Rogge) denounces the CP arrests and the Supreme Court validation of the Smith Act. The debaters have changed places.

Maybe that's just a wry joke that history plays on individuals. But we record the following fact with some astonishment:

● At the time when guilt-by-association raised its head against fascists in the dock and when a fascist country was the war enemy, it was Lerner and Rogge who cheered and Schlesinger who defended civil liberties.

● At a time when the same anti-democratic doctrines are raised against Stalinists in the dock and when the Stalinist empire is the war enemy, it is Schlesinger who wants to go along and Lerner who defends civil liberties.

Are we supposed to conclude that Schlesinger is "friendlier" to fascists and Lerner "friendlier" to the Stalinists? This would not only be somewhat slanderously untrue, but it would also miss a much more important point than any such conclusions about either of these confused liberals. Would it not rather be fairer to explain the wry joke quite otherwise?—that Lerner hates fascism more than he believes in the efficacy of democracy, and that Schlesinger hates Stalinism more than he believes in the efficacy of democracy.

It is the common element in both that interests us. For that common element is not lack of faith in democracy in the abstract—they believe in all the noble language; it is lack of faith implicitly in the possibilities of democracy within the framework of the present system and government. But they are tied to making their choice within that framework.

AFL Report: Franco Tottering

(Continued from page 1)

it should be regarded with caution until confirmation is received from socialist sources in Spain. It appears that Brown's chief purpose in releasing this information at the present time is to influence the American government against its present policy of support to Franco. This intention is brought out most clearly in points 6, 7, and 8 of his report which outlines what he believes to be the vital political aspects of the internal situation in Spain:

"(6) The anti-Franco opposition in Spain wants to know what is the intention of the Allies after the events of Barcelona. If they want further such demonstrations, or even violent demonstrations, against Franco this can be done. But if the situation continues, the non-Communist anti-Franco forces will be subject to Soviet Communist propaganda which is being beamed to the Spanish people in twenty-five different broadcasts weekly while the West carries on no propaganda and the internal non-Communist forces lack sufficient means to counteract the huge Spanish apparatus and propaganda.

"(7) In the event of war, the people of Spain will not support Franco and will use any arms they can get or the arms that the Soviet Union parachutes to them against Franco. In other words, Franco is not even a good military asset, let alone a political one.

"(8) Knowledge about America is distorted to the purposes of Franco who tells the Spanish people about all the economic aid which he will receive from the United

States in order to bolster up the present regime. Every time the United States makes the slightest gesture toward Franco, it is utilized on the radio and in the newspapers to emphasize the support of the United States for the Franco regime. Without this propaganda and without economic aid from the United States, Franco cannot last."

Thus, Brown points out, the United States policy of backing up present anti-Moscow governments, no matter how reactionary or how hated they may be by their own people, is once again boomeranging to the advantage of the Stalinists. In view of the clear fact that this is the true American policy, Brown's contention that "knowledge about America is distorted" can only be attributed to his desire to put his case in diplomatic language.

ARMY TORN

The most important thing about Brown's report is that it brings further evidence of the disaffection of all social strata in Spain from the rotten Franco regime. Although he undoubtedly plays down the role of the working-class and socialist organizations such as the POUM for his own purposes, he makes it clear that the anti-Franco movement extends to elements of the capitalist class, the army, and the Falange itself. The first five points of Brown's report are as follows:

"1. The strike was not merely economic nor spontaneous. It was planned and reflected political antagonism to the Franco regime.

"2. The workers could not have conducted the strike in a successful fashion unless

they had had the support of the monarchists and, at least, the passive support or indifference of the police and army.

"3. The workers were definitely encouraged to strike and were promised to be paid by the employers, who have their own private grievances against the Franco economic regime. In spite of Franco's warnings to the employers, the workers were paid for the strike days lost."

LABOR MUST SPEAK

"4. The order for the strike, in many cases, was sent out on the stationery of the Phalangist [Falangist] trade unions, which revealed the opposition to Franco in the Phalangist movement and the extent of infiltration by the anti-Franco trade unions.

"5. The army is not united and there are many generals commanding whole areas in Spain who are cooperating with the National Committee, which unites the extreme Right and Left Wing in the fight against Franco, under General Aranda."

It is now clear that within Spain most of the prerequisites for the overthrow of

Franco exist. All the problems of political reorganization which would follow such an overthrow still lie ahead. How they will be worked out will depend on the relations of power and the policies of the different wings of the anti-Franco movement. They will depend also, on the kind of support or opposition these different wings receive from abroad.

Brown's report was made to his organization, the AFL. The whole American labor movement bears a heavy responsibility toward the Spanish people, and particularly toward the workers of Spain who put up such a heroic resistance against fascism in the '30s. The job of the labor movement here is to conduct a major political campaign against the pro-Franco policy of the Truman administration, and once the Spanish people have rid themselves of Franco, to demand that the American government permit them to work out their own political destiny without American interference.

The Spanish people, despite the agonies of civil war and fascist suppression, are once more in a position to

strike a major blow at totalitarianism. Of course, the Stalinists will seek to make political capital out of the situation. Without American interference, first in the form of support of Franco and later in the form of support to the most conservative anti-Franco elements, their chance of success is at a minimum. The Spanish working class has had its belly full of totalitarianism. Everything now points to its desire for democracy. Only outside interference against its democratic aspirations could lead it to seek support from Stalinism.

Irving Brown's report is an encouraging symptom, not only because of what it says about Spain, but for the policy it is obviously seeking to suggest to the labor movement and the American government. The government has proved only its reactionary approach to problems such as this. The American labor movement must make its voice heard:

End all support to Franco! Not a cent, not a gun to Spanish totalitarianism!

American labor's support to the democratic struggle of the Spanish people!

Buffalo Anti-Totalitarian Committee Rallies Support for Spanish Labor

BUFFALO, June 23—In response to the needs of the Spanish workingmen and women imprisoned by Franco because of their participation in the recent wave of strikes from Barcelona to Madrid, a meeting of the Anti-Totalitarian Committee to Aid the Spanish Strikers was held here this week.

The Anti-Totalitarian Committee to Aid the Spanish Strikers was formed by individuals whose aim was to give moral, political, and financial aid to the Spanish strikers. They represented many organizational points of view. Trade unionists, ministers, liberals, socialists, participated in the meeting.

Six local speakers described the conditions under Franco, the struggles taking place at present in Spain, and the need for immediate aid to the Spanish workers.

A resolution adopted at the meeting called upon all democratic individuals and groups to protest the sending of financial, military, or other support to Franco's totalitarian regime. The resolution opposed diplomatic recognition of the Franco government, which was imposed upon the Spanish people by the fascist guns of Mussolini and Hitler.

In calling for the U. S. government to give no aid to the Franco regime, the resolution declared it was striking a blow for freedom both inside and outside the Iron Curtain.

Although the meeting was small, \$84 was collected from those present.

The meeting hall was decorated with colorful banners and posters bearing the following slogans: "All Aid to the Spanish Strikers"—"Put an End to United States Aid to Franco"—"Release Franco's political prisoners"—"For Freedom Everywhere, Inside and Outside the Iron Curtain."

The leaflet distributed for the meeting read in part:

"The Spanish people will not

be helped by the big loan given to Franco by the Export-Import bank of the United States.

"The Spanish people will not be helped by the United States voting in the UN to resume diplomatic relations with the totalitarian Franco.

"The Spanish people will not be helped by the United States subsidizing Franco's armies.

"In effect the United States will be giving Franco money and arms to keep the Spanish people under his control.

"The struggle of the Spanish people against the totalitarian Franco is a blow against the totalitarian Stalin. By supporting

Franco, the United States is playing into the hands of Stalin. The fight for democratic liberties in Spain gives heart to those fighting for democratic liberties behind the Iron Curtain. The American people, by aiding the struggle of the Spanish people against Franco are also aiding the struggles of the oppressed people under Stalin. Already the anti-Stalinist sections of the French labor movement are raising funds to help free the imprisoned Spanish strikers. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, to which the AFL and the CIO people are affiliated, are demanding the release of the Spanish prisoners. American labor must do its part."

Breathing Spell

(Continued from page 1)
them. The labor leadership has a pretty good understanding of what this will mean for them: the necessity of putting up a big fight on the home front.

But somehow they do not seem to be able to understand that the same politicians who are striking at U. S. labor standards are also responsible for the ruinous foreign policy. Even Taft has stated that there is no bipartisan foreign policy in the country any longer, and has declared his independence from any such concept. Only the labor leadership hangs on to the illusion that in this field "unity" is essential.

Although the elements of a foreign policy for American labor are clearly indicated, the labor leaders prefer to content themselves with mild criticisms of and pious pleas to the Truman administration on this score.

The first point in a thoroughly democratic foreign policy for the labor movement would be a demand that the United States gov-

ernment clearly and honestly recognize the right of self-determination for each and every country in the world. This cannot mean that the United States recognizes this right only when it is convenient to the immediate imperialist interests of this country, and reserves the right to violate national self-determination when such a violation appears to be to its interest. It must be a demand that the United States government supports the right of any nation, however small or weak, to determine its own national destiny.

Of course, this would prove embarrassing to the American government. Even though this is an elementary democratic right, it is a right which is peculiarly repugnant to imperialism. At this moment it is being violated in Indo-China and in almost all of Africa by the allies of the United States.—with her backing. The fact that it is also denied to all the nations under the brutal heel of the Kremlin is no excuse for people who really believe in democracy.

WHERE WE STAND

To get acquainted with the ideas of Independent Socialism, send for the special issues of LABOR ACTION listed below:

May Day Issue 1950

THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

May Day Issue 1951

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

Ten Cents Each

LABOR ACTION, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

THE NEW COURSE

by LEON TROTSKY

The Struggle for the New Course

by MAX SHACHTMAN

Both in one book—Trotsky's historic essay on the beginnings of Stalinism, and Shachtman's study of the development of Russian totalitarianism

\$1.50

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.