

Supreme Court Opens Hearings On School Bias

By George Lavan

On April 11 the U.S. Supreme Court finally began to hear arguments on how and when its school desegregation ruling of almost a year ago should be put into effect.

Lawyers for Negro children and their parents urged the court to make a ruling that would start desegregation rolling in the South at the beginning of next year's school term or at the latest the school year after the next. Lawyers for border states — those Southern states which were not boycotting the hearings — presented a line of argument which would make the Supreme Court's May 17, 1954, ruling a dead letter as far as compulsory desegregation was concerned.

The announced purpose of these hearings — the implementation of the Court's decision — was to decide ways, means and time limits of enforcing the earlier decision that school segregation was unconstitutional. Yet the attorneys — general and legal representatives of the Jim Crow school states didn't argue about how or when desegregation should begin but tried to prove that desegregation was impractical, unhealthy, undesirable, impossible and dangerous.

This led the lawyers of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to

tell the court that "the Southern states have made no sincere attempt to advance constructive plans . . . as to how the May 17 decision outlawing segregation in public schools should be implemented." The NAACP lawyers called Florida an exception to this statement. This, however, appears to be a case of over-generosity.

While the friend-of-the-court arguments submitted by the Florida Attorney General were not as rabid as some of the others, they certainly do not represent an effort to find the best and quickest way to begin school desegregation. Florida argued against immediate integration. It also asked that the Supreme Court leave the details up to district courts and tell them that petitions of Negro children to enter hitherto lily-white schools should be refused as "capricious" if the motivation was desire to advance a racial group. Petitions should be considered as being in "good faith" solely on the grounds that the Negro child's education was being impaired in a segregated school.

This would be a gimmick by which segregation could be maintained. Florida and other Deep South states are appropriating money for the horribly inadequate Negro schools. They hope in a few years to be able to claim that the improved Negro schools are "equal" to the white. Then state officials would declare that a petition from a Negro child for transfer to a white school was a "capricious" desire "to advance a racial group" since no educational impairment was being suffered. Thus would be revived the old legal trick of "separate but equal" which the Supreme Court supposedly outlawed last May.

INSULTING ARGUMENT

One of the most insulting arguments was presented by Archibald G. Robertson representing Virginia. He alleged that Ne-

(Continued on page 2)

Encouraging Vote Given Los Angeles SWP Candidate

LOS ANGELES, April 9 — Robert Morgan, candidate for the Board of Education sponsored by the Los Angeles Local of the Socialist Workers Party, received the encouraging total of 17,293 votes, it was announced here this week.

This compares with 12,588 votes which he received in running for the same office in 1953.

Morgan ran on a platform of opposition to the witch-hunt He advocated that funds now earmarked for war by the capitalist government should be used for education.

Some Who Should Get Invitations to Bandung

By Bob Dixon

The peoples of Africa, numbering some 200,000,000, have the smallest representation in the so-called "councils of the world." This lends special attractiveness to

Bandung Afro-Asian Conference in the eyes of 50,000,000 Arab and 150,000,000 Negro Africans. It appears to be a forum promising to give voice to their views and opinions on some of the most burning questions of the day.

In the United States itself the Bandung Conference has excited great interest among the Negro

people. So much so that five American Negro journalists will attend as observers. The famous Negro novelist and publicist Richard Wright as well as the Harlem congressman Rep. Adam Clayton Powell will also be present.

The cold attitude of the State Department toward the Conference served to whet interest all the keener and give the gathering a still greater anti-imperialist coloration. Rep. Powell expressed this sentiment of the Negro people in his way when he said on the floor of Congress March 31: "I do not believe we are indifferent to a conference representing three-fifths of the earth's population."

Yet just how representative is the Bandung Conference? Invitations have been extended to Egypt (population, 17 million), Ethiopia (10 million), Liberia (two million), Libya (one million), and the Gold Coast (four million).

Of these, the most significant invitation is the one to the Gold Coast, since it is the first Negro government to arise directly out of the struggles of the African peoples against colonial domination, even though it is still a colony within the British Empire, its one-crop cocoa economy completely under the thumb of British capital.

Thus the Afro-Asian Conference gives a voice to those claiming to speak for no more than 18 million North Africans and 15 million Negro Africans.

What then of the millions of Africans engaged in bitter and often bloody struggle against French, British, Portuguese, Belgian and Spanish colonialism?

Why was no invitation proffered to Jomo Kenyatta and the Kenya African Union? To Messali Hadj, leader of the embattled Algerians? To the African National Congress, waging a bitter fight against the racist South African regime? To the RDA of French West Africa, the Istiqlal of Morocco, the savagely repressed peoples of Madagascar?

The ostensible purpose of the

(Continued on page 2)

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XIX — No. 16

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1955

PRICE: 10 Cents

GM Seeks to Handcuff UAW With Another Five-Year Pact

Workers Need Eyes In Back of Heads to Watch Slippery Moves

By Art Preis

General Motors has launched a drive to handcuff its production workers with another long-term contract like the detested five-year agreement that expires May 29.

This may be the price the world's largest industrial corporation is asking in return for concessions on the guaranteed annual wage plan sought by the CIO United Automobile Workers in current negotiations which began April 7.

The huge monopoly corporation is plugging the five-year pact through costly full-page ads in leading newspapers throughout the country. These ads appeared almost immediately following the opening of negotiations. A hint of the line GM would take had been given by its president Harlow H. Curtice last month when he issued a statement fulsomely praising the 1950 long-term contract that CIO and UAW President Walter Reuther helped to foist on the GM workers.

OLD PACT PROTESTED

From its start in 1950, the five-year contract that is about to expire aroused bitter criticism and protest from the auto union's ranks. This reached such a pitch in 1953 that Reuther was forced to seek reopening of the contract on wages and to threaten strike action. The five-year pact became a major issue of the 1953 UAW convention.

GM has kept strict silence on the guaranteed wage issue and given no hint of its stand in the newly opened negotiations. But its ad campaign is intended to win public support for a demand for a long-term pact.

WHAT GM CLAIMS

The ad claims that "General Motors and their employees have enjoyed five great years" and one of the reasons "certainly traces right back to the historic con-

tract worked out by the UAW and General Motors in 1950." The ad then boasts that GM today employs 511,792 persons compared with 383,688 in Jan. 1950. The implication is that the increase over the past five years is due to the long-term pact. The comparison, of course, is with a recession period and simply omits the fact of the Korean War boom that was the principal cause of the employment increase. But GM employment declined in 1954 over 1953 — a fact not cited in the ad. The new automation program is likewise aimed at still further reducing the working force.

The ad also claims that GM wage and salary payments rose from \$1,719,491,556 in 1950 to \$2,398,465,867 in 1954. In short, while the number of its employees rose one-third, its payroll increased only a little more than 18%.

What the ad leaves out is GM's profits — the real reason why the corporations "enjoyed five great years." Last Jan. 26 the company announced 1954 net profits of \$806,000,000, about 34.8% higher than the 1953 take of \$598,119,478, despite a 2% drop in net sales.

(Continued on page 3)

Republican Machine-man Witch-hunted

Red-baiting is still in vogue as a means of settling an opponent's hash. The latest politician to find this out is Edward Corsi, prominent New York Republican. Corsi was former Republican candidate for New York City mayor and for U. S. senator. Until last week, he counted Secretary of State Dulles, Attorney-General Brownell and Republican National Chairman Hall among his close personal friends.

Three months ago, Dulles urged Corsi to take a job with the State Department to administer the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. On April 8 Dulles fired Corsi after Rep. Walter (D-Pa.), now head of the House Un-American Activities Committee, charged that Corsi had once belonged to "Communist front" organizations.

Corsi, who was born in Italy, opposes those features of the 1952 Walter-McCarran Immigration law that discriminate against South and East Europeans and Asians. For instance, under the act, normal 1954 quotas allowed 65,000 immigrants from England as against 5,600 from Italy and 185 from Japan.

To soften the resentment of Italians, Poles and other minorities in the U.S. against the Walter-McCarran act's racial bias, the Eisenhower Administration sponsored the 1953 Refugee Relief Act. Under its provisions 209,000 non-quota persons supposedly could enter the U.S. on the plea that they were victims of "Communist persecution." But with half the operating period already over, only 15,000 applications have been processed.

The Refugee Relief Act was meant as window dressing and so was Corsi's appointment. But Corsi got in the way of the restrictive bloc in Congress headed by Rep. Walter. Nor was he wanted by Scott McLeod, administrator of Immigration and chief McCarthy lieutenant in the State Department.

Walter smeared Corsi in Congress. McLeod and other McCarthyites put pressure behind the scenes and Dulles dropped Corsi. Dulles claimed Corsi was not qualified for the job and only held a 90 day appointive post, anyway.

This was news to Corsi. As was his alleged past membership in "Communist front" organizations. "But even if I had belonged, so what?" he complained to reporters. "Doesn't 25 years of service in conservative Republican surroundings count for anything?"

Evidently not among witch-hunters.

Rail Strikers Solid



Striking railroad workers reaffirm their stand at mass meeting in Louisville, Ky. The Louisville & Nashville railroad and two subsidiaries, branching through 13 southeastern states, have been halted by a strike of 25,000 members of 10 non-operating rail unions since Mar. 14.

WASHINGTON HUSH-HUSH ON BOMB TEST DANGERS

By Theodore Kovalsky

"Is a studied attempt being made on a world-wide basis to hamper the American program for improvement of its atomic weapons by arousing vague fears that the human race might be accidentally poisoned by too many weapon tests?" This begins a feature by Nat S. Finney of the Buffalo Evening News Bureau in Washington. And thus begins also the governmental counterattack against the millions of American people who are feeling alarm that borders on terror concerning the ghastly results of the atomic tests.

This is not a subtle move on the part of the government. The News goes on to admit openly that this question "has some ugly implications for American scientists who have kibitzed about Atomic Energy Commission policies." Among the "ugly implications" is the claim that protests "are always directed at American tests and never at Russian tests."

If this "ugly implication" is correct, it is hardly strange. The American tests are occurring in America and the Russian ones, in Russia. It would seem logical that the atomic fall out most to be dreaded would be that which was closer. It was in Colorado that two scientists warned that radioactive fall out had reached dangerous proportions (and the governor of the state said they should be "put in jail" for their pains). Where the fall out may be occurring in the Soviet Union we do not know. But surely it is not Colorado, U.S.A.

Now, publicly to express one's worry over the hazard of atomic radiation, the News story indicates, is not merely an "ugly

implication" of subversion; it is worse, if possible. It is not fair play, not cricket, because "responsible government authorities are handicapped in several ways about correcting alarming statements they know to be false." Mr. Finney then sympathetically lists four different ways the long-suffering Washington officials are being taken advantage of.

WOULD END IGNORANCE

First, by countering the statements of those alarmists who don't want to be poisoned by radiation or see the form of the human race changed by freakish mutations, they might disclose information that would be of value to Soviet intelligence.

There is obviously only one way out of that. The American people must have blind faith in their government. The old traditions of democracy have to be swept aside into the trash of modern times. There must be no questioning. The government must have a "divine right" to do what it sees fit to do. Anybody who may wonder about the course that Washington is pursuing, even with regard to the continuance of the human race, is by implication, working hand in glove with the Russian Intelligence.

Secondly, "responsible authorities are sometimes handicapped by ethical considerations." American authorities "know" that the famous Japanese fisherman "said to have died of exposure to poisonous radiation actually died of infectious hepatitis. . . . that he probably got from the use of an inadequately sterilized transfusion needle. But because Japanese doctors attended the fisherman (Continued on page 2)

Minn. Ballot Ban Measure Dropped After Protests

ST. PAUL, April 6 — A victory for democratic rights appears certain in the Minnesota ballot fight. The drastic increase in the number of signatures required for filing by petition, originally proposed in an administration-sponsored bill (House File 1292), has been dropped.

This action came on a unanimous vote of the House Elections Committee of the Minnesota State Legislature after a hearing at which V. R. Dunne, state organizer of the Minnesota section of the Socialist Workers Party spoke against the proposal. He cited the fact that this curtailment of civil rights was a direct blow to the right of minority parties to participate in election campaigns.

In discussing the proposed bill, committee members emphasized their agreement with the right of minority parties to participate in elections, and they struck this section out of the bill.

The Minnesota SWP quickly organized a campaign when the threat of this move was first announced in the newspapers. Every effort was made to alert and inform individuals in civil liberties groups, other minority parties and activists in the farmers and union movements. The success of the campaign can be gauged by the fact that the chairman of the House Elections Committee announced at the opening of the hearing that he had received many calls, personal contacts and letters from people protesting this move.

Perhaps the best proof was the readiness with which the committee struck out the offending part of the bill.

They're Both War Parties

By L. P. Wheeler

Since 1952 Republican Party spokesmen have hurled the charge of "war party" at the Democrats. This charge was a powerful weapon during the presidential election campaign and was instrumental in electing Eisenhower. The vote-catching line goes like this: "Don't forget, it was the Democratic Party that was in the administration during World War I, World War II, and the Korean War."

But, are the Republicans ready to say they were wrong in supporting the Democratic administration in each of these wars? That they were wrong in voting for each and every war measure and taking joint responsibility with the Democrats for the conduct of these wars? No, they reply, they wouldn't say that, they are merely stating a fact, no innuendo intended . . . etc., etc.

In the meantime they hope that millions of voters get the impression that somehow the Republican Party did not share

equal responsibility for U.S. participation in these terrible wars. Now the Democrats come along. They try the same game. They accuse the Republicans of being the "war party" today. They charge that by its "bungling" and "fumbling" diplomacy, the Republican administration is dragging us into a war in the Far East — at the "wrong time" and in the "wrong place" (Quebec and Matsui islands).

But, are the Democrats ready to renounce the basic policy they share with the Eisenhower administration on the "cold war" in general and the Far East in particular? Are they ready to favor the removal of all armed forces from the Far East? Are they in favor of getting the Seventh Fleet out of the Formosa Strait? Are they ready to call for the cancellation of the astronomical war expenditures which account for 62% of the entire federal budget? Are they at least ready to stop their clamor for even greater war spending than Eisenhower proposes?

In other words, are they ready to abandon Wall Street's foreign policy, get out of Asia and let

the Chinese and other colonial people settle matters with their exploiters without the armed intervention of the U.S.?

No. They are not ready for that, the Democratic demagogues will hasten to explain. They are merely pointing out that "clumsy diplomacy" can be dangerous, and can lead to unfortunate results; they meant no innuendo . . . etc., etc.

In the meantime they hope that millions of worried voters get the impression that somehow the Democratic Party does not fully share the responsibility for the present war danger.

Now that the Democrats are turning the "war party" charge against the Republicans, some of the GOP leaders are getting disturbed. What kind of an effect do these charges and counter-charges of "war party" have on public opinion?

Vice-President Nixon on April 3 declared that "there is no war party in America" and that anyone who says otherwise is furnishing grist for the "Communist propaganda mill."

Nixon is really saying that the game of "war party" accusations must be played within strict limits. It must not interfere with any basic moves in the war drive; and it must not reinforce the suspicion of the American people that both parties are war parties.

Hand of Morgan Seen In Mail Order Battle

By Sam Marcy

It is utterly impossible to understand the current bitter struggle for Montgomery-Ward unless one takes into account the relationship between the House of Morgan and Sewell Avery.

First the reader should know that Sewell Avery, though a rich man by the ordinary standards of a working-man, is not a Rockefeller, Dupont, Ford or Morgan. As he recently described himself, he is a "mere manager" of a giant corporation. The fact that he owns 65,000 shares of Montgomery-Ward is in and of itself not sufficient to take him out of the category of a manager, since there are a total of more than 6½ million shares of Montgomery-Ward stock.

Up until June of 1948, if any giant company could be regarded as Morgan-controlled it was Montgomery-Ward. On its Board of Directors sat none other than Richard Whitney, chairman of the Board of Directors of J. P. Morgan; and H. P. Davison, the senior vice-president of J. P. Morgan. It was Davison who brought Sewell Avery to Montgomery-Ward to manage the firm in 1931.

Over the course of the war years, and especially since 1943, it became more and more noticeable that the Montgomery-Ward Company was accumulating so much in liquid assets (cash) that the firm had acquired the nickname of the "bank with a department store front." In the current proxy fight with his adversary, Wolfson, Avery described his financial policy as "salting away cash for a rainy day." His supposed rival, Wolfson, has described Avery as the chief prophet of "doom and bust."

(Continued on page 4)

