

Keep the Purgers Out of the Plants!

For political trend-spotters in this country, a new and virulently dangerous tendency is raising its head that requires no magnifying glass to be seen. Three important cases have already appeared—all in the past few weeks. Their coincidence in time, taken together with the recency of the whole development, is a bad omen for further extension in 1950.

• Item: Already reported in LABOR ACTION has been the demand of the Wright Company in New Jersey, made on the United Auto Workers local there, for the inclusion in the contract of a clause permitting the company to fire workers on "anti-subversive" grounds. The local began by opposing this poisonous bid to legalize a witchhunt against militant unionists, radicals and socialists—for it is by no means directed solely against the Communist Party—but, as we have reported, the UAW leaders, including Walter Reuther, authorized it to accept, on the proviso that grievance procedure would apply to such cases.

• Item: In Chicago, Stewart-Warner demanded that every worker in its plant take an oath that he is not, and never has been, a member of a "subversive organization," failure to sign such an affidavit being ground for firing. Five workers have already been fired and the Chicago branch of the American Civil Liberties Union is fighting their cases. Stewart-Warner stated that it took the action on the insistence of the army.

• Item: Also in Chicago, at Felt-Tarrant, the leadership of the union has accepted a plank in the contract which would exclude members of the Communist Party from employment. We do not as yet have the details of this agreement and therefore do not know precisely how far it goes, but that much is clear. In this case, the union is the former Farm Equipment Workers (now incorporated into the United Electrical Workers) and is led by the Stalinists!

What this trend amounts to, in a few pointed words, is one to turn private employers AND, EVEN MORE IMPORTANT, TRADE UNIONS, into cops to police the attorney-general's extra-legal "anti-subversive" witchhunt list.

This push has been made without the passage of a single LAW by any legislative body. Its starting point was the directive issued by President Truman, on the basis of which the Department of Justice drew up its list. This list was published, not only without any sanction by any elected representatives of the people, but without any hearings or testimony whatsoever or any opportunity whatsoever for organizations listed to contest it. The Department of Justice admits that there is no way for anyone to get delisted—it is a one-way street: there is no legal recourse pointed to.

Equally behind the back of any legal process, the attorney general's list quickly became the basis for a witchhunt in government employment. From top to bottom, down to the lowly position of file clerk in the Veterans' Administration (we refer to the case of James Kutcher, the "Legless Vet") the purge came to terrorize employees.

Such action was defended on the ground that the government has the right to "protect itself" (against VA file clerks?), but the government witch-hunt bids fair to become the trial balloon and model for private employment. The government bureaucracy has shown the way, has softened up public sentiment, gotten people used to the idea, let liberal opposition blow off steam—and now, creeping up in the shelter of the government purgers, comes the intrusion of the same thought-system into other sectors of American life.

Outside the Law

In the two most important cases where legislative bodies have put this system into law, the courts have declared it unconstitutional in vigorous language. This was in the case of the New York Feinberg Law and the Maryland Ober Law.

What Truman, the Fair Dealer, has initiated through the administrative apparatus of the Department of Justice is more insidious. There is no law to be declared unconstitutional; there is no law to be repealed. The ill-famed Mundt-Nixon bill of a couple of years ago was stopped in Congress; Truman even got some applause for opposing it. It should be clear to anyone that the Truman-Fair Deal opposition to Mundt-Nixon's methods was one of expediency: Truman could do it better WITHOUT ANY LAW.

A poison is being circulated through the veins of democratic processes in this country. If anyone thinks the three cases mentioned above are not enough to disturb anyone, he should think back to the beginnings of the current witch-hunt system—and see how far it has already traveled, not during a long historical period but in a few years.

When the Taft-Hartley Law was passed with its provision for anti-Communist affidavits, some of the most conservative union leaders in the country, including the heads of the CIO and AFL, denounced it in principle; Philip Murray refused to sign for the Steel Workers on principle. It was an invasion of the unions' democratic rights. It was an entering wedge to control the unions and union policy.

Today, the UAW authorizes one of its locals to accept an "anti-subversive" system ten times more dangerous than the T-H provision!

The Road to Serfdom

There are people who object to talk about the trends in the direction of a police-state in the United States—TRENDS!—on the ground that there is such a tremendous distance between the Russian prototype of the police-state and the situation in this country even now. This is sheer muddleheadedness.

That the tremendous difference is there, is without doubt. In Russia there are no TRENDS to a police state; it got there, all the way, a long time ago; it is the most totalitarian regime in the world, probably in all history, even counting Hitler's Gestapo Germany.

But when LABOR ACTION devotes substantial space, week in and out, to the horror, tyranny, and brutality of Stalinism in power, it is not only with the purpose of pointing a finger abroad, not ONLY for the purpose of trying to get a glimmer of the truth into minds bemused by Stalinism. The growing bureaucratization and militarization of American life (note Stewart Warner's explanation that the army insisted on its move) points not in the direction of an ALTERNATIVE to Stalinist totalitarianism but also in the direction of bureaucratic tyranny.

How—in the name of freedom, democracy and all other good things—can the modern liberal comfort his soul with the thought that the U. S. has still a long way to go before it catches up with its prototypes, and even use this as a rationalization for failing to react against the first steps along the road.

There is no doubt about one thing: the main force called on to fight this literally lawless, Truman-initiated, bureaucratic witchhunt system is the trade-union movement, and no one else. The American Civil Liberties Union and other defense agencies, where they will, can help greatly, but there is no substitute for the clear assumption of this responsibility by labor.

This warning is addressed in the first place to the men in the unions to fight down every attempt to put over another indefensible witchhunt contract, to denounce every move in this direction, to defend democracy where it counts most. The "defenders" of democracy by police-state methods are among its most cunning enemies. The union movement can go along with this process only to its own eventual grievous hurt.

At makeup time, as this issue of LABOR ACTION goes to press, we are in receipt of a very interesting letter on our article of last week dealing with the acceptance of a witchhunt clause in the union contract by the UAW local at Wright Aeronautical. The letter, signed jointly by Martin Gerber, UAW regional director, Region 9, and Gabriel DeAngelis, UAW international representative, takes vigorous issue with LABOR ACTION's criticism of the UAW leaders' policy.

The letter by Gerber and DeAngelis will be printed in full in next week's LABOR ACTION, together with a reply. We believe that the issues raised are of great importance and interest to the entire labor movement and we are glad to present this discussion to our readers.



What ECA 'Integration' Means: U. S. Vetoes British Oil Expansion Plans

By SAM FELIX

The newest slogan of the Marshall Plan is "integration." The November 1 speech of Economic Cooperation Administrator Paul Hoffman laid down the line that if the countries of Western Europe hoped to receive Marshall money after July 1, 1950 they would have to liberalize trade and "integrate" Western Europe into a single economic unit.

Specifically Hoffman wanted Western Europe to cut import restrictions by 50 per cent, to sharply limit import quotas, to allow for the free flow of capital, curtail cartels, set up customs unions and allow for the free convertibility of currencies. Or as Hoffman phrased it: "the formation of a single large market within which quantitative restrictions on the movement of goods, monetary barriers to the flow of payments and, eventually all tariffs are permanently swept away."

This demand for "integration" is an indication that the initial phase of the Marshall Plan has been accomplished. Western Europe has reached the pre-

war production levels; it is now in the vicinity of 120 per cent of 1938 figures. Western Europe economy is beginning to be faced by the old problems, the chronic problems. Overproduction is on the agenda.

Already there are signs of the slackening off of production. The trade arteries of the old continent indicate the hardening of overproduction. This, in a sense, is the paradox of the Marshall Plan. The recovery brought about with the assistance of the \$7 billion of U. S. aid meets its crisis in the success of the recovery aspects of the plan.

EUROPE ON RATIONS

So serious is this development that Times correspondent Michael Hoffman reported on December 2 "that almost without exception European and U. S. officials and statesmen close to the inside workings of the Marshall Plan feel that it stands at a point of peril and is in imminent danger of falling."

Introducing stability into the sick old giant of European capitalism is

Tresca Group Blasts D.A. for Failure To Solve Murder; Plans Memorial

NEW YORK, DEC. 28—Failure of District Attorney Frank S. Hogan's office to solve the Carlo Tresca murder case was cited today by Norman Thomas as giving "clear and open encouragement" to the gangsters who have since murdered Joseph Scottorriggio, Republican political worker, and William Lurie, organizer for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

Thomas, as head of the Tresca Memorial Committee, voiced this criticism in announcing plans to honor Tresca on Wednesday, January 11, seventh anniversary of his death.

The 1950 commemoration of this crime will be held at 8:15 o'clock at the northwest corner of Fifth Avenue and 15th Street, where the editor of the anti-totalitarian Italian journal *Il Martello* (the Hammer) was shot down in the 1943 war dimout. Short speeches in English and Italian will be climaxed by the dropping of red carnations where Tresca fell. If the weather should be unfavorable the speaking will take place in the Rand School auditorium, 7 East 15th Street.

"Seven years after Tresca's murder," Mr. Thomas said, "I do not be-

lieve that the district attorney's office exerted itself to the utmost in investigating it. I say this after scanning a current report of that office for 1946-1948. It gives four pages to the Scottorriggio killing, which it calls a political crime, and says 'The investigation continues.' But, as in several of Mr. Hogan's previous reports, the Tresca case is not even mentioned.

"This is profoundly disturbing to me, and to many of Carlo's friends, who feel that Mr. Hogan's continuing official silence about that crime signifies that he and his staff would prefer not to be reminded of their failure to bring the Tresca killers to justice. That failure, to my mind, gave clear and open encouragement to the gangsters who afterward murdered Scottorriggio and Lurie.

"There is ample reason to believe that the Tresca slaying also was political, that he was ambushed because of his relentless opposition to one of the totalitarian movements, two of which were under suspicion from the start. So why does the prosecutor's office say it will go on hunting for

the goal that the State Department has set for itself. But now the time has come when that giant is beginning to ask for more than the share that the U. S. apportioned to it. The question is how to divide the limited markets in the face of rising production.

The Marshall Plan, the regulator of Western Europe's economy during the recovery phase, now turns to the task of being the regulator at a time when the chronic problems are beginning to appear. The time is clearly at hand for the U. S. "to put capitalist Europe on rations." And this is what is called today "integration."

The strategic needs of the U. S. in the cold war necessitate the building of Europe into a viable force. At the same time there arise economic interests that conflict with the strategic concepts and with the economic interests of the U. S. These insurmountable conflicts form the background against which the U. S. works out its policy for Western Europe.

THE CASE OF OIL
The Marshall Plan countries have balked in their response. The interests of each national economy are not those that the U. S. has set for it. To the businessman of Western Europe this "single large market" means the entrance of foreign goods and "competition" which threaten to put him out of business. Their "solution" is just the opposite of what "integration" demands: private cartels and import restrictions. To the U. S. this means threatening the market for U. S. export goods.

This conflict between the strategic and economic needs of the U. S. and the economic drives of Western Europe to recover its old position in world trade is nowhere more clearly outlined than in the question of oil.

To each nation of Western Europe the road toward greater financial stability and the end of the dollar crisis appears to be one of increasing exports and restricting imports. This means the striving for greater production. However, because the production of coal has been relatively stable, a new source of energy is needed—oil.

Therefore the oil companies in Western Europe, predominantly British and Dutch, decided to embark on a program of increasing their oil production and refinery facilities. This would decrease their dependence on U. S. oil and thus ease the dollar shortage.

However, the American oil companies
(Continued on page 4)

Truman Message Sees Fair Deal in Year 2000 — What Does He Propose for Today?

By MARY BELL

In his annual State of the Union message, delivered Wednesday, President Truman announced the Democratic Party platform for the 1950 election campaign, keyed to the Fair Deal slogan, and the reaction of the Congress was strictly along partisan lines. A brave attempt is now being made by both sides of the major party lineup to transform generalities into issues—"welfare state" on the one hand and horror-stricken warnings against state "socialism" on the other. The actual content of the message bears out neither attempt.

The expected notes were struck in the message: Taft-Hartley repeal, Brannan Plan for the farmers, national health insurance, rent control, civil rights, higher taxation. The party-line reaction of the Republican big-wigs brought the label "dud" from Senator Wherry; Governor Dewey's response that it was "more socialism" even came in advance of the speech. What "socialism" means to the Republican opponents of "me-too-ism" is to be seen in the fact that they denounce even compulsory health insurance as "socialized medicine."

As far as the Republican reaction is concerned, its utter bankruptcy was symbolized the same day in the announcement that the New York Sun, staunchest Republican pillar of the press in New York, dedicated to "protection of industry" and "economy in government," was dead (sold to the New York World-Telegram), in its death throes printing a final jingle on its editorial page:

"Do-si-do and
Crash the gate,
Dance around the welfare state!

"Do-si-do, it's
All for free,
Circle left
And vote for me!"

And that's about all they can say about it.

These right-of-right critics fail to realize that it is precisely because of its welfare slogan that the Fair Deal administration has captured the votes of a majority of the population. By labeling it "socialist" for their own propaganda purposes, they even serve to enhance its illusory appeal in many working-class circles, who do not believe it is socialism but have their conviction reinforced that it must be something quite "left."

But the New Deal-Fair Deal-welfare state system of attempting to patch up capitalism is NOT socialism. It is more and more government intervention, ever increasing control over the economy and lives of the people, the levying of more taxes and the spending of more money toward shoring up the structure of the system.

All this government intervention, reiterated as a program in the president's message, is a confession of the bankruptcy of the private-enterprise profit system. That's what the squeals are about on the extreme right, namely, those troglodytes who are not yet convinced that this profit system cannot keep afloat by its own efforts.

While Truman says of his program: "These gains cannot be achieved unless our businessmen maintain their efforts."
(Continued on page 4)



Notice to the FBI

In the October issue of Harper's magazine, Bernard DeVoto, who runs a column in the publication, succeeded in snaring J. Edgar Hoover's nanny.

DeVoto's column bluntly declared that the FBI's "college-trained flatfeet" were helping divide the country between "the hunters and the hunted," and urged his readers to refuse "to answer the FBI's questions except in open court, under oath and before witnesses."

DeVoto's article, entitled "Due Notice to the FBI," said he preferred a country "where it's nobody's damned business what anybody reads, what he thinks, whom he has cocktails with."

"I like a country where no college-trained flatfeet collect memoranda about us and ask judicial protection for them, where when someone makes statements about us to officials he can be held to account. We had that kind of country only a little while back and I'm for getting it back."

National Survey Shows Rent Gouge Followed Administration's Decontrol

By L. G. SMITH

The real-estate lobby is preparing to smash what remains of rent control in Washington during the second session of the 81st Congress. Spokesmen of the lobby insist that there is now enough housing to go around, and that therefore decontrol of rents will simply permit a "fair" adjustment, but will not lead to any general rent increases.

A national survey published this week by the New York Times proves conclusively, however, that wherever rents have been decontrolled during the past year very substantial rent increases have taken place. Further, the survey indicates that, as usual, the poor people have suffered most by the rent increases, and that in many instances high-cost apartments have even come DOWN in rents.

At the present time, some 2,500,000 rental units have come out from under federal controls. About 12,000,000 remain in the controlled areas. But even in these, the control boards have been so favorable to landlords that in Philadelphia tenants are paying \$400,000 more per month than a year ago, and in San Francisco the total annual income of landlords has been increased by about \$695,000. Both cities are still under "rent control."

In the decontrolled areas rents for working people have skyrocketed. After controls were lifted in Tampa, Fla., all-year apartments bringing from \$90 to \$120 a month have dropped about 10 per cent, those ranging from between \$50 to \$90 have increased about 10 per cent, and those of the poorest people, chiefly Negroes, who were renting at \$4.00 per week have been upped 100 per cent and even as high as \$10 per week.

In Nebraska, which is decontrolled, the real-estate interests claim that "adjustment has been surprisingly easy," and point to the great reduction in evictions as proof. Mayor Glen Cunningham of Omaha and representatives of labor point out that evictions have declined because there is nothing people can do about the rent gouge, and estimate that rents

have increased from 45 to 50 per cent on the average.

In Los Angeles, where rents were decontrolled in some of the suburban areas, the average increases complained of by tenants have been \$52 a month. In that city there are quite a few apartments available at \$75 and up unurnished, but hundreds of families are looking in vain for places renting at between \$35 and \$70.

HINTS AT FUTURE

All this is a little foretaste of what would take place in our terribly overcrowded cities if the real-estate lobby has its way and all controls are taken off by Washington in June, when the present law expires. Low-cost rental units simply are not being built in sufficient quantities to take the heat off the tenants. Millions are still living doubled up, or under indescribably poor conditions. If unlimited rent hikes are permitted, hundreds of thousands of families will have to take the rise out of their food and clothes and the education of their children, since there is no place for them to move to.

It is a well-known fact that the real-estate lobby is one of the richest and most powerful in Washington. It has successfully blocked all but token amounts of government low-cost housing. Even after the recent housing bill was passed in Washington, it has succeeded in blocking its application in many communities.

The tenants are disorganized and find it almost impossible to finance a powerful lobby or a political machine by themselves. In these circumstances it is up to the labor movement to throw its whole weight into the scales at Washington and in the localities to block decontrol, rent hikes and evictions. Most workers in the larger cities live in rental housing and to permit decontrol is the same thing as permitting a direct wage cut. Further, by fighting for the interests of all tenants, the labor movement can prove that it isn't a narrow special-interest group representing only the organized dues-payers, but rather that it represents the interests of all the poorer people in the country.

(Continued on page 4)

ECONOMIC NOTES ON MONOPOLY BUSINESS—

Financier Says Wall Street Has Taken Over SEC; Coffee Scare Was 'Rigged'

When a financial and industrial tycoon appears before a Congressional committee to testify that the Securities and Exchange Commission of the administration has been taken over by Wall Street, that's news.

That was part of the testimony before the Celler committee of the House, and the tycoon was Cyrus S. Eaton of Cleveland, one of the biggest west of the Alleghenies. Eaton charged that the SEC set up presumably to defend the public interest, was bagged in an operation "masterminded by 17 top-flight Wall Street law firms under the leadership of Sullivan & Cromwell," of which John Foster Dulles is a senior partner, and that as a result "access to capital markets has been practically denied to the medium-sized and smaller companies."

For one thing, he explained, the cost of registering a new security with the SEC is so great that "only the blue-chip corporations around whose financing the investment-banking monopoly is built" can afford it. Another factor is the "unholy alliance" between the SEC and the National Association of Security Dealers, which he described as "the only government-created monopoly in the land."

Aiming a barb at the House of Morgan's biggest baby, Eaton said: "The policies of the U. S. Steel Corporation are often determined without reference to what is for the best interests of the stockholders of U. S. Steel, or its employees. I think managers determine those policies with reference to their over-all interests. They consider what effect this is going to have on this bank, on this insurance company, on this other industry, maybe on the political future of the country, as to who is going to be elected."

A Republican Congressman challenged him to show how U. S. Steel has "dictated" to politicians. Eaton answered: "They would not do anything as crude as that, Mr. Congressman. But when a man is being selected as the candidate to head either party, a great deal of subtle influence is exerted from Wall Street." The reference to both parties will be noted.

OOPS! HE SLIPPED

A Senate agricultural committee headed by Gillette has been holding hearings on farm prices. Most of the testimony, from large food-processing corporations, has been strictly for the birds. Now and then, however, a revealing remark turned up. One such came from Henry B. Arthur, economist employed by the Swift meatpacking empire.

Among the charts displayed by Arthur, purporting to show that Swift did not really make much profit, was one which showed return on capital investment. Senator Gillette remarked that the chart made clear that Swift's profit had DOUBLED from 1946 to 1947 and asked the witness to explain the sudden change.

The economist replied: "1946 was the year in which OPA controls ended."

REGULAR GRIND

At the same committee hearings, both Gillette and W. F. Williamson,

manager of the National Coffee Association, agreed that somebody was making a mint of money on the coffee-shortage scare and the subsequent price rise. Gillette said the take on this operation would amount to \$670 million in a year, and stated his belief that someone rigged the market by planting the coffee-shortage story.

Williamson opined that the hoax was not invented by anyone. Presumably it just percolated through.

PILLARS OF SALT

Here's the typical story, recently aired, which goes to explain why the anti-trust laws get nowhere. It's about salt but need not be taken with a grain of it.

Way back in 1940 the Federal Trade Commission charged the big salt manufacturers with conspiracy to fix prices and limit production. In 1941 the commission ordered them to "cease and desist" from their anti-trust violations.

As usual the monopolists fled to the courts. In 1943, however, a federal appeals court ordered them to obey. By 1947 the FTC decided that the leopards had not changed their spots and asked them for some pertinent information on their prices.

The companies thumbed their noses at the request, refused to obey. The FTC trotted out a weapon never before used though it had been in the law for 30 years. It slapped a \$100-a-day fine on the recalcitrants. While this fine was only a dent in their daily monopoly profits, the corporations rushed to court against two of them, Morton and International Salt.

A district court gave them what they wanted—a decision that the FTC had no right to demand the information. On appeal, the same appeals court which had upheld the FTC in 1943, this time plumped for the pillars of the salt industry, two to one.

The minority member, Sherman Minton, asked the companies' lawyers whether they thought the court should make an investigation such as the FTC had asked. "Oh, no," they said. "But," Minton pointed out, "you say the FTC can't make the investigation. You don't want the court to make it. In short, you maintain that nobody can do it. If so, Uncle Sam is helpless."

The Supreme Court still has to decide the case. Even if it decides in favor of the FTC, the game starts around again.

MILITARY ECONOMY

It is known that military brass have been quietly working on a plan to shift key industrial plants from coastal areas to the interior. The International Association of Machinists' executive council has been studying the effects of this program. On the basis of its study the IAM has come out with the blast that the economic consequences of the program can be "catastrophic" and that it will be, if the military are given a free hand to move plants where they please.

Already, the IAM points out, one aircraft plant (Chance-Vought) has been switched in toto from Connecticut to Texas. The result has been to "transform a large part of Connecticut into one of the most depressed areas in the nation."

A Viewpoint on—

The Dynamite Plot Against UAW

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT—Now that the chips are down and the would-be killers of the Reuthers are still at large, the time has arrived when serious questions can be asked, and must be answered, if the United Auto Workers and its leaders are ever to defeat the campaign of terrorism launched against them.

The pre-Christmas dynamite plot at the UAW headquarters has every earmark of a crackpot fascist, Ku Klux Klan or Black Legion stamp to it. Why has this part of Walter Reuther's original theory on possible responsibility for the plots never been given a careful public or private investigation?

Everywhere in America, especially down South, the terroristic elements of the Klan have been revived and are doing their dirty work. Does anyone in Detroit think it has not had a similar revival in the city's plants among the latecomers from the South who are plunged into the UAW's "radical" and "pro-Negro" milieu?

Should not some of the UAW leaders be a little abashed at how quickly they plumped for the sole and exclusive theory that "The Communies did it" so that they were sure to make factional capital out of it?

And what about the panicky people who even suggested to the police

that ALL radicals be checked? (Did the cops get a list?)

The terror campaign against the UAW and Walter Reuther is far too important to be permitted to rest on the level of petty trade-union politics.

The FBI spokesmen in Detroit gave many good reasons why they thought the CP, for its own reasons, would not pull the job. And does anyone who knows anything about Stalin's GPU think they would call a newspaperman and tip him off that dynamite was placed at the UAW headquarters?

We would like to see a UAW statement on another matter: the famous plot between racketeers and the Communists, which Isaac Don Levine is peddling. It is entirely possible that racketeers are behind the killing attempts, although we doubt it. The quarter of a million bucks' reward would have brought some results if that was the source of the terror.

No one knows better than this writer how violent the antagonism between the Stalinists and Reuther is. Nor that when the GPU decides to murder an opponent it usually succeeds. We were saying that before Leon Trotsky was assassinated—and when UAW leaders were opposing us as being too harsh and too factional about the CP.

But the present Stalinist phobia in the UAW is a perfect cover for fascist-minded, Ku Klux Klan-educated scum who hate Reuther as part of their hatred of labor and "reds." How about some investigation in that direction?

The military have also compelled Boeing to transfer manufacture of certain new planes to its plant in Wichita, Kansas, leading to the layoff of 4,000 workers in Seattle, and are contemplating shutting down the Seattle operations altogether.

IAM President Hayes contends that "the decision as to which sections of the country to wreck in the name of peacetime defense cannot be left to a few military minds alone."

KICKBACKS

John D. Rockefeller did much to build up his oil empire by forcing the railroads to give him rebates (kickbacks) on freight rates. The exposure of this monopoly-building practice was one of the scandals of a half-century ago.

Last month, a Department of Justice official told the Gillette Senate committee that the A&P has been doing the same—demanding and receiving rebates from companies from which it buys food products. These kickbacks give the food trust great advantage over its competitors, whom it seeks to drive out of business.

Assistant Attorney General Bergson said that two Chicago dairy firms have been indicted for this practice with relation to A&P. He also testified that A&P does not use its swollen profits to lower its prices, except temporarily in order to undercut a competitor, after which prices go up again, with less competition to keep them down in the future.

DRINK FUSEL OIL?

From Labor, railroad union paper, for December 24:

"A bottle of \$2 whiskey won't necessarily make you feel any worse the next morning than one of \$7 bourbon."

"There's more fusel oil, the knock-out stuff, in 'good old whiskey' than there is in back-country corn 'likker' or in skidrow 'smoke.'"

Those are quotations from a magazine article summing up some revelations made when spokesmen for opposing whiskey interests aired their dispute at recent public hearings, in which vast profits were at stake.

During the war, some distillers could not get new charred barrels in which to age their whiskeys. So they began reusing old barrels.

Some big distillers, who had their own cooperage plants, got from them

all the new barrels they needed. They told Uncle Sam's Alcohol Tax Unit that no whiskey concern should be allowed to label its product "aged in the wood" unless it had been aged in new barrels.

That was opposed by the distillers who were using old barrels. They told the ATU that no one, even expert chemists, could tell the difference between whiskeys from the new and old barrels. Uncle Sam's chemists said the same thing at the hearings.

Moreover, they, and the whiskey men, let out some other surprising information. For example, about fusel oil.

It is a deadly poisonous kind of heavy alcohol often blamed for the hangover from whiskey. Most people believe that aging in the wood removes the fusel oil and makes whiskey safer.

Yet, it was brought out at the ATU hearings, there actually is more fusel oil in whiskey after aging in the wood than there was when the whiskey went into either an old barrel or new barrel.

Readers Take the Floor . . .

Whitewash by White

To the Editor:

On Sunday, December 18, I heard Mr. Walter White speak on Civil Rights and the Negro before a capacity audience at Cooper Union. On leave from his post as national secretary of the NAACP, Mr. White had toured the Eastern countries as a member of the Town Hall forum.

In his speech Sunday, he dwelt mainly on the impressions he had received on his trip. According to Mr. White, the U. S. has lost prestige in the East to such an extent that, everywhere he went, embarrassing questions were put to him and he was hard-pressed to give adequate answers. Here are some of the questions asked of him and his companions:

(1) If you say that you have democracy in the U. S., how is it that you still have Jim Crow and the poll tax?

(2) How is it that Truman's civil-rights program is still the main fight

By KARL HILLYER

The Illinois state CIO convention was rather dull again. However, Senator Lucas came in for criticism from President Joe Germano of the Steel Workers Union, who called the majority leader of the Senate "a fair weather friend of the CIO" because Lucas would not come out publicly in support of the recent steel strike.

The Fur Workers Union was the only union of the Stalinist camp represented which took the floor. The replies from the official leadership were very poor and gave no sign that they have learned how to fight the Stalinists on a progressive basis.

The turmoil in Chicago in the Farm Equipment plants continues. The Tractor Works plant of International Harvester sees a daily trip to the courts from both the Stalinist-led United Electrical Workers (UE-led FE) and the United Auto Workers. The NLRB recently handed down a decision ordering an election in the near future. If the UAW does not conduct a better campaign than the one it just lost in Louisville, the Sta-

minists will be likely to ring up another victory.

The West Pullman plant of Harvester is also in a fierce contest. The leaders who are for the CIO have been expelled and the UE-FE has been conducting a campaign to show that the UAW is backed by the press, the company, the courts, etc.

To win, the UAW's campaign will have to be based upon proving that the UAW is and has been the most militant fighter for the workers in the shop; that the leaders of FE who are talking militantly today are likely to do anything else tomorrow. Mere red-baiting of FE, a mere call to support the CIO (what does that mean to the average rank and file?), merely speaking about a better arbitration procedure—these will not win. The point is that the UAW in most of its plants has higher plant wage averages. It has to point out that the reasons the skilled tradesmen are paid less than at GM and Ford is precisely because of the war policy of FE which subordinated the fight of the workers for the sake of joint labor-management committees, increase of production, etc.

The NAACP-sponsored mobilization in Washington which will convene in the capital city before Congress opens, is meeting with good response in UAW circles. Local delegations from Harvester, Electro-Motive, Doehler Jarvis and other plants have already been selected. It will be interesting to see how Jim Crow Washington houses this mass delegation, many of them being Negro members of the trade unions.

The \$4.00 a ton raise in steel prices produced a report, at first, that the Steel Workers Union was going to fight for a wage increase based upon the fact-finding board's report that if prices went up the steel workers could ask for a wage raise. However, this has been hushed up and union officials have stated that they are going to abide by the contract. The conduct of the leadership of the steel workers in not attacking the steel companies' extortions was blasted last January by Robt Lynd in his famous speech at the UAW education conference. This has been recently printed as a pamphlet and is available in Detroit from the UAW educational office. It makes good reading, even though it took quite a few months to get the pamphlet set up in type.

Ike and Hot Dogs

On December 14 Columbia students reacted to their President Eisenhower's recent statement that perhaps people wanted "champaign and caviar when they should have hot dogs and beer." The campus statue of Alexander Hamilton was discovered in the morning bearing eight frankfurters and rolls in its cupped right hand and an empty beer carton in the other. On its front was chalked "Beer and Frankfurters for All," and on its rear "Ike" and five stars.

On his return to the U. S., Mr. White met with Vice-President Barkley to discuss his trip. Mr. White wanted to know why congressmen do not realize that their reactionary conduct has repercussions in the East. The answer of the vice-president was that it was his opinion that Congress is not concerned about it, and he, Barkley, had himself not given it a thought.

During the question period, Mr. White was asked whether a Labor government like that in Britain would deal with the problem of civil rights more adequately. Mr. White's reply was strong with indignation against Britain's foreign policy in the East—quite rightly—but how sad after his whitewash of American imperialism! All in all, Mr. White was a poor representative of his people to the lands which he visited.

I forgot to mention that when Mr. White and his group returned to Washington and had to meet in a hotel for dinner, they were not admitted because among them was the dark-skinned Negro woman I mentioned above.

Mary HALL

Pegler Sued

Westbrook Pegler—once described by Heywood Brown as the "light heavyweight champion of the upperdog"—has had a second libel suit thrown against him, this time by his one-time sport-writing pal, Quentin Reynolds, who will sue him for a half million for "false and obscene charges." Another suit is now pending against Pegler for the same amount, filed by Drew Pearson, for Pegler's printed assertion that Pearson's attacks brought on the suicide of James Forrestal.

Company Recognizes New CIO Affiliate—

IUE Gets Pension Plan at Philco

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, Dec. 28—Beginning January 1 the workers at the Philco Corporation here will be covered by a company-financed pension program recently negotiated between the corporation and representatives of Local 101 of the newly formed International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers (IUE-CIO). This action indicates that Philco has granted full recognition to the IUE as collective bargaining agent for its employees without demanding a National Labor Relations Board election between the new CIO affiliate and the previous bargaining agent, the Stalinist-led United Electrical Workers.

Although details of the pension plan were not made public, it appears that the plan is similar to the one negotiated between the Ford Company and the United Automobile Workers (CIO) and provides for \$100 a month, including social-security benefits to employees retiring voluntarily at 65 after 25 years' service.

The cost to the company was estimated to be eight and one-half cents per hour per worker. The contract specifies that no changes can be made

without mutual consent until January 1, 1955. Although the agreement at present applies only to workers covered by Local 101, it is expected that the provisions will also soon be extended to Local 102 at the Philco Refrigerator plant.

Early in May, 1949, the Philco workers were on strike for seven days and returned to work without any wage increase but with additional holiday allowance and a non-contributory hospitalization plan. The wage question was then left open with the stipulation that Philco would be required to consider wage increases "if and when in the opinion of the union [then Locals 101 and 102 of the UE, but dominated by the James Carey faction], a national wage pattern within the industry is established."

This pattern was never established because of the failure of the Stalinists to secure any gains in the General Electric and Westinghouse plants. Nevertheless the new union was able to secure a pension plan similar to those established by the UAW and other CIO unions in lieu of a wage increase.

contempt for the view that a public body like the transit board can contract for services like electric power or materials like streetcars or buses but cannot contract for the labor of public employees. . . . The treatment given the transit strike by Cleveland's three daily newspapers reached a new high in prejudice against labor regardless of the merits of the dispute. . . . The old concept of American newspapermen as objective reporters who keep personal opinions out of news stories was discarded in this instance to confuse the public and to beat the transit workers into submission. . . . We pledge solidarity with the transit union and instruct that President Meany of the union be so notified."

The transit workers are indeed angry. Some of them are doing some serious thinking. It is too early to predict what may result from the strike but it need surprise no one if some of the union officers have a rough time from now on.

Method in Madness

Senator Taft is now in favor of doing away with union-shop elections under his Taft-Hartley Law. He says they are "meaningless" and he wants to be "fair" to the taxpayers.

Ninety per cent of the union-shop elections under T-H have gone in favor of the unions, and 92 per cent of all workers voting cast their ballots for the union shop. That's why Taft now finds them meaningless and wants to save money.

Ghost-Quieter

Out of a job? Don't ascribe any "major significance" to that inconvenience. You're only a statistic.

That's the good word from William Haber, in an article in Survey magazine for November, entitled "Quieting the Unemployment Ghost." He says:

"Last spring and summer this country had a fit of hysteria about a vastly overexaggerated job situation. Given a labor force of sixty million, an increase of three to four hundred thousand, or even a million, in the number of unemployed is not of major significance."

representative. But the members were angry, as they had good reason to be, and they overruled the officers. There was plenty of evidence at this meeting that a good number of the members had no faith at all in the promises of the leadership and decided it was time to act for themselves.

Starting at midnight, December 21, the whole system was tied up tight, not a bus or streetcar moving. But the strike was attacked from all sides by almost everyone. The mayor, the press, the radio, Christmas shoppers and the Cleveland Federation of Labor—one and all launched a bitter attack on the strikers. The mayor announced he would break the strike with police-escorted cars or with the National Guard if necessary. Governor Lausche promised to help him in any way possible. It is not hard to figure out how the strikers reacted to these announcements; they were plenty sore.

But before trying forceful methods the mayor decided on something else. He instructed his attorneys to try for an injunction to stop the strike. Of course there was a nice, friendly Judge (there usually is) to do the job. Judge Joseph Artl very quickly found the strike to be illegal and gave the strikers a deadline of 2 p.m., December 27, to get back on the job. President Meany of the union announced there would be no fight against the injunction. Said he: "It's the law; we can do nothing."

CIO BACKS STRIKE

A very interesting event took place two days after the strike ended. At a meeting of the Cleveland Industrial Union Council (CIO) a statement expressing the strongest solidarity with those who fought and lost the strike was approved. Compare this with the fact that the Cleveland Federation of Labor, to which body the striking union was affiliated, denounced the strike, saying that Meany (the union's president) had broken his promises to the transit board.

Part of the city CIO statement follows: "The recent strike of transit workers brings to a head the question of how public employees are to have a voice in determining their wages and working conditions. Workingmen and women in Cleveland got their first taste this week of the Ferguson Act, which forbids strike of public employees. . . . We have nothing but

On December 21 a meeting was held to discuss the situation to date. About 1100 members were present; most of the others were working. A majority of those present decided to call an immediate strike. This action was opposed by the president, the secretary-treasurer and the international

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

Only \$1.00 a Year

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE**LABOR ACTION**

A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL
 Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents
 One year (52 issues) at \$1.00

NAME..... (PLEASE PRINT)

CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....

ADDRESS.....APT.....

Bill me Payment enclosed (stamps, currency or postal note)

Subscribe! \$1 a Year
LABOR ACTION

Titoism and Independent Socialism—VI

TITO, FRANKENSTEIN AND FATHER GAPON

By HAL DRAPER

VI

We have been considering, in the latest articles in this series, various forms of pro-Titoist whitewash. That is only one side of the question of Titoism. The positive side of Titoism, for us, lies in the objective effect of the Yugoslav heresy upon the edifice of Stalinism. We began the series with that and return to it now: Titoism as "the beginning of the end of Stalinism."

The effect of the break in shaking up the whole Stalinist empire has already been emphasized. Its objective effect in shaking up the structure of Stalinist IDEOLOGY deserves to be mentioned separately under the same general head.

What has to be stressed here is that it has such an effect in spite of the fact that the official ideology of the Titoists is thoroughly Stalinist, not because of any fancied tendencies within the Titoist bureaucracy to return to pristine Leninism. The identity between Titoist and other Stalinist ideology holds in all basic respects; the Titoists' appeal to Lenin against Stalin is only on such question as the Stalinist attempt to make out that "Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism" requires the subordination of all other "socialist" countries to Mother Russia—that is, only where such differences are required by the national-Stalinism of the Belgrade theoreticians (primarily Moshe Piyade and Djilas).

Otherwise, the Titoists claim not without justice to be better Stalinists than Stalin in their manhandling of Leninism. Thus Djilas wrote in *Borba* in September, arguing against the idea that a world socialist state is possible rather than separate national socialist states:

"Today it is common knowledge that there can be no simultaneous world revolution, and so there can be no world socialist state either, no world dictatorship of the proletariat, and no world Soviet Federated Republic. To assert the contrary means to cut quotations from Lenin at will, tearing them from their context, for it was exactly Lenin who replaced the older Marxist theory of world revolution, as outdated in the imperialist stage of capitalism, by the theory and practice of the feasibility of the development of socialism in one country."

SELF-DETERMINATION—FOR THE BUREAUCRACY

Even when arguing on the grounds of democracy for the right of self-determination, the reader will notice Djilas' basically Stalinist thinking: the idea of self-determination of the nation is explicitly made identical with that of the ruling party which is also the sole existing party. After emphasizing that relations between countries must be voluntary, Djilas writes:

"The attitude of the working class on the question of self-determination has very great importance. That is clear because the workers must follow the party leadership, and if the party is not equal, self-determination is not the expression of the free will of the workers. According to that, if a party is not really equal in rights, its policy will inevitably be subordinated to another party, that is, to another country. A voluntary agreement between the parties in power is one of the main conditions for the reaching of a real equality of the peoples in the development of socialism." (Our emphasis—H. D.)

Again, a better statement of totalitarian *gleichschaltung* in all aspects of social life could not be found in Russian sources to beat the following from Tito's Macedonian organ, *Flaka Vlaznimit* (an editorial in September):

"The economic, cultural and social life of the people is thus systematized and being regulated. Under the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party headed by Comrade Tito the economic and social life of the people is developing similarly throughout our Fatherland, not only in working-class and industrial centers, but in the most backward parts of the country."

Today, as I write, the *New York Times* reports the decree of the Yugoslav CP Central Committee for the wholesale rewriting of all textbooks (undertaken, says the Central Committee with its full share of the amazing Stalinist penchant for 1984-type doublethink, to combat "standardized ideas").

TITO CANNOT STOP THE QUESTIONING

It is not from this direction that the Titoist impact on Stalinist ideology comes. It comes from a simple source that even Tito's standardized textbooks cannot eliminate: *the mere fact that ALL Stalinist ideas are called into question as soon as ANY one of them is called into question.* This is true of any totalitarian ideological structure, which must either be swallowed whole or be rejected if tasted mouthful by mouthful.

The power break forced the Tito-Stalinists first to question and then to reject the infallibility of their Pope in the Kremlin. Their need is immediately for a new orthodoxy and a new Pope (therefore the new standardized textbooks, for one thing) but this is simply impossible of achievement in one blow, on the heels of a rejection of the old.

Thus, for example, the Rajk trial in Budapest, where the confessions "proved" that Tito is an agent of American imperialism, *must* be rejected as a frameup; this is not a matter of ideology. But if the Budapest confessions were a staged farce, extorted by the GPU, the question is *inevitably* raised of other confession trials. It did not take the Budapest trial to raise this question in the mind of Tito or his leading bureaucratic henchman; they knew and know the truth of the Moscow Trials as well as we.

But in the mind of a Yugoslav Stalinist worker, who has been educated by Tito to revile the Trotskyist-Bukharinist-mad-dog-saboteurs with references to the Moscow Trials, the mind-wrench is bound to be painful. As with widely publicized, Moshe Piyade was forced to make the connection himself. Down in the ranks, how great must be the questioning about the old Bolsheviks who were "proved" to be traitors, about the generation which made the Russian Revolution and which was slaughtered by Stalin in the course of purges which (it is now revealed to them in a passing paragraph in *Borba*) were based on Budapest-type confessions?

Tito himself was forced to make a speech in which he explicitly cautioned that, in spite of all, Russia must still be considered a socialist country and stressed that its treatment of Yugoslavia, while bad, could not affect the "building of socialism" in Russia itself. He was saying: Don't carry our criticisms too far!

WHEN THE TOPS SPLIT

But they cannot help being carried further. The official editorial writer in *Flaka Vlaznimit* gets carried away in August and indites: "The intervention of the Cominform is comparable to the action of the Pope of Rome against the Communists of the Catholic world. It is a backward step, an anti-revolutionary and mercenary act." Djilas wrote: "The unprovoked blockade of Yugoslavia is like nothing the USSR has undertaken even against capitalist states, and is a rare phenomenon even in the history of capitalism." What ideas do these heated denunciations stir in the minds of the ranks who want to be Leninist communists and not merely Stalinists?

This may serve to concretize one way in which the inevitable objective effect of the break takes form. Especially in totalitarian structures, any split at the top creates a break in the dyke through which an opportunity is afforded willy-nilly for the surge from below to pour through, and this in turn tears at both sides of the break as it rushes through. This is as true in the ideological sphere as in the case of mass-action movements.

In January, 1905, the priest Gapon led a mob of St. Petersburg workmen to the czar's palace to petition the beloved Father of His People for reforms, preceded by an ikon. The troops fired upon the demonstrators, a thousand dead bodies covered the square on that "Bloody Sunday," and all Russia rose in fury. The masses learned more than the priest Gapon wanted to teach them.

The reader will be able to make all the necessary abstractions from this analogy, since Tito is not simply an edition of Gapon, but the Yugoslav people will also learn more from their experience than their present leader wants to teach them. The same is even more true of the pro-Tito Stalinists outside the Russian empire, who are not under the physical constraint of the Tito dictatorship.

Gapon himself disappeared in the whirlwind: "For they have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind; it hath no stalk; the bud shall yield no meal; if so be it yield, the strangers shall swallow it up."

(Next week: The defense of Yugoslavia)

Get acquainted with the

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

For information and literature, write to:

ISL, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

WORLD POLITICS

Discussion: Pro and Con on the Question of Rearming West Germany

By SUSAN GREEN

In the discussion article "Socialist Policy and the Rearmament of the New Germany" (December 26 issue of LABOR ACTION) Eugene Keller seems to minimize the dangers inherent in the idea that "the first necessity is the unconditional recognition of the right of the Germans as a nation to have their own armed forces."

"The fact," he wrote, "that these may be led by reactionaries is, to be sure, of justifiable concern to thinking people everywhere, but the case is the same with the leadership of the armed forces of any nation. Given the opportunity and a little aid from their foreign friends, the German masses are quite capable of dealing with the reactionaries in their midst."

This is a very comforting statement, if one is looking for comfort, especially if the bad name Nazi is toned down to the much more acceptable "reactionaries." However, the uncomfortable fact appears to be, judging from all the information coming from abroad, that the rebirth of the German army today on the nationalist basis emphasized by Comrade Keller, could well give the Nazi forces the power they seek for a comeback.

Many of Hitler's faithful are still around, with the training and know-how to take over the organization of a new German army. Thus entrenched in military power, the Nazi elements who have also found for themselves places in industry and in government will have acquired the centralization once more to make a bid for national leadership. Comrade Keller's confidence that "Given the opportunity and a little aid from their foreign friends, the German masses are quite capable of dealing with the reactionaries in their midst," is not substantiated. What opportunity does he mean and which foreign friends? These ideas seem too vague to counter against the very definite Nazi danger.

PART-TIME ARMY?

Comrade Keller described the kind of rearmament he thinks the Social-Democrats should work for: "It would be plausible and practicable to propose and build a militia based on the existing mass organizations, such as trade unions, peasant organizations, etc., with election and rotation of officers and a certain number of hours per week devoted to training in the many special skills needed in a modern army. Insofar as full-time officer personnel would have to be employed, means could easily be found to control their activities. There is certainly ample evidence in the history of the German workers' movement to demonstrate their ability to organize their own military formations, hence this would be nothing new to at least the older ones among them."

The question arises as to how realistic is this notion of a people's militia made up of part-time soldiers. Do not "the many special skills needed in a modern army" demand intensive, full-time training? Certainly every army being trained in the world today is based on this assumption. This uniformity does not stem from the politics of the various governments, which are diverse indeed, but from the technical necessities of modern warfare. In thinking about military matters the notion has

to be abandoned that a modern fighting force can be made, as in the olden days, when to seize a gun from behind the door and to join workers similarly armed was deemed sufficient.

However, Comrade Keller's proposal for a people's militia is not only unrealistic from the point of view of military requirements. It is inconsistent with his political approach, which seems to imply acceptance of the role that the United States plans for German manpower. After explaining the prospective need of the United States for German manpower on the continent of Europe in case the Russian armies begin to move, he concludes: "Considering this basic trend of military-political policy, German manpower is obviously a factor which cannot be ignored. The new German army, however, . . . must have an ideology. It must at the least be able to feel that it is fighting for a country of its own, if nothing more sublime." This seems to mean that a new German army—to be sure, with an ideology of its own—is to become part of the military machine of the Western bloc. Therefore, the proposal of a people's militia has no base at all. Furthermore, with this military-political approach, what becomes of the confidence to control "the reactionaries"? As part of the military machine of the Western bloc, the Nazi army men would find very good berths.

ANSWER: INDEPENDENT WESTERN UNION

To conclude, then, Comrade Keller does not submit "a sound democratic alternative" to United States military plans. To be sure it is no simple matter to work out a plausible socialist policy in the complicated cross-currents of international politics today.

On the question of the rearmament of Germany, the problem seems to be three-fold: (1) to restore German national rights; (2) to arrest the power-strivings of the Nazis; (3) to curb the "foreign friends" of the Nazis.

Certainly the restoration of full national rights to the Germans is on the agenda, as will also be the reunification of all of pre-war Germany. What can the Social-Democrats do to prevent these national aspirations from becoming the meat of the ambitious Nazis? It is apparent that, in the international milieu today, the German people have not merely to wage the democratic struggle themselves, but must indeed look abroad for "foreign friends."

Where else can such friends be found except in the democratic and socialist elements in Western Europe, to whom both Nazism and Stalinism are anathema? In a word, as the German democratic sectors struggle to rid themselves of the supervision of the Allied powers, they must also call for the unification of the peoples of Western Europe in an independent democratic union. This might be a plausible socialist policy.

Instead of pressing for "the unconditional recognition of the right of the Germans as a nation to have their own armed forces" as "the first necessity," socialists and democrats need to put on the immediate agenda the independent democratic union of Western Europe as the instrumentality to work for the democratic solution of Western Europe's problems, including military problems.

Fenner Brockway Gives Background Of British Provocation in Nigeria

The background on the recent shootings of native strikers in British-controlled Nigeria has been given by Fenner Brockway, detailing "the facts as they have so far been collected by the London center of the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism." He writes in the *British Socialist Leader*:

"Press cables will have told the people of the shooting of strikers at the Enugu coal mine, of the riots in four other towns, and of the state of emergency, including the censorship of the press, which has been declared throughout Eastern Nigeria."

The mines, he relates, are government property. The government whose property they are, however, is a colonial government set up from London over which the Nigerian people have no control. "The African people certainly do not feel that they own the mines," says Brockway with some understatement. "They feel that the mines are owned by their alien rulers."

The miners, through their trade unions, had submitted a demand for a raise in basic daily wage from 3s. 4d. (47 cents) to 5s. 10d. (81 cents).

The government resisted the demand on the ground that the present scale was higher than that paid other government workers—that is, they argued that the miners should be content with the fact that other workers were being sweated even more.

STRUCK FOR LIVING WAGE

"The case for the miners," writes Brockway, "is that the cost of living has gone up so markedly that the present wages do not allow of a healthy standard of life. The recent drought has meant a precipitous rise in the cost of food, and overcrowding in the towns has sent rents up by leaps and bounds. It is not only the miners who are complaining. There have recently been strikes by one section of workers after another, including the railway workers and, more remarkable, the domestic workers."

Creech-Jones, the British colonial secretary, had claimed that the housing provided for the Enugu miners was a model, but, says Brockway, "many of the men employed at the Enugu mine do not live in these good houses. The estate (housing develop-

ment) is crowded and the housing shortage is so acute that there are miners who are compelled to walk sixteen miles a day—eight miles to the mine and eight miles back to their homes—in order to keep a roof over their heads. The rents of the mining estate-houses are reasonably low, but many of the men live in lodgings outside the estate and they have to pay nearly half their wages in rent."

"The bitterness of the Nigerian workers is intensified by what they regard as the luxurious scale of living of the Europeans in their midst. The social gulf between English officials and Nigerian people is similar to the gulf which existed in India prior to the British withdrawal. There is also a limited number of Nigerian officials who live in this 'other world' of comfort, but it is inevitable that the contrast should be interpreted in racial terms. The resentment felt by the Nigerians toward alien occupation is deepened greatly by the constant evidence they have of how well the white administrators live compared with the wretched existence of most of their own people.

POLICE PROVOCATION

"There is no doubt that the sense of injustice and humiliation arising from this contrast was responsible for the looting of European shops and houses which occurred in four towns after the shooting at Enugu. The fact that all the European women and children had to be removed to army barracks and that all European men were conscripted into the police shows how acute and dangerous racial feeling has become.

"The official explanation of the shooting is that police were sent to the mine to remove explosives and that the miners attacked them and their lorry. Final judgment must be reserved until one can examine fuller reports; but one may be permitted to ask now whether it was wise to send armed police into a mine that was occupied by the strikers. A stay-in-strike was proceeding; that is to say, the strikers were in possession of the mine. It was a serious decision, to say the least, to order armed men in these circumstances to enter the mine."

So Brockway puts it. In view of the circumstances he describes—the deliberately decided provocation of the authorities in sending armed police into the sitdown strikers' camp—whatever exact information may be dug up on precisely how the shooting started cannot do much to lighten the responsibility of British imperialism for the strike slaughter.

BOOK REVIEW

Vannevar Bush on the Atom and Democracy

MODERN ARMS AND FREE MEN—A DISCUSSION OF THE ROLE OF SCIENCE IN PRESERVING DEMOCRACY, by Vannevar Bush. Simon & Schuster, N. Y., 1949. 111 pages, \$1.00 (pamphlet ed.).

By WALTER GREY

Dr. Vannevar Bush, former director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the top wartime research agency, has written a national best-seller which represents the latest trend in America's war policy. Its contents are of interest to every class-conscious worker.

Until recently top American strategists appeared to be aiming at a "pushbutton war" of intercontinental bombing with "absolute weapons" which would be swift, dreadful but decisive. In such a struggle retaliation in kind would result in terrific destruction on the home front. The dilemma of waging such a war is apparent.

Bush, in reviewing the achievements (for destruction) of American science and technology, concludes that the technological future of war is less dreadful and frightening than many believe, and that the democratic process is one in which enthusiasm and skill can build a world of peace. The political implication can only be the more-than-doubtful thesis that the United States can again wage a relatively limited war, confining destruction mostly to Europe and Asia, without critical disruption of its own economic and social system. This only, however, if the workers of America can be sold on one more "democratic war."

Aside from its political implications, Bush's book is of interest for its technical aspects. To workers in basic industries it will be no news that mechanized war of today is only possible through precision manufacture and mass production as well as the development of the internal-combustion engine. World War I served as a proving ground for such weapons as automatic guns, self-propelled vehicles, tanks, aircraft, submarines, radio communications and poison gas. "Peacetime" developments in the automotive, radio, aeronautical and chemical industries made ready the more deadly weapons of World War II. Likewise the more specialized technologies like radar and sonar gave the United States an advantage it never lost.

READY FOR THE KILL

Today, as never before, warfare is a duel of applied science and organized industry. Through science there is now the proximity fuse, a small radio set in the nose of a shell, which triggers off a predetermined distance above the ground or from the target. Thus the effectiveness of artillery fire is increased ten times. Also, by means of light rocket-firing weapons like the bazooka and other recoilless guns, the firepower of a few men can be increased tremendously.

On the surface of the sea, radar, plus high-flying aircraft and guided missiles, may well foreshadow the end of great ships and fleets. This has been reflected in changes in national armament like the curtailment of the aircraft-carrier program.

Less publicized has been the development in submarine warfare with the emphasis in this country on detection. Sonar, or the reflection of high-frequency sound waves, as used by hunter-killer groups of surface vessels plus radar-equipped rocket-carrying aircraft, turned the tide in the last war against the submarine. On the ascendancy in offensive is the schnorkel-equipped submarine with long-range torpedoes to permit firing beyond the range of sonar. Countermeasures to this threat occupy the best scientific minds in government research.

In the air, it will be of interest to the homeless bomb-glutted millions of Europe that from a strategic viewpoint mass air raids on large population centers are now, after careful scientific analysis, not considered too effective. Radar networks, fast jet intercepter fighters and proximity fuses have made great fleets of bombers, even at high altitude, obsolete and not worthy of the cost.

As to intercontinental guided missiles of 2000 miles flight, Bush feels that at present these cannot come within 150 miles of their target with reasonable frequency, and then only at a cost of millions of dollars for a single shot. The ability of any nation, including the United States, to bear the cost of such haphazard launchings is questioned.

FOR WAR OR FOR PLENTY?

Regarding the total war of the near future, Bush writes that America would probably suffer some destruction of factories and cities from bomber fleets and guided missiles as well as from submarines along the coast. However, the heating would not be as bad as England took in the last war and not sufficient to greatly weaken U. S. war potential.

Modern warfare, according to Bush, yields victory to that nation best utilizing science. Men of good will in the democracies will win against the dictatorship behind the Iron Curtain since only they can best organize the research to provide the weapons to defend that democracy.

Bush, with the usual naivete of men of science in political, social and economic matters, does not realize that war makes true democracy in the world today impossible. Nor does he indicate how science in the United States is becoming increasingly prostituted to the military machine. On the other hand, while Hitler's doom may have been due in part to his failure to utilize science properly, dictators as well as democrats can still use the achievements of science to do severe damage to the enemy and to workers' aspirations, as well as to all that science stands for.

It is in the interest of workers of all nations that the fruits of science be applied not to winning a future war, either total or "limited," but to build a world of plenty and security now. Science by its very nature is an activity embodying the desires of all men for good; its harnessing to the war machine by any nation is its negation. As this becomes more apparent there should be increased dissatisfaction among scientists over the misuse of their activities. As with all skilled workers, "pride of output" in science itself should extend to its social use.



By L. G. SMITH

Last week we didn't have room for the Press Action column, but the subs continued to come in. We give below the scorecard for the past two weeks. The first column gives the number of six-month subs, with a year sub counting as two. The second column indicates the number of individuals who subscribed to the paper.

Branch	Sub Score	Single Subs
Los Angeles	5	3
Detroit	5	4
Cleveland	2	2
San Francisco	13	11
Buffalo	1	1
Philadelphia	2	1
Newark	2	1
New York	18	11

Akron	4	4
Miscellaneous	2	1
Total	54	39

That would not be too bad a score, all things considered, if all these represented new subscribers. Many of them are renewals sent in by the subscribers themselves. Of course, for a paper like LABOR ACTION it is especially gratifying to have people resubscribe, because it indicates real interest in our ideas.

But we think the branches can and should do more. The most important subscribers are people who know you and who have some relation to the League in addition to reading the paper. Are there any friends of the organization in your city who don't get the paper? Those are the people to go after.

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism
Published Weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Co.
114 West 14th Street, New York City 11, N. Y.
GENERAL OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.
Tel. IRonsides 6-5117

Vol. 14, No. 2 January 9, 1950

Editor: Hal Draper
Asst. Editors: Mary Bell, L. G. Smith
Edit. Bd.: Hal Draper, Emanuel Garrett, Albert Gates
Business Manager: L. G. Smith

Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50c for Six Months (\$1.25 and 65c for Canada and Foreign)

Re-entered at Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Nehru Makes Peace with Capitalists; Hindu Fascist Issue Divides His Party

Indian Socialist Party Calls for Left Unity

The following is a report of the recent plenary session of the National Committee of the Indian Socialist Party at the city of Bangalore. The report is reprinted from Janata, the official paper of the ISP, for October 16. The writer, Yusuf Meherally, is an old-time leader of the party in Bombay.

The report is interesting for its information as well as for the indications of the current political atmosphere among the party's leadership. For these reasons it is presented to readers of LABOR ACTION. Needless to add we do not take responsibility for the program or politics presented here, nor are we called upon to do so.

What is important is that the Indian SP is by far the most significant socialist organization on the Asiatic continent today. It is the spokesman for a substantial section of the Indian workers. Earlier this year the party organized a new labor federation opposed to the government-sponsored company unions of Patel and the old Stalinist-controlled federation. This new Hind Mazdoor Sabha (Indian Labor Association) now has a membership of some 650,000. The extremely powerful Railwaymen's Union has for its president Jay Prakash Narain, leader of the SP.

The party has seats on many city and provincial councils including such basic industrial cities as Bombay, Madras and Calcutta. It is a rapidly growing force in the working class and also in the middle classes and intelligentsia, whom it is beginning to attract away from the CP. The Congress Party increasingly recognizes the SP as its chief opponent.

This is not to imply that the party does not have its weaknesses in program as well as in organization. One has but to examine the section below on agrarian policy to perceive what could prove to be a fatal weakness. Yet this is the most dynamic socialist and democratic organization to emerge from the great post-war revolt of Asia. American socialists will have to pay increasing attention to this movement.

By YUSUF MEHERALLY

The central fact in the Indian political scene is the great loss in popularity suffered by the Congress (Indian National Congress Party). They came into a bountiful inheritance, which has been squandered with reckless prodigality. The Congress is suffering from the well recognized diseases of a swollen majority. The disorder is now becoming serious.

But, outside the ranks of megalomaniacs and ministers, no one supposes that the results of the last general elections (before independence) represent the permanent wishes of the electorate. Already, the tale of seats lost is beginning to mount and the future holds little comfort for the Congress.

This serious decline in Congress popularity, apart from other reasons, is largely due to their unreadiness to deal with the burning problems of the day in a bold and realistic way.

STATUS QUO ECONOMY

Take, for example, the deteriorating economic situation. Undoubtedly the situation would have been difficult even otherwise, but it has been aggravated because of the anxiety of the administration to maintain the status quo and to go on making commitments in favor of vested interests and the privileged classes.

It is at the door of their refusal to make any basic change in the social order that the blame must be laid.

Events are making it amply clear that there is no other solution for this but socialism. Your executive committee has been meeting for the past ten days and the statements of policies will be laid before you.

It will be clear from them that economic problems in industry and agriculture cannot be satisfactorily solved except on the basis of drastic alterations in the economic order.

UNITED SOCIALIST PARTY

I would like to refer very briefly to the question of Left unity. It is gratifying to note that all Left groups in this country have accepted socialist conclusions. That being so, it is desirable that the entire movement should be integrated into a single party.

The Socialist Party has now opened its doors to all and so far three organizations have come into it. It is no use having a score of competing groups, with separate identities and small membership.

I extend a cordial invitation to them to join forces with the Socialist Party and help to build a powerful socialist movement in this country.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

Another issue is that of civil liberties which have been steadily shrinking in the past two years and more. The disruptive activities of the Communists and communalists are to some extent responsible for this. But the party in power has used its strategic position very unwisely to strengthen its sectarian aims. Freedom entered by one door but civil liberties left by the other, making freedom look hollow.

It is time now not only to remove irksome restraints on freedom but to cancel the Public Security Measures Acts in the provinces, which have been misused and whose continuance is not warranted by any national emergency.

As for the food problem, this question should be lifted out of the realms of party politics and treated as a national emergency. The Socialist Party would offer its complete and ready cooperation to the government in tackling this.

LAND ARMY

In this connection, the importance of raising a powerful land army

should not be overlooked. The formation of the land army was not only an original but important and constructive suggestion made by the Socialist Party. The land army should consist of three sections.

(1) The first should consist of highly trained experts forming the technical arm of the campaign.

(2) The second should be of a very large army raised, equipped and financed by the government from the farmer and agricultural laborers to push ahead with the tasks of intensive cultivation, reclamation of new lands, helping with irrigation schemes and so on. The costs which would run into crores would have naturally to be borne by the state.

(3) The third part should consist of volunteers from both the urban as well as the rural areas. This will be crusaders and missionaries of freedom. We must tap the idealism, especially of the younger generation, to tasks of national reconstruction. The volunteers would not only help in the tasks of food self-sufficiency but also address themselves, after a little training if need be, to building roads, spreading literacy, sanitation and allied matters and regualvanze our entire rural economy.

We visualize that in three to five years the land army will bring about a revolution in our rural economy. Cooperation and collective farming will come to play an increasing part in our agriculture; and the heavy drain of Rs. 150 crores (\$350 million) for purchase of food from abroad will be stopped.

The Socialist Party attaches the greatest importance to the idea of the land army.

CULTURAL FRONT

Then there is the urgent need for building up an adequate cultural front for the Socialist Party. There is a tendency among socialists to concentrate on trade unions and kisan panchayats and comparatively neglect other important aspects of activity.

The literary and cultural activities of the party should be given a high priority. Finally, there are the young socialist leagues and an institute of higher training for party members, by establishing labor colleges in different centers and publication of suitable literature.

ORGANIZATION

In conclusion, socialists must remember that the country has great expectations about them and that imposed upon them is great responsibility. If today, or in the near future, we are called upon to shoulder the burden of office, are we prepared? It is important to develop a powerful political organization for the party. In certain parts, no doubt, they had a creditable organization. Others also must develop it to that standard.

BOMBAY, Nov. 15 (SP of India Foreign Bulletin) — Pandit Jawharlal Nehru, before he became the first prime minister of India, called himself "a convinced socialist and democrat." The responsibilities of office have apparently brought about a sea-change in his outlook. No more does he refer to socialism even as a distant ideal. Significantly enough, in his speeches in America, the prime minister scrupulously avoided the word "socialism."

Though he continues to talk about economic freedom and the middle course of "mixed economy" between the extremes of private enterprise and socialization, the recent declaration of Sardar Patel, the deputy prime minister, at the meeting of the Central Advisory Council of Industries, has left little doubt as to the direction of government economic policy. It is not socialism that influences the government's economic policies but the traditional theory of free enterprise.

Sardar Patel in his analysis of the economic crisis praised the industrialists and said: "I know that you have carried a very heavy burden in the past" and assured them that in the near future the government would relieve the entire tax structure and bring some relief to the capitalists. He further said that investments have fallen because of heavy taxation and consequent "diminution in the resources of the investing classes." We must create a sense of confidence, he continued, both in the investors and in those on whom will fall the great national duty of utilizing investments.

CAPITAL ON STRIKE

With this end in view, he announced that the government will bring down direct taxation to a "more reasonable level." He further assured the capitalists that it is the aim and purpose to remove obstacles and not to place new ones in their way. The government has also agreed to amend the Control of Industries Bill, in an effort to meet the objections of the capitalists. Thus the war of nerves waged by the industrialists has ended in a resounding victory for them.

They complained of loss of confidence and extracted the declaration from the government that there would not be socialization of industries for many years to come. In the name of "Capital is shy," they refused to subscribe to government loans, sabotaged capital formation and have now got the government to remove all "obnoxious" controls to pave the way for the operation of free economy.

The working class and the common people have hard days ahead. Scarcity increases and prices continue to go up. Now the rural masses are threatened with a cut in the prices of agricultural produce. When the government talks about reducing the industrial prices, the capitalists and the middlemen hit back by bringing about artificial sugar famine and by closing down textile mills and factories. The Indian National Trade Union Congress, handmaid of the ruling (Congress) party, sacrifices the interest of the working class and calls upon it to support this policy, which cannot solve the crisis but must result in growing unemployment, high prices and scarcity.

They complained of loss of confidence and extracted the declaration from the government that there would not be socialization of industries for many years to come. In the name of "Capital is shy," they refused to subscribe to government loans, sabotaged capital formation and have now got the government to remove all "obnoxious" controls to pave the way for the operation of free economy.

HIT OPEN DOOR TO FASCISTS

On the eve of Nehru's departure to Washington, the Working Committee of the Congress Party (headed by Nehru) took a momentous decision to admit the members of the Hindu Fascist Communal organization called

Free Enterprise

"The trend toward corporate mergers is still a trend. There's been little publicity about it, but the number of merger deals has jumped in the last few months. The deals have come in all parts of business, too. In one group of 35 mergers, 25 different industries were involved. Wall Street, of course, has a ready explanation for the upturn. As these Streeters see it, business simply wants to put through as many mergers as it can before Congress cracks down." —Business Week, big business organ, Dec. 24.

the RSS, on whom the government imposed a ban after the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi.

This decision evoked a storm of protest from the ranks of the Congress Party itself. Its provincial organizations in Delhi, Madhya Bharat and Marashtra protested against this ruling of the Working Committee, which they considered to be against the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi and the principle of secular nationalism professed by the Congress. Some of the provincial organizations, however, heartily welcomed the decision, for they thought that the influx of the militant RSS youths in the Congress would so strengthen its position as to enable it to fight the growing socialist challenge.

Yet the memory of Gandhi was too fresh and even in the United Provinces where no less a person than the Provincial Congress President Purshottamadas Tandon advocated the cause of the RSS, a section of the Congress openly revolted against the policy of the High Command. Even a journal as pro-government as the Times of India was constrained to characterize this move of the Congress Party as a "desperate attempt at political collaboration."

When Nehru returned to India he pronounced severe strictures on the RSS. He said that the "RSS approach did not fit in with the Congress mentality." Now the Working Committee has hastily come out with a "clarification" that the members of the RSS will have to resign from the RSS if they choose to become Congress members!

The collaborators have been given a sharp rebuff and no amount of constitutional quibbling, as the prime minister himself described this clever interpretation, can conceal the fact that a very large section of the Congress leadership, within less than two years of Gandhi's death, is prepared to collaborate with the enemies of democracy in order to perpetuate themselves in office.

ECA 'Integration' --

(Continued from page 1)

This strategy is seen in the attempted solutions put forth by U. S. officials at the above mentioned October conference. The American oil companies were willing to take dollars in exchange for sterling only to meet their costs, and take a chance at being able to convert their profits. Undoubtedly this meant that the U. S. government was going to subsidize the oil companies. Continued and expanding production was the goal.

U. S. VERSUS EUROPE

In October 1949 a conference began between British and American government officials to plan control of production and explore possibilities of allocating markets (N. Y. Times, Oct. 9). The U. S. began to force the British to curtail their expansion plans and recognize the "legitimacy" of the interests of the U. S. oil companies.

At stake was more than the mere "legitimacy" of these companies, the strategic plans of the State Department itself. Oil is an integral part of the American defense plans, the blood of the modern war machine. The American oil fields in Arabia and Venezuela could not be allowed to fall into disuse and deteriorate.

The "stability" of these areas, in the first place, depends on oil production. Therefore the political and economic consequences of the depression and the possibility of social upheavals demand continued production. Second, these oil fields may be leased out to another nation, perhaps even Russia, and thus the U. S. would lose direct control over them.

Consequently there is the necessity for the maintenance of the foreign markets in order to continue production at the present level at least. This, in turn, runs head-on into the attempts of the European nations to solve their dollar crisis, for which American "aid" is necessary, by producing and refining their own oil. The British plans call for an increase in oil output to meet the needs of the entire non-dollar world.

Thus the ECA (European Cooperation Administration) intervenes in early October and overrules the European Marshall Plan Council, which is supposed to have the "authority" for coordinating the Marshall Plan nations by the Europeans themselves and curtails the expansion plans. Though almost the entire amount of machinery necessary had to be bought in the U. S., with 88 per cent of non-Marshall Plan dollars, the overriding determinant was the strategic need of oil.

On the House

A four-day strike of beer-wagon teamsters started in Dublin, Ireland, when employers ordered the men to stop the practice of giving the horses a half keg of beer a day. The strike was won.

Congressional Tax Bills Hit Co-ops But Real Tax Dodgers Ignored

By MIKE STEVENS

When Congress meets again there will be a new flock of bills to tax the cooperatives and the trade unions.

The reasons for these bills are obvious. Heavy taxation on these organizations will wreck them. The unions have no revenue outside of the dues they receive from their members. Even the cooperatives have no profits in the usual sense of the word.

But if the lawmakers in Washington really want a few tax-free setups in this country, let them just take a look around and they will find tax-free enterprises that net close to ONE BILLION DOLLARS A YEAR.

They will find that the Giffen cotton ranch in California was recently sold for \$4,800,000 and that the famous Tom Campbell's wheat ranch in Montana was sold for \$2,000,000. These used to bring in a nice slice of taxes — but they won't any more. A tax-free religious outfit, the Sacred Heart Foundation of Omaha, has bought them up. The old owners are still there, of course, getting salaries even higher than they took out when they owned the places.

The government will not be getting any taxes from the huge building that houses Lit Brothers in Philadelphia, or the Allied Stores Corporation, or Macy's in San Francisco. Colleges own all that property now. The department stores have long-term leases, pay low rents and have no investment in the property.

There won't be a nickel coming to the government, either, from the real estate or from the business income of the Ramsey Piston Ring Company, or from the Mueller Macaroni Company, or from the Limoges China Company. New York University owns all of them—lock, stock and barrel—as well as a few dozen more.

TAX DODGERS

The University of Michigan owns Willow Run airport; another college owns a radio station; a college owns the property on which stand a liquor store and a pool room; a college is

to inherit the racetrack Churchill Downs.

At least sixty companies have been permitted to move to Puerto Rico and thus not pay taxes. The setting up of "tax-exempt" trust funds by dozens of corporations to finance business expansion and operation hasn't even been mentioned in the newspapers.

In Illinois's Lake County there is so much tax-exempt property owned by religious organizations that Samuel Cardinal Strich of Chicago, recently admitted that he refused permission to one of the Catholic orders to purchase more property because "overburden the county even more."

The cooperatives and trade unions should be tax-exempt because they are not profit-making bodies, and equally important is the fact that they are the organizations of the people — of the great masses of all the people.

A church which owns property is a different matter. Because it is tax-exempt everybody in the community, whether he is a member of that church or not, is automatically contributing toward the propaganda and development of that institution. The same holds true for the parochial schools of the Lutherans, Catholics, Jews and others.

The issue of tax-free churches and religious institutions goes a bit deeper than the mere fact that the property they own is taken off the tax rolls and everybody else's taxes go up. The basic issue of separation of church and state is involved. When the government makes religious property tax-exempt it is, in effect, subsidizing the churches.

The time is now for the trade union movement and the cooperatives of this country to organize their forces for the battle that will take place during the next session of Congress. All the bills will be aimed directly at them. Some of the bills will not be as crude as those mentioned above — nevertheless it will be the trade unions and the cooperatives that they are gunning for.

The significance of the proposed British action is seen in the immediate response it brought from the petroleum industry, from congressmen, the ECA and above all the State Department, which indicated its "concern at the present action in this field." The N. Y. Times of December 21 reported that "Marshall Plan officials canvassed the possibilities of indirect sanctions in the form of a cutback in funds already allocated for expansion of British petroleum refining."

The more direct forms of action to be applied by the ECA and the State Department remain to be seen. But evident at this time is the practical meaning of "integration," the fitting in of the economy of Western Europe to meet the imperialist needs of the U. S. in the cold war.

MEANING OF INTEGRATION

On December 20, Britain, forced by the failure of the sterling devaluation to make any significant dent on the dollar shortage, announced the curtailment by one half of dollar oil import and the use of oil bought with sterling.

Tresca Murder --

(Continued from page 1)

Scottoriggio's slayers, and not even make the gesture of such a promise in the Tresca case?"

Thomas declared that Hogan, in assigning Assistant District Attorney Louis Pagnucco to question Benjamin Gitlow about the Tresca case before a grand jury last February, violated a 1944 pledge that Pagnucco would not be permitted to examine any new witnesses in this case. That pledge was made, Thomas averred, "after Attorney Morris L. Ernst and others presented documentary evidence showing that Pagnucco had been closely associated with Fascists in the past and had been honored by the Mussolini government."

NO HOPE IN HOGAN

For nearly two years Pagnucco had handled the Italian part of the inquiry in the Tresca case, in which both Fascists and the Communist Party had been suspected. Gitlow, ex-general secretary of the American Communist Party, had alleged in a new book that Tresca was killed because he bucked the OGPU—the Russian secret service—in the Juliet Stuart Poyntz disappearance case, and because he tried to foil Stalin's plans in Italy by keeping the Communist Party out of the Italian-American Victory Council. Tresca had told a federal grand jury that Miss Poyntz, a disillusioned Soviet agent, had been slain by Communists.

"Why was Pagnucco assigned to question Mr. Gitlow?" Mr. Thomas demanded. "It is true that he had protested passionately to me his repudiation of Fascism and his desire to solve the Tresca case. Yet his being used to examine a new witness—any new witness in this case—was a glaring breach of Mr. Hogan's 1944 pledge to the Ernst committee."

"Our committee remembers, too, that the district attorney's office long

neglected to question four close friends of Tresca, who were familiar with his enemies, and that even after Mr. Hogan's attention was called to this, we had to apply great pressure, and many months passed before all four intimates finally were examined.

"In view of these facts, we are doubtful about getting effective action from the Hogan office in the Tresca case. We think it much more likely that Carlo's murder eventually will be solved through the continuing quiet work of certain members of the Police Department who, for reasons of their own, would like to get to the bottom of that case."

"I do not accuse the District Attorney of deliberate intent to shield anyone, but of failure to act boldly, imaginatively, and persistently to clear up the mystery of the Tresca slaying."



CARLO TRESCA

Truman --

(Continued from page 1)

spirit of initiative and enterprise and operate in a competitive economic system," he also knows that the "competitive economic system" cannot itself achieve "these gains."

What are "these gains"? The maximum Fair Deal program boils down to the minimum promises necessary to satisfy the people's desires for reform. Public housing—a few more drops in the bucket, "decent housing" in Truman's words. Increased unemployment compensation — only the amount a family can subsist on for a while if the head of the family is thrown out of a job, covering also those who do not get any compensation at all under the present law. Health insurance—supplying the facilities that are partially or totally lacking to many people.

WILL HE FIGHT?
This is not socialism. This is government therapy for an economy beset by inextricable contradictions, recommended by the more far-seeing capitalist physicians.

Meager as it is, the Truman program is bound to be trimmed down in Congress by the Republicans and by Truman's fellow Democrats, particularly his Southern colleagues. Truman himself did some whittling on the rumored tax increase which was to pay for the program. It had been bruited in advance that more taxes were to come from the wealthy and the corporations; now the message is vague. There is no hint of a decrease in the wartime taxes the workers are still paying.

Moreover, even Truman's most enthusiastic Fair Deal friends—especially the more enthusiastic—express their suspicions about that Truman does not even want to make a fight to push his measures through this session. The New York Post, this past week, editorialized an exhortation to him to really get behind his own program; the suspicion is that he would be just as happy to see it shelved this year so as to retain his slogans for the presidential election of 1952.

But the biggest obstacle of all to any real Fair Deal is Truman's admission that "more than 70 per cent of the government's expenditures are required to meet the costs of past wars and to work for world peace." The expression world peace is, of course, for military preparations for World War II.

No wage increase is proposed for labor. It is proposed to maintain the present weak rent control, already cut to ribbons by Truman's own administrative agency headed by Tighe Woods. As a matter of fact, prior to the message, Truman gave his reason for maintaining rent control the removal of any pretext for a new round of wage increases.

2000 OR 1984?

In lieu of a more concrete program for the needs of the people, Truman permitted himself an H. G. Wellsian glimpse into the American paradise that will exist in 2000 A.D. According to this piece of futuristic fantasy, the welfare state has continued unhampered, productivity has increased by four times over 1950, with a family income three times the current average, and capitalism is stronger than ever. The Republican-labeled "socialist" capitalist is merely repeating the glowing pictures of the future drawn by exponents of the profit system before the 1929 crash, when capitalism was painted as marching on from triumph to triumph.

Meanwhile the more realistic picture in all people's minds for the next half century is that of atomic warfare, a capitalist system that is dying in Europe, and permanent insecurity and fear as long as it is still alive on these shores. And another picture of this future has been drawn, referring not to 2000 A.D. but to 1984, drawn by its author George Orwell on the pattern of the increasing bureaucratization of Western capitalism.

Truman stated that "our republic continues to increase in the enjoyment of freedom within its borders and to offer strength and encouragement to all those who love freedom throughout the world."

This comes from the man who ordered the attorney general to draw up his "subversive list," which has become the basis for a systematic witchhunt new to this country. "Guilt by association" has become accepted government procedure, in spite of its rejection by one court after another. His administration has instituted the loyalty oath, first in the government, now spreading to private employment, schools and colleges and other agencies, whereby any and all dissidents can be victimized without any possibility of defending themselves. The FBI develops increasingly into a thought-police force.

On this field too, government intervention proceeds apace, on a capitalist basis, in the direction which has the police-state at its end.

The State of the Union continues to be "good"—good for the powers that own America now.

Gobbledygook

Year's prize for doubletalk goes to the Interstate Commerce Commission examiner who reports there is no black market in train reservations but says there IS evidence in some cities of block purchase of train space and its resale to travelers at above cost.

No. 3 (September-October Issue)

CONFRONTATION INTERNATIONALE

Revue Internationale de Discussion

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 COURT SQUARE
LONG ISLAND CITY 1, N. Y.

Single copy: 50 cents
1-year sub (6 issues): \$2.50