

## 3 Chicago Corporations Institute Plant Purge

CHICAGO—Three instances in this city evidence the growing trend to subject plant employees to political frisking.

At Stewart-Warner, five workers (one with 26 years of service for the company) have been fired for refusing to sign loyalty oaths. At Felt-Tarrant the union (Farm Equipment Workers, now in the Stalinist-led UE!) has accepted a contract which would bar from its employment "any employee who is found to be knowingly aiding or abetting any organization having as its purpose the overthrow of the U. S. government by force or violence."

At Foote Gear a worker was fired because he was alleged to be a Communist; in arbitration, the union won its case for reinstatement, but the company stood pat on its action and the matter is still pending.

The Stewart-Warner case is the most striking, though the others are no less lacking in import. For one thing, five workers (all of them stewards in Local 1154, UE) are already involved and it is entirely possible that the company may proceed against any worker whom it may suspect, or find it convenient to suspect, of being a "subversive" influence. For another thing, the move at Stewart-Warner is most clearly combined with a pointed drive by the company to depress working conditions and wages.

The company presumably acted (and there is nothing to indicate that it gaged at the invitation) because the U. S. Department of Defense last December 5 directed a bulletin to employers informing them that military contracts would be denied plants employing "subversives" who might thereby gain access to military information. The Chicago branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, which is fighting the Stewart-Warner action, has accordingly charged that the Defense Department was "apparently impelling employers to engage in attempted thought control and interference with employees' political affiliations."

### ANTI-LABOR RECORD

With respect to the particular case, which is so blatant that even the Chicago Daily News has been unable to digest it, the ACLU charged that it was "not at all clear that Stewart-Warner Corporation would jeopardize its position as a military contractor by retaining in its employ persons who refuse to sign non-Communist affidavits."

For its part, in firing the five stewards, the company left no doubt that it intended to fire all Communist Party members, former members (presumably former CP members who are bitterly anti-Stalinist, too, if they happen to be union militants) and workers believed by the company to be Communist Party supporters.

### Not Big Enough

The big business magazine Business Week devoted over four pages of a recent issue to propaganda on the theme of "Big Labor." The "appalling" picture it showed was that the 50 biggest unions, with over two-thirds of all trade-union membership in the U. S. and Canada, had aggregate assets of \$339 million—much of it in the form of insurance reserves earmarked for death, disability and other benefits.

The very same issue carried another story which showed that the assets of one single company, Ford Motor, stood at three times the net worth of all 50 of the biggest unions—1,140 million!

If General Motors is thrown into the picture, the net worth of this single company is nine times that of all the 50 unions. Even its PROFITS alone for the first NINE MONTHS of 1949 were far more than the union figure for total ASSETS.

The assets of the trade unions are far too small, not too big. Speed the day when Business Week really has something to squawk about!

### Child Labor

Child labor is still plentiful in this country. In the state of New York the number of child laborers is still twice as high as pre-war (it stands at two millions), and would be higher but for the fact that job opportunities are falling off, according to the latest report of the National Child Labor Committee.

Federal law has not ended child labor. Thousands of children as young as 7 and 8 are still permitted to work in commercial agriculture outside school hours, and all day in summer, and federal law does not close the door to child labor in a host of occupations which are subject only to state laws.

In general, the company is pulling all stops on its notorious anti-laborism. For years it enjoyed a contract with the union that was a monstrosity from the labor point of view, especially in the matter of seniority.

The contract contained virtually no protection for senior employees. The company held the prerogative of transferring men with seniority to any job at all—with no alternative for the men involved but to accept the transfer or get out; classification seniority was not plant-wide and there was no shift preference. By and large the company was glad to get the assistance of the Stalinist union leaders during the war years, offering them concessions on hiring and such matters, but little in terms of contract provisions. The honeymoon having ended, the company is out to smash unionism in the plant.

### POISONOUS PATTERN

The old contract had a clause which provided that if a new contract were not signed by June 30, 1949, the contract was to be held terminated. The company stalled, the UE did next to nothing and the contract lapsed. Today the workers are being victimized by down-grading, wage-cutting, layoffs, out-of-line seniority and much else. The company's latest move in dismissing the five stewards drives home the point of its intentions.

Of course, what is at stake is more than a particular plant situation. It is the kind of thing which has already happened in a number of instances, each of them seeming to be isolated, but betraying evidences of a poisonous pattern. It happened in Philadelphia (with anti-Stalinists as the victims!). It is happening here. Whether as dismissal or as contract clause, the menace of the witchhunt is growing.

It is a major concern for every person who values civil liberty. It is a particular concern for a free labor movement which must act to defend its freedom.

## Battle over Formosa Ignores Formosa's Right to Freedom

By JACK BRAD

The battle of Formosa which has raged over Washington these past weeks is now concluding its first phase. Truman's announcement that the U. S. has no intention of intervening, since Formosa is Chinese territory and must be settled by Chinese political forces, does not close the matter. But it reduces the opposition to the position of critics rather than potential makers of policy.

That the real war for control of Formosa should be fought in Washington is indicative of the world power framework. For it is true enough that, having lost in Washington, the Nationalists have almost lost all. Their loss of the island is now largely a matter of time, barring a major change in the international scene. The second stage, the shooting battle, will be an anticlimax, however bloody.

In a sense, the Formosa issue itself is anticlimactic. That it arises at all is a consequence of the much greater disaster for American policy on continental China. It was Roosevelt who anchored U. S. Asiatic policy in China, where it has centered at least since the Panay incident of more than 10 years ago. Formosa is the backwash of this historic collapse and only because of it does it acquire significance.

The speedy mobilization of various reactionary interests on this issue arises because of their prior agreement on the China issue. The ridiculous position of these people is revealed in all its garishness by their pathetic effort to rally last-minute support to Chiang on his tiny island as their defiant answer to the victors across the narrow strait.

In spite of the transitory nature of the Formosa issue it has been revealing of the kind of thinking that dominates the leading governmental factions in the U. S. For obvious partisan reasons, the Republican Party produced the chief spokesmen for the extreme militarist-strategic approach. Senator Taft and Herbert Hoover led off with demands for immediate intervention by the U. S. Navy to defend Formosa and the other off-shore islands for Chiang, against any invasion. Chiang would be reduced to his proper role as Chinese front for direct U. S. military control.

While Taft spoke for the anti-Vandenberg group in the party, Hoover, in addition, has a special interest. It is now distant in men's memories, but

(Continued on page 4)

### Quill and CIO Leaders Get Their Reward—

## Ungrateful O'Dwyer Slaps N. Y. Labor Supporters

NEW YORK, Jan. 9.—There's just no gratitude in politics. Michael J. Quill, head of the CIO Transport Workers Union and Mayor O'Dwyer's chief labor backer, has been finding that out.

Quill, who boosted O'Dwyer during the election campaign in spite of the mayor's strikebreaking tactics against Quill's bus drivers, is angry again at his fresh discoveries. "Resentful and angry," says the press, which also reports that only at the last moment did he call off a press conference at which he was reportedly going to make an open break with the mayor.

The straws that almost broke Quill's back, in the past week, have been two. First, O'Dwyer has appointed G. J. Minetti as a member of the Board of Transportation, the boss with which Quill's union largely

## FBI Claims Right to Break Law, Reveals FDR Approval

There is one group in this country whose members can break the law, publicly admit it, publicly boast that they are going to continue doing so—and get away with it. That is the FBI, and the illegal action which it confesses to is wiretapping.

This week, Attorney General McGrath stated in Washington that he had "fully reviewed" the wiretapping activities of his secret-police department and saw "no reason at the present time for any change" in the FBI's policy.

The week before, the former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, James Lawrence Fly, had given him a reason. Fly sharply attacked the practice in a letter to the Washington Post, asserting that the Department of Justice was flouting the laws it was supposed to enforce. He said FBI wiretapping was clearly contrary to the intent of the Federal Communications Act and a grave threat to American civil liberties, demanding a Congressional investigation.

FBI wiretapping has come up as a hot issue in the Coplon-Gubitchev spy trial now being held. FBI agents and spokesmen at first baldly denied that any information so gained was used as evidence, but subsequent testimony broke this pose down. The judge in the case has ruled that no evidence gained through wiretapping, or indirectly through clues provided by wiretapping, could be admitted.

McGrath, Truman's cabinet member responsible for the continuing outrage, in this week's statement on January 9, justified the practice on the ground that "limited" use of wiretapping had been authorized by President Roosevelt during the war. In thus shifting the onus from himself, he merely succeeds in implicating Roosevelt in the government officials' conspiracy to violate the law. McGrath also said that wiretapping had been OK'd by former Attorneys General Robert H. Jackson and Tom Clark, as well as by Francis Biddle. The first two now sit as august justices of the U. S. Supreme Court as top "watchdogs" on the constitutional rights of the people!

"In view of the emergency which still prevails and the necessity of protecting the national security," said McGrath, "I can see no reason at the present time for any change."

Comments the United Press news item: "He did not elaborate on the reference to an 'emergency,' but it was presumed that he meant the so-called cold war."

As everyone knows, the so-called cold war is no passing emergency but bids fair to be the permanent state of affairs in a world divided between American and Russian imperialism. The government is laying down the dictum that no law can restrain its secret-police activities, that the latter are a law unto themselves—the principle being identical with the view of the Russian GPU and Hitler Gestapo practices held by the totalitarian regimes.

However, there will be found the usual consolatory illusion among friends of civil liberties that, since it is only the principle that is involved and nothing approaching the practice of these regimes, there is not too much to worry about. This head-in-the-sand view, reinforced by anti-Communist hysteria, seems also to be taken by the leaders of the labor movement, who have yet to speak out as vigorously and hotly, on this issue of the subversion of democratic processes by the FBI, as they have in their denunciations of the totalitarian Stalinists.

### On the Skids



CHIANG KAI-SHEK

### President's Economic Message Designed to Placate Business—

## Truman Points to Necessity For Speedup in Production Rather than Wage Increases

### Wealth Upped—Who Got It?

In his State of the Union message, drawing a mid-century balance sheet, Truman reported that the average wage, in terms of today's prices, had risen from 45 cents at the turn of the century to \$1.40 an hour today, or by about three times.

Later in his remarks in the same message, he pointed to the increase in total national production over the same fifty years, from \$50 billion to \$255 billion a year—an increase of over five times. Even greater progress, percentage-wise.

Truman made no correlation between these two figures, the figure on wages received and the productivity of the wage-earners. In the capitalist mind, they are not related. By socialist standards they are.

The figures mean simply that while absolute wages have risen, wages relative to the amount of goods produced have declined.

The worker receives a smaller share of the total national product. The country as a whole produces five times as much goods, but an even greater share of the fruit of labor goes to the capitalist than before. The gap between the little people and the economic rulers, between the poor and the rich, has widened.

The socialist demand is that the fruit of labor be enjoyed, not by those who rake out their share because they own, but by those who now get the shorter end of the stick because they are merely the ones who have produced the vastly increased wealth.

The socialist demand is that the people own the factories, mines and plants themselves, through their own democratic workers' government.

By GORDON HASKELL

President Truman's economic report submitted to Congress last week is being studied with interest by all groups in our economy. The report represents the thinking of the president's economic advisers, which means that it represents the ideas about the state of our economy on the basis of which the government is going to shape its policies during the present session of Congress and beyond.

The central point in the report is the belief that the country is on its way to a sound recovery from the drop which began in the fall of 1948 and extended till the middle of 1949. To dramatize the idea that this recovery will last for a long time, Truman states that if present trends continue, and if all groups in the country do the right thing, the national income will reach \$300 billion dollars in five years. This would mean, he said, an average increase in income of \$1,000 for every family in the United States, and would wipe out extreme poverty for almost everyone in the nation.

This situation, if it should come about, would be something new for any country in history. But before we let ourselves become dazzled by the dream of prosperity for all Americans, it would be better to take a close look at the economic facts and theories on which the president bases his predictions.

### TRENDS NOT REASSURING

The first striking thing is the still great economic strength of the country. All the figures on production and income show a general relative prosperity compared to the poverty which grips the rest of the world. Further, they show no apparent trend towards a deep and lasting

(Continued on page 4)

## Spanish Labor's Appeal: Stop U. S. Aid to Franco

By WILEBALDO SOLANO  
General Secretary, POUM

PARIS, Dec. 30.—The founding conference of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions at London took up the Spanish question, as is customary in all international working-class bodies.

On the initiative of the General Union of Workers of Spain (illegal republican trade-union federation) the new world trade-union organization explicitly came out against all economic aid by the capitalist powers to the Franco regime and especially against any attempt to bring the Spanish totalitarian tyranny into what is sometimes called "the union of the free peoples."

Those who were in London reported that its condemnation of Francoism was one of the most emotional scenes at the conference. We do not intend to cast doubt on this. It is a well-known fact that emotion has never been lacking at international workers' congresses whenever the tragedy of the Spanish working class is brought up.

But more than five months ago the Spanish workers demanded from our class brothers of the entire world something more tangible and effective than emotional gestures and resolutions on paper. We asked for action—positive, concrete and effective action.

This time, something which is of great significance under the present circumstances took place in London. The representatives of three great U. S. labor organizations—CIO, AFL and the miners' union—denounced and condemned the plans of the Yankee capitalist and military circles who want to come to the aid of the dying Spanish dictatorship.

Until now, mere words—resounding words which tempered, to a certain degree, the legitimate skepticism

of not a few Spanish workers. But the situation demands much more, rapidly, without delay.

France has no hope of salvation except the assistance of U. S. finance capital. He begs for it anxiously. To get it he offers everything from strategic raw materials to the blood of Spanish youth.

The recent parade to Madrid of Yankee generals, admirals and government representatives proves that Franco relies on active and devoted allies in various U. S. circles. Under such circumstances, before the international situation develops further, it is no exaggeration to say that the immediate fate of the Spanish people is in the hands of the labor movement of the U. S.

By using all of their immense resources, the powerful labor organizations of the U. S. can easily prevent Wall Street and Washington from actively helping to save the Franco regime from disaster.

### TIME TO ACT!

The time has come for the CIO, the AFL and the United Mine Workers to translate the London labor congress's declarations into deeds.

At his December 14 press conference in Washington, Secretary of State Acheson declared that the admission of Spain into certain special bodies of the UN can perhaps be prepared. Acheson added that, once this takes place, results would accrue on both sides which would permit Spain's reconciliation with some of her European neighbors.

A few days later Republican leader Vandenberg called for the sending of an ambassador to Madrid and the inclusion of the "Spanish bastion" in the organization of Atlantic strategy. The same thing has just been asked, in truly scandalous phrases, by Democratic Senator Connally.

The Franco press, as usual, is ringing bells in jubilation. Its rejoicing is premature. But it is not our job to minimize the dangers which face us.

Leon Blum (French socialist leader) wrote some time ago that in 1945 "a single gesture" of the great powers would have been enough to end the Franco tyranny. Indalecio Prieto (Spanish socialist leader) wrote a few weeks ago that the Spanish workers grumble about why Franco has not been overthrown by those who can do it with "a single puff."

At the beginning of 1950 no one expects the "gesture" of Blum or the "puff" of Prieto. But all of the Spanish workers swallow their bitterness and still hope that the labor movement of the United States will not be found failing in militant solidarity in these ominous times.

### NEXT WEEK

• Discussion on the case of the Wright Company "witchcraft contract," with Martin Gerber and Gabriel DeAngelis.

Press reports of the expulsion from the Communist Party of Japan of Ko Nakanishi, member of the Parliament's House of Councilors, indicates a serious rift in the ranks of Japanese Stalinism, with an unusual turn.

## Japan CP Fires Pro-Cominform, Break Reported

Last week, according to dispatches, the Cominform journal, published in Bucharest, launched a violent attack on Sanzo Nozaka, one of the top leaders of the party. The attack accused Nozaka of believing that the American military occupation of Japan has created a situation favorable to the Japanese CP, and further that the Stalinists in Japan can hope to come to power and create a "people's democracy" by the peaceful means of getting a majority of the people to vote for them. To believe the Cominform, Nozaka says further that in the event such a majority were to come about, the army of occupation would leave Japan. Naturally, the accuracy of this Moscow version of Nozaka's views cannot be accepted, pending further information, but it indicates the seriousness of the situation.

The most interesting aspect of the break, however, is the fact that the Cominform attack did not lead to the expulsion of Nozaka, its intended victim, but to the Japanese CP's dumping the leader of the PRO-COMINFORM faction, Nakanishi, by the party control committee. The charges against Nakanishi were that he is using the Cominform's attack to disrupt the Japanese CP.

According to the Associated Press dispatches, Nozaka had fled Japan before the war, became a member of the Chinese CP and worked with Mao Tze-tung during the war. Nakanishi had also at one time belonged to the Chinese CP but during the war he was arrested by the Japanese government and was released under a general amnesty for political prisoners promulgated by MacArthur. He was imprisoned on charges of working with a Chinese spy ring which was gathering information for Russian intelligence.

Pending further information, the news raises the possibility of the infiltration of national-Stalinist ("Titoist") feeling in the Japanese Stalinist party, perhaps associated with similar tendencies in China.





