

## An Exchange Between Labor Action and 2 UAW Leaders on —

# Purge in the Plants: How Can Labor Stop It?

## Gerber, DeAngelis Present Views on Wright Contract

LABOR ACTION here presents an exchange of views in discussion between its Editors and two leaders of Region 9 of the United Auto Workers (CIO), on one of the most important issues facing the labor movement today: the recent tendency pushed by the government and management toward an "anti-subversive" witchhunt in the plants on an increased scale.

This became prominent last month when the Wright Aeronautical Corporation of Paterson, N. J., proposed a "national security" clause in the union contract with Local 669 of the UAW. The local rejected a unilateral version of this clause (see LABOR ACTION story of December 19, 1949) but then accepted a modified version (see January 2 issue).

Since then, we have carried a front-page editorial (January 9) and a news story (January 16) on three cases in Chicago which, in a different way, also bring up the "national security" purge problem before labor.

The present discussion, however, is solely on the Wright contract. On the right appears in full a letter of criticism by Martin Gerber and Gabriel DeAngelis, respectively regional director and International representative of the UAW, directed against the January 2 article in LABOR ACTION. Below is the reply by the Editors. Further discussion from the labor movement is invited.

To the Editor:

Your article titled "Reuther OKs Acceptance of Wright Contract" on page 1 of the January 2 issue of LABOR ACTION came to us as a distinct surprise. For a number of years now, from time to time, we have been reading LABOR ACTION. We have in practically every instance noted that the articles contained within its columns were of a highly critical nature. Sometimes we have agreed with your criticisms and sometimes we have disagreed, but always we have noted that your criticism analyzed fully the available facts and based a conclusion strictly upon the analysis of those facts.

However, in the article referred to above you apparently departed from this procedure. When you say flatly and boldly that Local 669 departed from its original position on the "witchhunt" clause proposed by management you just don't know what you're talking about. What the company demanded and what was finally written into the contract are two vastly different things.

### LICKED THE GRAVE DANGER

The company in the first instance demanded the unilateral right to remove from its payroll anyone who was a member of a subversive group or in any way associated with such group. That right, had it been granted by the union, would clearly and simply have endangered the civil rights of anyone working in the plant. It would have permitted management to fire an individual simply because that individual chose to believe in something which the management considered subversive. An individual would not have the right to be a Communist (CP) or a Trotskyist or anything else which does not happen to be patriotically fashionable in our present day and age. That was the grave danger; that was a violation of a fundamental principle of democracy which we hold dear; and it was that which we fought and firmly believe we licked, after explaining the danger fully to the membership.

Your condemnation of Walter Reuther served a motive which is apparently known only to you. It certainly was not based upon the facts. Reuther's position was quite clear. He maintained that the company needed no language of any kind in its contract; that its security obligations to the government would have to be maintained whether we had contract language or not. He stated that he most certainly would authorize a strike in Local 669 on the question of the company's demand. He stated further that he would authorize a strike even on the question of language dealing with security provisions if the membership felt strongly enough about it. That position was clear and forthright. However, what LABOR ACTION fails to reveal is that the membership of Local 669 voted down the original clause as indicated above. That membership did not deny that the company has to live up to its security regulations. It seems to us that we fail to recognize the realities of the day if we bury our heads in the sand and say to hell with the security regulations, and

while we agree fully with you that these security regulations are broad and dangerous, we cannot agree with you that the fight against them can be made on a labor-management front. Such a fight might very well make for a national series of strikes on this issue alone. And while there may be certain forces in our society which would welcome such strikes, unfortunately, you cannot number us among any one of these forces.

### GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE PROTECTS

The clause which we have written into our contract recognizes the fact that the company must live up to security regulations. It states that if the security division in the plant asks the removal of any employee from access to work which is of a secret nature, the union will not hold the management responsible for such action. We are protected from a misapplication of this clause through the grievance procedure and the arbitration provisions of our contract. That certainly and distinctly is not granting the company the rights they sought. Further, the clause stating that the union recognizes that the company has security regulations and will not do anything to place the employers in violation of such agreement serves only to give the company the right to move hastily in the event that anyone is jeopardizing the security of the plant. This provision, too, is subject to the grievance procedure and arbitration provisions of the contract.

Let us agree with you completely that it would have been infinitely better to have no such language in the contract but let us also make it quite clear that we personally would not hesitate one moment to eliminate from any plant under our jurisdiction anyone who is a real threat to our national security. This clause in the Wright contract was included because in the considered opinion of the officers of Local 699 and the representatives of the International Union a further fight would have meant strike action. This action we did not deem wise.

Of one thing you might be certain: this clause will not be used loosely by management. This union is going to be vigilant; this union is determined that any employee which comes under the provision of this clause will be deemed innocent until proved guilty.

Let us state again in closing that we were greatly surprised at the shallow and superficial manner in which you treated this story. Let us repeat again that the danger lies not in the language written between the union and management, but in the security regulations themselves. On the question of the broadness of these security regulations, on the question of the loose application of these regulations, the UAW has been making and will continue to make a determined fight.

Very truly yours,  
MARTIN GERBER,  
Director Region 9, UAW  
GABRIEL DE ANGELIS,  
International Representative, UAW

January 3, 1950

# Dewey Fact Board Soaks Buffalo Bell Workers; Union Men Now See Arbitration as Company Trap

BUFFALO, Jan. 17.—The fact-finding board appointed by Governor Dewey to settle the Bell strike accomplished its mission two and a half months ago—it got the men back to work. This week, on January 10, it handed down its "award" to the company.

This marks another incident in the "cold war" between the company and the union local of the United Auto Workers. The essentials of the "award" are:

- (1) No pension plan.
- (2) No increased vacation.
- (3) A five-cents-an-hour wage increase, of which—

(4) Two and a half cents an hour is contributed by the workers to increase insurance benefits.

(5) The discharge of six union activists tagged by the army as "poor security risks" (although the army did not ask for their discharge).

(6) The temporary reinstatement of fourteen union activists that the company asked to be discharged, including the president of the union, until decisions are handed down in the pending court cases.

(7) Contract changes in three categories: (a) changes asked for by the company to weaken the contract—all granted; (b) changes agreed to by both company and the union to strengthen the contract, prior to the strike—even some of these thrown out by the board; (c) union demands not agreed to by the company—all refused.

### THE VOICE IS BELL'S

The motivations given by the board for the various points in its decision indicate the type of company-minded board it is as much as does the "award" itself.

(1) The board members accept the company's line of using as a basis for comparison the standard aircraft industry instead of the standards agreed to by the major part of American industry.

(2) The reason for no increased vacation is solely the board's unwillingness to put an additional financial burden upon the company.

(3) The five-cent package is apolo-

gized for on the grounds that other aircraft plants agreed to five cents an hour, and so the company's competitive position would not be worsened. The facts are that most aircraft settlements had a flat five-cent wage increase PLUS other benefits, making a larger package.

(4) On the insurance, the board went out of its way to go beyond the company's position and changed a company-paid insurance to a contributory plan with no motivation whatsoever.

(5) On the discharges a mere repetition of the company's argument.

(6) The board played at being benefactor to the union by the temporary reinstatement of the other fourteen on the grounds that they did not wish to weaken the union too much.

(7) No motivations on any contract changes except on the union shop, where they point out that they prefer that the union not lose this valuable asset in order to avoid conflict in the shop over a campaign to sign up newly hired employees.

The reaction to the decision among the workers is a combination of sharp anger and deep disgust. None of the strike issues are settled, but new areas of conflict have been created.

### WORST LABOR POLICY

The court cases, instigated by the company against union leaders, members, and wives of members of the local members, are still pending. Some of the best union activists are out of the shop. Others still have a sword over their head.

The problems of the workers' security in the most important regard—a pension plan, has not even begun to be solved. The company's labor policy is the worst in its history and its attempts to crush the union are

**NEXT WEEK**  
An exclusive story on the rise of a "five-percent" —  
**MARAGON AND TRUMAN**  
by Chris Sikolis

# Hydrogen Bomb To Trigger Off New Arms Race

Ten days after an Atomic Energy Commission report attempted to minimize the destructive potentialities of even improved atom bombs, public announcement has been made of practical plans in readiness to produce a hydrogen atom bomb which would be 1,000 times as deadly as the original A-bomb and could destroy an area of 50 to 100 square miles.

The latter disclosure also came only two days after the head of one of the country's top scientific institutions had scored the effects of the administration cold-war program on scientific thought and research.

Estimates on the cost of producing the new super A-bomb had been put at from \$2 to \$4 billion, but the public announcement was accompanied by the "assurance" of officials that it would be "nearer \$200 million." How much nearer was not stated. In any case, it was made clear that cost was not a decisive factor; the government gives no weight to expenditures when they are for war purposes while warning direly of inflation and breakdown at the mention of increased wages and sharply raised social security.

It is revealed, however, that the White House is as yet holding up the green light for hydrogen-bomb production pending study of "the scientific, political and moral implications" by the AEC, State Department and Defense Department. In the light of past developments and brief references in the announcement, it would appear that the main reason for delay comes from opposition in the world of science.

REVOLTED AT IDEA  
N. Y. Times Washington correspondent James Reston reports that "One of the most distinguished scientists connected with the production of the first bomb has written a detailed report opposing any decision to proceed with the hydrogen bomb." He also writes: "Some officials are revolted at the very idea of setting out to produce a weapon in which the possibilities for mass destruction of life are beyond human imagination."

# Stalin's China Headache Linked to Japan CP Rift

By JACK BRAD

On January 5 the Cominform journal denounced Sanzo Nosaka, head of the Japanese Communist Party, as a misleader, an agent of American imperialism, guilty of "bourgeois attitudes." In this abrupt fashion Moscow suddenly made public long-smoldering differences with the Japanese party.

The reason for the sharpness of the

break became apparent in a few days when Nosaka showed it was he who held the upper hand, by expelling from the party its only open and clear pro-Moscow voice, Iseo Nakanishi, a secondary national leader and member of the upper house of the Diet.

Nakanishi took up the cudgels for the Cominform in typically absolute terms: "the leadership of the Japanese CP . . . has given a fatal blow to the struggles of the working class of this country." Moscow manipulates its parties so as to assure control through key figures in the leadership, those with organizational control. Its resort to public denunciation probably signifies failure to enforce its dictate in a more subterranean manner.

Significantly, the Cominform journal did not yet denounce or expel the party but only denounced its leader for misleading the party. This may signify that Moscow, while feeling impelled to take such a drastic step, nevertheless felt that there were still forces of redemption which could be activated and strengthened. Time will tell whether this calculation proves correct.

CLOSER TO MAO  
Meanwhile, it is Nosaka who has taken the offensive by the expulsion of Nakanishi. Subsequently he issued a statement which, after customary verbal obscenities, rather bluntly rejects Moscow's charges: "the masses of this country do not accept the conclusion of the [Cominform] writers that Mr. Nosaka's theories are undemocratic and un-Japanese." (N. Y. Times, January 13.)

(Continued on page 4)

### The Main Danger Was Not Licked

However, in defending your course of signing the Wright contract you contend that you "licked" the security provision. Here we disagree.

All the dangers in the original clause are in the clause finally adopted, except that the company cannot move quite as "unilaterally" and arbitrarily as it would like. Now, it very well may be that you were compelled to accept the clause. But it is in this light that it should be explained and not as a successful defense against "national security" clauses.

The contract negotiations between the Wright Aeronautical Corporation and UAW Local 669 are, in a sense, incidental to the problem that confronts the people of this country in general and the labor and political organizations of the working class in particular.

But let us, first, set the record straight and, as you say in your letter, establish the facts as they are.

LABOR ACTION carried two stories on the contract dispute of Local 669 with the Wright Corporation. The first story told how the local and the regional representatives rejected the original company demand for "the unilateral right to remove from its payroll anyone who was a member of a subversive group or in any way associated with such group." Since the facts in that story are not objected to in your letter, we assume that they are not called into question.

You do, however, criticize LABOR ACTION for the "shallow and superficial manner" in which it treated the second story. We grant that the article left the impression that by accepting the final version of the "security" clause, Local 669 had expressed itself in favor of the witchhunt principle and further that Walter Reuther also took a similar position. Such was not our intention and we regret that the article was in error on this point. As explained in your letter, both you and Reuther opposed the inclu-

(Continued on page 4)

# Housing Expediter's Figures Show Decontrol Unleashed Rent Boosts

The office of the Federal Housing Expediter has analyzed what has happened to rents in six large cities where controls were ended by local option. The survey shows that the longer controls are off, the higher the rent increases tend to be, and that they increase most on the houses and apartments of the poorer people.

For units which had rented for \$30 a month or less under controls, rents jumped an average of 55.8 per cent in Dallas, 46.4 per cent in Houston, 37.7 per cent in Topeka, 36.1 per cent in Knoxville, and 26.3 per cent in Salt Lake City. In Dallas, which has been decontrolled for five months, landlords got increases in

6.7 per cent of the units freed from controls, and the average increase was \$13.66 per month. Cities which have been decontrolled for a shorter period show less widespread increases and for smaller amounts.

If the present session of Congress permits the rent-control law to lapse at the end of June, the working people of America will be hit hard when it hurts them most, in the pocketbook. When the real-estate interests claim that the housing crisis is over, and that rent decontrol will not result in sharp rent increases they are simply lying in the face of all the facts. Labor had better go into action.



# UAW Sets Strike Date To End Chrysler Stall

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, January 15 — After marking time for more than six months, the United Auto Workers (CIO) came to grips with the Chrysler Corporation on an adequate pension and health plan for its 70,000 workers.

Norman Mathews, UAW Chrysler director, announced that the union would give the corporation a 7-day strike notice this week, which would make a strike deadline of Wednesday, January 25.

The primary purpose of setting the strike deadline was, of course, to put pressure on the company for written proposals, since the company has been stalling in recent weeks of negotiations, although it verbally has made some concession to the union.

In view of the fact that Chrysler has a relatively small number of employees over the age of 60, it is very likely that the UAW will obtain a pension plan whose key feature is 25 years seniority and age 65 as the basic prerequisites for a \$100-a-month pension.

The relatively small cost of such a pension plan, amounting to about 3 cents an hour per man, makes both possible and necessary the winning of a medical plan which would replace the employee-paid Blue Cross hospitalization plan now in effect.

At a recent meeting of over 800 chief stewards and shop committeemen, Walter P. Reuther, UAW pres-

ident, Emil Mazey, UAW secretary-treasurer, and Norman Mathews promised Chrysler workers a better pension plan than that obtained at Ford.

Since both the union and the company permitted negotiations to drift along for the past six months, the rank and file at Chrysler is not now keyed up to a showdown struggle, although a few months ago the ranks voted by extremely large majorities to support their negotiations by strike action if necessary to win an adequate pension plan.

It seems to be anybody's guess as to whether or not a Chrysler show-down will lead to a strike. The company has just begun a 6-day week schedule on its 1950 cars and seems very anxious to get production. Top union leaders apparently believe that this factor alone may serve to win a reasonable and acceptable set of proposals from the corporation. Among the ranks there is much uncertainty, and considerable hope that no strike action will be necessary in view of the layoffs last October and November in the Chrysler plants. The next 10 days should tell the tale.

An interesting aspect of the Chrysler stewards' and committeemen's rally was Walter Reuther's very sharp criticism of the Chrysler contract and his pledge that the obnoxious provisions would be eliminated next fall when the contract is subject to reopening and renegotiation.

# Two Billion More — to Squeeze Out Small Farmers and Keep Prices Up

Contrary to what is probably the natural belief of the man in the street, the huge surpluses of farm products now piling up, and threatening to pile up, in the United States are no boon, but a danger to the country's well-being—under the present system.

It is not, however, the man in the street who is crazy.

The terrible consequences of surplus food, cotton, etc., which now "menace" us (and which will, despite all, never reach the millions of people both at home and abroad who need a bit of these necessities to make up bare subsistence) led last week to the introduction of a Congressional bill to provide an additional \$2 billion for price support to 1950 farm crops, since the previous authorization of \$4.75 billion will soon be exhausted. Under present arrangements, this means sending more billions of dollars down a path which has already led to dangerous economic consequences.

The present price-support program provides for maintaining farm prices at an artificially high level (parity price, in most cases equal to the 1909-1914 period). This is done through government non-recourse loans which assure to the grower the difference between this and what he would otherwise get. The taxpayer pays for this, and then also pays the higher consumer prices for food and clothing which result.

### SMALL FARMERS HIT

Without some government program to prop up the agricultural section of the economy, however, present-day relative farm prosperity could disappear and a critical breakdown could be produced. As in the days of the New Deal Triple-A program for plowing-under cotton and pigs, there is hardly a more spectacular demonstration of the fundamental non-sensibility of the profit system, which makes farm surpluses a boggy rather than a benefit in an economy which produces for profit rather than for use.

The specific problems now facing government agricultural policy as a result of the price-support plan, as reflected in current heart-searchings, are as follows:

"Under the present program . . . the tendency of many farmers is to produce for the loan rather than for the disposal of their products in the regular commercial manner. . . .

"In addition, the program is not proving beneficial to a large group of farmers, particularly the small producer, who has had to cut his acreage in order to qualify for ben-

efits. While the large producer also has had to curtail, he has had a much higher base from which to cut his production, and still is able to operate on a large scale. With an assured price for his products, his profits usually have continued at a satisfactory level. In fact, it is that group which is producing mostly for the loan.

"The present agricultural policy is believed also to be gradually eliminating the small farmer. Because of acreage restrictions, he in many instances is unable to produce enough to operate profitably. Consequently, thousands of small farmers are quitting each year and letting the big farmer, with his highly mechanized operation, take over." (J. H. Carmical, in the N. Y. Times, Jan. 15.)

### PERILS OF PLENTY

It is clear also that one of the aims is to keep down production. (This at a time when the official outcry against wage raises stresses that workers can raise their income only in proportion to the total production achieved by the country—in industry.) A part of the government's headache would be solved if a god-sent drought or cloud of locusts were to ravage crops in 1950. (But the Department of Agriculture still educates farmers on insect control.)

## ILLINOIS LABOR NOTES

### Dems Cold-Shoulder Chicago Labor; Rent-Hike Scandal Faces Inquiry

By P. KAREN

CHICAGO, Jan. 16—The incident related in last week's LABOR ACTION about the treatment given to New York labor leaders by Mayor O'Dwyer has its parallel in Chicago where the Illinois CIO-PAC was completely rebuffed by the Democratic Party machine. The CIO had timidly suggested several candidates for the state legislature and was met with a rousing NO! Gratitude is not in season these days.

Paul Douglas, ADA's shining light in the Senate, has just added another to his collection of wrong positions. First it was on civil rights and segregation; then came the introduction of a "catastrophe" insurance bill (which isn't a big doctor bill a catastrophe for workers?) instead of the Murray-Wagner-Dingell health bill. The latest to date is the report coming out of the Senate Banking Committee on the investigation of "labor monopolies," where the press reported that the vote was 10 to 0. The old saying applies: "Save me from my friends; I can take care of my enemies."

### HOUSING SCANDAL

The housing situation in Chicago is as bad as anywhere else. However, the tenants and public representa-

tives of the Chicago Rental Board have called for an investigation of the wholesale award of rent increases by the local board.

The racket system of splitting up apartments and making individual furnished rentals is a scandal. Money-mad landlords are making every use of this idea, charging workers \$25 a week for two and a half rooms (which are anything but rooms) without ventilation, cooking facilities, etc. This has long been the practice in the Negro districts, but for the last two years it has been extended to all neighborhoods.

After a two-week campaign by the boss papers in Chicago against people on relief, the expected relief slash came. The CIO protested; but as yet there has been no call for an action conference; so this drive against the people that need aid the most may go off with no fight. The comparison between the amount of relief spent, and the amount of money made by the politicians on recent land grabs is enough to top off this item.

### Anti-Murray Rumor

Worst thing anybody's said recently about Philip Murray appeared in the New Leader's gossip column for January 14. According to this social-democratic grapevine, "NMU's Joe Curran is understood to be Phil Murray's idea of a successor to the CIO president. Walter Reuther is out; too much opposition, particularly from Textile Workers' president Emil Rieve."

Joe Curran is the gent who has been recently trying to run the NMU into his private concentration camp with the help of goons and cops.

### DuPont Secret

A Federal Trade Commission report on the monopolistic structure of the DuPont empire, prepared months ago, has been kept under cover by the FTC. The Cellular committee of the House, investigating monopoly, is reported to be preparing to blast it into the open with a subpoena.

Those who have seen the buried report say it is a damaging indictment of the way in which the chemical monopoly has operated to strangle competition.

### MacArthur Formula

One of the most notorious labor-busters in the country has offered General MacArthur a job as member of its board of directors and a \$100,000 a year "executive post." The company is Remington Rand, whose head, James H. Rand, is the originator of the infamous "Mohawk Valley Formula" for strikebreaking.

A few days after the bid to MacArthur was disclosed, it was announced that Remington Rand was going to open a plant in Japan.

## The Militarization of America—V

# U. S. POLICY ARMS REACTION THROUGHOUT LATIN AMERICA

In our relations with Central and South America there is a strong military influence. As early as May 19, 1926, Congress authorized military missions to all countries in the Western hemisphere. On June 4, 1938, Congress agreed also to authorize the navy to help train Latin American forces.

Since then the army and navy have been operating on an important scale in Latin America. In early 1946 there were 17 military missions in 13 countries and in the year 1946-47 \$408,390 was spent on American military and naval missions to Latin American governments for the training of troops. In the year 1947-48 the sum for these missions has increased to \$1,240,000.

The purpose of the increased use of military missions, according to army spokesmen before the House Appropriations sub-committee is to encourage "training in our methods and utilization of our equipment by Latin American armies."

In line with this, the army and navy began a program of pressure to get the United States to "transfer a considerable quantity of equipment to Canada and the Latin American nations." They were successful in getting President Truman on May 26, 1947, to ask Congress to make "arms and military equipment...available to the other American states."

Despite army and navy pressure, civilian elements in the State Department led by Spruille Braden continued to oppose the Latin American arms program on the ground that it would not strengthen their defenses but would strengthen the non-democratic elements in the hemisphere at the expense of the democratic elements.

Dean Acheson, then undersecretary of State, in a letter to the War and Navy Departments on March 19, 1947, said that encouraging expenditures for armaments would weaken their economies and therefore their political stability." (Human Events Supplement, April 1947.)

General Marshall "rejected the advice of his State Department Latin

### Eddy the Laboring Man

Horatio Alger lives and breathes. Writes the Toronto Star in an editorial:

"The life of the late Edward R. Stettinius reads like an Alger success story although he was handicapped by having a rich father. . . . Edward lived to outgrow his handicaps. He worked for a short time as a common laborer for General Motors at 44 cents an hour. In three years he became assistant to Vice-President Pratt. Four years later he was assistant to President Sloan. . . ."

The Star does not give the year in which Edward saved the boss's daughter from being trampled by a runaway horse.

American advisers and fell in alongside his old army associates." (New Republic, June 9, 1947.)

### "WHY MORE GUNS?"

President Truman's message and General Marshall's support were hailed by those nations "where the army had long played a major role in politics. One of the first to endorse the plan was Argentina's Peron government." (Ibid.)

Many civilian elements, however, regarded "the arms program with genuine distress. 'Why send us more guns which we do not want when we need hospitals and machinery?' they ask." (Washington Daily News, August 19, 1947.)

The Washington Post editorially opposed the measure, saying: "We conclude that the whole thing is dangerous from beginning to end, and we should rue the day that we inaugurated this arms traffic, set up our military missions as the dominant element in our representation to Latin American countries, and elevated the status of Latin American military staffs as the dominant element in those countries." (Washington Post, June 28, 1947.)

Although the arms standardization bill did not pass, lend-lease military equipment was sent to South American nations as late as 1947 and war surplus was made available at a fraction of the original cost of the material.

In addition to this, the State Department sanctioned munitions sales by U. S. firms to Central and South America totalling \$54,064,378.63. This was only slightly less than the sum of \$55,670,593.23 paid by Europe to U. S. munitions firms.

### MAKING THE ROLL CALL

To "Colombia, where a liberal revolt April 9 in Bogota almost wrecked the Pan American Conference. . . \$1,707,524.57 in arms, ammunition, vessels, military aircraft, chemicals and explosives" were sent.

"Costa Rica, where rebels have overthrown the established government and sent its leaders fleeing, \$298,735.33 in arms and ammunition" was sent.

"Nicaragua, whose troops recently entered strife-torn Costa Rica," received \$554,870.77 in arms." (Albany Knickerbocker News, April 22, 1948.)

In Nicaragua in 1929 the U. S. army forced the government to establish a National Guard which would function both as an army and was a domestic police force. Given complete control over all armaments, ships, prisons, forts, etc., the guard was extremely powerful. General Anastasio Somoza, who became chief of the guard in January, 1933, has, except for an interval of six weeks, ruled Nicaragua ever since.

The Dominican Republic, which was fighting with Venezuela and Guatemala, "brought in 15 primary trainers from the United States to train army pilots" and "he (President Trujillo) is dickering for acquisition of American P-51 fighters." Trujillo, a dictator who has ruled his country for 18

This is one of a series of articles on the militarization of American government and life, based on the findings of a committee of nationally known liberals.

This committee, organized as the National Council Against Conscription, in February of last year published the booklet "New Evidence of the Militarization of America." (A previous booklet, entitled "The Militarization of America," had been published in January 1948.) All the information and quotations used in the present series of articles comes from the first-named booklet.

The NCAC publications are sponsored by a group including: Pearl Buck, Louis Bromfield, Albert Einstein, Victor Reuther, President James G. Patton of the National Farmers Union, Prof. F. A. Sorokin of Harvard, former Secretary of Interior Ray Lyman Wilbur, President W. S. Townsend of the CIO Transport Service Employees, President C. S. Johnson of Fisk University, President W. J. Miller, S.J., of the University of Detroit, and many other prominent individuals.

years, "has imported Americans to handle his stepped-up air program." (Washington Evening Star, June 10, 1948.)

Ecuador, where a Col. Mancheco took control of the government and established a dictatorship in August, 1947, had received through 1946 a total of \$7,534,175 in U. S. armaments under the lend-lease program.

In Paraguay in October, 1948, the government suppressed a revolt which centered in the military academy. Paraguay had received \$101,621.17 in American armaments during 1947.

Armed soldiers under the command of high army officers attacked the police headquarters in an effort to overthrow the government in Paraguay. Other army units were in readiness to participate if the overthrow seemed obvious. However, quick presidential action in using a few loyal regiments ended the revolt. A Paraguay dispatch summarized the situation by saying: "After having helped save his own regime by quick action on October 25, President Juan N. Gonzalez is now attempting to placate and control all factions of the army and to achieve a united front in his own party." (N. Y. Times, Dec. 2, 1948.)

In Peru the army deposed the president after a three-day revolt and the leader of the revolt, General Odría, became president.

### RESULTS OF MILITARISM

A Venezuelan political crisis in which the cabinet resigned was reported in the November 24, 1948, New York Times. The account stated that "President Gallegos will announce tomorrow a new cabinet dominated by men acceptable to the moderate wing of the nation's armed force."

The Times also stated that "the military representatives were reported to have been demanding changes in the government and particularly the inclusion of more military men in the cabinet and other government posts." Even though the president acquiesced in these changes, "the army staged a coup and threw President Gallegos out of office." (November 28, 1948.)

In Chile, an attempted coup led by three high army and four high air force officers failed to overthrow the government, largely because some army elements remained loyal to the government. Santiago newspapers said editorially that "foreign money and influence" had played its part in the uprising though they did not mention the nationality. Later Chile officials implicated military elements in Argentina.

The United States had previously arrived at an agreement with Argentina, where for a four-year period a U. S. army mission would advise that country's armed forces. Similar military agreements have been reached with thirteen other American republics and the U. S. is currently negotiating additional pacts with other Western hemisphere countries. Prior to the surprise disbanding of Costa Rica's small army, the U. S. army maintained a military mission there to train Costa Rica's "force of 500 officers and men."

The United States has an air base in Brazil as well as the right to use the Galapagos Islands and other bases in South America. There are American bases also in Jamaica, Antigua, St. Lucia, British Guiana, St. Thomas, Bermuda and Trinidad.

### "KARL MARX"

by Franz MEHRING

The standard biographical work on the founder of scientific socialism

Only five copies are available—new, handsomely bound, British edition. Send payment with order —\$3.00—first come, first served.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

J. H. (Seattle)

# Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor . . .

### IUE's Pension

To the Editor:

Since the appearance in LABOR ACTION of January 9 of an article on the recent pension-plan agreement between the Philco Radio Corporation and Local 101 of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers (CIO) some details of the plan have been made available. Those interested should consult the IUE-CIO News dated January 9 for full coverage.

In my LABOR ACTION article I stated that "it appears that the plan is similar to the one negotiated between the Ford Company and the United Automobile Workers (CIO)." Both plans are non-contributory and provide for a maximum pension of \$100 a month, including federal social security benefits, to employees retiring at 65 with 25 years of service. In addition the IUE agreement provides for payment of death benefits to the worker's survivors under all contingencies and for severance pay.

This latter feature provides the "younger members with a 'deferred' wage increase if they do not work to retirement." This rather complicated combination of payments is facilitated by dividing the company's payments in two parts, one of which is deposited directly into the pension fund and the other is credited to each individual worker. The worker's individual credit reverts to the pension pool upon retirement. Some matters such as the exact proportioning of the company's payments are still to be worked out.

Thus while in cash equivalents the Philco and Ford plans are almost equal, the Philco type is more nearly attuned to the present and future needs of all the workers. Another advantage of the IUE agreement is that it permits the Philco Corporation to benefit from increased federal social security only in proportion to the

company's increase in social-security tax payment; that is, Philco will not reap, as Ford does, the benefits of increased payment into the federal social security from the general funds of the federal government itself.

Frank HARPER

Philadelphia, January 13.

### Jim Crow on Screen

To the Editor:

With the issuance of The Home of the Brave, the first film to come out of Hollywood that dealt with the problem of discrimination against Negroes with some degree of fairness and frankness, Hollywood's mouthpieces heralded that a new era was born. Hollywood has turned over a new leaf, they said. Hollywood has seen the folly of its ways. From now on the Negro was going to get a fair break from the motion picture industry. To prove it, every major picture company was either in the process of releasing a picture handling the same subject or was scheduling one for production.

But this was a lie and the tragedy is that many people have been taken in by this lie. It's true that there are few people who are completely satisfied with the efforts of Hollywood so far; neither Home of the Brave, nor Lost Boundaries, nor Pinky, nor Intruder in the Dust has been free from some very noticeable defects in their attempts to deal with the problem of Jim Crow; but most of those who are not bigoted and warped have felt that "this is at least a beginning," that "Rome wasn't built in a day," and that given time Hollywood would do better in its efforts along this line.

In the past LABOR ACTION has pointed out the inadequacies of these pictures while at the same time greeting the fact that such films were finally being made. But I am sure that the editors and writers for LABOR

ACTION have no illusions about the movie moguls' turning over a new leaf, although we were certain that many who are still naive will complain that "nothing will ever satisfy those radicals."

But those who are not blind cannot long be naive. Currently there is a cartoon, appearing in the first- and second-run houses, entitled "Little Eight Ball." This "Cartune" portrays a one-toothed Negro infant who is visited by a "spook" his own age and remains unafraid.

In a phony adult vocabulary, spoken in a phony drawl, "Little Eight Ball" tells the spook that nothing the spook can do will scare him; whereupon the spook drags him to a haunted house where he is presented as a non-believer to the father of the little spook. The father then calls all his gang out of the woodwork and they begin to give the Negro child a treatment guaranteed to scare Dracula. At first he retains all his courage but he is gradually worn down until he is sent screaming from the haunted house back to his own home and into his own bed—where, stuttering, he turns to the audience, college vocabulary gone, drawl even more exaggerated, shaking and screaming, to proclaim that he is still unafraid.

This is all there is, no humor except to the warped, not even any of the stock attempts at straight comedy, a story simply told; no matter what anyone says, no matter how much polish any Negro may attain, underneath it all he is still the same superstitious, ignorant, inferior, comical animal. Hail the new era!

And this cartoon is no isolated instance, for many are the pictures, mostly Grade B, that have been issued since The Home of the Brave appeared that continue to show Negroes as objects of derision.

Hollywood, one of the most important mediums of propaganda of the capitalist class, has not embarked on

### LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Sq., Long Island City 1, N. Y. specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc. and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

### Subscribers — Attention!

Check your NAME — ADDRESS — CITY — ZONE — STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

14-4

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW



## Titoism and Independent Socialism—VII THE DEFENSE OF YUGOSLAVIA

By HAL DRAPER

VII

We have thus far discussed the character of the Tito regime and the attitude of Independent Socialists toward it: no political support of it, no political alliance with it, no whitewashing of it.

The importance of being clear on this much is underlined by the way in which a pre-world war III state of mind is being created in this country around the Tito-Stalin fight, as we have mentioned. Poor, little, brave Yugoslavia beset by the Russian bear—"we" (that is, American imperialism) must come to its defense against Moscow!

It is certainly true that Yugoslavia is poor, little, and brave; but the Belgium attacked by Germany in 1914 was also little and brave, as was the Finland attacked by Russia in 1939. Two imperialist world wars have broken out in our century presumably around the pretext of defending one little country or another against an aggressor. In all of these cases there was an aggression, militarily speaking, but anti-war fighters knew that these incidents merely triggered off the inter-imperialist rivalry that was building up toward the outbreak of hostilities. The just fight of the small country was swallowed up in the world holocaust.

But with this out of the way, at least as far as this series of articles is concerned, it is next important to reject an equally erroneous and opposite view, much less common but still to be met. This is the view that, since Moscow is Stalinist and Tito is Stalinist, and there is no social difference between them, one must take a plague-on-both-your-houses approach—an attitude of neutrality in the struggle of Yugoslavia as against Russian domination.

### TITO AND CHIANG KAI-SHEK

This view will not bear a moment's Marxist examination. Let us approach it in three ways.

(1) First of all, the elementary Marxist idea has to be kept clear that our political attitude toward a given government or regime does not automatically determine our attitude toward a given war in which this regime is involved. The social identity of Stalinism in Belgrade and in Moscow determines many things about our politics, but it does not by itself determine the socialist attitude in case of national conflict.

For example, the Spanish loyalist government and the Franco insurrection (would-be government) were both bourgeois as far as their social nature went, even though one represented bourgeois democracy and the other fascism. Still, the Marxists gave military and material support (not political support) to the former and fought the latter.

But since the important political difference did exist in the situation, it is more instructive to remember that the Marxists also gave similar support to the war waged by Chiang Kai-shek against Japan in the pre-World War II conflict which raged over control of China. In this case, if there was any social difference in the regime, both essentially bourgeois, it was not to the advantage of the Chinese warlord, whose social

basis had an even greater admixture of backward feudalistic elements than the Japanese.

Chiang was a dictator, a "bloody butcher" in the eyes of every revolutionary socialist in the world, the hangman of the Chinese proletariat, no democrat in any sense, etc. But, as against the attempt of Japanese imperialism to impose its own foreign yoke upon the Chinese people, we supported even his military struggle.

### EVEN UNDER A TYRANT

Marxists support all legitimate struggles of peoples for national independence from all imperialism, including those peoples who are unfortunate enough to be themselves ruled by native tyrants and dictators. This doubling of their burden does not exclude them from the right to their national freedom. Rather it has been true often enough that, through such a just fight for independence, even though under a tyrant, the people have been able to mobilize their strength not only to defeat the would-be foreign oppressor but also to sharpen the fight for social freedom at home.

In the pre-war case of Chiang Kai-shek China versus Japan, there was always a real danger of possible compromise between the contestants over the backs of the Chinese people. To be sure, this element is not absent in the case of Tito (or rather, more broadly, of the Titoist bureaucracy), but—since Russia is not Japan and can afford far less to admit a compromise on its own part—Tito knows very well that today any weakening on his part toward compromise may mean his own head.

There was another element in the Sino-Japanese case which concerns us: the danger of the subordination of the Chinese struggle against Japan to another imperialism, like that of the U. S. (This, of course, is what actually took place once the Second World War engulfed the East.) This possibility is likewise far from absent in the Tito struggle today.

But today the Titoists are fighting for their country's independence against Russian conquest. For their own national-Stalinist interest, they resist in action and in deed, on all levels. Of this there can be no doubt. And this fight, which they head for their own reasons, is also the fight of the entire Yugoslav people for national liberation.

In this fight, national resistance against satellization by Moscow, the fact that Tito is a totalitarian dictator has the same significance as the other fact that Chiang was a butcher. The social identity of the Moscow and Belgrade regimes no more excludes support of a national war for freedom than does the social identity between (say) a colonial country's bourgeois leadership and its imperialist oppressor.

### CONSEQUENCE OF A DEMAND

(2) The example of Chiang and China is close enough to the issue to illuminate the main point we would make; but lest it be urged that it is no guide in dealing with the brand-new phenomena presented by Stalinism (a view we do not share), let us confine ourselves to

the Russian empire today for a second approach to the question.

Consider the task of an independent socialist—anti-Stalinist and anti-capitalist—in the Russian satellites today, in Bulgaria, Rumania, et al. In whatever way that may be possible, he would desire to bring his denunciations of the regime to his fellow workmen. He would denounce it as anti-working class, totalitarian, exploitive, etc., of course, but not the least part of his condemnation would be to hammer away at the most obvious line of attack of all: *These Kolarovs, these Rakosis, etc., they are nothing but Stalin's puppets, they have sold our country to Moscow, they have made us a colony of the Kremlin; even if you support Stalinism, even if you don't agree with the rest of my indictment, must not we demand that our country break with its Russian masters, achieve real national independence?*

And this would be among the most popular of the issues that could drive a wedge between even pro-Stalinist sections of the workers and the puppet regime.

But what if—for good or bad reasons, because of our motives or their own—the satellite bureaucracy does break with Moscow, as we have been demanding? And what if, decisively because of this break and no other reason, Russia sets in motion its machine of intimidation and terror against the country that has taken this step?

In such a case—which is the case in Yugoslavia today—it would be simply politically impossible for our hypothetical socialist to turn around and say, to the very workmen whom he had agitated before: *Yes, our rulers made a break for national independence, as we demanded, but now that our national independence is menaced precisely because of this action, we are neutral in this struggle . . . !*

### THE BASIC THEORY

(3) What the above merely concretizes is, in fact, the basic theoretical reason why the plague-on-both-their-houses view is incorrect from a Marxist standpoint—incorrect with reference to the Yugoslav struggle as against Russian conquest, a struggle which would reach its sharpest expression in case this struggle flares into war, a war for national independence.

We have seen that the Marxist criterion for policy in war is not automatically given by the social nature of the regime. War is simply another means of achieving political ends (or, as the more time-honored formula goes: war is a continuation of politics by other, that is, forcible means). The Marxist's attitude toward a given war is determined by his analysis of the politics from which that war flows, the politics of which that war is a continuation.

If Russia invaded Yugoslavia tomorrow, and Yugoslavia had to defend its national independence, the war on its side would not flow from Tito's totalitarianism (a democratic socialist regime in Yugoslavia would be invaded by Russia with twice as much enthusiasm)—it would flow decisively from the politics of the struggle for national independence.

This is why our hypothetical socialist above would find it impossible to make political sense (both to others and to himself: the problem is at bottom the same) out of a rejection of support. The war flowed from the realization of his own demand. If the demand was a correct one, the consequences must be accepted.

### ON TWO FRONTS

Support of the Yugoslav regime and its deeds as against Russian imperialism by no means affords the necessity of fighting the Titoist dictatorship at home; it by no means implies political reconciliation with Tito-Stalinism. Socialist support for fight for Yugoslav national independence in their own way, without any political reconciliation with the enemy at home.

Naturally, there have always been those self-styled socialists, in all the cases we have mentioned, including Spain and China, who saw only two alternatives: (a) either support the struggle for national independence and therefore give up any political struggle at home; or else (b) maintain "revolutionary intransigence" by supporting neither the home regime nor the real national fight. In no case has the Marxist movement adopted either of these deadly alternatives—and we do not do so in the case of Yugoslavia.

Full concrete support to the struggle against the reactionary foreign imperialism; no political support to the domestic tyrant—a fight on two fronts, toward the democratic socialist revolution which will mean the end of both Tito and Stalin. The latter is also the only sure road toward grounding Yugoslav independence in that which alone can maintain it: the victory of working-class democracy in all of the Balkans, in all of Europe and the world.

# WORLD POLITICS

## A British Socialist Looks at the TUC's Wage Freeze in England

By WILFRED WIGHAM

(In British Socialist Leader, Dec. 17)

LONDON—The document issued on November 23 by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress to the 187 unions affiliated to the Congress and their 8,000,000 members is a determined attempt to shackle demands for wage increases. The first of the seven points demands rigorous restraints upon all increases of wages, salaries and dividends. All the other six points deal with wages.

Point two insists that the existing machinery of voluntary negotiation be preserved; but point three urges unions to frame their policy in conformity with the General Council recommendations, and point five proposes the scrapping of existing machinery in the case of the many unions which have agreements binding wage-rates to cost-of-living indexes (for at least a year, and within a range of six points rise or fall in the official cost-of-living figure, the Interim Index of Retail Prices).

From a socialist angle the General Council statement is the negation of leadership. Instead of fighting for the rise in wages at the expense of profit which socialism demands as a first step and which need not result in higher prices, the General Council has apparently devoted no research to the restraints on dividends which it recommends—and dividends are paid, to former owners, out of nationalized industries as well as by the 80 per cent of industry still privately owned—and has spent all its energies on devising schemes against the interests of the workers it is supposed to represent.

### MILITANT LEADERS OPPOSE POLICY

According to the *Daily Herald* report (Nov. 24) the document was adopted with only two dissentients out of 33. All honor to those two—James Figgins (National Union of Railwaymen) and Edward J. Hill (Boiler-makers)!

In an article in his union's journal, the *Railway Review* (Dec. 2), Figgins points out that the Bridlington Trades Union Congress in September called for reductions in prices and profits; the new General Council policy is exactly the opposite. The rising cost of living is accepted as inevitable and the stabilization of wage rates will mean that real wages will fall. "The new policy is no solution either temporarily or permanently for the present economic difficulties."

Bryn Roberts, general secretary of the National Union of Public Employees, writing in the *NUPE Journal*, calls the policy "dreary, hopeless and nega-

tive." Alfred Tomkins, general secretary of the National Union of Furniture Trade Operatives, writing in the December *NUFTO Record*, says his union will not put into cold storage its claim for 3d. an hour cost-of-living increase.

The General Council document urges the extension of schemes of payment by results and suggests that by relating wages to output in this way, workers may still get higher pay when production increases. Unfortunately there is no guarantee that increased production will be credited to the worker by the employer.

### WAGE FREEZE SETS PATTERN

As suggested by this writer two years ago, the engineers have got the right idea when they demand a rise of 1 pound sterling a week out of profits. Other unions may take this line: and as the meeting of union executives is expected in January, branch resolutions on this issue should be pouring in to all head offices.

Not only unions which have official machinery binding wages to cost-of-living figures but all unions which have or may have wage claims pending are asked in the General Council document to make no claim—or withdraw their claim—to wage increases unless the official cost-of-living index rises six points. (At present the figure is 112; June 1947 being 100.) "Low-paid workers—not defined—are named as a possible exception; but even in the case of these the General Council (all of whose members probably get considerably more than £5 or £4 10s.!) asks for a standstill. This is assuredly a wage freeze, grimly seasonal."

One other aspect of these proposals should be noted and may be illustrated by a speech at the Free World Labor Conference on December 3. Deven Sen, of the Indian National Trades Union Congress (a National Congress organization, not the All-India TUC which remains within the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions), said that Indian industrialists were threatening to close the factories unless the workers agreed to wage cuts, even though prices were shooting up, and added:—

"Acceptance of wage-freezing in Britain will have its repercussions on other governments and employers, who will be encouraged to copy this experiment."

So that the year is ending with Britain giving a reactionary lead to the world in the sphere of industrial relationships as well as in the sphere of colonial workers' rights.

## Not in the Headlines

### Cry, Beloved Country

In South Africa, probably the most racist country in the world today, a recent case underlined conditions in that country. Daniel Gieskens was arraigned for assault on a native and charged with burning and marking him with a branding iron. The judge in Magistrates' Court at Johannesburg denounced the act as the most shocking and brutal assault he had ever known, according to the Cape Times for December 10, and said that if the courts looked lightly on that kind of thing there would be complete anarchy in this country.

Whereupon Gieskens was sentenced to—five months! What is unusual about this, however, is the fact that this is the first, or one of the few, cases in which ANY JAIL SENTENCE AT ALL has been given for assault on a native, the alternative of a fine being the custom. Even so, the sentence may still be reduced by the Appellate Court.

### The Economy Boys

"If every tax legally owed the government were collected, I believe the budget could be balanced without any tax increases."

This statement was made at the end of December by a leading member of the House Ways and Means Committee, Forand of Rhode Island.

Forand was referring to the wealthy men and corporations who do most of this tax-dodging, with the aid of skilled lawyers and complacent Congressmen, who—Forand pointed out—in the name of "economy," have "cut down the staff of special agents the Treasury employed to catch tax evaders—although these agents were putting into the Treasury \$20 for each \$100 spent in collecting the money owed the government."

### DISCUSSION: A REJOINDER ON—

# Socialist Policy and German Armament

By EUGENE KELLER

The objections raised by Comrades Green and Fenwick in the last two issues of LABOR ACTION to my discussion article on Western Germany's rearmament (December 26, 1949) appear to me, with one major exception, irrelevant to the subject discussed. Both represent my discussion of American politico-military policy in Europe as though it had been thought up by me.

For example, both quote the following passage from the article: "The new German army . . . 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." Within the context of the article this passage was meant to pose the difficulties that face the Americans in furthering German rearmaments. That is, on the one hand they would like to "control" it, and on the other, their policy gives rise to unpredictable and uncontrollable tendencies, such as most likely will arise

in any army which is not merely a foreign legion.

Nor have I anywhere implied, as Fenwick states, that I am ruling out the defeat of Stalinism by other than military means; rather the implication, as I indicated in the article, holds true for present American policy.

Nor am I "in favor of" German rearmament. In making the point that Germany's right to rearm must be recognized, I made it—the context is clear on this too—against those who, as an alternative to German rearmament, desire the continued occupation of Germany.

Susan Green's and Fenwick's "alternative" is the call for and creation of a Western European Union. However, this idea represents a basic political orientation; one must seek to relate individual political questions to it; it furnishes the general framework of our politics in Europe, but within it we are still compelled to seek such answers to questions as

will give concrete shape to the idea. Thus, neither Green nor Fenwick has dealt with the issue.

### MILITIA SYSTEM FEASIBLE

The one relevant objection raised by them was against my advocacy of a militia in Western Germany, controlled by trade unions and other democratic organizations. Both Green and Fenwick hold that nowadays a militia no longer corresponds to military realities. Having thus disposed of what I had held to be socialist policy on German rearmament, they proceed to ignore the issue and propose an Independent Western Europe as the "alternative."

Now, the argument that the vast complexity of modern military organization rules out its democratization—and that is what the idea of a militia implies—is the fit companion to the argument that modern technology inevitably tends toward the elimination of democracy, making the "experts" indispensable. The point simply is that Fenwick and Green have not proved their argument at all.

It is the very complexity of industry, the accompanying division of labor and the relatively high skill of the average member of modern society which make a militia feasible. For example, the training of aircraft mechanics in the U. S. army took but a few months, because each mechanic was assigned to only a few repair operations. Whatever general objections to the modern division of labor one might have, it remains one of the factors which make a militia feasible.

In other respects, a highly industrialized country, like Germany, with its modern facilities broadly distributed, allows a militia to have the requisite local or regional control which is one of the constituents of its democratic character. As indicated in my article, there are only a few military activities which will need the attendance of permanent staffs which are easily placed under popular control (research, certain educational facilities, etc.). This subject deserves a thorough treatment which cannot be given here; anyway, the burden of proof that a militia is outmoded rests on Comrades Fenwick and Green.

### COUNTER TO EAST

Fenwick indicates the belief that it is really premature to speak of rearming Germany, that there are issues of greater priority, etc. Obviously, my discussion of German rearmament dealt with only one facet of America's policy in Germany. My use of language may at times have been overemphatic but I certainly did not suggest that the issue takes precedence over other issues; it is, however, intimately related to them and must be met as, say, the issue of dismantling is met (although it is somewhat more complex than that).

Certainly, I do not think it was premature to discuss it and to formulate some sort of political program to meet it. There have again been reports in recent days (N. Y. Times, January 13, 14, 15) of plans for re-establishing a German army, and such plans are probably not

drawn up without the assistance of American officers.

America hopes to use a German army for its own purposes; the German bourgeoisie, on the other hand, will seek to re-create it as a base of social control as well as, eventually, to create power relationships favorable to itself. Therein lies one of the dilemmas of American foreign policy; there are also implied new aspects of the national question.

For the present purpose, it suffices to point to the official reason given for a new Germany, i.e., the threat posed by the "police" troops organized by the East German government. To me it is obvious that a militia could counter this threat with as much efficiency as a re-established army (and certainly with vastly greater political effect) and that from this assumption can proceed a socialist military policy in Germany.

### Gobbledygook Defined

How to speak like an Important Statesman in one easy lesson has been explained by the CCF News of Canada. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation is Canada's counterpart of the British Labor Party. In the October 27 News, a laudatory article on British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin told its readers what a Great Man he is:

"He is not a tidy or logical speaker. He tangles himself up in sentences that often have no true beginning or middle or end. Often he leaves some of the thoughts he utters hanging in midair. He is profuse and ungrammatical. He is capable of uttering sentences like 'What we have to do is not to create a situation.'"

"But he utters them with a slow force that seems to clothe them momentarily in profound meaning, and as the majestic and untidy river of his speech flows on, it sometimes carries his audience beyond the concrete meaning of his words into a country of infinite horizons."

Evidently: what his audience has to do is not to get drowned in the untidy river.

## NEW YORK 'SUN' SETS

### TAKES LAST SWIPE AT LABOR, FIRES STAFF WITHOUT NOTICE

NEW YORK—A newspaper made news here when the city's second oldest paper, the Sun, announced on January 4 that it was giving up the ghost. But the Sun, rock-ribbed Republican bible of the suburbanites, could not resist the opportunity of linking its own demise with a last swipe at labor in its very death throes.

In the well-publicized statement made by its president, Thomas W. Dewart, a good share of the blame for the event (which is not deeply lamented by the great majority of New Yorkers) was hurled at labor: "Despite continued warnings of the economic consequences, various unions have forced and are continuing to force, higher wages, until, in the newspaper business as a whole these have risen beyond reason," said the lame-duck publisher.

The CIO Newspaper Guild replied sharply. It pointed out, first that the Sun was the only New York metropolitan paper whose editorial and commercial employees were not cov-

ered by a Guild contract. Secondly, the Sun had not given a wage increase in 1949 in any department and had not been faced with any increase in 1950.

President Harvey Call of the Sun's independent union, the Sun Editorial Employees Association, said that his organization's contracts and those of other unions with the Sun had not been out of line with city-wide wage scales. He added that the management had never made any plea along the lines of economy.

It is now also revealed that the Sun's editorial department employees learned their jobs were gone when they read a notice posted on the bulletin board on January 4—notifying them that "all positions are terminated" that very same day, the same day the announcement appeared in the paper. With no more advance notice than that!

Dewart, of course, made no mention of the main reason for his paper's fate: too many people just didn't want to read the darned sheet!

## 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. 4

January 23, 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, 1874.

Read  
LABOR ACTION  
and THE NEW  
INTERNATIONAL

### NOT DUE TO SIN

Donahue devoted the last part of his speech to reminiscences about his own role in the labor movement. He described his expulsion from the International Longshoremen's Union

Writings and Speeches of  
**Eugene V. Debs**  
Introduction by  
Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr.  
(486 pp.)  
Reduced from \$4.00 to.....\$2.25  
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y.



# Purge in Plants: How Can Labor Stop It?

# New Bomb Race - -

(Continued from page 1)

sion of such contractual provisions, but felt that in this case the local had no alternative but to accept it or go out on strike. We are glad to correct an error here.

It is precisely because the UAW recognizes the danger of such clauses, and because your letter lays such stress on this danger that we feel it necessary to stress it over and over again.

Let us recall that when the local originally rejected the unilateral demand of the company, it issued a statement giving reasons for its action. That statement, so far as we understand it, was not confined to the "unilateral" nature of the company's demand. It was a general denunciation of the very idea of the loyalty witchhunt.

In other words, the membership understood that, involved in the contract clause proposed by the company, was the whole question of civil rights and the dangers to the democratic rights of the union and its individual members in a clause that makes possible the victimization of workers for whatever political (or even trade-union) views they might hold.

And your letter, referring to the clause finally incorporated into the contract, says that "it would have been infinitely better to have no such language in the contract. . . ." With this sentiment, we agree completely. To make clear what these "security" clauses signify as a threat to democratic liberties, it is necessary to review briefly the whole chain of events twining about Local 669 and linking it to the grave threats to democratic liberties.

## This Is How It Works

In the fall of 1947 President Truman issued Executive Order No. 9835. The procedure under that order has been and is the following: The president issues a directive to his attorney general to draw up a list of organizations which in his opinion are subversive. This list is made public and the country at large is "put on guard" against the organizations listed. Any individual who belongs to one of them, reads its press, or associates with its members in any way is also considered to be "subversive."

This is accompanied by a series of loyalty oaths introduced in one after another government administration, national, state and local. The FBI goes into action with methods that are strictly illegal and mark an invasion of the rights of individuals which are presumably protected by the Constitution of the United States.

Organizations listed by the attorney general are not advised beforehand that they will be listed. No evidence is presented against them. They have no opportunity to defend themselves. After they are listed, they may, in a closed "hearing," present evidence why they should not have been listed. In true Stalinist style, they are guilty until they prove themselves innocent. Procedures not embodied in any act of Congress are ingeniously devised to make any appeal to the courts awkward and difficult. The administration merely expresses an "opinion," while hiding behind governmental immunity and privilege.

The FBI gathers evidence in a thousand and one ways, legally and illegally, much of it spurious, and all of it based on the conception that if anyone does not bow to the sacredness of capitalist enterprise, he is automatically outside the pale of society.

The victims have no way of challenging the "evidence" presented against them, for naturally everything the FBI does—its methods, agents and informers—must remain secret in true political-police style.

The president's directives are immediately picked up by the military brass and made effective instruments on the industrial front, beginning with the Stalinists, but as the UAW knows so well, quickly trained against socialists and union militants in general. Such individuals are advised that they are "poor security risks" and are fired or shunted off their jobs. No evidence is presented to them; they have no way of questioning their accusers, or meeting them face to face.

Now let us get back to Local 669 and its contract clause on "security risks." You contend that the clause finally adopted protects the membership against violation of its democratic rights because it provides that disputed cases arising under the company's "security" agreements with the government" will be subject to grievance procedure up to and including arbitration. But the violation of democratic rights is inseparable from the government's "security" regulations themselves. All the clause can accomplish, at best, is to make it a little more difficult for the company to act even more high-handedly than the "security" regulations demand.

The dangers in the original clause are present in the final clause. You may have been compelled to sign, but let us recognize the continuing dangers. That is why it would have been "infinitely" better to have no clause at all. The company concession was a fairly minor modification of its demand for "security." The union concession was far greater. And that is what the LABOR ACTION article had in mind when it said that Local 669 "reversed" itself in accepting the "modified clause."

## We Have to Stop It!

It is true that the government is the prime mover in pressing for such security clauses and that the problem and danger would exist whether the clause was in the contract or not. And it is just because the government with its tremendous power is the prime mover, so difficult to check in any local situation, that militants must be put on guard and warned of just what is happening in this country.

Under government regulations, the only question to be taken up or arbitrated is this: Is the accused worker, or is he not, a member of any organization on the attorney general's list or "associated with it in any manner" or with any individual who, in turn is "associated" with it?

You may, it is true, attempt to prove that the particular individual, though associated with the organization, is nevertheless not a "security risk" but such a consideration is unfortunately irrelevant in these star-chamber processes.

The government hides behind the "confidential" character of the evidence presumably at its disposal in any case. What the evidence is, if there is any at all, must be accepted on faith. And in this period of spy-hunt hysteria, we have every right to fear that arbitration boards will accept at face value weird processes by which the government classifies workers as "subversive." In fact, experience has already borne out this fact.

You state in your letter that you "personally would not hesitate one moment to eliminate anyone who is a real threat to our national security." You presumably refer to spies, saboteurs, and espionage agents of foreign powers. Naturally no one in the labor movement, we least of all, is interested in protecting the "rights" of such elements. Espionage and counter-espionage is a game we gladly leave to those whose natural inclinations or greed impel them to it.

But after all, that is not the question here at all. The statute book bulges with laws which give the government ample power to deal with any individuals or groups committing any kind of crime. The so-called security regulations are not laws. They are necessary because the government wishes to act against those who have not committed any crime and against whom it has no evidence to justify legal action of any kind.

You express yourself clearly in favor of the fullest democratic rights and explain that you will oppose penalizing any worker merely for his political opinions even if he is a Communist. That is the crux of the whole question: the "security regulations" aim simply and essentially at political opinions. Security risk is translated into "subversive." Subversive is interpreted to include anyone who sharply criticizes official government policies, or who opposes the exploitation of workers by capitalists, and, by easy extension, will include any active aggressive, militant unionist who speaks up vigorously and courageously.

Somebody has got to put a stop to this kind of thing before the union movement is tied up in knots.

But what to do? We, militant unionists who do understand the vicious character of the security regulations, how shall we act in a labor movement which in its majority is not alive and alerted to the menace of encroaching authoritarianism?

First, second, and third: we must say what is; we must not underestimate the threat itself; we must not delude ourselves into thinking that we have

licked it by a lawyer's trick in contracts; we must arouse the whole labor movement, insist that it take a stand against the administration's "democracy by classification," demand that it issue pamphlets, radio broadcasts, mass meetings to tell the world that we of the whole labor movement intend to preserve our democratic rights to the full and will resist all attempts to chip them away.

You say that you cannot agree that the fight against the security regulations can be made on the labor-management front, since such a fight might very well make for a national series of strikes on this issue alone. We are not irresponsible adventurers or strike-mongers like the Stalinists who can turn it on or off depending on the political requirements of the Kremlin bureaucracy. We did not and do not, for example, suggest that Local 669 should strike if its members and officials feel it unwise to do so or are convinced that such a strike cannot be victorious. Nor do we call for a big "national series of strikes on this issue alone."

But once we aim to defend our union membership and its democratic rights, can we pledge in advance not to strike? If the employers and the government get such a guarantee, then victimization of union militants is automatically speeded up. Such was the lesson of the no-strike pledge during the last war.

## A Job for the Whole-Labor Movement

On the other hand, if a united labor movement were to take a solid stand in refusing to submit to the witchhunt, such a show of force alone would be sufficient to make the government backtrack.

But Local 669 is just one small local in the UAW. And you brothers, who, we are sure, write in full sincerity when you say that you intend to make a determined fight on the "broadness" and "loose application" of the security regulations, are officers in only one region of the UAW. But what are the leaders of the American labor movement doing to combat this abomination?

In a way, this whole business can be traced back to the "non-Communist" affidavits of the Taft-Hartley Law. That law should have been met by a frontal attack of the whole labor movement, AFL, CIO and independent. When the AFL surrendered the fight against the "yellow dog" affidavits without a struggle, it became clear that no such struggle would be waged.

Under those circumstances we understand that signing the affidavits was tactically necessary, without yielding in the slightest on the principle involved. The labor movement, even its most conservative section, has never ceased to demand repeal of the law itself. But had it acted unitedly, we are certain that a struggle would have so crippled the Taft-Hartley Law as to make it totally ineffective.

The present situation is not very different. If the entire labor movement were unified in a struggle against the attorney general's "yellow dog" listing, or even if the CIO alone were vigilantly opposed to it, then another kind of fight could be waged against it, and most certainly it would never have invaded the plants and become a direct union issue.

The pity is that so much of the CIO leadership endorses the attorney general's action in the mistaken belief that it is okay because it is directed against the Stalinists. As an independent Socialist organization, what we can and must do is attempt to turn the tide the other way.

Every concession granted by the labor movement weakens its general position and increases the reactionary threats against it. The failure to fight the Taft-Hartley affidavits helped lay the groundwork for the current witchhunt against union militants and the insulting demand by companies for the right to victimize the best elements of the labor movement and thus weaken the unions. Make no mistake about it: the main interest of the employers is to weaken the union movement and that can be proved easily enough.

But there is one difference between the two cases that strikes the eye. Regardless of one's opinion of the tactics pursued by the labor movement in the fight on Taft-Hartleyism, one thing was and is clear: THE WHOLE LABOR MOVEMENT OPPOSES THE TAIT-HARTLEY LAW and carries on a year-round fight against it, in one way or another, rousing union members, taking the case to the public.

But that is not the case with the "security regulations." So that the immediate question before the labor movement is not primarily how to fight the witchhunt drive (although that is one problem) but first and foremost whether it should be fought at all.

With the change indicated, we can agree with you that the fight against

# Japanese CP Rift Linked to China--

(Continued from page 1)

The whole of Nosaka's statement is not yet available but the excerpts seen thus far contain such contradictory sentiments that it is possible to assume that it represents a compromise between conflicting tendencies. It is probable that Nakanishi's expulsion, like the Cominform blast, was the overture to a deeper and continuing struggle.

The Japanese CP has a long history of factional conflict, antagonisms among the leadership, doctrinal differences and cliquishness. During the last year the party has suffered a severe decline and has been affected by several splits. It has lost its initial post-war dynamism and attractiveness as well as much of its influence inside the organized union movement, in which it once had a leading role. These conditions would make for crisis even without Cominform intervention.

What may have brought the situation to a head is the China question. Nosaka has been known as far closer to Mao Tse-tung than to Stalin. He spent the latter part of the war at the former's capital in Yenan where he developed a program strikingly similar to Mao's. Functioning as a part of the Chinese party leadership, Nosaka sought to apply Mao's theories to Japan. He proposed a moderate program of anti-feudalism and anti-Zaibatsu measures along with cooperation with the U. S. occupation and other "democratic elements." Nosaka, for example, refused to call for abolition of the emperor system but only for its moderation.

It is an open secret that a conflict has raged between the two within the leadership ever since Nosaka's arrival. On February 12, 1945 Nosaka captured control of the National Committee from Tokuda and announced "the Nosaka line" of moderation toward the emperor and the occupation. Yet this line was only partially effectuated. Many CP activities seemed to contradict it. The outstanding characteristic of CP post-war policy has been opportunism — in a different direction from that of the Social-Democratic Party, but that is because the cold war forced it into a different position. These contradictions are an expression of the continued leadership conflict.

While it is Nakanishi who was expelled from the party, it seems likely that Nosaka was aiming at Tokuda, whose policies are much closer to what the Russians are demanding. This is why Pravda and the Cominform did not excommunicate the Japanese CP but only denounced Nosaka; that is, they issued a call to Tokuda to take up the decisive struggle for control. Nakanishi's expulsion, then, is Nosaka's warning to Moscow to call off its dogs.

This reconstruction admittedly has elements of speculation and as such may prove to be wrong in de-

tails. Such an element of uncertainty is inevitable in an analysis of an inner-CP situation, in the nature of the Stalinist type of organization. Nevertheless, it is this writer's opinion that the above is the basic outline of the real picture. To this outline, an essential addition has to be made.

The Russian charges against Nosaka are twofold. First, he is accused of Japanizing Marxism, "the naturalization of Marxism." Secondly, they attack his insistence on working within the framework of the occupation rather than striking at it head-on, and his view that MacArthur has brought democratic reforms to the country, so that the parliamentary road to power has become possible.

The first charge is very much like what Mao Tse-tung proclaims as his achievement in China. Mao-ism openly claims to have made a special adaptation of Stalinist dogma to China, on an exceptionalist basis. Tito, by contrast, makes no such special claim but is content to say that he is applying Stalinism rather than adapting it.

The second issue hinges on the Russian aim in Japan. Far deeper antagonisms exist between the U. S. and Russia within the Far Eastern Commission at Tokyo than in the UN. For Russian economic and military needs, the neutralization of Japan (either by elimination or discredit of the occupation) is a prime objective.

Specifically, the second part of the Russian charge probably refers to the so-called summer offensive—designed as the initial phase of a movement to embarrass and eventually drive out the occupation, to fulfill Russian desires. When the occupation announced a rationalization policy which required mass dismissals of workers in industry and government, the CP threw everything into a vast offensive, utilizing the legitimate issue for avowedly political purposes, the first of which was the overthrow of the reactionary Yoshida government to which MacArthur is fully committed. But the offensive never got much beyond the propaganda stage. There were several serious incidents but the movement never really got under way. Tokuda was in charge of this offensive, yet the party never seemed to gear to it fully. It seems likely, in the light of the present accusations, that Nosaka slowed it down.

Instead of an offensive leading to power, the CP began to lose control of the unions, Democratic Leagues,

led by ex-CPers and left Social-Democrats, denounced the CP's manipulative policies and captured many locals from the party. Tokuda's base was undermined and his policy discredited. Nosaka's "native" policy gained in leading circles. Since then the attitude toward the occupation has become less severe, while the Russians on the Far Eastern Commission have sharpened all differences. Very likely the failure of this offensive is the immediate specific spark to this affair.

Russia's military problem is obviously a geographic one. Economically, Russia's far eastern provinces could gain tremendously from the supplies of Japanese heavy industry; the reconstruction of Manchuria to a productive level would be greatly eased. Russia might not even be averse to more intimate Sino-Japanese economic relations, provided the lines of control ran through Moscow and were coordinated with its own needs. The greatest danger to Russian domination in China is represented by such serious economic alternatives as Japan represents.

Control of the Japanese party is one of the keys to control of China. The State Department is also aware of this and has begun to foster a cautious liberalization of China trade by Japan.

Where does Nosaka fit into this complicated jigsaw? In recent months he has become the chief protagonist of Japanese economic revival via China trade. He spoke before a meeting of the Tokyo Chamber of Commerce urging that the future of Japanese capitalism still lay in China and that to achieve this Japanese capitalists would have to make their peace with the Japanese and Chinese CPs.

In short, Nosaka has been acting as the go-between for the Chinese CP and Japanese industrialists. There is evidence that his efforts have had some success. Nosaka appears to have been acting like a commercial attaché for Mao. Mao's mission to Moscow is the proper backdrop for the Japanese CP affair.

It is this writer's opinion that this is the crux of the issue: the great problems raised by the Russian Stalinist empire by its Chinese victory are involved. For the wealth and power of China, Stalin would sacrifice a dozen Japanese Communist Parties. If the struggle in the Japanese CP continues, as it probably will, the party will be reduced to an ineffectual force. The Chinese will then be thrown back on the Russians that much more.

(Continued from page 1)

with Russia. Since there is little reason to believe that such an attempt, stimulated by the hydrogen-bomb prospect, could be any more successful in getting around the tensions inherent in the imperialist rivalry between Western capitalism and Russian Stalinist totalitarianism—it is admitted that Russia can get to produce the hydrogen bomb also—the weightiest argument for this step is undoubtedly that it would serve as a demonstration of "good will" to woo world public opinion.

Thus the cold-war imperialist tug-of-war raging over the planet jacks up, notch by notch, the potentialities for the ravaging of the planet in the threatened third world war.

The announcement of the hydrogen bomb, apparently precipitated by disclosures already made by the Alsop brothers, Washington columnists, followed a week and a half after publication of an AEC medical report which attempted to minimize the effectiveness of A-bomb improvement. Inspiring a headline like "Atom Bomb Ratio of Havoc Limited," the report stressed that a bomb of twice the power of the Hiroshima bomb would increase the RADIUS of destruction by "only" one fourth. Not brought out, in the N. Y. Times item for example, was the fact that this itself means an increase in the AREA and therefore AMOUNT of destruction by more than one half. Instead the AEC report is quoted as saying that "very great increases in explosive force are necessary in order to accomplish RELATIVELY SMALL INCREASES IN THE AREA OF DAMAGE."

## "OBVIOUS" VALUE

In any case, even aside from the hydrogen bomb, the uranium-plutonium bomb which is to be tested soon at Eniwetok is already six times more powerful than the Nagasaki bomb, which is supposed to have been more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb.

"The most obvious military value of the much more powerful hydrogen bomb," says the press report, "is that it does not require anything like the accuracy of delivery of a uranium-plutonium bomb," since its radius of destruction may be as much as over 5 miles. The most obvious social result of this "military value," is, of course, that it makes it possible and even inevitable that an industrial plant area which is bombed from afar without any attempt at accuracy can be destroyed only by also destroying any attached urban area, with all its people.

While such possible consequences of modern imperialist war tend to make other considerations pale, they would come into play only if and when war is allowed to break out. Meanwhile, still in "peacetime," the race toward war brings in its train social consequences which are felt now, in the growing militarization of every aspect of American life, under the aegis of the current Fair Deal leadership of American capitalism no less than would be the case under Republican administration.

The president of the California Institute of Technology, itself a leading beneficiary of the government's war-preparation scientific program, last week sharply attacked U. S. policy in that field. His remarks indicated growing fears in the educational world of the effect of the cold-war plans in militarizing science.

Dr. L. A. DuBridg, whose institute got nearly \$4½ million (out of its total operating income for the past fiscal year of over \$7½ million) from government research contracts, denounced the "widespread illusion that the chief function of science is to evolve weapons of war." "As a result," he said, "as far as the federal government is concerned, the support of science has been left largely with those agencies whose primary functions are military."

## SCIENCE LOSES OUT

The dangers, he said, are beginning to make themselves felt:

"(1) When basic science competes for funds with weapon development projects as well as with the heavy demands for the design and construction of battleships, airplanes and atomic bombs, science is certain to lose out as budget restrictions become necessary.

"(2) There is increasing pressure to extend to basic science the secrecy restrictions which necessarily pervade military weapon development programs."

On the same day as the hydrogen-bomb announcement, another government agency, the National Advisory Council for Aeronautics, also (this time unintentionally) underlined the pressure of the military upon science. "The committee notes with satisfaction a healthy pressure upon it from the military air services and from the aircraft industry for advanced scientific data, declared its chairman. Never before in peacetime, he noted, had it been unable "to stockpile scientific knowledge for future use." Truman's new budget asks Congress to provide \$63 million for his council, \$7 million more than it expended in the present fiscal year.

Subscribe to

LABOR ACTION

**The FIGHT for SOCIALISM**  
 by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

\$1.00 Cloth-bound \$2.00

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

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