

British Women Stormily Protest Atom Bomb Tests

British women are raising a storm against further atomic bomb tests because of the genetic hazards to future generations. An extraordinary demonstration of women occurred in the House of Commons on March 22 when the H-bomb test peril was debated.

The debate followed warnings by leading scientists that if bomb tests continue, accumulated radioactivity in the atmosphere could do incalculable harm to new generations. Radioactivity can damage the genes, the units of hereditary matter passed on from parents to children, and change inherited physical structures and functions.

Not only procreation of monstrosities is feared, but "a general deterioration of the human stock . . . a loss of vigor, a reduction in health, an increase in hereditary disease, a decline in physical ability," according to science commentator Waldemar Kaempffert in the March 27 N. Y. Times.

SCENES IN COMMONS

"Scenes reminiscent of Britain's historic suffragette movement have just been witnessed in Westminster," writes London correspondent Peter Lyne, in the March 27 Christian Science Monitor. He reports that "dread of the danger to human life from H-Bomb experiments," as well as fear of atomic war, has "spurred the women as they have not been spurred since they fought for their right to vote in the years before the 1914 war."

When the Churchill government's spokesmen falsely claimed women need not fear the genetic effects of the increased radiation from the 65 or so nuclear explosions that have already taken place, Lyne reports, "most of the women MPs, especially those on the labor benches, were not satisfied."

"TREMENDOUS FEELING"

Dr. Edith Summerskill, a minister in the former Attlee cabinet and now chairman of the Labor Party, demanded that the natural scientists of Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union and France be called together immediately to issue a world-wide warning of the effect of nuclear radiation on the health of present and future generations. This was voted down after intense debate by a 230 to 250 vote.

The Monitor reveals that observers in Westminster felt the Churchill regime "put up a weak performance and failed to recognize the tremendous feeling . . . stirred up by the hydrogen bomb question and especially the extent to which women are becoming united and resolute for some new action to counter the nuclear threat." Lyne adds: "The packed public galleries in the Commons were deeply impressed by the case Dr. Summerskill presented."

Turn Seen in "Cold War" To Yalta-Type Diplomacy

By Joseph Hansen

Two themes vied for priority in the headlines of the week ending March 27. One was the possibility of war against China within a few weeks. The other was the possibility of a Big Four conference to ease world tensions.

The pressure for an immediate attack on China, should the islands of Quemoy and Matsu be occupied by troops of the Mao government, emanated from the right wing of the Republican Party. The most belligerent and provocative statements were made by Admiral Carney, and Senators Knowland, Bridges and McCarthy.

Their argument boils down to this: If Chiang Kai-shek refuses to give up these islands, which are part of China, the United States has no choice but to back the dictator with armed force, even at the risk of precipitating an atomic world war.

"THE TIMES" IRRITATED

The clamor for "war now" was so high-pitched that even the staid N. Y. Times became a bit alarmed. This authoritative voice

of the dominant section of America's rulers swung an editorial paddle on Chiang's American lobby March 27: "It is time that the fire-eaters in Washington, whether in the Pentagon or elsewhere, went into silence."

This polite way of telling the most vociferous war-mongers to shut up does not prove that the Times is any more peace-loving than they are. It is simply that loud talk for "war now" cuts across the major diplomatic maneuver that the Eisenhower administration is at present engaged in; that is, a turn toward conferences with Moscow.

Washington is not prepared for immediate war. It is sufficient to note, for example, that neither Germany nor Japan are as yet armed. While that and other conditions are being fulfilled, the Eisenhower administration is especially concerned about mending its diplomatic fences. That means primarily putting on a "peace" demonstration so that the blame for the eventual outbreak of hostilities against the Soviet bloc falls less clearly on Wall Street.

NEED KREMLIN'S HELP

To accomplish that requires the cooperation of the Kremlin. This can best be done through secret conferences involving only minor concessions by the imperialist powers. Another important aim, as the recent publication of the Yalta documents served to remind the world, is to secure the aid of the Stalinist bureaucracy in heading off or betraying working-class revolutions and colonial uprisings.

At present the kind of conferences sought by the Eisenhower administration aim at probing in particular what Moscow can do to help contain the Chinese revolution.

That is why Eisenhower took the initiative in again raising the question of a conference with the current heads of the Stalinist bureaucracy. This was done first by a declaration by Democratic Senator George on the advisability of a get-together.

Senator George acted as an "icebreaker" for Dulles and Eisenhower, as one Washington correspondent put it. George's statement served primarily as formal notice by the Democratic Party that it would not seek to make political capital out of a conference of the Yalta type.

Eisenhower followed up immediately by publicly proffering an olive branch to Moscow; and Bulganin responded in kind.

Historic experience testifies that a repetition of the Yalta experience will not bring peace to the world. Resumption of Yalta-type diplomacy simply means that the cold war takes a new form as Wall Street continues the preparations for the third world war toward which it has been heading since the end of World War II.

St. Paul - Picture Of Meat-Packing Railroad Center

By Farrell Dobbs
National Secretary
Socialist Workers Party

ST. PAUL, March 21 — This city, along with neighboring Minneapolis, serves as a major distribution center for the grain, dairy and poultry formers of Minnesota, the Dakotas and eastern Montana. The railroad, trucking and warehouse industries (thus play a large role in the local economy.



Meat packing, concentrated in South St. Paul, constitutes the main component of industrial production in the St. Paul area. There is also a limited amount of diversified production in such lines as Scotch tape and abrasives, auto assembly, telephone and refrigerator manufacture, breweries and general construction.

Among the earliest cities to be organized on a craft union basis, St. Paul is primarily an AFL town. The CIO has its main strength in the packing-houses. This being the home terminal of the Northern Pacific and Great Northern railway systems, the railroad unions are an important part of the local labor movement.

German and Irish nationality groups predominate in the city's population. The large percentage of Catholics among these nationalities is reflected in the fact that around one-third of the local schools are Catholic parochial institutions. Small Negro

(Continued on page 3)

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE


Vol. XIX — No. 14

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, APRIL 4, 1955

PRICE: 10 Cents

Auto Union Ready to Strike For GAW, Convention Shows

Blessed Are the Peacemakers



WOMEN'S JOB RIGHTS ROUSE HEATED DEBATE

By George Breitman

CLEVELAND, March 27 — Frederick Engels noted many years ago that F. M. Fourier, the French Utopian Socialist, was "the first to declare that in a given society the degree of emancipation of

women is the natural expression of the general emancipation."

This truth can probably be adapted as follows: A union's attitude to women workers today is an expression of its general level of class consciousness. And of the degree to which it has resisted or been infected by prevailing conservative and even reactionary currents.

At any rate, the only real debate on the first day of the 15th convention of the United Auto Workers, CIO, was the one that broke out over "the woman question." Although the debate was cut off before all the delegates who wanted to speak got the floor, it shed considerable light on the moods and sentiments of a sizable section of the convention, including the Reuther leadership.

WHY THE DEBATE?

At the last UAW convention in 1953 there was also the beginning of a dispute over the rights of women workers. But it enlisted only a few speakers. This time it went deeper and further. Why?

The main reason is that the auto workers experienced serious layoffs during 1954. The union leaders failed to provide the members with any effective program to fight unemployment. This failure created an opportunity for the more backward elements in the union to come forward with their own "solution"—drive women workers, and especially married women, out of the plants as long as any men workers are unemployed.

Most of the auto workers laid off last year are working now, but the memory of those layoffs



WALTER REUTHER

and the certainty of new layoffs this spring or summer remain. Also remaining is a strong prejudice among UAW members against married women workers, as anyone familiar with trends in the main auto centers can testify. As a matter of fact, this reactionary sentiment has grown in the recent period. It has grown enough so that its supporters felt bold enough to express it openly on the convention floor — and to receive considerable applause.

Anti-woman bias got its first expression during discussion of a resolution on youth when one delegate attributed juvenile delinquency to the

(Continued on page 2)

But Reuther May Try to Back Down

By George Breitman

CLEVELAND, March 29 — The United Auto Workers, CIO, is ready to strike, if necessary, to win some variant of President Walter Reuther's guaranteed annual wage or guaranteed employment plan in 1955.

This was the meaning of today's vote, at the union's 15th constitutional convention here, to set up a \$25,000,000 strike fund through a dues increase.

Despite attempts of the capitalist press to inflate the strength of delegates who were opposed to a dues increase, there was never any doubt in the convention that it would be adopted by a decisive majority. Less than 10 per cent of the 6,100 delegates — most of them people who generally support the Reuther leadership — voted against the Reuther-proposed increase in the consultative hand vote taken today.

Dues increases have never been popular or easily put over in the UAW in the past. But the great majority voted for it this time because they think the union may be forced to strike this year and therefore will have need of a strike fund; or because they feel that the auto corporations would interpret a rejection of the dues increase as a sign of union weakness and would be encouraged thereby to act tougher in the coming negotiations.

WHY THE DEBATE?

Although the opposition to the dues increase and the strike fund was relatively small, the debate on this question was so arranged that it became the central issue. There was a reason for this arrangement.

A number of important problems faced the delegates. What, for example, was the exact nature of the GAW plan and how much of it was Reuther prepared to settle for? Which of the UAW's other contractual demands was he willing to drop in return for something that could be labeled "GAW"? What should the UAW do now, in the approaching negotiations, about the threat of mass unemployment resulting from automation, a problem which the GAW does not even begin to meet? What about the demand for a 30-hour week at 40 hours' pay?

Eager to distract attention from these problems, Reuther was happy to have a prolonged discussion of the dues increase, about whose outcome there was no question. And he was undoubtedly pleased that the leadership of Ford Local 600, the core of a loose anti-Reuther tendency, was also willing to center the main discussion of the convention not around the vital question of what the union should fight

(Continued on page 2)

Bevan Ouster Blocked, But Labor Party Crisis Deepens

By John White

LONDON, March 24 — Right wing trade union leaders unequivocally demanded the expulsion of Aneurin Bevan at yesterday's meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Labor Party.

A few days before the N.E.C. meeting these leaders had met secretly in a Westminster hotel and decided Bevan's head should roll. Present at this meeting was Arthur Deakin — not a member of the N.E.C., but the most dominating anti-Bevanite figure in right wing trade union circles. Also present was Hugh Gaitskell, a right wing Labor politician and staunch ally of Deakin. Gaitskell is a most vicious enemy of the left, who owes his position as Party Treasurer to the trade union bureaucracy. By the aid of their block of votes he defeated Bevan for the job at the last Labor Party Conference.

Gaitskell and right-wing leaders from the miners' union and the vast General and Municipal Workers Union, led the attack against Bevan at the three hour session of the N.E.C. They insisted on his removal from the Party despite the opposition of the rank and file of the movement, as evidenced in the hundreds of resolutions that have been carried by Constituency Labor Parties and trade union branches up and down the country. That opposition was reflected in the large minority vote (112 to 141) cast by Labor Members of Parliament against the removal of the Labor whip from Bevan last week.

However, the rabid anti-Bevanites failed in their immediate objective. Bevan was not expelled at this meeting. Instead, a proposition moved by Attlee, the leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party, was carried. According to press reports Attlee appealed for "moderation." By 14 votes to 13 the N.E.C. agreed to set up a sub-committee to interview Aneurin Bevan and "seek satisfactory promises of good behavior in the future."

The rift between Attlee and the trade union right wing stems from the different positions they occupy in the labor movement. Both, it is true, are in fundamental opposition to the mass left wing which Bevan reflects; both strive to maintain the Labor Party in a coalition with the Tories on all major aspects of foreign affairs; both want to defeat the demands by the Party's base for a socialist program. The trade union leadership, however, unlike Attlee, rests on a bureaucratic structure outside of the Labor Party. Attlee is thus subjected, more than these reactionary trade union tops, to the internal pressures of the Party.

The prospect of an immediate general election weighed more heavily on Attlee. In the days preceding the N.E.C. meeting the press was filled with obviously inspired rumors that Churchill intended to retire in the near future and the Tories (Continued on page 3)

Democrats Fail To Fight for Own Tax-Cut Measure

A Joint Congressional Committee on March 26 killed the \$10 per capita tax-cut voted by the House. Originally, the Democrats proposed a \$20 cut for each taxpayer and \$20 for each of his dependents. This was speedily modified by the Democrats to \$20 for both a husband and wife — \$10 each — and \$10 each for other dependents.

The Democrats milked all the political propaganda value they could out of a demagogic appeal for the tax cut, then failed to fight for it in the Senate, which the Democrats control.

WAR AND TAXES

Republicans howled "politics" but opposed even the miserly cut proposed by the Democrats. The Democrats answered that the GOP will try to pull the same political stunt or a similar one in the next election year.

Almost all the taxes workers are now forced to pay were levied under Democratic administrations. These taxes are required mostly because of the war costs, which have multiplied government spending 800% since 1940.

While talking about tax cuts, the Democrats continue to demand bigger "defense" spending.

Next Week:

An article on the late Walter White, NAACP Executive Secretary, by Jean Blake, will appear in next week's Militant.

Will "Walloping" Our Kids End Delinquency?

By Joyce Cowley

This week I attended a "Save our Youth" rally at P. S. 3 in Greenwich Village. Press notices had indicated that it was a spontaneous effort on the part of parents' groups and civic organizations to set up block committees that would help young people whose problems were still at a pre-delinquent stage — before they came to the attention of the police. Instead it turned out to be a thinly disguised "front" organization for the police themselves.

One hundred youth councils throughout New York City will call for volunteer "block parents." James E. Nolan, Deputy Police Commissioner, explained a little too emphatically that they would not ask block parents to be squealers or informers, but it

would be necessary for the police to screen all volunteers. No doubt this is to eliminate subversive elements — you can't tell when you will run into a parent who believes in Freudianism.

UN-AMERICAN SEX

"Freudianism" was explained by Judge Mahoney, who made a keynote speech in which he called it "more dangerous than the atom bomb. It's an un-American, anti-religious concept which holds that if people get enough to eat and are sexually satisfied, they will not commit crimes." I can't recall anyone advancing such an elementary program against crime, i.e. food and sex, but it sounds progressive and might be a good starting point. It was also surprising to learn that sex is an un-American activity. Possibly the Eisenhower administration

has traced our acute shortage of schools to the number of babies born.

Mahoney himself has a program outstanding in its simplicity and awfully cheap, too. Wallop them! Restore corporal punishment in the schools! Make the kids who are bad understand that they are bad. Make sure they suffer.

Things have come to such a deplorable state, said Mahoney, that even prisoners stage revolts and demand their rights. "Something's wrong with the system," he concluded. "People who violate the law are handed over to psychiatrists and social workers who consider them mentally ill. Punishment has become a horrible word and we have a new-fangled fallacy that there is no guilt."

In the course of his psychological research, Mahoney evidently did not come across "Who are

the Guilty" by Dr. David Abrahamson, one of the Freudian psychiatrists whom he condemns. Dr. Abrahamson does not support the concept that there is no guilt, for he sums up by saying:

"Each society has the number of criminals it deserves." Mahoney's viewpoint made a favorable impression, for he is scheduled to appear on "Spotlight on Youth," a new program which will be broadcast coast-to-coast.

CONTEMPT FOR YOUTH

There were a number of youngsters at the meeting, in PAL or Boy Scout uniforms, handing out literature about delinquency. (It was beautifully printed on high-grade, glossy paper, compliments of my state assemblyman.) These are the good boys, the ones who toe the line. But I kept wonder-

ing how they felt as they heard such hostility and contempt for youth, listened to meaningless platitudes and phony appeals for our courageous and misunderstood policemen.

In an attempt to minimize the problem, several speakers pointed out that 97½% of our young people are not delinquent (or at any rate don't get caught.) They believe these youngsters will conform to the status quo and they can count on them not to give any trouble.

I think Commissioner Nolan, Judge Mahoney and the others are wrong about this 97½%. It is only when protest and despair reach an unbearable intensity and can find no other outlet that they explode into the violence that makes headlines. The other youngsters may be searching for more constructive measures to solve their problems.

They may, for example, be examining the question of guilt which Judge Mahoney found so troublesome. They may be taking a good look at the officials and politicians who are eager to blame parents, comic books, atheism and Freud rather than face their own responsibility for the tragic crisis of our youth. They may be questioning a society dominated by greed, falsehood and senseless competition, driven by its own contradictions toward total destruction in an atomic war.

Nolan and Mahoney are not really afraid of one million delinquent teen-agers — they've got an apparatus to handle them. They're afraid of the other millions, the young people who will decide where the guilt belongs and take action against the whole rotten structure which creates violence and crime and war.

... Ready to Strike, UAW Delegates Show

(Continued from page 1)

Now, not around the crucial question of how the union should fight in 1955, but around the secondary question of how strike benefits should be distributed if there is a strike.

The main vote of the convention took place over the allocation of strike benefits:

The Reuther leadership argued that they should be given on the basis of "need," that is, to strikers suffering the greatest hardships because of going on strike, which has been the practice in the UAW up to now. The anti-Reuther delegates argued that they should be given on the basis of "right," that is, every striker should be equally entitled to a certain sum.

The Reutherites replied that they were for "right," but it was impractical at this time because it would take too much money. Their opponents contended that a much bigger strike fund than \$25,000,000 should be collected or borrowed, but their case was weakened by failure to make uniform concrete proposals along these lines.

WHAT WINS STRIKES

One of the delegates, Irving Gilbert of Fisher Body Local 1045, Euclid, Ohio, made a very good point when he said, "The kind of money that we raise never could compete with General Motors and Ford. What wins strikes is the willingness and readiness of the workers to sacrifice in order to win strikes."

But none of the anti-Reutherites, including Local 600 president Carl Stellato referred to this point. None of them told the convention that what makes workers willing to sacrifice is a program that meets their problems. Instead, they tended to imply that workers can be inspired to sacrifice merely by assuring them of some strike benefits.

A secondary question is not necessarily an unimportant one. There was need to discuss how strike benefits should be apportioned in a union with a big membership but without a big strike fund. But elevating this to the main debate at the convention, as the anti-Reuther delegates did, instead of fighting for a program to mobilize the militancy and enthusiasm of the auto workers, represented an abdication of the struggle against the policies of Reuther.

That's in effect what happened at this convention. The anti-Reutherites managed to get a relatively high vote in favor of their stand on "right" — I estimated that they got around 40 per cent of the standing vote — but it was a hollow achievement. While they differentiated themselves from Reuther on a secondary issue, at the same time they gave up the fight to replace his class-collaboration program

with a program based on the real needs and interests of the workers.

Their surrender, of course, began before this convention. It was announced in advance last November at the UAW's national economic conference in Detroit. It was spelled out when they agreed to shelve the fight for the 30-hour week at 40 hours' pay in response to Reuther's vague promise (repeated at this convention) that he too would be ready to fight for a shorter work week some time after 1955.

The Reuther machine, therefore, remains dominant and, in any real sense, even unchallenged at this convention. What effects that will have on the coming contract fight will be disclosed to the view of all in the next few months.

Preparation for a hard fight is now talked by the UAW. Publicly, Reuther talks about such a fight. But outside of getting the dues increase he isn't doing anything to prepare one.

On the contrary, there are signs that the strategy of the Reutherites is not based on mobilizing the workers but on getting a few modest concessions on the GAW demand that can be proclaimed as "a victory on the principle of the thing" and used to justify dropping other contractual demands.

It's significant that members of the Reuther machine have been going around the convention talking about the "reasonableness" of Reuther's GAW plan. "After all," they say, "why shouldn't the corporations be willing to pay a dime an hour per employee into a reserve fund out of which laid-off workers can get guarantee payments? A dime an hour is only five per cent of current average payroll. Is that unreasonable?"

If that is what Reuther is willing to settle for — payments into a fund by the employers at the rate of only ten cents an hour per worker — and if he is willing to bargain away other things in return for such a "victory," then it is possible that there will be no auto strike this year.

But while Reuther may be willing to settle cheap, there is no certainty that the corporations are in the same mood. As the Militant recalled editorially last week, everybody predicted in 1952 that there would be no steel strike because the steel union leaders were willing to settle for peanuts that year. But everyone was wrong and the steel corporations forced a 53-day strike on the workers.

The same thing can happen in auto this year — unless the UAW shows it means business and is ready to fight for its demands.

[Our report and evaluation of the second half of the UAW convention will appear next week.]

GM-Ford "Battle of the Century"

By Sam Marcy

He who would see the coming socialist revolution in America, can get an advance view of it this spring, from the window of any car on any Sunday on any great highway — when all the new models off the assembly line will be on the road.

But this, the propagandists of Big Business tell us, shows the triumph of capitalism — not the rising tide of socialism.

We will show why this is not so. The ferocious war among the giant auto firms — "The Battle of the Century," as Newsweek magazine so splendidly phrases it, marks a turning point in the destinies of American finance capital. For this "battle" can only be concluded in the form of a catastrophe for capitalism in the United States.

But, say our propagandists for Big Business, this is merely the usual competitive struggle among automobile firms for larger sales, on a larger scale. Instead of a million cars, as in 1916, there will now be six million or more. Doesn't this show capitalism is doing fine?

STUBBORN FACTS

Facts, stubborn facts — not theories — refute this. In 1916, there were a million cars produced; but there were 140 companies manufacturing them. In 1921, there might have been almost two million cars, but there were only 88 companies. In 1953, there were nine companies and in 1954, only 6 (if you include the "Little Three" which arose out of mergers of Kaiser with Willys, Nash with Hudson, and Packard with Studebaker). In the same year, 1954, Chrysler was driven out of second place, with the net result, that the "Big Two," Ford and General Motors, cornered 80% of the automobile business.

The struggle between Ford and General Motors has become so fierce, that they can no longer permit themselves the freedom to publish their statistical sales data — undoctored. An Associated Press dispatch of March 4, states that "both Chevrolet (GM) and Ford claimed to have finished in top place in the number of passenger cars delivered at retail last year" — and both firms quoted the same statistics, R. L. Polk and Co., to prove their point!

The struggle between the auto giants is therefore not a phase of "ordinary commercial competition," but a life and death struggle between monopolists for exclusive domination.

GM and Ford find it necessary to phony up their sales statistics because these are for public consumption. But they find it unnecessary — and even impossible, to cover up their relations in the delicate matters of high

finance, where the intricacies proved sufficient cover from general public view.

GM STOCK OFFERING

The phenomenal cost of retooling and expanding — especially the problem of die costs — makes it absolutely necessary to obtain more and more cash to finance these operations.

Thus early in January, the General Motors Corp. announced an offering of stock in the amount of \$325 million for approximately 4 1/2 million shares. The capitalist press ran out of superlatives in describing the stock issue.

Now the purpose of the stock sale, naturally, was to obtain a quarter of a billion dollars, without borrowing from the bankers, and without creating a debt on which interest has to be paid. In floating the stock issue, GM said it offered it for sale to what it described as its "family of 460,000 shareholders." Had this "family of 460,000 shareholders" exercised its full right to purchase this stock, it would have indeed constituted the high water mark in the history of American finance capital. For that would have meant that 460,000 people had enough surplus money to purchase GM stock.

Morgan Stanley and Co., the House of Morgan's giant underwriting firm, put on a tremendous publicity campaign to put the stock issue across. On the opening day, when Morgan's 850 employees awaited the deluge of mail, only one check for the purchase of stock arrived — that of the duPonts, for \$75 million. This astonishing fact went unnoticed by the broad public, because it was buried on the inside pages in a small AP dispatch of March 4, under the by-line of Arthur Merims.

The significance of this event can hardly be overestimated; it is tantamount to the grand opening of a store, where all the sales clerks await the opening rush of business, and then to and behold, the owner turns out to be the only customer for that day.

But the reader needn't hold his breath in anticipation of a failure of the GM stock issue. You can be sure other "customers" later came to the rescue, such as the fabulously rich Fisher brothers; George Whitney, of J. P. Morgan Co.; Alfred P. Sloan, of General Electric; not to mention Lucius Clay, the Skinner family, the Pratt family, the Kettering family, and a score or so of others of the "insiders" of the GM Corp.; all directors and reputed to be large stockholders. To this should be added the purchases made, on behalf of hundreds of millionaire families. Thus the required financing was probably further re-

duced by at least an additional \$75 million, still leaving a required sum of about \$170 million to raise.

This took the financing operation out of the realm of the "super-duper, colossal" category, insofar as purchasing from the broad public was concerned. Not all the ballyhoo and publicity of the Morgans could bring more than \$150 million from what could actually be considered broad public subscription. Even that, let it not be forgotten, came only under the impetus of the Formosa crisis, which sent all stocks soaring to abnormally inflated levels and hence induced the sale of GM stock.

ROLE OF CASH

The economic significance of the GM stock operation shows that cash — liquid assets — has become exceedingly tight — even for the biggest industrial corporation in the world, backed by the most powerful, financial oligarchs — the Morgans.

But the critical importance of the GM stock issue however, lies in its relation to Ford. For the \$170 million that GM actually raised, is \$170 million more than Ford can raise now. Ford is a closed family corporation, having all these years relied on its own cash to finance all its operations.

When GM unloaded its stock sale, it was like a block-buster thrown at the Ford empire. For it meant \$170 million added to the war chest of GM in its struggle against Ford.

The response of the Fords was revealing in every respect. A carefully-planned story in the March 18 issue of the U.S. News and World Report states that the Ford Company is now planning to sell its stock. "The public," says the article, "after 51 years, is going to get its first chance to buy stock in the Ford Motor Co. . . . The Ford Co. has never allowed outsiders to buy stock since Henry Ford, Sr. bought out his original backers. Control will still remain with the Ford family however. Only stock to be sold is held by the Ford Foundation — and it carries no vote in company management."

The article however, "forgot" to mention that large-scale corporate financing on the style of Ford or GM is virtually impossible without firm links with one of the giant banking groups, to make successful any large scale stock offering. This idea was cursed by old Henry Ford to the end of his days, and was the cause of his endless fulminations against "international bankers." Viewed from this angle, the emergence of John J. McCloy, Chairman of the Board of the Rockefeller-controlled Chase National Bank, to prominence on the Board of the Ford Founda-

tion, may be more than just accidental. We shall soon see.

BANKS OVEREXTENDED

The reader may want to know why Ford should have resisted the blandishments of the big bankers these last 51 years in view of the obvious benefits. The GM prospectus shows one of the reasons why. There you will find a statement that the House of Morgan and their underwriting associates netted a cool \$4 million for their services in floating the GM stock issue — a mere office job handled by 850 employees.

But should the Fords embark upon a public sale of stock, it would not only indicate their subjection to a big bank, but would intensify the struggle for liquid assets, which has now reached unprecedented proportions. This would be particularly aggravating in the present state of U. S. economy, because the banks themselves, who in the final analysis are the ones to extend the liquid assets (cash) to these corporations, are themselves overextended.

This is illustrated in an article in the March 27 issue of the N. Y. Times which shows that \$101 1/2 billion have been extended for individual auto loans. This sum may not mean anything unless it is put in proper relation to other things. For this \$101 1/2 billion is just a bare billion dollars less than the total annual product of the entire auto industry, according to an estimate made by Readers Digest, Jan. 1955.

HEADING FOR ABYSS

These six or more million cars which may be produced this year on the basis of the highest degree of productivity and exploitation of American labor in general and the auto workers in particular, also coincides with the outbreak of the sharpest antagonisms among the ruling factions of American finance capital.

These billionaire cliques are relentlessly driven by the mad hunt for super-profits. They are determined to keep the colossal productive power of the U. S. within the tight embrace of the profit system. For this they must maintain the exclusive domination of the super-monopolies. In the age of the atom and automation this is an utterly fantastic capitalist Utopia. And it is leading capitalism to the abyss.

It is also why we think any motorist this spring will be able to get an advance view of the coming socialist revolution in America.

(Third of a series. Watch for the next installment: "Behind the Stockmarket Investigation.")

\$15,000 Fund Scoreboard

City	Quota	Paid	Percent
Philadelphia	\$ 400.00	\$ 486.00	121
Allentown	75.00	89.00	119
Seattle	175.00	207.00	118
Detroit	750.00	835.00	111
Cleveland	250.00	266.50	107
Chicago	1,600.00	1,703.00	106
Pittsburgh	150.00	155.00	104
Youngstown	200.00	200.00	100
Boston	600.00	600.00	100
Akron	125.00	125.00	100
Newark	275.00	275.00	100
San Francisco	800.00	737.00	92
Buffalo	1,600.00	1,395.00	87
New York	3,200.00	2,678.00	84
Los Angeles	3,000.00	2,504.83	83
Minneapolis-St. Paul	1,200.00	959.00	80
Milwaukee	250.00	177.00	71
St. Louis	75.00	50.00	66
Oakland	300.00	118.00	39
General		133.00	
Totals through March 29	\$15,025.00	\$13,693.33	91

FUND DRIVE 91 PER CENT AS WE ENTER FINAL LAP

By Constance Farr
Campaign Manager

"We note with joy the increased tempo of the payments on the \$15,000 Press Fund Campaign," writes V. R. Dunne, Minneapolis. Again this week, we can report an unexpected gift to The Militant — \$100 — from a supporter of the paper in Philadelphia. This puts Philadelphia at the top of the Scoreboard, with 121%! And that's not all: Alma Seton writes us, "This \$100 was truly a wonderful surprise for us, as I'm sure it will be for you. And there's more to come. The individual pledges have not all been fulfilled as yet, and when they are, you will get more cash for the Militant."

New York, with the biggest quota, moved up three places this week. Campaign Director Ethel Peterson reports: "We thought at the outset of the fund drive that our very high quota of \$3,200 would be difficult to meet. But since the money was needed to support our paper that we are all so proud of, we knew that we would have to raise it somehow. So we took the challenge. Although far behind schedule during most of the campaign, we kept aiming for more and more contributions and pledges. The result was that many friends and supporters of the Militant in New York increased their original pledges, and a number of new pledges were made during the campaign. This last week the pay-

ments really rolled in, so that we were able to turn over to the Militant a total of \$633.18! We are now confident that we will stand along with all the other 100% cities in the final scoreboard next week.

"An inspiring example was that of Manny and Meryl, who recently left the city, yet sent in payment of their New York pledge in full (plus \$1.35). Hoory! We all want to express our appreciation to them."

Boston is very happy about reaching 100%. Franklin reports that it is "the highest amount as far back as I can remember, and a week ahead of time to boot."

Akron, which moved up from 60% to 100% this week, sent a check by special delivery to be sure to make this issue. "It was a long haul, but we did it," writes S. Harte. Los Angeles assures us that they will complete their quota March 31.

With only eight per cent of the total left to come in by the next issue of the Militant, we are only about \$1,300 short of our \$15,000 goal. We urge readers who have not yet given their contribution to have it in by April 5, the deadline for the April 11 Militant.

APRIL SELECTION FOR BOOK-A-MONTH

INTERVIEW WITH INDIA. By John Frederick Muehl. New York: John Day Co., 1950. 310 pp. \$3.50.

This is a remarkable book by a remarkable writer. It is, in one sense a travel and adventure book, since its framework is an account of a tour of India by foot, ox cart, camel, horse and fishing vessel.

During the month of April Interview With India (originally published at \$3.50) is available for \$1.00 (plus 15c mailing charge). All orders must be accompanied by check or money order. Order from Pioneer Publishers, 116 University Place, N. Y. 3, N. Y.

hatred for their oppressors — the landlords, Brahmins and money lenders.

For this book is a devastating exposure of the reactionary class character of the present government of India. It shows the tremendous gulph between Nehru's regime and the mass of the people. The chapter on the mobilization of the landlords and Brahmins that culminated in the assassination of Ghandi — and the Nehru regime's whitewash of it — is the most informative account yet offered to the American reader.

IMPERIALIST MYTH

A reading of this book will destroy forever the impression so prevalent in America of an insurmountable psychological barrier between our thinking and that of the Indians. This was a myth created by the imperialists and those tourists who were so appalled by the poverty, dirt disease and starvation of the mass of Indians that they could never live close to them.

Living in their huts, eating their meager meals, getting their lice and diseases, Muehl came to know these people and to love them as fellow men. The reader will close this book not only with understanding but with a great affection for the workers and peasants of India — as well as a

CHICAGO
Socialist Forum
"Negroes and the American Labor Movement"
Speaker: C. De Bruce
Sat., April 9, 8:30 P. M.
Discussion — Refreshments
777 West Adams Street
Donation 35c.

... Women's Job Rights Rouse Heated Debate

(Continued from page 1)

injustice to families where both parents are working and urged parents to put in more time with their children.

When he sat down, Reuther interjected: "There is a lot of good philosophy here today."

Perhaps encouraged by this remark, two other delegates spelled out the matter further. One, who went out of the way to identify himself as a Catholic, said, "I wonder sincerely how many of the women who are helping their husbands out would not better put their services to mankind and to their families by staying home and taking care of their children." Another said, "People, women particularly, who work in factories who are married and have children at home are one of the causes of child delinquency."

THE REAL ISSUE

After this the debate on the youth resolution was closed. But the real issue was women workers, not juvenile delinquency, and it came up again more sharply a few minutes later when the resolution on job security for women workers was presented. This reaffirmed the UAW's official position, calling for protection of women workers against discrimination, equal pay for equal work clauses in all contracts, inclusion of a model maternity clause, the passage of Federal and state anti-discrimination legislation, etc.

A number of women delegates took the floor to support the resolution and militantly attack male prejudice both inside and outside the union.

Agnes Loveland, Local 174, Detroit: "I sincerely believe that if it wasn't for my union the few women we have left would have been eliminated long ago. Local unions should be on the alert to see that no woman member is discriminated against, but far too often locals close their eyes when it comes to the protection of women workers . . . I don't

think that any of the delegates in this room have the right to challenge the necessity of two incomes, and I don't think it is too much of our business."

Hattie Somerlott, Local 1055, Adrian, Mich.: "I work in a plant where there is only a small percentage of women, and they grow less every day because they are being forced out by the company . . . Now they are making the jobs so heavy that just recently all the women in the machine shop of our plant were forced out, some of them with 14 and 15 years' seniority, because the company has made the jobs so hard and so tough that they cannot perform them any longer."

Cecelia J. Carrigan, Local 887, Inglewood, Calif.: "We have our company using state laws to keep us in lower classifications and thereby cut the ground from under our brothers who are on the same jobs. Many of us have ten or more years of seniority in our jobs and are still in the lowest classification . . . The best reason for working mothers being in the plants is because they realize that an even greater contributor to delinquency is poverty and want."

"LIP SERVICE"

Emma Murphy, Dodge Local 3, Detroit: "Year after year we come to convention, and the same resolution is passed every time. We are just giving lip service to the women in industry. We go back for two years and the same thing happens over and over again. Certainly I am in favor of the resolution, but let's do something about it, and not just say we are going to and forget about it."

Mildred Szur, Local 174, Detroit: "Who is to say a woman should work or not? Where is our democracy in this country if a woman cannot be a free individual and make up her own mind? I think that when you start telling a woman you can't work you are infringing upon their civil rights, which I

as a woman resent. I am not ashamed of some of the various speakers, they are union people. But I am disgusted with them . . . We women helped organize this union. We pay our dues, we attend our meetings, and many of us stand up to management better than some of our weakest brothers. There is a reason for this, because women in our plant have no chance of becoming foremen. Our past chairman in our unit is now a foreman and because he lost his election took the easy road."

BIAS VOICED

A number of men delegates likewise supported the resolution, but as many opposed it. Following are some samples of their discriminatory views:

William H. Hill, Local 961, Detroit: "I am not opposed to single women and widows working in the shop, but I am opposed to married women working in the shop, and I think that the committee should withdraw this resolution."

Albert Rutt, Local 195, Windsor, Ont.: "I don't know why the men married the wives if they can't keep them . . . As long as there are single women looking for jobs the married women's place is in the home."

Thomas Hair, Local 877, Bridgeport: "I don't think we can go on record as being opposed to women working, but I don't believe that we should encourage women working, and I am opposed to this maternity clause to be incorporated in our agreements . . . If we are going to force the employer to bring back women after they go home and have their children I think that we are working against our main objectives here. I happen to be chairman of the shop committee in Sikorsky in Bridgeport and last year some of our negotiating committee wanted to put that clause in our contract. It was opposed to it because I have never married for 17 years and I never felt that my wife should

work. I still don't feel that she should work. Her place is home with the children and I don't think we should do this."

Jack E. Dean, Local 330, Grand Rapids: "I fully realize that you are not going to cure the thing (unemployment) by eliminating married workers, but you cannot build a dam against unemployment and not put in all the bricks. It takes a lot of bricks to build a dam . . . The support we give to married women's job security equal to men fosters one of the causes of child delinquency . . . I do not accuse each and every married woman worker of being a poor mother, but it is one of the causes which is recognized by competent authorities throughout this country. It is also one of the causes for unemployment of a great many of our men."

Sylvester L. Colin, Local 1200, Centerline, Mich.: "I cannot agree with the sentiment that I see on the floor saying that a woman has a right to compete with a man for a job . . . I think there are those women, a minority of women, that need a job, widows and women who are not married and things of that kind. We can agree on that. But I say this, let's do not leave this convention with the understanding and with the endorsement . . . that a woman has the right to compete with a man is what we want. I think it is one of those things that we are not in agreement with. It is one of those things we must frown on . . . (We must) try to raise the standard of living of all the people so that the women can go back to the home."

REUTHER DUCKS

The scissorblills who voiced these ideas were answered by women delegates and some rank and file men delegates. But Reuther, who does more than his share of speaking at conventions, did little to educate the convention against male prejudice. On the contrary, instead of combat-

ing the prejudices expressed, he made matters worse by thoroughly confusing the issue:

"I believe what we have done here is that a lot of people have substituted emotion for what the resolution calls for. It does not deal with whether you think women ought to work or not work. It deals with whether women are going to be protected when they are working . . . Where people are working who are women are we going to protect their standards, are we going to permit management to exploit them and use them to undermine our standards? That is what we are dealing with here. So we ought to understand that."

Here members of the UAW were openly saying that married women had no right to be in the plants. That's not the issue, Reuther told them. They ducked what has become a burning issue in the plants for 150,000 women UAW members, and he avoided giving offense to the scissorblills. Real labor statesmanship! A model labor leader!

But Reuther did more than evade the issue. He also damaged the fight for women's equality. Debate had been closed when he made his remarks, and so no one could point out that Point 5 of the resolution explicitly directs local unions to "continue to work toward the elimination of discrimination against women at the hiring gate, in training and promotional opportunities."

By saying that the resolution "does not deal with whether you think women ought to work or not work," Reuther contradicted Point 5 of the resolution and undermined it. He not only made unpardonable concessions in principle but he gave a pretext and a handle to the prejudiced men workers who are opposed to fighting for "the elimination of discrimination against women at the hiring gate."

Few delegates bothered to vote against the resolution, which was passed overwhelmingly. But Reu-

ther's own remarks indicate that the passage of the resolution will not accomplish much in the fight against discrimination in the plants or in isolating the prejudiced elements in the union.

Such a scene would have been unbelievable in the early days of the UAW. Women workers have made important gains in and through the UAW, but discrimination against them is still strong and threatening — inside as well as outside the union. A lot of fighting remains to be done if the women are not to be squeezed out of their jobs by the employers, while the union stands by, passing essentially progressive resolutions on paper and doing little to back them up.

And a lot of fighting has to be done by UAW members who are concerned about the steady growth of conservatism in their union, a trend which was amply illustrated by the discussion on the woman question at this convention.

New York
Friday Forum
"The Guaranteed Annual Wage and the UAW-CIO"
Speaker: Harold Robins
Fri., April 15, 8:30 P. M.
116 University Place
Donation 25c.

Newark Fri. Night
Socialist Forum
presents a talk on
"The Yalta Papers"
By George Lavan
Fri., April 8, 8:30 P. M.
52 Market Street
(2nd floor, Corner Plane St.)

Subscription \$3 per year: \$1.50 for 6 months. Foreign: \$4.50 per year: \$2.25 for 6 months. Canadian: \$3.50 per year: \$1.75 for 6 months. Bundle Orders: 6 or more copies 6c each in U.S., 7c each in foreign countries.

THE MILITANT
Published Weekly in the Interests of the Working People
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 5-7460
Editor: MURRY WEISS
Business Manager: DOROTHY JOHNSON

Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the Militant's policies. These are expressed in its editorials.
Entered as second class matter March 7, 1944 at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Monday, April 4, 1955

Who Owns America?

It was nearing the golden spring of 1953 for American capitalism. Production was at an all-time high; unemployment at an all-time low. Best of all, profits were almost double the lush take in World War II.

Not that this country had abolished poverty. "We certainly haven't," said Life. But we were on the way to universal well-being. Was this perhaps due to the war economy — the Korean War? Life magazine simply ignored that foolish question.

Life's indefinable "dynamic new economic system which has safely by-passed socialism" was based, of course, on private ownership of the means of production and distribution and was operated for private profit.

The scene now shifts to the slightly less golden spring of 1955. Unemployment has tripled. Production has continued below the previous peak for almost two years straight.

The March 21, 1955, Life magazine now finds that something has happened to "one of the great social revolutions of history."

"Hustling Humphrey"

Dorothy Schiff, publisher of the liberal New York Post, is not the ordinary publisher whose main interest is raking in the profits. She writes a column of her own and she is idealistic about liberal politics.

She relates how she first heard Humphrey some years ago at an Americans for Democratic Action convention. Although he was enunciating the standard liberal line of the period — with which she agreed — she sensed that he was a demagogue.

"Last August," she writes, "I was horrified to learn that our friend the 'liberal demagogue,' whose term was about to expire, had seized upon the passions aroused by McCarthyism and appeared to be attempting to turn them to his own political advantage."

Labor and the Farm Bloc

We have always contended that if labor built its own party, it would receive the backing of the majority of the population. In addition to support from the organized workers, a Labor Party could count on powerful allies, and the combination would guarantee a clear-cut victory.

Who are these allies? The Negro minority, for one, is solidly in labor's camp. The official Negro organizations consider the unions their firmest supporters in the fight to end Jim Crow.

Now important farm spokesmen are elated because the AFL and CIO have officially endorsed their key demand for rigid farm price supports set at 90% of parity.

The bi-partisan majority of the House of Representatives Agriculture Committee has just issued a ten-page pamphlet quoting CIO and AFL leaders in favor of rigid price supports. This pamphlet is being mailed to 30,000 farm organization leaders throughout the country.

Labor leaders assured the farm-bloc Congressmen that workers don't blame farmers for high food prices. The price to farmers could go up without resulting in higher food prices for consumers, they said.

Net farm income dropped 10% in 1954 over the previous year, and this prompted

All Americans are not becoming capitalists and owners of industry through the widespread ownership of common stocks. In fact, Life finds that what this country needs is "more people to own a stake in industry."

"In the greatest capitalist nation in the world, where common stockholders own the industries that provide the livelihood for us all, 77% of the adult U.S. population do not even know what common stock is." (Original emphasis.)

But that's not all. There are so few people willing or able to become "partners in industry" that Life cautions the Senators about scaring off potential new purchasers of stock. These Senators "will serve the country poorly indeed if they seek to frighten the 95.5% of the public which already owns no stock out of buying any at all."

It's a mighty slow-working "social revolution" that has extended the ownership of industry to just 4 1/2% of the people. If that's how far corporate ownership has spread in the almost two centuries of U.S. capitalism, we can confidently expect full "economic democracy" under "free enterprise" in just a few thousand years.

In case you don't want to wait a few millenniums for economic democracy, you can get it in your lifetime by a real social revolution. Just fight for socialism which ends private ownership in the means of production and distribution.

filibuster legislation. And last week Hubert pulled another fast one. He tried to butter up liberalism's arch enemy, William Randolph Hearst, Jr.

That liberal crusader on-the-make, Humphrey, put Hearst's articles on the Soviet Union into the Congressional record, calling them "extraordinary" and "valuable" and their author "the distinguished American Editor."

The ADA leaders do not have such delicate political stomachs as Dorothy Schiff. They invited Sen. Humphrey to be toastmaster at their recent convention banquet. As an influential liberal publisher Mrs. Schiff was given several platform seats. These she tore up in protest.

This well-intentioned publisher has everything upside down. She sees Humphrey as the deep-dyed villain and the ADA as a betrayed organization. Not so. Humphrey is no better or worse — even in this realm he is mediocre — than any other liberal politician. His demagogy and readiness to sell out civil liberties and the struggle for Negro rights is not a personal wickedness but an occupational disease of liberalism.

German Report on Anti-Militarism Fight

[The following article was received from a correspondent in Germany. It describes the anti-rearmament movement of trade unionists and youth in Bavaria. Since the time of writing Adenauer has hammered through the rearmament measure in both houses of the West German parliament. Reports indicate, however, that the movement against capitalist militarism continues to seethe in the German working class and youth. — Ed.]

MUNICH, March 3 — "We don't wish to die for dollars or roubles." The cry rang through the streets of Munich last Thursday evening. It came from several hundred young trade unionists who marched behind three of their number dressed as skeletons. One beat out a death march on his drum.

They marched to the Koenigsplatz. In the past, the classic-style buildings around this vast square echoed back the nationalistic war harangues of Hitler. On this night their ruins surrounded 30,000 workers coming from the factories of Munich to demonstrate against the rearmament of Germany.

The memories of bitter suffering under Nazism and war exploded in the roar of applause which regularly punctuated the speeches denouncing remilitarization. Above all over this vast

crowd of Bavarian trade unionists hung the fear of a Bruderkrieg — a war of brothers. A great shout of assent greeted Herr Woerner — President of the Bavarian Trade Union Council — when he declared: "In no case is it our intention to be used as an expendable force to help free the way to Dunkirk for the Americans."

CONTRAST

Five hundred miles away from the bitter cold and dim light of the Koenigsplatz the warm assembly hall of the Parliament of Bonn was brightly illuminated. There too, German rearmament was being discussed. But what a contrast!

The official speakers on the Koenigsplatz and those who backed them were members of the Socialist Party and trade unions, among them former inmates of the concentration camps, and war cripples; those who suffered the most from Nazism and war.

The official speakers in the Bonn Parliament and their supporters were representing all those German industrialists and the social strata which backed Hitler and benefited from the suppression of the German working class movement. They were led by Konrad Adenauer, millionaire, linked by his shareholdings to the Ruhr industrialists and the American banking concern — Morgan and Co. He is a personal friend of Herr Pford-

menges, the notorious German coal and iron baron. He controls a Foreign Office of which 80% of the personnel are former Nazis.

On the Ministerial bench in Bonn sat Herr Schroeder, Minister of the Interior. He recently attacked an anti-war poster of the Social Democratic Party as being the product of demagoguery. Herr Schroeder joined the Nazi Party in 1933 and served as a high official in the Ministry of the Interior under the Nazis.

Near the Minister for Refugees, a former S. S. colonel sat, Herr Kraft, Minister without portfolio, himself a former general of the S. S.

Backed by the select band, Minister Strauss intervened in the Bonn debate to help force through the ratification of the Paris Agreement. He denounced the Munich demonstration, declaring: "Most political stupidities start in Bavaria."

PUNITIVE THREATS

There was good reason for the nervous reaction of Herr Strauss. Bavaria has been the center of the resistance to German rearmament. Over two years the movement has grown under the leadership of the trade unions. From here came the resolution of the trade union youth opposing remilitarization which was carried last October by the all-German Trade Union Congress.

From here is being organized the collection of signatures in

support of the appeal against remilitarization made by socialist and church leaders from Frankfurt a few weeks ago.

The government has stated it is setting up a commission to inquire whether those who issued the Frankfurt appeal can be tried for high treason. A leaflet issued by Adenauer's party declared that those who sign in support of this appeal are "aiding Moscow."

Despite the open and hidden threats from employers and government, despite ratification; the campaign continues.

The Bavarian trade union youth will open an anti-militaristic exhibition next week. It will be held in Munich's Botanical Hall — opposite one of the offices of the American Military Occupation. Young artists are now preparing the posters and photographs attacking Nazism, militarism, and their German and international capitalist supporters.

BURDEN OF MILITARISM

The trade union leaders express determination to resist the effect of militarization on the standard of living and political conditions. The executive committee of the Bavarian trade unions underlined those effects in a document which they issued last month. They pointed out that the amount necessary to begin rearmament was 60,000,000 marks, an amount equal to the yearly income of the whole working class and employees of

Western Germany. They quoted a New Years Day article in an employers' journal which declared: "To rearm without encroaching on the standard of living would be a prescription which has not yet been discovered."

Recalling the Weimar Republic, the trade union document stated "once again the new army will only formally stand on the basis of the Constitution but would not be ready to defend it."

"The method of government" they continue "which uses parliamentary majorities to flout the will of the majority of the people opens the way to authoritarianism."

Whether or not German reaction succeeds in consolidating itself will depend on those forces in Germany of which the Munich demonstration was a part. Let us hope that the working class of England and the U.S.A. will not again support the wrong side in this struggle. Thus, those who oppose remilitarization here may not again be faced with the situation related by Herr Urbans, the president of Augsburg's 54,000 trade unionists — and a former prisoner in the Dachau concentration camp.

"When the news of the Scarborough (British Labor Party Convention) decision on German rearmament was published in the press here" he said, "workers asked: 'What can we do, when even they are voting against us?'"

... St. Paul -- Packinghouse, Rail Center

(Continued from page 1) and Mexican minorities are present.

The Mexican people came into the area during the Thirties to work in the sugar beet fields. Since then a growing number have settled in St. Paul where they find work mainly in the packinghouses and on the railroads, usually being assigned, like the Negro people, to the hardest and dirtiest jobs.

In industry they are generally militant unionists but in their segregated community life their organized activities are polarized around the Catholic church, with an annual church-sponsored fiesta designed to divert them from the struggle to improve their social and economic conditions.

FIGHT FOR EQUALITY

By comparison the Negro people here are more militant in their struggle against discrimination. The sleeping car porters and dining car employees unions are an important force in the community struggles for Negro rights as well as on the railroads. In packing the CIO militants are carrying on a fight for Negro equality in hiring and upgrading. Discriminatory management policies have held Negro employment down to eight

per cent of the labor force at Armour's and only three per cent at Swift's.

The NAACP, a long-established force in the city, follows an up and down pattern of activity according to the times and the immediate issues. The Urban League functions mainly as an agency to help jobs for Negroes, especially for middle class elements. The city's Negro press supports the Democratic-Farm-Labor party. It denounces the worst forms of discrimination but seeks to divert the Negro people from mass action, advocating instead that they help elect D-FL "friends" to office.

FAMILIES ON RELIEF

Employment for all categories of St. Paul workers is conditioned by the city's sensitive reaction to the state of the farm economy which in recent times has sagged a bit in the dairy and poultry sectors. The working force here as of February totaled 145,300, a decline of 2,200 since February a year ago. In August 1953 the relief case load (families) stood at 823. Since then there has been a constant increase with the current case load standing at 1,823, more than double the 1953 figure. Some upturn in employment is

now anticipated from a pickup in residential building during the coming months. A main item in this field will be \$12,000 homes built for occupancy by middle class elements and the better-paid workers. These are one-floor dwellings having five rooms compressed into a space of 24 by 36 feet. A down payment of \$800 to \$2,000 is required and monthly installments, including interest, of about \$80 must be paid for 20 to 25 years. By then these houses will be neither square, nor level, nor plumb.

The job situation in packing is a mixed one. Last fall Cudahy shut down its Newport plant throwing 1,200 out of work. The corn-hog price ratio has fallen off balance impairing pork production. European hams are flowing into the American market, cutting into the sales of domestically-produced hams, mainly because the greedy meat trust puts out a low-quality product with an excess of fat.

Production of mutton and beef, on the other hand, has picked up some, partly because sheep and cattle can be put to pasture and then primed for a short period on corn. Local employment has also been aided by the transfer of the Armour sheep and calf

kill from Chicago to this area and by the expansion of frosted and canned meat production at its South St. Paul plant. So far these factors have offset any sag in lines like pork and have permitted absorption of many Cudahy workers by Armour and Swift.

"MECHANICAL MONSTER"

Jobs in packing are nevertheless made insecure by technological change which is taking place at an increasing tempo. Mechanization in the canning of meat, machines that make wieners, an electronics process for the curing of meat are eliminating workers from the production lines. A device called the "mechanical monster" will soon be in use for the automatic skinning of cattle thus making obsolete one of the most skilled jobs in the industry.

At the Hormel plant in nearby Austin a gas chamber has been installed for the killing of hogs. This will eliminate the dangerous shackling process in which a shackle sometimes catches in a worker's clothing and he is hoisted toward the man who cuts the hogs' throats, shouting "Don't stick me!" The catch is that it also ends a lot of jobs for workers who now do the shackling but because they love danger but because they love meat.

As in all other industries a terrific speedup exists in the local packinghouses, based on a piece-work and bonus system. Certain workers on the production line are given special incentive rates so they will exert pressure on others who receive less incentive pay, thus bringing the Judas goat from the stock pen right onto the killing floor.

Speedup and technological change are likewise invading the railroad backshops. Diesel locomotives are sending the boiler-maker the way of the horseshoer. Division locomotive repair shops are being eliminated and many jobs along with them. An automatic axle lathe now in use makes it possible for two men to turn out in three months what it previously took five men a year to produce. On the operating end manpower is being reduced by using greater Diesel power to lengthen the trains and through the installation of telephone communication from locomotive to caboose. Humphreys' with electrical retarders and automatically-thrown switches are forcing yardmen to hustle new jobs for themselves.

"HORIZONSCRAPER"

A "horizonscraper" is under development for the car shops, a building over half a mile long. As many as 50 freight cars can be put through it in a single day. They go in one end, get a complete overhaul through assembly line methods and emerge

at the other end fully reconditioned. Such installations are breaking down the skilled labor patterns, building up new speedup pressures and throwing workers out of jobs. One subtle way in which manpower is being reduced comes to light through the fact that few retired railroad workers are being replaced.

MOOD OF WORKERS

Apprentices in the railroad shops are worried about their future employment. They come to union meetings in above-average numbers and voice a considerable approval for the idea of a 30 hour week at 40 hours pay. Building trades workers show concern over the rate of sales of the new houses they are constructing. With millions of pounds of meat going to the armed forces, packinghouse workers are quite aware that war production alone keeps many of them on the job.

"What will happen if we quit the war program?" they ask. "How far is automation going to go?" They seem to feel things are moving from bad to worse. They manifest much apprehension and confusion but tend to keep their real political opinions pretty much to themselves, except in discussion with their closest fellow-workers. Signs of jitteriness are present even among the best paid workers. In general they tend to blame the Republicans for the way things are going and hope they can rely on the Democrats to do something about it.

Many seek a personal solution of their problems by taking a second job or through both the husband and wife working. Women usually have to turn to the seasonal retail trade or to waiting-table in restaurants and bars where the pay is pretty poor. Some working couples overextend themselves in the purchase of homes, cars and other things with the result that they become conservative for the moment through fear of any interruption of their earning power.

Such interruptions occur nevertheless. Extra jobs are getting harder to find here. Want ads are mainly for sales work. The over-all employment picture is far from stable. Relief rolls are mounting. No hope, or ambition, or personal advantage for the day can stand up against the crushing longer-range impact of capitalism in decay. Here and there a worker is already coming to this realization and moving out ahead of the mass in his political thinking. Coming events will add to this potential left-wing force. From among these elements the revolutionary socialist vanguard can be gradually strengthened in the days ahead.

... British Laborite Crisis Deepens

(Continued from page 1) were intending to pull an election in May or June. Right wing politicians like Attlee, while arguing it is necessary to have a showdown with the left, hesitate to split the Party before an election. They could thus undermine their own support.

Many right wing M.P.s would certainly not return to Parliament, either because of the apathy of the workers, or because left-wing candidates would stand against them.

OFFICIALS FURIOUS

The trade union bosses' hatred of Bevanism can be measured by the contempt with which they treat the hesitations of Attlee. Today, the industrial correspondent of the "Daily Telegraph" — always well informed on the opinions of the top trade union leadership — reported a trade union leader as saying: "What can you do with a man who doodles when Transport House (headquarters of the Labor Party) burns. We are getting

tired of trying to uphold the authority of the Parliamentary leader while he takes this kind of action."

The report continues, "Another trade unionist made the caustic comment, 'You will notice that the official statement (issued from the N.E.C. meeting) has been typewritten appropriately on yellow paper.'"

"These right-wing leaders will now seek to bludgeon Attlee into line between now and next Wednesday, (March 30). In the prospect of Bevan's immediate expulsion has not been removed by the formula adopted at yesterday's meeting of the N.E.C. As this week's Tribune comments, 'The Right-wing move is scotched, but not killed.'"

The strategy of the trade union bosses will now be to place before Bevan demands for assurances which they know he cannot accept. In fact, at least one vote was cast in favor of Attlee's motion in the belief that it was the best way of tying a noose around Bevan's neck. Mrs.

Jean Mann, M.P., a member of the N.E.C. who owes her position to the trade union vote, and who supported the motion of Attlee, is reported as saying there was no chance of Bevan giving the assurances asked for.

Will the hesitation of Attlee result in the sub-committee making demands that Bevan can accede to? Or will the trade union leaders succeed in placing conditions before Bevan he could not possibly accept? We will know next Wednesday. In the meantime, to answer those questions involves speculation.

SHOWDOWN COMING

However, no serious political observer can have any doubts that if Aneurin Bevan is not expelled next Wednesday, then the showdown which the trade union bureaucracy is demanding has only been postponed until after the General Election. Nothing fundamentally will have been resolved.

The right wing leadership — a transmitting belt for capitalism — will continue their support for the imperialist war preparations. If Labor wins the election a new Labor Government would take office with a seething mass in the Labor Party distrustful of its policies, demanding an attack on capitalism and a break with the Anglo-American war alliance.

If the Labor Party loses the election then the frustration of the rank and file will burst forth in a condemnation of the policy of the leadership as responsible for the electoral defeat.

The division in the Labor Party cannot be bridged by postponing Bevan's expulsion. More than his head is involved. The opposing tendencies are driven forward by class forces which will explode any temporary truce and place the Labor Party once again on the edge of a split.

N. Y. ANNUAL SPRING BAZAAR WILL BE HELD ON MAY 14

The 1955 Annual Spring Bazaar, sponsored by the New York School of Social Science, will take place on Saturday, May 14, at the Militant Hall, 116 University Place. The School is sponsored by supporters of the Militant and conducts a year-round activity of classes, forums, movies and other educational and cultural activities.

The committee in charge of the Bazaar invites all readers of the Militant to contribute items. Wearing apparel, books, phonograph records, prints, electrical appliances, costume jewelry, dishware, leather goods, tools, candy, pastry and anything else that has use or beauty will be

highly appreciated and cheerfully accepted.

The proceeds of the Bazaar will further the activities of the New York School of Social Science.

According to preliminary plans announced by the committee, the Bazaar will start at noon on May 14 and "run until both bargains and participants are exhausted." Then a hot supper plate will be served and a social evening will climax the event.

Subscribe!
Start your subscription now. Clip the coupon and mail it in today. Send \$1.50 for six months subscription or \$3 for a full year to The Militant, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.
Name _____
Street _____ Zone _____
City _____ State _____
\$1.50 Six months \$3.00 Full year New Renewal

The Negro Struggle

By John Thayer

Southern Liberals — A Disappearing Species?

The point reached by the Negro struggle today — the demand for integrated schools North and South, given legal endorsement by the Supreme Court decision, has jeopardized the very existence of a political grouping that commanded a fair amount of attention formerly. This was the political grouping known as "Southern liberals."

Today the very ground seems to have been cut out from beneath them. Their stock in trade has become obsolete. Discouraged, most of them have even stopped trying to peddle their wares. Unless they can find some new variation or unless the Supreme Court's still-to-come decision on implementing school segregation gives them a new lease on life they may just fade away.

Who were the Southern liberals? Some of their more prominent figures were Ellis Arnall, Lister Hill, Jonathan Daniels, Hodding Carter, Virginius Dabney and many others whose names were familiar to Northern readers of the liberal press.

What was their position and line? They were all men of standing in the South — mostly as politicians and journalists. Their line was that the "excesses" of Jim Crow should be done away with. They deplored lynchings, the cruder forms of Jim Crow and the glaring inequality of the "separate but equal" facilities in schools, hospitals, etc. for the Negro people.

They stood 100% for "separate but equal" segregation but "liberally" urged token reforms so that the South could defend itself against the charge that all public facilities for Negroes were abysmally unequal to those for the "master race."

Their "pro-Negro" position never jeopardized their standing in the South. Indeed in most cases their careers as public figures were based on it. For they were very valuable to Southern Jim Crow and the rulers of the South realized this and protected them from any Ku Klux elements who might not understand what it was all about.

These Southern liberals were invaluable ambassadors to and placators of Northern opinion. They were "living proof" that not all Southern leaders were rabid on the race question. They seemed to give promise that, left to itself, the South would solve the disgraceful and barbarous treatment of the Negro people without Northern interference.

While no Negro, labor or liberal gathering in the North would for a moment tolerate the presence of a Bilbo or Tammadge, these Southern liberals could appear and explain the Negro "problem" and urge that the South be left to solve it in its own way (and in its own sweet time).

But everything they said was premised on the doctrine of "separate but equal." Now that has been thrown out the window. Today Negro people will not settle for anything less than integration, nor will labor. Not one of these Southern liberals has dared come out for integration. That is the great dividing line in Southern politics. A decade ago Judge J. Waties Waring had enough courage to do so and was immediately excommunicated from white Southern politics and life.

The disappearance of this brand of Southern liberalism will clear the air. No one will mourn the passing of these hypocrites except their fellow hypocrites, North and South.

'Bad Day at Black Rock'

By Myra Tanner

Just a lonely spot on the desert. The streamlined train hadn't stopped in four years. Only four or five buildings to accommodate a few hopeless, grubbing desert ranchers. That's the setting for a lynching that slowly comes to light in the MGM movie, "Bad Day at Black Rock."

The hero of the movie, played by Spencer Tracy, comes to Black Rock in search of a Japanese-American farmer and finds he had been lynched there the day after Pearl Harbor. The townspeople had kept their guilty secret throughout the war years.

"Thank heavens there aren't many towns in America like Black Rock," says the hero as he unbare the ugly facts of the racist lynching.

Black Rock — a tiny, isolated exception? What about the federal government of the United States? Wasn't it acting like a lynch mob when it condemned thousands of Japanese-American citizens and their families to concentration camps during the Second World War? When it pronounced men, women and children "guilty" without a trial, a jury or any other "due process" just because of their national descent?

And what about California, the big golden state controlled by the big golden Bank of America with its vigilante tradition and the so-called "Farmers' Association"? Is Hollywood reluctant to lift the glamorous mask off the face of its own home state?

Too many of us know the real story. We lived that history. All the newspapers of Los Angeles, the third largest city in the United States, must share the blame as well as the miserable citizens of "Black Rock." In almost every issue of the daily press, we were treated to hysterical, lynch-inciting lies following the tragedy of Pearl Harbor.

The newspapers carried pictures of gun displays in hardware stores on Terminal Island where many Japanese-Americans worked in the fish canneries, and radio

antennae on the homes of fishermen — all long-familiar sights — now made out to be sinister evidence of "Japanese treachery."

A super-patriotic group in the Fish Cannery Workers Union, whipped up by the newspaper hysteria, introduced a motion into the union meeting to expel forthwith their Japanese-American union brothers and sisters. The good name of the union was fortunately saved by a small majority of the workers who withstood the avalanche of lynch propaganda.

But the problem was soon taken out of the union's hands by the federal government. The U.S. army moved in. The Japanese-Americans were taken from their homes and herded into concentration camps. The first big Pacific victory for the U.S. army in the war was the "capture of Terminal Island" in San Pedro, California.

During the 1945 election campaign in Los Angeles, the Socialist Workers Party campaigned to defend the Japanese-Americans. The Hollywood Taxpayers Association hooted and howled to silence the S.W.P. spokesman in language no less vile than that used by the citizens of Black Rock. That was a "Bad Day in Hollywood."

In the movie the lynchers have a material motive in addition to their racist hatred. In the water-hungry desert the Japanese farmer had successfully dug a well. Multiply this situation by several thousand at least, and you will get the picture of successful California Japanese small-farm enterprises, and the greed of big landowners who stood to gain a great deal from the wholesale expulsion of the Japanese-Americans.

The movie tells an exciting story and does it in an exciting way. It does one's heart good to see racist lynchings getting the knocks for a change. But as Hollywood so seldom deals with a fragment of historical truth, why must it be coupled with a lie? Black Rock was not an exception. Let's face the whole truth.

Notes from the News

"SECURITY" TESTS FOR PSYCHIATRISTS?
Labor's Daily reports that in Washington, D. C., serious consideration is being given to a plan to require FBI clearance for psychiatrists before they can treat government employees or former employees in "sensitive" positions. This development follows the disclosure at the recent convention of the American Ortho-psychiatric Association that the loyalty program is driving many government employees to nervous breakdowns. One Washington physician queried on the merits of screening psychiatrists said: "The administration would do better to mind its own business. Pretty soon the psychiatrists will have to see psychiatrists."

CIO PACKINGHOUSE WORKERS CONVENTION of locals in Iowa, Nebraska and Colorado (membership 25,000), passed a resolution condemning "the action by the State of Kentucky in taking reprisal action against Carl Braden for his activity on the behalf of better relations among peoples." Braden helped a Negro buy a home outside the overcrowded Negro districts of Louisville. Then he and six others were framed up and indicted under the state sedition law. First to be tried, Braden was sentenced to 15 years imprisonment.

A KU KLUX LEADER has been appointed to the Government's Subversive Activities Control

Board, according to charges made by John W. Bobbs, Vice-chairman of the Georgia Republican Party State Committee. The Negro Republican leader has addressed a protest against the administration appointment of ex-Congressman John S. Wood of Canton, Ga., to the witch-hunt post. Bobbs said he has reliable information that Wood was not only a member of the Ku Klux Klan but one of its leaders. The Ku Klux Klan is more or less on the "subversive" list. That is it was on erment agencies retain it on their copies. Other erment agencies retain it on their copies. Other government agencies, notably the Army, have quietly dropped the Ku Klux from the "subversive" list to which officials make inductees swear non-membership.

THAT \$2½ MILLION BRINKS ROBBERY in Boston in 1950 was largely facilitated by the fact that the company was too cheap to pay overtime for two guards. Every night of the week except Tuesdays two guards were assigned to the entrance-way turrets. That was the company's work schedule. On Tuesday nights, however, there never were guards there because the company would have had to pay them time-and-a-half overtime. Guard's wages were \$1.42 an hour. These facts were revealed by Joseph Dineen, crime reporter for the Boston Globe, in a recent book on the famous robbery.

Lundeberg's More Work At Less Pay

By Roy Gale

SAN FRANCISCO, March 23 — Harry Lundeberg, Secretary of the Sailors Union of the Pacific (AFL), has reversed the traditional stand of labor for shorter hours and more pay. In the name of fighting runaway ships, operating under foreign flags, he signed a crew for the S.S. Tonsina with seven less men in the crew — at drastically reduced overtime. Watch standers are required to work 56 hours at sea.

The runaway ship problem is a serious one. American ship operators register in Panama in order to evade union pay standards and conditions. But Lundeberg's answer to the runaway threat was greeted with bitter hostility by other maritime unions and rank and file seamen.

In the first place Lundeberg signed a crew on the Tonsina which included every person on the ship — from Master down to wipers. This brought a sharp clash with other AFL seafarers' unions. When this jurisdictional raid was apparently patched up by Lundeberg's reassurances, the issue erupted in the conference of American Maritime Unions, which was set up a year ago as a joint AFL-CIO body.

AFL-CIO SPLIT

Lundeberg's move caused a split at the March 21 session of the Conference in Washington, D.C. The AFL unions walked out hurling red-baiting charges at the CIO maritime unions. The CIO unions replied with a blistering statement which declared that the Lundeberg contract destroyed the 40-hour week for seamen. "This deal of Lundeberg's," the CIO statement charged, "was an indefensible sellout of the fundamental gains of union seamen . . . It is a threat to the hard-won standards of American seamen."

The March 15 San Francisco Chronicle reveals that other ships are planning to follow the Tonsina pattern. This is entirely likely since the Lundeberg contract slashes conditions so completely that the operators have everything to gain. Only the men who run the ships will lose.

The Chronicle gave warm editorial support to Lundeberg's action: "In Harry Lundeberg's new approach to the problem of fighting foreign flag ship competition, there is a realistic recognition of the principle that what's good for the American shipping industry is good for Lundeberg's Sailors Union of the Pacific."

This is straight talk from the boss press. The Chronicle even spells it out. They praise Lundeberg for recognizing that the only way to compete with the scab ships is by reducing costs: "That means less money paid out for wages, more work for wages paid out, or a combination of the two."

Certainly this is "good for the shipping industry" owners, but its strictly phony for the seamen.

Rake Up Old Mess



Members of Senate permanent Investigations subcommittee shown beginning a new attempt to rake up some witch-hunting muck in the case of Maj. Irving Peress, New York dentist, a prime target of Sen. Joseph McCarthy. Sen. John L. McClellan (D-Ark.), left, is now chairman. Next to him are McCarthy and committee counsel James Juliana.

Star Seattle Informer In Return Performance

SEATTLE, March 20 — For the second time in a year the witch-hunting House Un-American Activities Committee invaded Seattle to conduct public hearings. Front page headlines on March 17, 18 and 19 screamed "information" about alleged "Communist plots" hatched in the State of Washington.

The real purpose of these hearings as well as those conducted last June was to intimidate or victimize union militants and others in the community disposed to criticize the rule of Big Business.

The hearings last week were conducted by a sub-committee composed of Morgan Moulder (D-Mo), chairman, and Harold Velde (R-Ill). Despite the change to Democratic auspices, the hearings differed from last year's Republican directed hearings only in the absence of direct TV broadcast of testimony. Also the cast of informers was changed.

NEW STAR INFORMER

Whereas last June, Barbara Hartle, former leading CP official in the Northwest and Smith Act prisoner, was the star finger-merchant, the hearings last week featured Eugene V. Dennett in that role.

Last year, Dennett was subpoenaed by the committee. On his first appearance he defied the witch-hunters, using his constitutional right under the Fifth Amendment not to answer their questions. But he returned on the last day of hearings as a cooperative witness offering to "tell all."

For 16 years until his bureaucratic expulsion in 1947, Dennett was a leading Northwest official of the Communist Party. After his expulsion, he pursued an independent course in Local 1208 of the United Steelworkers of America. He was an outstanding militant in the local, and an advocate of building a Labor Party. He defended the right of free speech for all, including

NAACP Takes Witch-Hunt Step In Los Angeles

By Thelma Clyde

LOS ANGELES, March 20 — The newly elected leadership of the Los Angeles branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has shown willingness to concede to the prevailing

witch hunt atmosphere in recent weeks.

Last week's Tribune, local Negro bi-weekly, commented editorially "that the current 'brain-washing' going on in the local branch NAACP is loathsome, disgusting, and offensive . . . to the excellent spirit of trust and confidence which has always existed in this community, whatever its other imperfections." The editorial suggested that "the shameful rending of the NAACP on the basis of 'who is and who isn't a Red, . . .'" could be expected to have harmful effects on the NAACP membership drive now in progress.

Readers of the Militant will probably recall that the election of Thomas G. Neusom as president of the local branch by an overwhelming majority in December was considered a setback to red-baiting in the branch. It had been the defeated opposition who unfurled the banner of an anti-red crusade the hotly contested election.

Yet the first action of the newly elected executive board was to approve an anti-communist resolution introduced by the president-elect: "Be it resolved that we, the members of the Los Angeles Branch, NAACP, do hereby serve notice on all persons seeking to join or become affiliated with the Los Angeles Branch:

"That the 42nd annual NAACP Convention in 1951 stated as a fact that persons who belonged to, or organizations fronting for the Communist Party, could not support the principles of the NAACP, and that therefore, the Constitution of the NAACP was amended, restricting membership to those who support the principles and the programs of the NAACP;

"In accordance therewith, we do hereby reject the assistance, cooperation or membership of any person, organization or group, who is now or has been without having resigned or disavowed such position, connected with or held membership in any organization declared to be subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, since such persons could not constitutionally be members.

"Further, that we as officers of this branch will discharge our duty in a diligent and alert manner, being constantly on guard to resist the effort of any organization on the Attorney General's list, or person who is a member of such organization from taking part in or infiltrating in any degree in the local branch."

This resolution was presented to and concurred by the membership meeting at which newly elected officers were installed.

The 1951 convention resolution (on which the "constitutionality" of the local branch resolution is based) sought to exclude from membership those who "belong to, or organizations fronting for the Communist Party." The local branch resolution goes a step further. It proposes to "reject the assistance, cooperation or membership of any person, organization or group, who is . . . connected with . . . any organization declared to be subversive by the Attorney General . . ."

Why this anxiety to broaden the witch-hunt formula? It is very likely that the local NAACP leaders seek with this resolution to legitimize the organization in the eyes of the Democratic and Republican officials before whom they plead for "equal rights under the law." But democratic rights for all will not be won by the adopting of the undemocratic principle of guilt by association, loyalty purge and thought control.

The witch-hunt is designed to stifle all opposition to any measures and institutions the ruling class and their representatives find necessary to the continuation of the capitalist system, and this includes segregation and the discrimination it breeds.

What guarantee has the NAACP leadership that the NAACP itself will not appear on the Attorney General's subversive list? It is certain that concessions to the witch-hunt will not win such a guarantee. So long as the local and national leaders of the NAACP follow this course, the slogan "Free by '63" remains a mockery.

As the Tribune editorial quoted above correctly observes, "The local community needs its NAACP, not as a junior grade McCarthy, but as a fighter for civil rights and civil liberties."

Profits of the German industrialist Alfred Krupp have been reported for the first time since World War II. Directors of Krupp's industrial empire announced that they are already out of the red and had totalled \$235 million last year. This was done without the coal mines and steel mills which Krupp hasn't gotten back yet — but hopes to soon. The U.S. and Britain returned Krupp's property to him in 1953. He was one of the industrial backers of Hitler and used forced labor in his plants during world War II.

Hidden Victims of the Atomic Explosions

By Theodore Kovalesky

The change jingled in the old man's pocket as he closed the door and faced the deluge. Rain slapped into his face, but he grinned. One dollar and sixty-seven cents! It wasn't much, but that wasn't the point. The meat of the whole matter was simply this: He had come out ahead.

His grin broadened as he savored the memory of the look on the fire chief's face when he had shown his cards, and there had been an ace of diamonds, an ace of hearts, and an ace of spades. Even if he didn't win much, it was always a memorable occasion when he came out ahead of the firemen at an evening of poker at the fire hall.

And what if he did lose sometimes? It was his only pleasure in life, his only real recreation. For an old man in a small town such small pleasures can be very important. The rain pounded and pelted him. He was soon soaked through. What would Ellie say?

A FREAK STORM

He pouted. Ellie always thought he couldn't take care of himself. So what if it was raining? A man's daughter gets to think he should spend all his evenings sitting in a rocking chair. Well, this storm would pass. It was just a freak rain storm anyhow. You never get storms like this at this time of the year. It would rain itself out in no time. He turned the corner into Main St. Not far now. Down a block, over the creek bridge,

and then home and out of those wet clothes. Let Ellie say what she wanted to. He could take care of himself.

He stopped for a moment, bewildered. That roaring sound — what could that be? Maybe a passing jet plane? He half turned, standing in the driving rain. The roar grew. He looked, saw a black mass bearing down on him with incredible speed. Frozen with disbelief he stood there.

Then, panic wrenching him out of his immobility he turned as the flood waters struck him and knocked his legs out from under him. He went down, scrambling and clawing. This couldn't be happening to him right in the middle of Main St.! He half gawped his feet and was sent sprawling again by a surge of the black water. He clutched at a lamp post, a lamp post he had leaned against perhaps a thousand times in passing the time of day with his friends. He missed the lamp post and was swept headfirst against the fire hydrant in front of Al Peterson's barber shop. A small sound went from the old man's lips, and he ceased to struggle. After that, carried along passively, he went as the waters went.

Slam and swaying like an erect cobra swaying before the charmer, or like a strange un-biblical cord holding the darkened land to the black turbulent clouds, it was a thing of beauty. It was an eerie, unbelievable thing of beauty that could not

exist, a thing of terror that must be the terror of sleep and not of wakefulness.

So it was that the twister came to a land where twisters should never come. And as it came, this strange foreign thing of dark beauty and terror, it uprooted the trees and smashed to splinters the farmhouses that stood in its way. It strode across the land, passed on, and vanished somewhere. And where it had passed death and destruction lay upon the earth.

Then men counted the dead and buried them. Men and women mourned them. And men and women and children set about rebuilding what had been destroyed. But in their hearts was a strange, unappeased wonderment that this thing had really happened.

Who are these dead? Who is the old man, struck down in his moment of small and quiet triumph? Who are the men, and the women, and the children who were dug from beneath the wreckage of windshattered buildings?

They are part of America's growing atomic toll! Dr. Linus Pauling has said that atomic rain which has fallen on Germany and Japan may result in a new cycle of leukemia victims or in the birth of monsters, which would have been children but for the poison of radiation that entered the bodies of their parents. And two Colorado scientists have warned that

atomic fallout in Colorado is reaching the danger mark. Scientists have called for an end of the atomic tests before radiation accumulates in the atmosphere to such an extent that human life will be endangered on this planet.

But this is something else. These people, these dead, are the hidden victims, victims of an almost perfect crime. But murder will out.

"CRAZY WEATHER"

There is a man now teaching physics at the University of Panama. His name is Dr. Bohdon Medusa Cwilog, a student and an expert on the weather. Dr. Cwilog has stated that atomic explosions are affecting the weather. Atomic particles in the atmosphere are performing a function much like that of dry ice in cloud-seeding operations. The results are more rain clouds, more gales, excessive and out-of-season hurricane activity — and death, "accidental" death.

Dr. Cwilog has stated a fact that many of us knew already. In the mills and in the bars across from them, in the elevators of office buildings, wherever men and women have greeted each other and spoken of the weather, they have been saying, "You can't tell me those atomic bomb tests aren't causing this crazy weather!" Now a scientist has come forth to back up this suspecting and knowing with the words of science. The presence of radioactive

particles flung into the atmosphere by the atomic tests, Dr. Cwilog says, "will certainly change completely the weather all over the earth. Only comparative measurements from other laboratories and more work here (Panama) can tell us what is really going on. But the indications are grave."

Yes. They are grave. And how many graves will these murderers fill? The body of an old man, tossed up on a mud bank when the flood had had its way with him; the body of a child lifted tenderly from the rubble strewn by a passing hurricane. These innocent victims cry for revenge.

The day will come when man will control the weather. But the blundering, power-seeking fools who prepare the death weapons of the capitalist armies are merely tampering with the ways of nature. And in their ignorant tampering they are spreading destruction and death.

The atomic explosions must cease!

LOS ANGELES Farrell Dobbs

"What's Ahead for America — War or Peace?"
Fri., April 8, 8 P. M.
1702 East 4th Street
Donation 50c.