

QUICK, CONGRESS, THE DDT!

Don't be lulled into any false sense of security by the overwhelming evidences of popular support for continued price control, as shown by opinion polls and statements by community leaders of all kinds.

Washington is positively crawling with lobbyists, out to wreck price control by lifting ceilings in every direction. Powerful and wealthy interests are flooding the press with their propaganda.

The campaign against effective price control is already getting results, and the danger of inflation through uncontrolled price increases is growing greater and greater.

The Twohey Analysis of Newspaper Opinion reports a steady decline in clear-cut support of price control extension in the daily press. In the last three weeks it has dropped from 36% to 32% and again to 23%. Meanwhile, 18% of the press is urging "qualifying conditions" in extending price control, 4% oppose it outright, and 55% are mixed or unclear.

The most dangerous opposition to price control comes, not from those who brazenly opposed it outright, but from those who say, "We're for it, but..."

The but is a cover for every sort of inflationary amendment to raise prices and cripple OPA, thus reducing price control to a farce.

In Congress, the enemies of price control are more strongly organized than ever before. The loose alliance of reactionary Republicans and polltax Democrats that has long operated against all progressive legislation has recently been transformed into a formal, organized group with a chairman and 150 members.

The overwhelming popular sentiment for price control must be translated immediately into an overwhelming demand on Congress to extend the Price Control Act without amendments and with adequate funds for OPA.—The CIO News.

THE WORKER'S PROBLEMS

You hear quite a lot about the unreasonableness of labor these days of advancing wage scales and other conditions of employment, cost of living, inflation, etc., but you "ain't heard nothing yet", as the saying goes. You haven't even been told how much the cost of living really has advanced.

And then there is among employers and business men almost universal condemnation of labor union "royalties" and other new concessions now being demanded. In Congress a bill has been introduced to curb one union.

But you hear nothing about business "royalties", chiefly because Big Business controls your sources of information, both printed and on the air. The only real information you can expect will be in a labor newspaper.

For instance, though it has been abolished now, for many years the steel business exacted a royalty in the form of what was known as "Pittsburgh plus." This meant that, regardless of where steel was produced, the price was equivalent to its cost in Pittsburgh plus transportation, which brought steel made on the West Coast up to the Pittsburgh price.

And then there is oleomargarine. Buttermakers have for many years been able to persuade you to use their product by having Federal and State government exact taxes which brings the price of oleo to just about what butter sells for. And even then you can't buy it already colored.

These are only two instances of the control Big Business exercises over your existence. Others could be cited, but it all comes back to the fact that labor, in demanding some of the gravy, is merely imitating the methods of Big Business.—The Brewery Worker.

LET'S NOT ONLY PREACH, SHOW ALSO SOME GOOD EXAMPLES!

By Raymond Hofses, Editor, Reading Labor Advocate

THE EFFORTS OF American diplomats to establish a world order would be funny if it were not that their failure is fraught with tragedy. For how can any nation hope to contribute anything worth while to a search for world order when it lacks system and order within its own borders? How can we offer a plan for economic sanity and political unity to others when they do not have such a plan for ourselves?

HERE IN AMERICA we are fatuously attempting to do the impossible. We are trying to effect a condition of national unity and, at the same time, doggedly holding fast to a private-profit economy that divides our own population into groups and classes.

Capitalism is a divisive force, not a unifying one. "Every man for himself" has been the text of life for so long that it has been bred into the bones of all who have become so much as second-generation Americans. "Get what you can get, no matter how," neatly describes the way the American people act at home. And so we have strikes and lobbies and black markets and a multitude of groups — color groups, religious groups, veterans' groups, and especially industry groups — all pressing for something for themselves with not even a casual regard for the results of their success upon society as a whole.

That's the kind of thing that capitalism develops, and the kind of people the profit system has bred.

ONLY IN WAR has America been able to effect any semblance of national unity. Only with a purpose as big as victory and with a threat as menacing as the Axis was for a while, and with controls (temporary, we were told) as effective as those established by our totalitarian enemies could capitalist America effect a condition of national unity.

But now the war is over. Now the threat from without has disappeared. Now the old and time-dishonored game of producing wealth for the private profit of an owning class has been resumed. So now the people who make the nation's political and economic

THE MARCH OF LABOR

THE AVERAGE INCOME FOR AMERICAN WORKERS IN 1942 WAS \$967 FOR MEN AND \$540 FOR THE WOMEN WORKERS.

PROFITS IN THE LEATHER INDUSTRY ROSE 1500% IN 1943 OVER THE 1936-1939 AVERAGE BEFORE TAXES.

IN THE 1880'S MOST OF THE CIGAR MANUFACTURING IN NEW YORK WAS DONE BY ENTIRE FAMILIES WORKING 14 TO 18 HOURS A DAY IN THEIR TENEMENT HOMES FOR INCREDIBLY LOW WAGES.

THE UNION LABEL IS THE TRADE-MARK OF THE ORGANIZED LABOR MOVEMENT. SHOW YOUR SUPPORT BY BUYING UNION LABEL GOODS. LOOK FOR THIS UNION LABEL IN THE NEXT HAT YOU BUY.

FOR THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC IN 1946 AS IN 1919

(From "La Parola," New York, N. Y.)

"The days of Kings, Kaisers and Czars are fast waning. A goodly number of these despotic rulers have already gone to their political graves. Others are on the verge of political downfall. The day in which the whole world will be rid of all rulers by divine right is fast approaching and the dawn of a new era will presently gladden the earth with its democratic light.

"Italy will be the next nation, we believe, to overthrow the Monarchy and establish a free Democratic Republic. The Italian Socialist Party is on the alert. It is on the job. It is doing all in its power to awaken the masses to the new light. To proceed in its work it needs money to spread its propaganda. The workers of America are herewith appealed to for help to finance the political struggles in Italy. Every Monarchy overthrown is a step forward towards the international brotherhood of man. Everyone who has at heart the best interests of humanity will not fail to help finance political progress in Italy.

"Next June the General Elections throughout Italy it will take place. The Italian Socialist Party will be in the fight to capture the reins of government. The outcome of this election may determine the fall of the Monarchy. Quick action is necessary. Send all contributions to our editor, Girolamo Valenti, 803 West Madison Street, Chicago. He is the director of the special campaign fund to make Italy safe for democracy."

The above is a reproduction of an appeal which appeared in "La Parola" of April 22nd, 1919. It is said that history repeats itself. It surely does! In the year 1919, immediately following the First World War, "La Parola" was fighting for the establishment of an Italian Republic. In the year 1946, while celebrating its 38th Anniversary, "La Parola" is again fighting for the establishment of an Italian Republic. All this shows two things: First, that the Italian Monarchy is rotten to the core. It was no good in 1919 and it certainly is a disgraceful institution after having worked hand in hand with Fascism for more than 22 years and having brought Italy to the brink of destruction. Second, that La Parola is true to the ideals for which it was launched and for which it has fought throughout these 38 years.

In 1919 the objectives of the Italian Socialist Party, all the Republican elements and "La Parola" were not realized. We are now straining every effort in support of our comrades in Italy in their tremendous task of bringing about the establishment of the Italian Democratic Republic.

And of course the establishment of the Italian Democratic Republic is but only one of our objectives. We are in the fight and we shall carry on towards the achievement of all our objectives, the goal of which is the establishment of a Socialist Society throughout the world.

WALLACE'S AMAZING PROPOSAL

Many regard Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce and former Vice President, as a "liberal." Some people call him a "radical." Whether he is a "radical" or a "liberal," Mr. Wallace has just announced one of the most un-American proposals we have heard in many a day.

He contends that any member of Congress who votes against his party "on important issues" should be kicked out and literally driven into the political wilderness.

Evidently, Mr. Wallace has been talking with Winston Churchill. That's the way the Liberal and Conservative parties ran things in Britain for many a day. The result wasn't so good.

Here in America, progressives, at least, have always held that Senators and Representatives should not be "rubber stamps" and that when they thought the leaders of their party were wrong, they should vote against them.

Labor is in favor of a large part of the program President Truman has presented to Congress. We regret that Republicans from the North and West have entered into a coalition with "sweatshop" Democrats from Dixie to defeat some of the best features of that program.

But the way to discipline legislators who ignore the public welfare is to defeat them at the polls. We must assign that job to their constituents, not to some party boss in Washington—even if that boss happens to be the President of the United States.—Labor.

BABSON HAS SOMETHING THERE

We seldom agree with Roger W. Babson, but for once we find ourselves on common ground with that dispenser of economic nostrums.

In his most recent "column," Babson says: "I believe this country and the entire world could be saved from much grief by one simple thing. This would be for the conservative Democrats of the South and conservative Republi-

Some Odds and Ends

Canada accuses Russia of stealing its atomic bomb secrets. And Russia's reply seems to shake down to: "Not guilty, and we didn't get much anyhow."—The St. Louis Post Dispatch.

From Newark, N. J., comes the news that a whiskey-with-a-beer-chaser has been outlawed by the taverns until the Government lifts restrictions on the production of beer. Patrons are informed that they can have whiskey straight, or with soda, ginger ale or water chasers only. Observing the craft gleam in some patron's eyes, bartenders quickly ruled that drinkers can't evade the beer-chaser ban by ordering a beer first and then the whiskey.

It's twice as easy to get in wrong when you think you're always right.

The U. S. Treasury predicts profits after taxes in 1946 of at least \$10,000,000,000, or a more than 200% increase over the pre-war level of \$3,300,000,000. Does that look like the OPA and other government agencies are "strangling" industry?

It's a smart person who has judgment enough to use his own.

Hearken to this tale of woe: When God gave out brains, I thought He said trains, and I missed mine.... When He gave out looks, I thought He said books, and I didn't want any!... And when He gave out noses, I thought He said roses, and I ordered a big one!... When He gave out legs, I thought He said kegs, and I ordered two fat ones!... When He gave out ears, I thought He said beers, so I ordered two long ones!... When He gave out chins, I thought He said gins, so I said, "Give me a double!"... And now, am I a mess!—The Journeyman Barber.

Stockings of spun steel, now in the experimental stage, should fill a long-felt need, unless nature comes up with a carborundum mosquito.—"Senator Soaper" in the Cincinnati Times-Star.

Coalition government has been made fashionable in Europe, and the American Congress has adapted the idea—reactionary Republicans and bourbon Southern Democrats are organizing their bloc to rule this nation and block any more liberal or "New Deal" legislation. The progressives of both parties likewise made a vain effort to get together, without perceptible achievements so far. Reactionary members of Congress are more cohesive and homogeneous than the liberals. Since FDR died, the reactionary bloc has either defeated or emasculated every progressive bill presented, from the FEPC to the housing bill and the full employment bill.—N. L.

Representative Hatton Sumner of Texas should know: he has been in Congress for 34 years; he says that our Federal Government is "an instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption." He damned both parties as unprincipled, guided by expediency. Sumners is what is usually called a reactionary, so his testimony carries weight. He said the government is "beyond democratic control, extravagant, inefficient," in announcing that he will not seek re-election. Only two others have been in Congress longer — Representatives Sabath and Doughton. N. L.

Appalling Stories of Waste; Food Is Burned at Naval Posts

Shocking disclosures of the destruction of food at naval establishments came from widely separated sections of the country.

At the Marine base in Quantico, Va., the most nourishing portions of "C-rations," which require no refrigeration and are packed for easy shipping were being thrown onto the trash heap and burned.

This revolting waste in the midst of the worst hunger in the modern world has known was revealed by A. F. L. workers on a construction project at the base and was confirmed by a Washington "News" reporter.

Two thousand pounds of butter, which "smelled slightly rancid," followed by 3,000 pounds of frozen turkeys were fed into the incinerator at the Seattle Naval Station.

In both cases the disclosures were dismissed by the commandants with the alibi that "they didn't have time" to check on everything going on.

REPORT OF DEATHS EXAGGERATED

In the negotiations for a new bituminous coal agreement John L. Lewis is making a play for new safety devices in the mines. His argument is bolstered with figures. During the past 14 years, Lewis stated, 28,000 miners have been killed and 1,400,000 have been injured. To this Harry M. Moses, president of the H. C. Frick Company, delivered a withering reply. "Only 14,615 have been done to death," said Moses, "and the number injured was only 646,591."

If the Moses figures are correct, they mean that "every day three men die" and more than 150 are wounded in order that we may have coal.

A lot of nice people object to John L. Lewis. They might, even, have objected to his way of dramatizing the troubles of dirt-streaked men who go down into the dark holes to pull out our coal. "What-are-you-going-to-do-about-it?" he slowly asked. "Nothing now? Because you've done nothing yesterday?... Caesar, we who are about to die salute you. You condone these conditions by your silence." Then he paused, and for a long space nothing could be heard in the gilded hotel room but the heavy breathing of the men under attack. Then he added pointedly, "And we protest."—The New Leader.

After Fifty Years

Although newspaper editorials rarely hesitate to condemn unions and working men they resist with obvious restraint any discussion of war profits.

Here are some of the reasons why news of corporation profits have been relegated to the back pages. They come from a Treasury statement issued in March this year. They show that profit levels during the war-time years were four times that of prewar years. This total, net profit before taxes, in case you can handle an astronomical number, is \$27,790,651,000.

This is a net figure after the Treasury had deducted losses suffered by the few corporations which had gone into the red. The profit-makers reported total profits of \$28,689,371,000.

There were more than 68,000 corporations reporting excess profits. Out of a total of excess profits of \$14,519,000,000, more than 10 billion dollars was in the hands of 2,000 corporations, each of which had profits of more than one billion each.

What is involved here is more than just the fact that corporations can more than meet wage demands out of accumulated profits. The war has concentrated more wealth and power in the hands of the major corporations than they have ever had before. Fifty years of capitalist "trust-busting" has resulted in creating the greatest corporate power the country—and possibly the world—has ever seen.—The Progressive Miner.

Reuther's Rise to Power

If anyone imagined that Walter Reuther's election as United Automobile Workers president meant that he could "run" the union, the delusion was quickly corrected when R. J. Thomas was chosen vice-president over Reuther's opposition. But the advent of the fiery young progressive to top leadership clearly has great significance.

His triumph indicated majority endorsement of his strategy in the General Motors strike. It indicated majority endorsement of his economic ideas—his conviction that unions should not fight on narrow wage issues alone but broaden their outlook to include discussion of prices, profits and production policies. It indicated that the automotive industry's scarcely veiled bids for his repudiation had backfired.

Enlightened businessmen, however, should welcome Reuther's election. He is a tough fighter, but he is also intelligent and scrupulous. Though he opposes "company security" clauses in contracts, he recognizes the necessity for unions to build their own sense of responsibility. Though he is a leader in the "open the books" demand, he understands that, in the long run, both profits and good wages must come from efficient production. He is a new type of labor leader, but still is profoundly in the American tradition. He has before him now a great opportunity.—The Chicago Sun.

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

RUSSIA COULD BE IMITATING OUR BAD EXAMPLE

Kenesaw M. Landis II in the Chicago Sun

GUADALAJARA, Mexico. Down here below the Rio Grande it looks as if Stalin were trying to establish a Monroe Doctrine for Russia.

More than a hundred years ago we told the world: "Hands off the Western Hemisphere." Any outside interference would be regarded as "dangerous to our peace and security."

Whatever our motives, this was taking in a lot of territory—more territory than Stalin is taking in now.

Five world powers were disposed to accept our proposition that small countries up to 7,000 miles from our boundaries were part of our security zone.

At the first opportunity, when we were distracted by civil war, France challenged the Monroe Doctrine and installed a puppet emperor to rule Mexico.

But as soon as the Civil War ended, Sherman's army was sent to the Rio Grande and France decided to accept our diplomatic advice and get out.

Americans like to think of the Monroe Doctrine as an idealistic principle, designed to protect the small nations of Latin America from the imperialist designs of other powers.

Yet Mexico became as important to us as Iran is to Russia. During the administration of our friend, Dictator Diaz, American investors were able to acquire title to half the wealth of Mexico, half a billion dollars being tied up in oil wells.

Naturally we didn't like it when the Mexicans rose in revolt under Madero, kicked out Diaz and started taxing our oil concessions. The American ambassador Henry Lane Wilson, negotiated Madero's overthrow and we installed Gen. Huerta.

Then we fell out with Huerta and American Marines seized Vera Cruz despite Huerta's prior offer to submit the dispute to arbitration as called for in a treaty then in force.

After the first World War, when we made the world safe for democracy, we almost invaded Mexico to make it safe for Doheny's oil concessions. During this period, Secretary of States Hughes was referred to as "Secretary of Oil."

It is hard to tell whether Stalin regards Iran as his Mexico, or whether he intends to go further and establish an outright protectorate as we did in Nicaragua and Haiti.

It seems that he sent his troops to Iran to keep the props under the "autonomous" province of Azerbaijan, which revolted with his blessing.

This would indicate he tends to follow the policy adopted by President Theodore Roosevelt, when Colombia refused to grant us canal rights across the Isthmus of Panama.

Panama was encouraged to declare its independence from Colombia, and as soon as the rebellion started, Roosevelt sent American warships to the scene to prevent Colombia from doing anything about it.

"I took Panama," said Roosevelt, and his example seems especially dangerous now that we know Stalin wants to fortify the Dardanelles.

Somewhat we must persuade Stalin that his timing is bad and that he is following a reactionary capitalist policy, out of date in an atomic world.

M. P.'S ASK PAY HIKE

British members of Parliament get \$1,600 a year. They are clamoring for a 50 per cent boost to \$2,400. The low pay was fixed years ago so that only rich men, or the tools of rich men, could sit in Parliament.