

## WHERE WE DO GO FROM HERE?

Economists and statisticians, both those employed in government offices and those who work for great business organizations, are trying, in vain, to warn the country that there is something wrong about the situation in business and industry and that, if things continue to slide, we will be in for a depression in 1947. Perhaps the public refuses to pay much attention to these warnings because bad news is unpopular. People like to gloss over such things.

There is, however, an important warning to Organized Labor in the ominous news from the economists. One government expert says that industry, having completed most of its peacetime expansion, is now showing a tendency to wait until conditions have settled down before developing further investments. Then follows this very significant paragraph:

"Recently something new has been added. It has become apparent that some business quarters are preparing for a real fight with labor in congress and over the collective bargaining table next winter. The former will probably take the form of a frontal attack on the National Labor Relations Act, the latter will show up in an unyielding attitude on wage demands and a firm opposition to bring profits into the discussion. Hopes for a management victory are probably based on GOP gains in November and the possibility of increased disunity within the labor movement. Even so, it is feared that the struggle may be bitter and long, with adverse effects on sales and profits next year."

This expert frankly says that insiders have quit investing. They are going to sit out the expected knock-out fight with labor. Meanwhile, hoarding of goods the public wants is going on at an unprecedented rate. Prices will be uncertain for a time, some going up and others down. There will be a brief period of lull, and then a first rate depression, probably midway in 1947. Most of the business research organizations agree with this summary. They say the boom is over, that the decline already has set in. They predict unemployment this winter even though many prices continue upward.

Looks like this is a good time for caution, for straight thinking, for responsible leadership to study the road signs.

## BACK TO "NORMAL"

The country is rapidly returning to normalcy, that is, to the state in which capitalists have their own way, and in which the needs of the country are disregarded, especially if they conflict in any way with the desires of the nation's economic rulers. President Truman, in his haste to beat the Republicans to the punch, has called off most price controls, and has invited labor to make a "truce" with capital. (It is impossible for a capitalist politician to make a move without stopping to deliver a lecture to labor on its responsibility.)

Apparently Truman's advisers have decided that the way to block the Republicans is to carry out the Republican policy before Congress convenes, and before the GOP itself is prepared to lay down the lines of its program.

The future, as outlined in one of the country's conservative magazines, is described as follows, "anybody who wants to build a house, or put up a store building, or to cut a wage, or to do other things that the government now says he cannot do, is likely to get his chance before long to do what he wants."

The government, composed of capitalist-minded legislators, is more than happy to comply with the desires of Big Business. What does prevent business from "cutting a wage" is the fact that the labor movement is in existence, and that American workers have shown no great delight in the demands of "free enterprise."

And yet, merely to acknowledge the power of the labor movement is to move on to an analysis of its weakness in the face of capitalist "freedom." Even if the Republicans, looking to 1948, do not go all out in passing anti-labor legislation, the real blow to workers will be dealt on the economic front.

And it is there that labor can put only a rearguard defense. It cannot put up the kind of battle that will eliminate the possibility of "cutting a wage" simply because an employer decides to do so. It is in no position to declare itself free of its fetters, and to take over for itself the direction of the American economy. And it will be in no such position until American labor decides to support a system based on fulfilling the real needs of the country, and not the selfish interests of its rulers.—The Call.

## NOT EVEN WORKERS HAVE A RIGHT TO ASK FOR MORE THAN THEY MAKE—BUT...

By RAYMOND HOFSE, Editor, Reading Labor Advocate

The same people who voted themselves out of the Democratic frying pan and into the Republican fire are griping about the prospect of a coal strike that may kill their jobs, freeze their families and almost certainly will boost their coal bill to a new all-time high.

They are the same kind of people who did the griping back in the late 20's and early 30's when a strike of the owning class barred millions of Americans from using the tools of production and created a breadline economy.

They are also the same people who went along with the capitalist system all down through its sorry course and who complained bitterly about the shortages, exploitation and profits without which the private-profit economy for which they voted simply could not function.

If the American people continue to act as they have in the past, some future day will find them fretting against—and still voting for—the same kind of controls that they described as "fascism" in other countries when the continuation of a class society made it necessary for a super-government to take over and apply the pressure that would keep workers producing the necessities of life under conditions that will assure a rake-off for owners.

About the least inspiring sight we can imagine is that of 140 million people pitying themselves because of what a few people are doing to them.

The working people of this nation—or of any nation for that matter—could enjoy the utmost good that their combined ability could create—if they'd use their combined power to that end. They wouldn't need to impover-

ish themselves in a fruitless struggle for just a little more. They could have all the coal they mine, all the oil they tap from the earth, all the clothing they make, all the comfortable homes they could build—if they'd own the sources of wealth and produce abundance for use instead of scarcity for private profit.

The working people of the world are powerful. They could have all they make if they would not vote to keep themselves weak by permitting the means of life to be owned by a few people.

And, surely, nobody, not even workers, have a right to ask for more than they make.

## Some Odds and Ends

Prices are pretty high right now, economic bigshots admit. . . . But cheer up. The next depression will send 'em tumbling down.

A Cleveland doctor advises big business executives to take a nap each noon if they want to keep their blood pressure down and live longer. . . . Also, it might give them a chance to dream up a way out of the jam they're running the country into.

Of all sad words in sound or ink, The saddest are: "I didn't think."

The You-Should-Live-So-Long Club has just voted honorary membership to Honor Hogshead, who's waiting for the company to give him a raise without being asked for it.

It takes a baby two years to learn to talk and around 70 to learn to keep his mouth shut.—The Brewery Worker.

## THE MARCH OF LABOR



## Another World War Is Not in Sight

THAT'S THE OPINION OF THE BEST-INFORMED MEN IN WASHINGTON; HERE ARE SOME OF THE REASONS FOR THEIR CONFIDENCE

This is not a "Top Secret." It isn't "inside information" peddled by a radio commentator. It's just a plain statement of facts which any newspaper man can gather in Washington. It all adds up to this:

**The best informed men in the nation's capital do not believe there is any great danger of a war with Russia. That means they do not anticipate third world war within the measurable future.**

That's not the impression you get from reading the newspaper headlines or listening in on the radio, but it represents the judgment of men who should know.

This is the way they figure it out: **We don't want another war and Russia isn't in a position to start one, even if it were inclined to do so.**

A top-ranking military man, just back from the other side, said: "Of course, some fool on either side may start something which would inflame public sentiment and precipitate another contest. This sort of thing is always possible.

"However, during World War II, Russia lost the cream of its young manhood; and a great portion of its most valuable territory was ravaged to an indescribable extent.

"Furthermore, while the Russians have made unusual progress along many lines, their efficiency is pretty low. I think it is safe to say **one American worker can do as much as three Russian workers.**

"On top of all that, we have the atomic bomb and up to date Russia has not solved that riddle. **We do not want war, but don't let anyone tell you we are not prepared to slap back should someone attack us.**"

We think that is good news. It may ease the mind of some mother or father who fears "the boy" may have to go off to another war. That's why we are presenting it in the form of an editorial.—Labor.

## RIEVE DOESN'T WANT MUCH

In presenting the demand of union textile workers for a wage increase of 20 cents per hour, Emil Rieve, leader of the Textile Workers' Union, justifies this most-recent demand by declaring that statistics show the employers taking a profit of 53 cents per hour on all workers employed in the industry.

One wonders, now, what about that extra 33 cents that the union textile workers appear willing to have the private owners of their industries keep for themselves.

Why not go after it all? And if the textile workers don't want to take the whole business for themselves, why don't the American people use their power to see to it that a cut in selling price brings some benefit to all the people who must buy textiles!

We're not satisfied by the hoary claim that the owners need that 33 cents in order to do business. That just isn't true; profits are not figured until after all operating costs, including taxes, are deducted. The generous rake-off that Emil Rieve is willing to leave with the owners is more tribute to parasites; it is the salary we pay somebody for owning something.

We suppose it can be said that people with money to invest in activities that will make jobs for workers just won't use their money that way unless they can have some hope of taking a profit. That, of course, is true, and we don't blame the private investors on that score.

Our dissatisfaction is with the workers who vote approval to a system under which they wait for private individuals to start industries and make jobs. Perhaps there was a time when that was the best that workers could do, but now it is possible for them to use their government to initiate production without paying 33 cents an hour to any owner. And that is precisely what we think the workers of all industries ought to do.

The point is that an industry that is privately-owned is, and possibly should be, operated for the benefit of the owner. But an industry that is publicly owned would likewise be operated for the benefit of the owners—who would be all of us. — Reading Labor Advocate.

## PIRITICAL!

The good-will which America once possessed throughout the world, but which is slowly being dissipated, is not enhanced by piratical practices of some of our business men.

They are said to be buying off-grade goods at sacrifice prices and selling them abroad for more than best-quality products.

Foreign consumers don't quibble about the cost when they see a label that heretofore has meant superior workmanship and material to them. When they discover they have been cheated, they'll be "sore."

## Pity the Poor Packers

Look at this: The Big Four packers—Armour, Cudahy, Swift and Wilson made profits of up to 241 per cent as compared with only 106 per cent in pre-war years, even with controls on meat during the war years.

In the first half of 1946, with controls still on, Armour made a profit of \$9,700,000, as compared with a total for the entire year of 1945 of only \$8,972,000.

Imagine what they'll make with controls off!

## IN THE WIND

### FROM THE NATION

Around Town: The Wind spent most of the week blowing through the five boroughs that contain and surround its home office, eyes open, ears wide, and in general making a nuisance of itself. On the overhanging morning of November 6, for instance, the Wind caused quite a traffic jam at a crowded intersection, regarding with prolonged fascination the Daily Worker's banner headline: "ALP Vote Strong."

Conversational fragment in the financial district, overheard that same morning, from a man who never flinched as part of a scaffolding fell loudly on to another part: "And another 20 shares dropped!"

The display window of the Mosler Safe Company, 320 Fifth ave., has been featuring a huge photograph of the rubble of Hiroshima. Staunch and undamaged in the middle of the photograph is a Mosler safe (advvt.). This is the way the world ends, with a bang and a well-protected insurance policy.

Farther downtown, the City Hall Hardware Shop at 33 Park Row is offering a bargain sale in household odds and ends. One of the odds is a large basket filled with second-hand policemen's billy clubs, at 29 cents each. "No Home Should Be Without One," declare a poster.

Just two blocks south, Modell's (198 Broadway) is holding its bargain sale—of surplus war property. Center of attraction is furnished by G.I. gas masks at 19 cents each. "Children Will Love Them," chortles Modell's tag line.

Up in the hinterland—Yonkers, that is—City Comptroller Thomas V. Kennedy has declined an \$800 increase in his present annual salary of \$7,200 because, he announced, "the city is not in a position to pay it." Kennedy, who passes on Yonker's tax expedients, goes on to say that "if you're going to have stabilization of government, it has to start with someone." "And find," Mr. Kennedy might have added, "what wind serves to advance an honest mind."

A spy who snuck up to Buffalo over the week-end reports this sign on a cage in the zoo there: "Bald Eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus)—range: the whole of North America. Never fishes for himself as long as he can rob the more skillful and industrious fish hawk. The bald eagle is our national emblem."

Scanning the out-of-town papers in the huge Times Square newsstand which carried them, the Wind uncovered this editorial sentiment in the Tucson (Arizona) Star: The Republicans "will probably do what Senator Taft wants as long as he continues to be the leading bull in the Republican herd."

## IT WAS MUTUAL

Before signing a receipt for his pay check, the young man was handed a company form slip with the wording: "Your salary is your personal business—a confidential matter—and not to be disclosed to anybody else."

He read it carefully, then, shielding the paper with his hand, he wrote:

"I won't mention it to anybody. I'm just as much ashamed of it as you are."

## Doesn't Blame Workers

FORD REVEALS OPERATING LOSS; SHOCKS COMPLACENT BOSSES

For the first time in its history, the Ford Motor Company has taken the public into its confidence regarding its financial condition. Ernest R. Breech, executive vice president, says that a loss of \$54.6 millions was sustained during the first six months of this year. However, he added that tax refunds will reduce the loss to about \$32.9 millions.

Unlike some other executives, Breech did not attempt to pin the blame on the workers. He said the management knew as early as last December that losses would have to be shouldered during reconversion.

Then he proceeded to make statements calculated to shock complacent bosses.

There "is too much isolation in our business," said Breech — by which he meant that the men at the top have lost touch with "the men and women who are so essential a part of any project the manager may design and plan."

## WELL, IT'S THE PROFIT SYSTEM!

Within the past two weeks some labor papers have been telling the story of how the General Electric Company multiplies its profits. The formula is so simple that any apostle of individual initiative ought to be able to understand it. General Electric keeps down the quality of its electric light bulbs so that they wear out quicker than they need to.

There's the scheme: Sell more! It's the same scheme the big tobacco barons had in mind when they doubled their customers by teaching women to smoke. It's an anti-social scheme, to be sure, but who cares about the welfare of society when altruism conflicts with the profit sheet.

Here's another development of the capitalist system which persistent apologists might justify by saying, "Wouldn't you do it if you had a chance?"

And under the profit economy the answer that most people would have to give—if they wished to be truthful—is that they would do the same thing if they had a chance. They'd fill their own pockets at the public's expense.

But WHY would most people serve themselves at the expense of their fellow men?

The answer is obvious. People act like that because they are living under a system that places self-interest in opposition to common interest.

People wouldn't act that way under an economy in which the means of production and distribution were owned by everybody, with wealth produced for use instead of for profit.

People don't do less than their best when they're working for themselves. There's no incentive for that with people who use what they make. But they do it when they're out to sell their product for more than its value. Remember how the big Anaconda Copper Company furnished defective cable at the risk of soldiers' lives during the war? That, too, was quite in keeping with the ethics of capitalism. "Wouldn't you do it . . . ?"

There's another reason why big corporations do such things. They do them because they have a corner on the market, because in their particular line there is no competition.

Anti-Socialists better ponder this fact and get its full meaning. In article after article a few people have a monopoly. This "free enterprise" system about which we are told is the bunk. It doesn't exist. We, the people, are at the mercy of a few economic overlords who levy whatever tribute upon us they think we can bear.

Mossbacks and foggy thinkers who have been so afraid that Socialism would be a monopoly should be able to see now that we're getting a monopoly economy anyway. The trouble is that it's a private monopoly, while Socialism would make industry a people's monopoly. What we have is run for the benefit of a small clique of owners and at our expense. What Socialism proposes is that industry should function for the benefit of everybody.

We've told the story often. But we have to tell it again and again because an understanding of it is essential to correct action by the victims of the private-profit monopoly economy.

How can we talk of freedom when the lives of most of us are planned by corporation scientists with the percentage table as their guide?—Reading Labor Advocate.

## WHITE SUPREMACY IN ALABAMA

Until the last general election, the state of Alabama had been an island of liberal refuge between the Sylla of Mississippi and the Charybdis of a Georgia which had relapsed into Talmadgism. But on November 5 Alabama voted to adopt the Boswell amendment to its constitution, an amendment which will set up the most highly restrictive voting qualifications in force in any state in the Union. The author of the amendment is Representative E. C. (Bud) Boswell of Geneva, in Alabama's Black Belt. Mr. Boswell wanted "to save our Alabama traditions and principles from the frontal attack of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and their radical allies . . . (to) maintain and insure white supremacy in Alabama, by law, for the salvation of both the Negro and white races." The amendment provides that each applicant for the right to vote must appear before the board of registrars in his county and be able to read, understand and explain, to the board's satisfaction, any section of the Constitution of the United States. It is a foregone conclusion that registrars will accept no Negro's explanation of any part of the Constitution. The leaders of organized labor and many newspapers opposed the amendment, but the rank and file of labor in the large industrial districts failed to go to the polls. Racial prejudice is probably stronger than loyalty to a union, and every questionable device known to racial bigots was brought forth by proponents. The amendment was the baby of the state Democratic committee, and passed by the small majority of less than 10,000 votes out of 200,000 cast. It will, of course, be tested in the courts at the earliest opportunity. Many of the state's lawyers believe it will be held unconstitutional. Meanwhile, Alabama has taken a step backward, much to the dismay of those who have been priding themselves on the advancing forces of progressivism within the state.—The Nation.

## Reuther Urges Co-ops

FLINT, Mich. (LPA). — The battle against inflation, unemployment and depression is not simply a battle to keep prices down, United Auto Workers President Walter Reuther asserted. Speaking to a group of union members and other consumer-minded people here at the opening of a drive for \$30,000 to open a cooperative super-market, Reuther said that one of the most vital next steps is the organization of consumer co-operatives on a broad scale "to establish democratic ownership of distributive and productive facilities."

He warned that these consumer protests against high prices would continue with one commodity after another selected as targets—until the manufacturers, meat packers and food processors "got it through their heads that the American people did not fight World War II just to get paid off with high prices and unemployment."

Reuther called on the consumers of Flint to get behind the cooperative movement and join in the work of building new democratic controls over the economic system. He said that consumer co-ops establish such democratic controls because they gave the people ownership of the machinery of production and distribution, and return patronage dividends to the consumers. The co-op system eliminates unearned income and increasingly mentioned by those interested in purchasing power, he declared. The NORC is located at "As president of the UAW-CIO," the University of Denver.

## Fight Russia? 73% say "no"

Denver—(FP)—Although aware of misunderstandings between the U. S. and Russia, 73% of the American people do not think these disagreements serious enough to consider going to war about, according to a nationwide poll by the National Opinion Research Center here.

Furthermore, more than one person in five (21 1/2%) could not name a single cause of disagreement between the two nations, the survey showed.

More people answered in general terms rather than citing definite and specific causes of misunderstanding. Likewise, more people mentioned differences without attaching blame to either country. Of those who did place the responsibility for misunderstanding on either one, more people mentioned Russia than the U. S.

A general fear and distrust of each country by the other, partition and distribution, and return patronage dividends to the consumers. The co-op system eliminates unearned income and increasingly mentioned by those interested in purchasing power, he declared. The NORC is located at "As president of the UAW-CIO," the University of Denver.