

assailed Mayor LaGuardia's announcement that transit workers would not be allowed to strike or maintain a closed shop after New York City's unification of the subway system. . . . It was reported that on his cruise President Roosevelt had received assurances that Panama, Columbia and Costa Rica would give America the use of their airfields if needed for defense of

the Canal. . . . The House Appropriations Committee failed to recommend \$250,000 for the Byrd Antarctic expedition's 1941 expenses. . . . The District of Columbia Court of Appeals upheld an indictment under the anti-trust laws against the American Medical Association and two affiliated groups for conspiracy to restrain the activities of Group Health in Washington.

Investigate the American OGPU!

ARE THE G-MEN proving too much for another Attorney General?

The new incumbent of that post, Robert H. Jackson, intimates in his reply to Senator Norris' proposal for an investigation of J. Edgar Hoover and his federal police, that he believes they will operate strictly within the law. But Mr. Jackson gives no clue to the safeguards he will use to make this lawless organization behave. He does not even indicate that he deems safeguards necessary. All he says is that Hoover agrees with Jackson's principles, and has been asked by him to continue his service as head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Is Jackson putting the seal of his approval on the FBI and on J. Edgar Hoover as its director?

Jackson is not the first Attorney General who believed that Hoover was in agreement with the policy of keeping the G-men within the law. As a minor official, Hoover first agreed with Attorney General Gregory in 1918. As acting director of the Bureau, Hoover agreed with Attorney General Stone in 1924. As head of the Bureau, he agreed with Attorney General Murphy in October, 1939, that these federal law-enforcement officials must themselves obey the law. Before assuming that the FBI is likely to live up to such assurances by its chief, Attorney General Jackson should learn whether its performance has measured up to Hoover's similar pledges in the past.

In 1919, Hoover took over America's first big-scale political spy system. He directed the newly created General Intelligence Division—the so-called “anti-radical division”—of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Under the heading of “general intelligence” were included such activities as wholesale raids on thousands of defenseless and innocent citizens and aliens, the breaking up of strikes and the violation of the most sacred civil rights. So scandalous were these actions that they were publicly condemned, as gross infringements of constitutional rights, by a group of distinguished lawyers and law professors including Felix Frankfurter, now a Justice of the Supreme Court. Charles Evans Hughes joined in the public expressions of alarm over the lawlessness of our federal police.

“ultra-radicalism” of their economic or political beliefs or activities. The equivalent of one person out of every sixty families in the United States was on this list. Hoover beat Heinrich Himmler by fourteen years.

In September, 1939, on the outbreak of the present European war, Hoover saw his second great opportunity. Again he organized his General Intelligence Division. He started compiling his list of suspects. If you ever engaged in activities he regards as “subversive,” you should be on the list. To him “alien isms,” as well as those penologists whom he calls “sob sisters . . . sentimentalists and the alleged criminologists,” are subversive.

Which side on economic and political issues does Hoover suspect—Senator Taft's, which says the New Deal is leading to the same goal as red Russia, or Attorney General Jackson's? Were the President, Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Jackson acting subversively in addressing the American Youth Congress, one of whose local councils contained an undercover informer of the FBI, who devoted himself to destroying it?

At the very time Jackson became Attorney General, Hoover publicly berated the United States Civil Service Commission, and assumed that Congress would hold up its hands in horror because the Commission certified for clerical services in this Bureau persons whom he accused of possessing “radical tendencies.”

Hoover also put on his 1939-40 card indexes anyone suspected of “sabotage.” Does the FBI, in girding itself for action against what he calls “saboteurs,” adopt the definition publicly made by a Detroit plumbing-supply manufacturer with whom the Intelligence Division is coöperating—that a strike against his plant, manufacturing goods under contract with the navy, is sabotage? Only a small portion of this company's output was under such contract; and the article called for was a gadget for use in making bed springs for navy officers. Did Hoover have any part in the Detroit manufacturer's attempt to dismiss union men, employed in his principal business of manufacturing plumbing supplies for civilian use, on the ground that other employees, comprising one-tenth of his force, were making the bed-spring gadgets for the navy, and that this

the employees of many factories, "to ascertain whether any of those individuals has been engaged in subversive activities." What business has the federal police system to spy on men engaged in non-criminal activities which J. Edgar Hoover happens to dislike? Congress has not authorized him to do any such spying. What business has Chief Hoover to use government money to operate an OGPU?

In calling for an investigation, both on the floor of the Senate and in his letter to the Attorney General, Senator Norris did not limit himself to objections against the political spying of the General Intelligence Division. Norris objected also to the G-men's lawlessness in making arrests, and in their dealings with persons whom they have taken into custody.

He pointed to their arrest in Detroit, on February 6, 1940, of ten men and one woman indicted three days earlier under a statute enacted in 1818, for soliciting volunteers for the Spanish Loyalist Army two years earlier. All but one are native-born Americans, long resident in Detroit, and some of them have lived in Detroit all their lives, are married and have children. Several of the persons arrested are practising physicians.

The G-men had all day Sunday and Monday, February 4 and 5, to arrest those who were indicted. Instead Hoover waited. He sent to Detroit a squad of forty G-men to assist his local agents. On February 6, so early in the morning that he could be sure everyone was asleep, his agents descended on the homes of these eleven citizens. Several, who believed that burglars were trying to break into their houses and phoned the local police for protection, were interrupted by the G-men breaking in their doors.

Hoover's agents handcuffed their prisoners and then, without producing search warrants, ransacked the prisoners' houses from cellar to garret. They held their prisoners incommunicado for nine to ten hours, refusing to let them call their lawyers, or to see the lawyer who had been sent to the FBI's detention quarters by the prisoners' wives. The lawyer was even refused an opportunity to see the indictments on which his clients were arrested. A separate squad of FBI agents was assigned to each of the persons arrested. Each was grilled throughout the day. Each was stripped twice. Finally, five minutes before they were taken to court to plead guilty or not guilty, their lawyer was granted permission to interview all of them—less than one-half minute per prisoner. Even this concession was limited to conversation in the presence of the G-men. To take them from the FBI's detention quarters in the Federal Building to the courtroom on the next floor, the G-men chained the prisoners to each other and marched them in, two FBI agents to a prisoner.

The same week, in related activities at Milwaukee

Attorney General Jackson commendably dismissed the Detroit indictments. But when Senator Norris called for an investigation of the conduct of the Department's police, the Attorney General "reviewed the . . . arrests" with the District Attorney, who previously had repudiated public charges that civil rights were infringed, and "with the Federal Bureau of Investigation." The Attorney General added in his letter to the Senator: "I find nothing to justify any charge of misconduct against the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Meantime The New York Daily News had begun to criticize Hoover for his activities in Florida. He refused to comment, saying that any statement must come from the Attorney General.

Then a Hearst newspaperman in Washington turned to the work of lining up political support for Hoover. He persuaded Senator Nye to praise Hoover for being in Florida, "particularly when we know that a great many wealthy Americans are wintering there and threatened by gangsters." Senator Van Nuys was induced to compliment Hoover for his presence in Florida "at a time when the wealthiest people in the country are flocking there for their winter vacation."

The next day the Hearst papers started a scare headline campaign, accusing "Communists" of a "Smear Hoover" plot. If demands for an investigation of the FBI or criticism of its illegal conduct prove one's connection with this plot, the conspirators include Senator Norris, the ministers and labor organizations constituting the Michigan Civil Rights Federation, The New York Daily News, The Washington Times-Herald, The Philadelphia Inquirer, The Milwaukee Journal, New York columnist Westbrook Pegler, Washington columnist Ludwell Denny, The St. Louis Post-Dispatch and a host of others.

Needless to say, Attorney General Jackson has had no connection with this smear-the-critics campaign. He may or may not believe that Hoover is allied with Hearst lobbyists and gossip writers. But Mr. Jackson cannot fail to know of the nationwide publicity campaign conducted by Hoover for years through gossip writers, magazines and newspaper articles, motion pictures, radio speeches and even comic strips.

Does the Attorney General know that in 1939 Hoover and his agents propagandized for his Bureau by delivering over 5,000 public addresses? Does Attorney General Jackson know that Mr. Hoover has, at government expense, used FBI agents from all over the country to lobby in his behalf at the Capitol? In 1933, for example, when he feared that Attorney General (designate) Walsh would fire him, he called in an army of his agents from many states to lobby with their Senators in his behalf.

Though the Attorney General has no connection with the lobbying campaign now being conducted by Hoover and his friends, the Attorney General does have

is responsible for what they do. He has the responsibility of cleaning up the political spy system and lawlessness of the federal police. His report to Senator Norris on the Detroit case, based on the errors in what the District Attorney and the FBI told him, conclusively points to the need for a searching independent inquiry. Attorney General Jackson would add luster to his fine record by arranging for such an investigation without delay.

Invention and Unemployment

PRESIDENT COMPTON of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology picks a bone with President Roosevelt of the U. S. A. because Mr. Compton thinks Mr. Roosevelt believes technological advance causes unemployment. On the contrary, says Mr. Compton, technological advance creates new employment opportunities, and the real trouble is the discouragement of business enterprise which might put new inventions to work.

Now of course Mr. Roosevelt never said that he did not want technical improvements and did not believe in setting them to work. He did point out, however, what seems to us the incontrovertible fact that such improvements, besides being potentially good, create a problem in the kind of economic setting we now have. His language was, as usual, picturesque and none too exact. He said something to the effect that we must create new jobs as fast as technological advance takes them away. It is concerning the method of creating new jobs that Mr. Compton and Mr. Roosevelt seem to differ.

As we understand Mr. Compton's point of view, the new jobs will be created automatically by private enterprise if it is allowed freedom to operate and is encouraged to do so. This is the theory of classical economics. Let us take the widget industry as an example. Somebody invents a method of making ten widgets with the same number of workers as were formerly required to make one. Does that mean nine widget-makers must lose their jobs? Not at all, because it now costs only one-tenth as much to make a widget—as far as labor cost is concerned. The price will be reduced because of competition or the desire of the manufacturer to make more sales. Many more widgets will be sold, and employment in the industry may in consequence actually increase. (The automobile industry is often cited as a case in point.) If there should be any slack employment to be taken up in the widget industry, consider the case of the gadget. Somebody invents an entirely new gadget. A company is organized to make it. It spends money for buildings, machinery, materials, and makes new jobs for labor.

This is all very well as a theory, but it seems to be

Lubin, chief of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, points out that in all manufacturing industry the output per man-hour increased 103 percent between 1909 and 1936. Improvements of great magnitude have occurred also in agriculture, mining, transportation and even in trade, commerce and office work. But somehow or other we do not all grow steadily richer as we learn how to make more goods with less labor. Instead of having more goods to the extent of our increased capacity, we have in large measure less labor. Part of the reduction in labor is used for a shortening of working hours—and that is all to the good. But far too large a part comes in unemployment. Consequently we must find a way to increase employment as fast as technical advance occurs. Mr. Compton's automatic machine is out of order, and it was even more out of order under business enterprise's own President, Mr. Hoover, than it has been under Mr. Roosevelt.

Why? That is the important question; it is what economic experts have been discussing for over a decade; it is what the New Deal is in a ferment about. Mr. Compton should pay more attention to the facts and their interpretation, instead of belaboring Mr. Roosevelt with an ancient dogma. Has he never heard of monopoly and inflexible prices? Is he completely innocent of the fact that business enterprise frequently does not reduce prices as labor costs go down? Is he ignorant of the fact that this country could not consume all the wheat it raises, or all the cotton, no matter how low prices might go? Or that foreign markets for our crops have been reduced, partly as a result of the former high tariffs of the business-enterprise party? What does he think is blocking the use of improvements in home building? Let's pay a little more respect to empirical science in economics as well as in technology. It ill befits a scientific leader to chant the rituals of economic mythology.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

Assistant Editors: OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK
E. C. LINDEMAN JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD
REXFORD G. TUGWELL

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

E. G. WOOD BYRON DEXTER
Advertising Manager *Circulation Manager*

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION,
FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS;
FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR