

STOP THE POLITICAL SELL-OUT TO FDR! ORGANIZE LABOR'S OWN PARTY IN '44

URWA Ranks Fight Union-Wrecking by Dalrymple

By BILL FORD

AKRON, Jan. 25 — Ignoring completely the wishes and expressed demands of tens of thousands of Akron rubber workers, the International Executive Board of the United Rubber Workers of America, CIO, on January 22 approved the action of S. H. Dalrymple, URWA president, in expelling seventy striking members of General Tire Local No. 9.

Flouting the desires of the union membership, the IEB appointed Carl Swartz, a field representative, as administrator of Local 9 to dictate Dalrymple's orders over the heads of the members.

This action of the IEB climaxes for the moment what the local press terms a "violent upheaval" within the URWA resulting from Dictator Dalrymple's unconstitutional expulsion of striking band room workers at General. Since that time the Akron rubber union movement has been seething with anger at Dalrymple's attempted wiping out of the rights of the membership and the 1,000 per cent support he has received from the vigorously anti-labor paper, the Akron Beacon Journal.

Rank and file members of General Local No. 9 turned out to their regular union business meeting January 16 to find that their local president and executive board termed this meeting a "special" meeting, thereby supposedly illegalizing any discussion by the membership on Dalrymple's expulsion order. When local President Harper bureaucratically adjourned the meeting to prevent discussion, most of the workers remained at the hall, elected as their own temporary chairman Howard Haas, former president of the local, and proceeded to hold the regularly scheduled business meeting.

Rank and File Act

They unanimously condemned the action of Dalrymple and set up a special committee to carry the fight in behalf of the fired members to a successful conclusion. A spokesman for the workers' committee pointed out that many of the workers expelled by Dalrymple and then fired from their jobs by the company at Dalrymple's instigation were not

even involved in the work stoppage that led to the controversy.

He said: "These men were found guilty and punished without a trial. They were expelled without any investigation. They have been unable to get jobs in other rubber plants. Some are being inducted into the Army ahead of their regular turn. We feel they should have been entitled to a trial before any expulsions were ordered and that the innocent should not be punished along with the guilty."

In connection with the distinction made between the so-called "guilty" and innocent workers, it has been shown conclusively that the Dalrymple stooges on the Local 9 executive board recommended for expulsion and firing only 72 out of 348 male workers in the department which shut down.

In other words, these 72 were deliberately weeded out because the bureaucratic leadership of the local FEARS and HATES them. In reply, 144 of the workers who were not expelled and fired solidarized themselves with the expelled members, saying that they were just as responsible for the shut down and should also have been thrown out. They took this magnificent step to "show the international officers how they feel" about the expulsions.

News of the details of the General Local internal situation spread rapidly throughout Akron, infuriating every honest union member. Within the next few days, Goodrich and Firestone local unions, representing about 30,000 members, met and passed strong resolutions condemning Dalrymple's dictatorial action. Copies of these resolutions were sent to the International Executive Board, called into a special meeting to back up Dalrymple, who deliberately left town to get away from the "heat" and supposedly went to California on "union business."

Other Locals Join Fight

The Goodrich Local's resolution read in part: "There is ample evidence that the grievances of the suspended members of Local No. 9 were not properly adjusted by the General Tire & Rubber Co. management, which, like other companies in this

area, has not dealt with the union on a fair and honest basis. It is a well known fact that many corporations throughout the nation hope to crush organized labor during this war emergency and one of their methods is to split the labor movement by unjust and undemocratic discriminatory actions."

This lengthy resolution also demanded that "its rightful local autonomy be immediately restored to Local 9 and that the suspensions of these members be immediately rescinded, that they be immediately restored to their full rights of membership, that the international officers adhere to the constitution of the URWA in this case and all future occasions." It demanded that the suspended members "be immediately restored to their jobs and reimbursed for all lost time resulting from their unconstitutional suspension and subsequent discharge."

The Firestone Local's resolution is quoted in part as follows: "We believe in the democratic rights of all people that they be recognized as innocent until proved guilty by the proper processes of law. We go on record as opposed to the action of the international president in suspending from membership 70 members of Local No. 9."

Previous to the action of these locals, Dalrymple had been forced to rescind the expulsion and firing of two of the supposed 72 strikers because it was conclusively shown that THEY WERE HOME ON ACCOUNT OF ILLNESS at the time they were allegedly on strike. This same fact also obtains for many of the remaining seventy. In addition, the charge of connivance with both the local police and with Army officers to attempt to destroy the insurgent movement has been leveled against the international union dictators.

The rank and file representatives filed charges against the Local 9 president and six of his executive board members for neglect of duty in the situation and informed them that they stood suspended from membership on that account. The five-man committee set up by the membership then proceeded to take over the union headquarters. Immediate-

(Continued on page 2)

By JOHN BERNE

If anybody had any doubt about Roosevelt running for a fourth term, that doubt has now been removed. On January 22, at a meeting of the National Committee of the Democratic Party, the party leaders unanimously adopted a resolution of tribute and endorsement of the President as the only possible nominee for the 1944 election.

According to reports, there was "not even cursory discussion of an alternative candidate." It is inconceivable that FDR did not give his okay to all this in advance—and his hat is in the ring for a fourth term.

Problem of Post-War Jobs Ties In With Labor Party

By GERTRUDE SHAW

Judging by the contribution made by Mr. Wallace at the conference on post-war problems, just held in New York City under the auspices of the CIO Political Action Committee, there is very little else to recommend Mr. Wallace to labor except his good intentions—if that can be considered a recommendation.

As is to be expected from Mr. Wallace, he lambasted the cartels. This time he added something new, accusing some business men of financing "anti-Semitic movements." Also, as usual, he did not say how the cartels and fascistic big business can be fought without fighting capitalism as such.

The article on the Chase National Bank on page three of this issue of LABOR ACTION shows how all branches of capitalism are so interlocked it cannot be divided into good and bad.

Muffs the Point

When Mr. Wallace finally got around to the problem of unemployment in his speech, he did not look it straight in the face. He said:

"When the European war ends, there will probably be a \$40,000,000,000 curtailment in war production. This could conceivably cost the jobs of more than 10,000,000 men, unless plans are made."

And what about the total war, the global war, including the war with Japan? Will not the end of that bit of business mean more curtailment in war production—and more unemployment?

A large chunk of the Vice-President's comments was on the subject of reconversion to peacetime production. He spoke of "suggestions as to how the government may help business finance its reconversion." However, though he used some fine-sounding words about the common man, he did not mention a word about help to finance the workers in THEIR reconversion.

But reconversion of industry is not the basic problem, though it is something that has to be done. The point is to get jobs for the tens of millions of workers and soldiers for whom there will not be jobs AFTER RECONVERSION!

Generalities Mr. Wallace has plenty: We must utilize full productive capacity—unemployment hurts business—consumption capacity is as great as productive capacity if "labor is kept fully employed."

Certainly, most certainly! But HOW is labor to be kept fully employed when there are no more war orders and when the boys come marching home?

Mr. Wallace asks for a stockpile of blueprints for post-war construction. All optimistic supporters of capitalism are so very optimistic about post-war construction. However, on this subject another speaker at the conference, Alvin H. Hansen, economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Bank, gave some significant facts. He said that while \$15,000,000,000 to \$20,000,000,000 might help bridge the gap, at the moment only about \$700,000,000 in post-war government projects are in the blueprint stage.

The significance of these figures is that the planners are going easy—a bit concerned about how to finance a stupendous construction program when depression hits the land. The trifling amount of post-war construction now provided for indicates that the "free enterprise" boys are pretty influential where the plans are being made. Not willing to surrender their "just rewards" in war profits, they will be even less willing to pay high taxes to finance "socialistic ideas" when there are no more war orders.

The above about summarizes Mr. Wallace's contribution to the post-war conference of the CIO—only generalities and more generalities, worth a dime a dozen.

Hillman or Sloan

Sidney Hillman, who as head of the CIO Political Action Committee, was a leading light at the conference, in his own way did no better than Mr. Wallace.

He was indeed quite angry because Alfred P. Sloan, chairman of the General Motors Company board of directors—an astute business man—is proceeding on the basis of a post-war national income of \$100,000,000,000.

"Under such an estimate," Mr. Hillman declared, "our economy would operate at two-thirds capacity or less. A drop in national income to one hundred billion dollars would add up to unemployment for ten to fifteen million American workers." This is quite true.

Mr. Hillman is lots more optimistic about the future than is Mr. Sloan. He believes that even the present national income of \$140,000,000,000 "falls far short of providing the American people with purchasing power to satisfy their demand for goods and services, despite the fact that it is the highest national income in United States history." This is also true.

But the question that must be answered is: How can the national income be increased without breaking down the obstructions of production for profit? Mr. Hillman, who was once a socialist, no longer has any bones of contention with the capitalist system of production. Within the limits of capitalism, Mr. Hillman's optimism is unwarranted.

What Mr. Hillman and other labor leaders are banking on is that the government will intervene in production, curb the voraciousness of the "free enterprisers," and plan everything out nicely for the working people.

But what kind of government does Mr. Hillman have in mind to do this job for labor? The CIO leadership opposes a national independent Labor Party aiming at a workers' government. What the CIO Political Action Committee is working for is a houseful of "friends of labor" from the Democratic and Republican parties. How can responsible labor leaders still rely on this debunked political method?

A Sound Program

The CIO intends to bring out a full post-war program on the basis of the conference just held. It is to be hoped that it will be more fundamentally sound than the two speeches above considered. Certainly foremost among demands to prevent million-mass unemployment are the following:

1. A thirty-hour work week with no reduction in wages—to provide jobs for all and a decent standard of living.

2. Government-owned plants not to go to the capitalists to stand idle while workers starve, but to be held by the government and placed under workers' control.

3. Similarly all private factories closed by the capitalists should be taken over and operated by the workers to produce the needs of the population.

4. Large-scale construction of housing, schools, hospitals, playgrounds, parks, beaches and all public utilities that will add to the well-being and happiness of the people—a program for life as great as the present gigantic program for war!

A glance at these demands makes it clear that any serious approach to the problem of unemployment opposes the interests of the "free enterprisers" and the limitations of production for profit.

For such a program the labor movement must be willing to assume full political responsibility to the working people of the nation. That means coming forth with an independent Labor Party ready to fight for labor's needs against the capitalists and against their political parties—including all the "friends of labor."

Almost simultaneously, 2,000 CIO officials, meeting under the auspices of the Greater New York CIO Council, adopted a resolution "calling upon President Roosevelt to run for a fourth term and pledging him full support."

Of course, the endorsement of Roosevelt by the CIO is not unexpected. The CIO created its Political Action Committee to push the election of Roosevelt and everyone has known about this.

However, here's the actual endorsement. How does it look to the labor movement?

REWARDING FDR FOR LABOR DRAFT PROPOSAL

At the CIO convention held last November, Sidney Hillman, head of the CIO Political Action Committee, pretended to be pretty cocky. He was not going to commit the CIO in November, 1943, for elections in November, 1944. Not he! So FDR had better be careful what he does about labor problems in the interim—or...

Or what? Or the CIO will endorse him anyway!

Hillman's half-hearted threat meant nothing, and Roosevelt is a shrewd enough politician to see that. He has not only laughed up his sleeve at the pretended stand-offishness of the CIO. HE HAS DECLARED AS PUBLIC POLICY THE MOST VICIOUS ANTI-LABOR POLICY.

What else can his recommendation for labor conscription be called but vicious anti-labor policy? Can anything be much worse than "involuntary servitude" for the workers?

What do the CIO leaders do about the man who wants labor conscription as a national policy? They reward as their "friend" the man who sponsors this blow at the labor movement which would bind workers to their industrial jobs as the serfs of old were bound to the soil.

This is the contradiction the CIO finds itself in. On the one hand, it rightly comes out with blistering condemnation of the labor draft proposal. On the other hand, it endorses for president the man who leads the fight for labor conscription. That's what happens when labor chooses to play capitalist politics instead of standing independently on its own political might.

A rank and file storm of repudiation of the endorsement of Roosevelt CIO leaders should be the result of such a betrayal of labor's interests.

Why should thirteen million organized workers, together with their immediate relatives and the large section of the "little people" of the nation that looks to labor for leadership, remain the tail of either the Democratic or Republican Parties? An independent Labor Party would mobilize and consolidate this working class political strength—instead of throwing it away.

NEW DEALS AND OLD DEALS ARE RAW DEALS

And what does the Democratic Party—to which the CIO top leadership wishes to bind labor—stand for today? As always, for the interests of the capitalist class! Even the New Deal, now officially pronounced dead by its originator—and for a long time known to be dead by workers conscious of their own interests—was a way of preserving the interests of the capitalist class by making "concessions" to labor.

The New Deal could never have been put over on the American ruling class if labor was not mad as blazes about the depression of 1929 and ready to fight for its human needs. The masters of America saw "red" and feared revolution. It was labor's own determination to take up the cudgels in its own behalf that forced the departed New Deal on the Democratic Party.

At the above mentioned meeting of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Wallace was on the job in an effort to make it appear that the Democratic Party is still the place for labor—it, of course, never was the place for labor. His bit of by-play was indeed significant.

Before Wallace spoke, Sam Rayburn, Democrat from Texas, made a speech in which he appealed to the "Old Deal" Southern Democrats in conciliatory tone. He made sure to cast friendly words in the direction of Cordell Hull, whose policies have led to the strengthening of anti-democratic forces abroad. And he most consciously followed the President's new line that the New Deal is dead.

But Mr. Wallace wasn't going to have his party stand out so irrevocably against his precious New Deal—even though the President has buried it. For Wallace now has taken the niche of top "friend of labor." So he followed Rayburn with a brief speech containing fanciful statements such as "The New Deal is not dead—the New Deal is Franklin D. Roosevelt." Mr. Roosevelt must have smiled at that.

This is the sort of flim-flam created to "cater" to labor to get its overwhelming voting strength.

Cast all this aside! WORK FOR AN INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY—IN 1944!

Dalrymple Makes 'Mistake'

By JOHN C. GREEN

(John C. Green writes a weekly column for the Summit County Labor News of Akron, Ohio).

When General Marshall smeared organized labor by stating that strikes are prolonging the war, every labor leader and labor newspaper very rightly condemned this statement and falsehood in vigorous rebuttal.

But when a union leader, none

other than the president of a CIO international union makes the same statement—gives organized labor the same smear—about strikes involving a few hundred workers, this is passed up by the labor leaders as "just a mistake" and of little consequence.

The international union president as guilty as General Marshall, is Sherman Dalrymple, of the United Rubber Workers. No wonder he has

become the idol of the capitalist press and of the exploiting industrial masters.

Dalrymple is quoted as saying that by strikes "We give aid and comfort to the enemy."

Such a labor smear by a labor leader is a hundred times worse than Marshall's smear. Coming from a labor leader, it certainly gives "aid and comfort" to the real enemies of organized labor, the war profiteering capitalist employers.

He Smeared and Expels

This is the same Dalrymple who expelled seventy union members from the rubber unions without trial—without giving these workers an opportunity to defend themselves.

Time and again the rubber bosses in Akron have attempted to cut rates. The results have had to be many strikes and work stoppages by the workers to defend their standard of living.

Every struggle of the rubber workers has been a fight against rate-cutting, which would mean either speed-up or a wage cut.

Who Is Dalrymple's Boss?

It seems that President Dalrymple is more interested in keeping the workers noses on the profit grindstone than in protecting the interests of the members whom he is supposed to serve.

These labor leaders who serve the bosses instead of the workers should be removed from office!

Direct election of all officials by the rank and file would soon stop such bureaucracy in the labor movement. Rank and file control in the unions is the program for the rubber workers.

More Profits in 1944

Having pocketed the wartime swag for the year 1943, big business already has its finger in the pie of 1944 war profits.

The Treasury Department estimates that the profits this year will top them all.

The prediction is that big business will be put ahead another \$10,000,000,000 by the end of 1944. This figure is rock bottom, meaning after taxes and all fancy deductions have been made.

The 1943 profits after taxes and other deductions, approximated only \$8,600,000,000. "Free enterprise" is indeed progressive in the matter of making profits.

The 1943 increment for big business will be twice what it was before the war.

Interesting it is to note that war taxes rest so lightly on the big corporations that they have not prevented the doubling of wartime profits.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Attention! Rubber Workers Local 101

C. P. In Brewster Local Dons False Face

Editor's Note: An anonymous circular entitled "The State of the Union" and distributed to the membership of Local 101 of the United Rubber Workers Union, launches into a completely unprovoked and slanderous attack on LABOR ACTION.

This is a reply to its authors by a supporter of LABOR ACTION.

DETROIT—The "State of the Union" group, in its scurrilous attack on LABOR ACTION, accuses the paper of being a "manure spreader" and a "hate-breeding publication."

LABOR ACTION exposes war profiteering by big business. It tears the lid off the anti-labor campaigns which hide under the cover of "patriotism."

LABOR ACTION stands for a fighting union program. It calls for an end to the retreat of the labor movement of this country and stands for taking up once again the fight to defend and improve the standards of all working people.

LABOR ACTION stands for equal rights for all minority peoples in this country. Is that hate-breeding? Is it not the job of the labor movement to defend democratic rights right here at home?

WHAT IS "SUBVERSIVE"?

The "State of the Union" group try to create confusion by distortions and misstatements. They claim that a "subversive" LABOR ACTION group is being organized to take control of the local. That is untrue.

In the first place, the word "subversive" is not a term one loyal worker uses against another. It is a word the bosses use to discredit militant workers and union militancy.

In the second place, LABOR ACTION has no group of its "own" which seeks control of the local, nor is it organizing such a group. LABOR ACTION believes that the union movement AS A WHOLE must take up a fighting program in the interests of all labor.

We ask the members of Local 101, regardless of what groups they now support in the Local and regardless of who they voted for in the local elections, to consider this program, discuss it and urge its adoption:

- 1. Against Communist-Stalinist rule in the unions. For a democratically-run union.
2. Restore genuine collective bargaining by withdrawing the no-strike pledge and taking labor's representatives off the War Labor Board.

- 3. Equal rights for all minorities in the unions and in the shops.
4. For the organization of a fighting, independent Labor Party in opposition to the two old capitalist parties, the Democrats and Republicans.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR NEGROES

The "State of the Union" group say that the colored people should "cease to consider themselves a separate group to be herded together into a bloc of votes for the benefit of this faction or that."

Negroes do not "herd" THEMSELVES together. They are regimented as a separate group by those who stand for race segregation and discrimination. Do the wordy authors wish to change that? Then their free advice to the Negroes is not necessary, for all groups in the local must sincerely do something to obtain equal rights for the Negro brothers in the shop.

It states that both LABOR ACTION and the Communist Party are "courting the support of the Negroes in this local." That is a deliberate distortion of the truth, an attempt to make it appear that there is no difference between LABOR ACTION and the Communist Party.

LABOR ACTION stands for equal rights for ALL minority peoples, including Negroes. LABOR ACTION "courts" the support of ALL workers, white and Negro, to win this equality. Furthermore, we point out that in the interest of ALL labor the union movement must fight to defend and extend the rights of minorities. We say that so long as labor permits itself to be divided along the lines of race, creed or COLOR, it will be weakened in the fight against the real enemy of labor, the capitalist class.

The Communist Party TALKS in favor of minority rights but it opposes any fight to achieve these rights. That is why they are hypocritical on this question. Their attitude to Negroes is the same as their attitude toward all labor. They seek to manipulate all labor, Negro and white, to put over the latest policies devised by Stalin. They are puppets controlled by the anti-labor regime in Russia and are NOT primarily concerned with the needs of labor in ANY country.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND LABOR ACTION

The "State of the Union" group wishes to lump together LABOR ACTION and the Communist Party. But what is most interesting about the leaflet is that both it and the CP attack LABOR ACTION in the same way.

The CP is a most bitter enemy of LABOR ACTION for the reason that LA urges labor to fight to defend its standard of living against the big corporations and financiers, and to destroy their control over the nation's economy.

The CP, on the contrary, in the words of Earl Browder, is for a program which will "rouse a minimum of opposition from... the business men, industrial and financial capitalists and their managers who have effective direction of the nation's economy."

We say that one cannot serve two masters. Either you are for the working man or for the capitalist. The authors of the "State of the Union" say that LABOR ACTION is for "disruption and chaos." These are almost the exact words used by the Communist Party against LABOR ACTION.

Why is it "disruption" to recognize the need to maintain labor's rights and standards of living—and to break the power of monopoly and financial capitalists? The "State of the Union" group repeats over and over again that they are against the CP. But—

They do not propose a fighting, constructive, pro-labor program in opposition to the destructive, anti-labor program of the CP. This, however, is just what LABOR ACTION does do!

WHAT DO THEY STAND FOR?

Just what do they stand for? This is indeed very obscure in the circular, but by an intelligent reading between the lines it is not hard to discover some of the things they have in mind.

Where do these critics of LABOR ACTION stand on the question of democracy within the union? They say that the local should not be run by any minority, and that it true. But what gives them the right to speak in the name of the majority? What are they, these authors of the "State of the Union" leaflet, if not a minority group within the union? Why do they issue their leaflet anonymously if not to hide this fact and make it appear that they speak for the union as a whole? They speak only for themselves. Who are they and what do they stand for anyway?

We do not dispute the RIGHT of any minority group within the union to issue its own leaflets. But we do dispute the right of any MINORITY group to usurp the name of the majority.

DEMOCRACY IN THE UNION

True, the local must not be run by a minority. But in a democratically-run union a minority has the right to urge that the rest of the membership adopt its ideas. Before the last election, the administration of the local was in the hands of the Marmon-Stalinist group. Those who opposed it were in the minority. The minority organized the American Party within the local and urged the majority of the members to support them.

Do the "State of the Union" group dispute the fact that any members of the union who might disagree with the present administration now or in the future have the same rights as the American Party when it was in the "opposition"? Now that there is a new administration, do they propose that all OTHER groups be outlawed? If so, why are they afraid of criticism?

UNITY IN THE UNION

Differences of opinion in the local on important or minor questions are inevitable and are a healthy sign of a thinking membership. And the union can remain truly united when there are differences of opinion if it is run in a truly democratic fashion. Genuine unity in the shop can be readily obtained by two simple measures:

- 1. Real democratic procedure in the local. No frame-up campaigns against those who might criticize the leadership.
2. A sincere effort to establish equality for Negro members in the shop on the basis of a union system of upgrading without discrimination and based upon seniority.

ON "AMERICANISM"

The circular says: "If you are proud to say you are an AMERICAN without deeming it necessary to add a hyphenated prefix denoting your Old World antecedents or a suffix indicating some sort of 'ism,' you are the salt of the earth..."

Is it a crime or a disgrace to have Old World antecedents? Are there not thousands and millions of working men and women in Italy and Germany and other countries of Europe who opposed Hitler and Mussolini and fought for the rights of the labor movement—working people who opposed fascism when the ruling classes of the United Nations sympathized with the rise of Nazism and fascism and rejoiced at the crushing of the labor movement?

Are there not thousands of working men in Europe today who fight against fascism and for the rebuilding of the labor movement? Are there not thousands of working men in Ireland who fought to free their own country from British rule?

We have the right to be PROUD of such men. We have much in common with these working men in other countries. But we have nothing in common with men like Gerald L. K. Smith or Father Coughlin, who stand for the ideas of fascism, anti-Semitism and Jim Crow—while they shout their "Americanism!"

The labor movement in this country must fight for itself and not be scared by the word "un-American" flung at labor by its enemies at home. Forward to:

- 1. Rescind the no-strike pledge.
2. Get off the War Labor Board.
3. Organize an independent Labor Party against big business and its political twin servants, the Democratic and Republican Parties.

NEW YORK—A union election will soon take place at the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation. It is an even of unusual importance to the whole labor movement because this local, one of the most progressive in the nation, has been a particular target for the wrath of congressional reactionaries, the War Labor Board and the daily press.

There has appeared on the scene, as in the recent elections for delegates to the Automobile Workers convention, a "B" ticket to oppose the administration group of President Tom Di Lorenzo. The "B" line is known from its past and present policies to be inspired largely by followers of the Stalinist Communist Party. Its real policy is to sacrifice anything and everything for the "war effort," as Stalin desires.

A False Face

In order to win support in a local like Brewster, however, these people are forced to come out with some radical-sounding criticisms of the Di Lorenzo administration and with some very fine demands.

It is only necessary to consider one of these demands to see what a fraud the "B" line really is. Wage rates, they say, should be equalized throughout the whole aviation industry at the highest levels prevailing in any plant. The achievement of such a demand would, of course, benefit Brewster workers tremendously. It is a demand being raised by all units of the United Automobile Workers in wage negotiations. It would mean an end to the Little Steel formula; and the "B" line, having changed its tune along with Phil Murray recently, is now for this too.

Good! Very good! How is this to be achieved, though? That's the real question. Brewster workers, the administration of the local, and good trade unionists generally have supported such demands for some time now. The Stalinists, remember, are NEW converts.

New Era, the newspaper of the "B" line, speaks as if all that is necessary is to be respectable and thus gain the favor of the War Labor Board. Di Lorenzo, they say, has been irresponsible in permitting strikes and in otherwise acting tough.

They Lie and Know It

The New Era boys lie and know that they lie. They know that the War Labor Board has a very firm policy on this matter. In a famous decision issued on July 23 of last year, Public Member Morse said:

"Many unions appearing before the War Labor Board seem to think that they can justify a wage increase solely on the ground that the employees of some comparable plant or industry in the same area are receiving higher rates..."

URWA Ranks Fight--

(Continued from page 1)

ly thereafter the international officers held a conference with the police to determine whether the five-man committee could be ousted from the hall, but could not even get police sanction for their dirty business. One of the international officers made it clear that every effort was being made to "take care" of Ray Sullivan, one of the rank and file leaders, by having him railroaded into the Army, just because he rose to the defense of the expelled members, even though he was not involved in the work stoppage.

A Capitalist Paper Comments

On this point, the day following passage of the Goodrich and Firestone resolutions of solidarity with the expelled, the Beacon Journal found it necessary to beat a hasty retreat from its previous complicity to cover up. It wrote editorially:

"This brings up, also, the case of Ray Sullivan, leader of the group at General Local that has objected to the expulsions. Sullivan, a pre-Pearl Harbor father who is still employed in the highly essential work of tire building, has suddenly received a notice to report for his pre-induction physical examination. Many of his friends believe that he is being hurried into service because of his activities on behalf of those who lost their jobs. If this is so, selective service is being used for a purpose for which it was not intended—to influence, if not to stifle, the free expression of opinion. Not only the members of the URWA but the public at large have a right to know all the circumstances concerning Sullivan's case. Is he being taken in regular order or is he being punished?"

But on this question there is no doubt in anybody's mind. Sullivan, not to mention others, had a 2-B draft status. His draft board had previously informed him that he would not be taken for a long time. Then he suddenly received notice to report for his blood test. On returning home from his blood test, that same evening he found in the mail a notice to appear for induction. In ordinary cases induction notices follow by several weeks the taking of a blood test.

At present, then, the situation turns

"If the board should ever adopt such a theory... it would perform a great disservice to American labor, because such a program would augment inflationary trends.

"Surely we have not reached the point in this country where American labor in time of war is going to insist that wage rates must be equalized in return for its no-strike pledge. It is the view of the board that a program of wage equalization would be productive of real gross inequities in the wage structure of the country, and the board does not propose to embark upon any such program."

We may add what all workers know, even if New Era pretends not to: The WLB hasn't become more liberal in this or any other respect recently.

How can this most desirable demand be achieved? New Era can only repeat: Observe the no-strike pledge faithfully. Produce more. Cooperate with Mr. Kaiser and the company in labor-management committee love fests. This program, the real Communist Party program, needs only to be stated in order to be recognized as ridiculous by any worker with an ounce of brains in his head. The struggles of the coal miners and rail workers are not yet forgotten.

The decision quoted from above was written in connection with the Los Angeles street car case but was "addressed sweepingly to all workers" (New York Times, July 24). Did the decision stand? It did not. Not on one but on two later occasions, October 24 and November 16, the board granted increases and found an excuse for doing so, namely, furthering the war program.

WLB Changes Its Mind—But...

Why did the board change its mind? Perhaps even New Era remembers the Los Angeles strike and the strike threats. Officials of the union blamed the White House itself and defiantly suggested that the government send its "Storm Troops" to make the men work. Instead the WLB reconsidered and granted a more favorable decision.

But has the board changed its general policy? Not at all.

Some Brewster workers may very well be dissatisfied with their administration because of layoffs and because of weakened seniority and grievance clauses in the recent contract. It is perfectly true that the union has retreated under an almost unprecedented attack from all quarters. It lost ground, to be sure, but not because its program was too radical. On the contrary, that program was not carried out fully enough—

since the United Auto Workers Union as a whole has not yet adopted and supported that program.

Circumstances make it necessary for the Brewster union to have more support from the rest of the labor movement than the street car workers needed to change the mind of the WLB.

Certainly the Little Steel formula must be broken. Certainly rates should be equalized on a national

scale. To accomplish these ends the local will have to push its program in the ranks of the international union and stop retreating.

End the no-strike pledge! Withdraw labor members from the WLB! Form an independent party of labor!

We are waiting to hear—and it will be a long wait—how the New Era plan of being sweet, good and submissive will achieve that lovely program which they offer.

WORLD EVENTS

By Europacus

The Poisoned Fruits of "Liberation"

We have been reading over and over again about the gigantic plans now being made to feed Europe, once the Nazis are driven out. It is always easy to speak about relief—for the future.

In the meantime in those parts of Italy which have been "liberated" by the Allied armies, there is actual starvation. A Reuter dispatch from Sicily says the following:

"Sicilians are buying two-thirds of their total bread requirement at ten times the official price. They are consequently obtaining the equivalent of just one-half of their nutritional requirements of cereals, according to preliminary findings of an Allied commission. Inquiries brought out that the average price paid for two-thirds of the bread is twenty-one lira per pound, about ten times the official price. The average quantity of bread bought by each consumer works out at half a pound as compared with a requirement of one pound."

"Macaroni, flour, oil and sugar are unobtainable from official sources. Inquiries about clothing elicited the fact that more than half the members of an average family lacked either an overcoat, a suit or underclothes or all these garments. The situation is still worse regarding boots and shoes."

A soldier correspondent writes: "Wherever you go you are followed by a crowd of children who eat

everything you buy almost out of your mouth." Starvation always ways brings in its wake epidemics. A New York Times correspondent reports:

"Fifty times as many cases of typhus a day are reported in Naples as were found in the city at the time of the Allies' entry... The menace can be expected to extend to Southern Italy."

Apologists will, of course, say that this is only a temporary situation caused by the lack of shipping space. That this is in no way true is again proved by a report the New York Times reporter, Denny, has just sent out of Spain. The story demonstrates that where a POLITICAL interest to supply food exists, there are suddenly no longer any problems of shipping space. Denny writes: "A motive of our economic aid to Spain has been to prevent a breakdown in Spain's economy, which would probably have produced chaos and possibly even a renewal of civil warfare. Viewed in one light, our policy has helped to maintain a government of fascist taint."

There you have it openly and clearly. Everything had to be done to help Franco maintain his bloody regime of oppression, because otherwise revolution was threatening. But in Southern Italy the Army sits so firmly in the saddle that the feeding of the population is not such a pressing problem—it is too weak to fight anyway.

German Soldiers Showing Strain

A diary of a young German soldier who has recently been made prisoner is extremely revealing. It shows that the terrible realities of war—much better than any other method—help to educate young German soldiers, even those who had originally been fervent Nazis.

The diary began with an entry of January 15, 1943: "What excitement. My first real day as a soldier."

On October 27, in Italy, the diarist was quoting a marching song, "The Armored Grenadiers." But on December 22 he wrote: "Last night, during a retreat, I broke finally and irrevocably with my old life. In my soul only one thing remains: hatred for the bestiality of the German army. For, at the last, one is a human being. What have we to fight for? If I ever survive to leave the front alive, at least I shall have seen through the tawdry facade of Nazi politics."

That is the way anti-Nazis are born, not through "re-education" by Russo-American commissions—as now proposed by our well meaning liberal idiots.

The continuing demoralization among German soldiers is also confirmed by other reports. From the Italian front a New York Herald

Tribune correspondent reported that German prisoners now call their officers "Kriegsverlaengerer" (war prolonger). In the occupied countries, a Belgian report states:

"In Brussels, the German field gendarmier, which has been ordered to track down about a hundred deserters, is carrying out daily house searches in the city. "At Florennes, Province of Namur, a colonel of the German air force has been killed by one of his men. In that district, officers and men alike are often drunk. When they have been drinking, the men no longer salute their commanders, and the officers dare not reprimand them."

These reports must not be taken to mean that the Nazi armies are going to crack tomorrow. The hate propaganda daily poured from Russian, British and American broadcasts does a great deal to prevent the soldiers from revolting. The German soldiers thus fear the aftermath of defeat. It is nevertheless noticeable that German privates show a real antagonism toward their officers and superiors. All revolutionary movements in imperialist armies have started out by these movements of insubordination.

Great Britain Holds Up Trial Of Noted French Fascists

First it was the American State Department which developed the policy of working with Vichy and the ex-Vichy men in North Africa. It led to working relations with Darlan, General Nogues, Peyrouton and others who represented collaborationism and semi-fascist reaction in France.

With the establishment of the French National Committee of Liberation, de Gaulle finally achieved his aim of controlling the committee and carrying out his own policy, part of which is reflected in bringing to trial those men whom he calls "the traitors of France."

The French National Committee of Liberation has arrested many representatives of Vichy preparatory to bringing them to trial. This is where the British now come in. Among the men arrested by the committee are former Premier Flandin, pro-Nazi politician and advocate of a France-Hitler alliance; former Minister of the Interior Peyrouton, the man who established the Vichy "Gestapo" and originated the French anti-Semitic laws; and Pierre Boisson, former Governor-General of French West Africa. Together with Pucheu, General Bergeret and Admiral Darrien, they, among other things, fought against the Allies.

The British have now demanded that the French National Committee halt the arrests of these Frenchmen and release those already arrested, specifically referring to Flandin, Peyrouton and Boisson. Why? There is no explanation forthcoming. And where does the United States stand on this question? Here, too, the rumors are contradictory.

In the meantime the French are trying to figure out what scheme lies behind the British demand for the freedom of Flandin, Peyrouton and Boisson.



Introductory Offer

TO: LABOR ACTION 114 WEST 14th STREET New York 11, N. Y.

SIX MONTH SUBSCRIPTION 25¢

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

New International Features Timely Articles, Reviews

The January issue of The New International is out on sale, featuring timely articles on important events.

In his "Notes of the Month," Max Shachtman has written several important articles dealing with the developments in the war, the struggle over Poland and the dissolution of the American Communist Party.

The second installment of "Machiavellianism and Politics," by R. Fagan, also appears in this issue, along with an interesting article on American labor by J. R. Johnson.

An outstanding feature of the January New International is an old article by Leon Trotsky on the struggle against fascism in Italy, containing some thought-provoking ideas on how this struggle can be developed.

Rockefeller Bank Indicted For 'Trading With Enemy' Prolonging the War for Profits -- Will Stimson Tell Soldiers THIS?

The Chase National Bank and L. J. A. Smit have been indicted under complaint of the Department of Justice for violating the "trading with the enemy" act. Specifically, this outfit procured for and delivered to the Axis industrial diamonds—not jewels for the Nazi rulers to present to their lady-loves, but important strategic material in war production. In the manufacture of tools and dies, industrial diamonds are most desirable, if not indispensable.

With L. J. A. Smit, dealer in industrial diamonds, American workers are not particularly concerned. He is undoubtedly a Nazi agent doing his ignominious bit. The fact that one of his European representatives has become Nazi commissioner of industrial diamonds for the occupied territories of the Reich, indicates just who this Smit is.

But what about the Chase National Bank? What is the Chase National Bank?

In the first place, it is the largest bank in the world, with assets of more than \$5,000,000,000.

In the second place, it is the financial arm of the Rockefeller family, monopolists of the Standard Oil combine, which is linked with the powerful I. G. Farbenindustrie of Nazi Germany.

But the scandal does not involve only the Chase National Bank, the Rockefeller family and the Standard Oil monopoly. Because of the intermeshing of all of capitalist production and ownership, the Chase National Bank has its hands in every branch of industry.

The executives and directors of the Chase National Bank also control the administration of corporations in the field, not only of oil, but of electrical goods, telephone and telegraph, copper, nickel, insurance, shipbuilding, tool manufacturing, paper, sugar, natural gas, railroads, chemicals, steel, radio, movies, utilities, coal, rubber, dairy products and food, with many international connections. That about covers everything.

Here is how the system of interlocking directorships works out:

Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of Chase, is also director of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., of Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., and of other companies.

H. Donald Campbell, president and vice-chairman of Chase, is also director of American Smelting & Refining Co., of Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp., of Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., and of Western Union Telegraph Co.

Gordon Auchincloss, director of Chase, is director also of Compania Hispano Americana de Electricidad, of Societe Financiere de Transports et d'Entreprises Industrielles, of Solvay American Corp., and of International Paper & Power Co.

Earl D. Babst, director of Chase, is also director of

American Sugar Refining So. and of Great American Insurance Co.

Howard Bayne, director of Chase, is also director of Bankers & Shippers Insurance Co., of American Reinsurance Co., and of El Paso Natural Gas Co.

John A. Brown, director of Chase, is also president and director of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., of Columbia Petroleum Co., and chairman of South American Gulf Oil Co.

This is only a partial list. The rest of the nineteen directors of Chase are on such additional powerful companies as American Smelting & Refining Co., General Cable Corp., Northern Pacific Railway, Union Pacific Railroad, Seaboard Oil Co., Mathieson Alkali Works, American Rolling Mills Co., Mexican Gulf Oil Co., Venezuela Gulf Oil Co., New York Central Railroad, Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., Radio Corp. of Amer-

ica, National Broadcasting Co., Consolidated Edison Co., Scranton & Lehigh Coal Co., Kennecott Copper Corp., Mansfield Tire & Rubber Co., Public Service Corp. of New Jersey, Yellow Cab Co., Bell Telephone Co. of Canada, Borden Co., Equitable Life Assurance Society, Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co., General Foods Corp., Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., International Nickel Co., General Electric Co., U. S. Steel Corp., Babcock & Wilcox Co.

But don't think the above formidable enumeration of giants of American capitalism exhausts the limits of Chase National Bank control over American financial and industrial life. For besides the nineteen directors, Chase National Bank has sixty-six vice-presidents and sixty-three second vice-presidents, presumably distributed throughout the bank's local branches—all with their local, national and international con-

nections. This is the answer as to what the Chase National Bank is. It is the greatest of the great octopus growths borne by American capitalism and now controlling it in all its ramifications.

An indictment against Chase National Bank is an indictment against American capitalism as a whole. When Chase National Bank has been making money out of both sides of the war, many of its interlocking companies have been deriving ample benefits too.

There are no good and bad capitalists, as Vice-President Wallace and other demagogues of the "liberal" school would have us believe. Capitalism is all of one rotten piece. The thing for the working people to do is to shove the whole rotten mess off the stage of history—and make room for production for human needs under socialism.

Why Shipyard Workers Strike -- Case History of a 'Wildcat'

By VICTOR H. JOHNSON

(Reprinted from The Nation of January 15, 1944)

We set off on our junket to Washington with considerable hope. We were happy to have avoided for at least a week the shutdown of two of the biggest and fastest naval shipyards in the country. Labor's no-strike pledge had been kept; through pleading and the faith of the men who side by side with us we had held 43,000 rebellious shipworkers on the job. What, in turn, would Washington do for us in the way of adjusting the grievances of those men and keeping production going?

The first telephone contact made by the two rank and file members of our delegation of five was with Dr. John Steelman, head of the United States Conciliation Service. Dr. Steelman is one of the most down-to-earth government men you could possibly talk to. What his influence and power are among the other government labor people, I don't know. I suspect, though, that he is too straightforward and democratic to be popular with the red-tapers.

Dr. Steelman was already familiar with our case. After a few minutes of questions about details, he undertook to help get action. The mark of his sincerity was his giving us a definite time when he would have news; the mark of his democracy was the way he talked to us. "I know, Bud," he would say. "You have to have something to take back to those guys."

Dean Wayne Morse, one of the four members of the War Labor Board representing the public, was our next man. (We knew that the four labor members would go along with us; we expected the four em-

ployer members to stall; ultimately the decision would be up to the public members.) On the West Coast Dean Morse had a good reputation as a conciliator. In Washington he is known among union people as "the Dean" and they will tell you that he is a good man on vacations and sub-standard brackets but a tough adherent of the Little Steel formula.

"That's a pretty big speed-up you have," he said, apparently making comparisons with other yards. "The accident report shows it, too. And you were close enough to a strike—there seems no doubt about that. What do you think it would take to straighten out the situation?"

We left the Dean's office with our case out of the files and with the conviction that he would live up to his promise to push it.

William Hammond Davis, chairman of the board, is the other extreme from Steelman and Morse. He is an old man—his white hair, his round, involved manner of speaking, his smug self-assurance are like those of an old-time mechanic who takes his superiority for granted and resents any innovations.

Neither the president of our union, a fairly able pinner-downer, nor the rank-and-file accompanying him could pin this old patent lawyer down to a definite time of action. We felt discouraged when we left his office and feared that he would sabotage what Dean Morse and Dr. Steelman were trying to do. Meanwhile, the week our membership had given us to get results was sliding by. After two weeks our phone calls to Washington grew more frantic. The day shift going out wanted to know when we were going to get action. The night shift coming in asked the same question. The WLB's regular answer was: "We're working on it."

Once again "labor-management relations are worsening" between Local 16, Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers, CIO, and the Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., in Port Newark, N. J. A strike situation is in the making at the yards of this subsidiary of United States Steel, one of the greatest beneficiaries of the war.

The heart of the new strike fever is among the wirebrushers. Wirebrushing, a branch of the paint department of the shipyard, is a nasty, grilling, health-ruining job. The wirebrushers get eighty-six and a half cents an hour as against \$1.20 for painters. The wirebrushers want a raise to \$1.00 an hour. United States Steel, which is taking in war profits hand over fist, gives its accustomed answer to workers' demands: "No!"

"I'm getting sick telling our boys to keep taking company guff and not to walk out. This is a strike situation but we're pledged not to strike." These words of one of the

local's leaders indicates the seriousness of the situation.

In the face of this latest development among shipyard workers, LABOR ACTION reprints in part, from The Nation, the following "Case History of a Shipyard 'Wildcat,'" written for The Nation by Victor H. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson was a first-class mechanic and ship committeeman in the yard described in his story. He has since shipped out as second assistant engineer on a merchant vessel. So this is a first-hand story right from where it happened.

Because Mr. Johnson's account describes the basic situation of all American labor today, LABOR ACTION comments in full in the separate article printed below.

The reading time is not five minutes. But this "case history" is well worth all the time it needs for careful reading—and we believe the same is true of our own comments.—The Editor.

Sometimes when we'd call around three o'clock to try to get news for both shifts, we'd be told that Mr. Davis was not out or "not in." The men standing around the phone would crack: "Suppose we go out of town, too?"

Two months of the WLB's "working on it" produced no results, as far as the men in the yards could see. Even sober old-time trade unionists, who knew that a strike would cost us public support and perhaps bring organizational disaster, spoke bitterly of "teaching that War Labor

Board crowd a lesson." Spontaneous work stoppages, slowdowns, sit-downs multiplied. Union officials had a busy time nipping departmental demonstrations in the bud and keeping resentment from crystallizing into a general walkout. We tried to prevent news of the trouble from reaching the public; and so did the company, apparently.

Finally we got a sitdown that we couldn't keep from the public or from the WLB. The hookers-on in the steelyard and platemaking sat down and refused to budge. The company tried to break it up by sending the

men home. They went home, to return the next day and sit down again. After vain pleading by local union officials, John Green, national president of the Shipyard Workers, flew to the yards from Washington. It was a sad sight, the old leader of the Shipyard Workers standing on a flat-car, his gray head bare, valiantly trying to uphold the CIO's no-strike pledge. He was not met with boos and catcalls—just a respectful, deadly silence. The men were still sitting when he left the yard forlornly.

Ruling from Washington

The next week the Shipbuilding Commission issued a directive covering, with the exception of reclassifications, all the points at issue in our proposed contract. (On that one point the commission ruled that more time was needed to study other scales in the industry.) The union immediately put out a leaflet hailing a great labor victory. The men in the yards were led to believe they had really won. However, when we checked up on what had actually been granted, we found, in high-light, this: the union had obtained (1) a company check-off of dues under the maintenance-of-membership clause; (2) the right of shop stewards to operate on company time and property so long as they didn't interfere with production; (3) the right to use company bulletin boards for union notices.

These were all excellent gains for the union as an organization. On the demands affecting the rank and file, the following rulings were handed down:

1. One week's vacation was allowed for one year's service, provided that the employee had been employed in the yards before July 1, 1942. (This clause almost completely shut out the workers in one of the two yards from a vacation, inasmuch as the yard didn't open for production until after July 1, 1942.)
2. Two weeks' vacation for five years' service, effective in 1944. (In other words, men with five years' service were promised a vacation after July 1, 1944.)
3. Sick leave was denied.
4. Hospitalization and a liberalized insurance clause were denied.
5. Retroactivity on reclassifications was given to us at the start of a paragraph but was taken away at

the bottom by a clause leaving final discretionary power with the Shipbuilding Commission. (The union leaflet published only the first part of the paragraph.)

With production up five times over that of peacetime, with costs of living up but wages held down by the WLB, it would seem that the shipyard operators would have jumped at such mild terms as Washington proposed. But the operators didn't jump. They appealed from the order, hitting chiefly at vacations on the ground that they were in reality "a wage raise."

The Lid Blows

Again our case went back to the WLB. Again the strike fever in the yard mounted, with little stoppages, numerous slowdowns. After another month of waiting, the yard "blew." Thirteen thousand men hit the bricks over the pleas of union officials and shop stewards. We were on a big-time wildcat strike. It tore and screeched over the radio; it tangled claws on editorial pages. And it shook Mr. Davis up in Washington.

President John Green of the Shipyard Workers was ordered by Davis to intervene, on the tacit understanding that the WLB would act when production was resumed. Being somewhat wise in the ways of John Green and knowing his desire to protect the check-off already granted, we started the back-to-work movement even before he arrived. It was better to get the men back at work at the peak of their wildcat strength than to have the strike broken slowly by the union, Green, WLB pressure and the draft board. And, as we foresaw, Davis did act. The point is, he could have done it months before, without being forced at the point of a strike.

WLB Uses 'Checks and Balances' To Tip Scales Against Unions

By SUSAN GREEN

Every worker has heard the phrase, "checks and balances." It's another way of putting the idea that what the left hand gives the right hand takes away. Thus legislatures may pass pro-labor laws which the courts can "check and balance" off by declaring them unconstitutional. The above story of a so-called wildcat strike in a Jersey shipyard exemplifies how the system of "checks and balances" works for American labor. In a nutshell, all the checks are put on labor—while the big profit balances pile up for the shipyard owners and their brethren.

The War Labor Board is itself an outstanding illustration. Labor representatives of the so-called "public." And who are these representatives of the public—supposed to be a cross-section of the American people seen by Mr. Johnson, who narrates the above story? He had dealings with three of them, namely Dr. John Steelman, Dean Wayne Morse and William Hammond Davis. Who are these men, besides being members of the multifarious public?

Dr. John Steelman is professor of sociology and economics at Alabama University. Dean Wayne Morse is dean of the Law School at the University of Wisconsin. William Hammond Davis is a patent lawyer.

Are these men free, unbiased, interested only in balancing the scales

of justice in labor disputes? People are what their backgrounds make them.

The Universities of Alabama and Wisconsin are institutions of capitalist education—even though they may be state colleges. Their BASIC outlook—no matter in what "liberal" guise it is concealed—is that of private property. This is the background of Dr. Steelman and of Dean Morse.

Mr. Davis is a patent lawyer. Patent lawyers function for big fees paid by the captains of industry to protect and enlarge their profits by using and abusing the patent laws. Patent lawyers have a niche of their own in the capitalist structure.

How can such men represent the public interest when the public is made up overwhelmingly of the little people? THEY DON'T!

That does not mean that the War Labor Board granted absolutely none of labor's demands in absolutely every dispute. Not at all! Enough minor demands are granted to give the appearance of fairness. BUT LABOR AS A WHOLE IS KEPT UNDER THE FREEZE.

From Smiles to Threats

The methods of the government men with whom the yard committee came in unhappy contact are in themselves an application of the system of "checks and balances." Dr. Steelman, you noted, is "straightforward and democratic," calling the

shipyard committeemen "Bud." He is the smiling receptionist, putting the horny-handed sons of toil at ease. Dean Morse follows through with "sympathy." He agrees with the yard committeemen that "that's a pretty big speed-up you have... the accident report shows it." So the worried representatives of the shipworkers begin to feel they are among friends.

But then comes the balancing factor. Mr. Davis, patent lawyer, is the "other extreme." He is not concerned about the "night shift that had already walked off the job." Not he. He makes "his not very witty wisecracks about what he had done to John L. Lewis"—while all the time the yard committee knows that Davis refers to what he had done to "500,000 sweating, underpaid miners." So the yard committee interprets Davis's wisecracks as a warning to them. And sure enough, it was "checked and balanced" with an empty promise that the case will be taken out of the graveyard files of the WLB "some time in the near future."

Why Was Hague Interested?

It is noteworthy that the politicians also come in as a factor. The Hague gang became a bit worried. Why? Because the WLB is part of the machinery of the New Deal, and Hague's political wheels are important parts of the New Deal Democratic National Committee.

Boss Hague is kept in power by people such as these shipyard workers foolishly and blindly voting for his candidates. If the large body of shipyard workers are dissatisfied with the New Deal WLB, they might stop throwing away their votes on Hague's dummies.

That is why Hague sent his nephew down to Washington with the yard committee to "check" on the WLB.

With what result? This "check" is balanced off by the WLB referring the case to the Shipbuilding Commission, which was, however, in the act of being reorganized and couldn't take up the case just then.

Johnny Green's Role

After two months of WLB "working" on their case—when the bitterness of the men was great and spontaneous work stoppages, slowdowns and sitdowns ended in a "sitdown that we couldn't keep from the public."

The WLB decides another "check" is in order. So Johnny Green—in person—is ORDERED BY DAVIS (!) to get the men back to work. Didn't the WLB give Johnny the check-off in that yard in return for his promise to keep the men from striking? And doesn't Green owe greater loyalty to the WLB than to his own men?

The rank and file did not reward their president "with boos and catcalls"—as sometimes is, the response

given by shipyard workers to the "friendly" admirals who exhort them not to strike while the company fleeces them. To Green they gave a painful, icy, "respectful, deadly silence." But he deserved the same censure as anybody else who cripples the striking arm of labor.

The Last Straw

When, at long last, the WLB made its rulings in the case, they were a fine example of giving with one hand and taking away with the other. But modest as the rulings of the WLB were, the shipyard owners objected. Granting vacations, they claimed, was really a "wage raise" which was only more "checking and balancing" against labor.

That was the match that lit the tinder. After three months of shameful "checking and balancing"—with the union leadership working hand-in-glove with the pro-boo WLB and through it with the bosses themselves—"thirteen thousand men hit the bricks over the pleas of union officials and shop stewards." THAT IS WHAT IT TOOK TO GET ACTION OUT OF THE WLB.

What are the lessons to be learned from Mr. Johnson's graphic description of how the workers are being kept in check?

First, foremost and outstanding is the fact that it was only when "thirteen thousand men hit the bricks" that smug Mr. Davis in Washington stopped wise-cracking about what he

had done to the miners. There is no substitute for the might of the working people—no substitute for the right to strike—no other way to make the industrial owners and their "public" servants heed the demands of the workers.

Therefore, the no-strike pledge has to be finally and officially rescinded by every international union. There must be an end of the "sad sight" of labor leaders pleading with the workers who pay them fat salaries, TO CAPITULATE TO THE CAPITALISTS.

Furthermore, the no-strike pledge is a hidden weapon against UNIONISM ITSELF. The unorganized workers in the yard could certainly see no reason for joining a union that was keeping its own members down, just as the enemies of labor are. "The unorganized were more for striking than the organized. Non-unionists bailed us for being afraid to strike." That was the big hit the union made with the unorganized workers.

Labor or Capitalist Politics?

Mr. Johnson draws some very sound conclusions in his enumeration above. However, his last point is fundamentally wrong. It is indeed the fundamental wrongness of this point that makes it possible for labor to be "checked and balanced" as in the case of this shipyard strike.

Mr. Johnson says: "Come election time, it will be difficult for Mr. Roo-

sevelt to explain away the activities of these gentlemen. Undoubtedly the closed shop, maintenance of membership and check-offs will hold the top labor officials, both AFL and CIO, on the President's bandwagon. But rank and file workers who have been through the ordeal of the WLB, and who have been more or less coerced into acceptance of its decisions, will be on the lookout for a liberal candidate of presidential stature who will give the whole set-up the blasting it deserves."

But wasn't Mr. Roosevelt "a liberal candidate of presidential stature" who promised to give the whole set-up that labor hated and writhed under, the blasting it deserved? Why should labor run around in circles? Will Willie be better than Roosevelt? Will the Republican Party be better than the Democratic Party? Will anything be changed except the names of the political job-holders?

It is high time to stop this nonsense of jumping from the frying pan into the fire. Labor needs and must organize its own political party based on the unions and absolutely free and clear of all capitalist ties. Through the medium of an independent Labor Party it can proclaim a program to solve labor's problems on class lines. ASIDE FROM A CLASS SOLUTION, THERE IS NO OTHER.

And, of course, who, reading Mr. Johnson's excellent story, does not want to shout: "LABOR MUST GET OFF THE WLB!"

One Way to Curb Southern Democrats--

Labor Resumes Poll-Tax Battle

By JESSIE KAAREN

Congress will probably pick up that "hot potato," the pending bill to outlaw the poll-tax, from where it dropped it just before the Christmas recess. Prodded by labor, by liberal opinion and by Negro organizations, it will be debated once more in Congress. However, the prospects for the passage of this bill, which has been under consideration for almost four and a half years, are just as bleak as ever.

The Chances for a Miracle

The chances are that it will be filibustered to death, unless a miracle occurs, by the same group of Southern Democrats who used that device several times before. Even though the bill is assured a majority of votes in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, there are not enough votes to insure "cloture," or a vote to end debate, the only means by which the filibuster of Southern die-hards can be ended.

A two-thirds majority is necessary for a vote of cloture, and although the "liberal" congressmen from the North and West, where there is no poll-tax to repeal, are perfectly willing to vote for this progressive measure, they are not willing to vote for cloture, as that would endanger their bargaining power with the Southern group.

Twenty Southern congressmen, led by Senator Bilbo of Mississippi, have stated that they are prepared to talk for fifteen months if necessary to defeat the bill. The question of the terrific waste of man-hours involved in such a talk-fest is not even raised.

General Marshall Is Silent

Although President Roosevelt, Wendell Willkie and other national leaders have called for the abolition of the poll-tax and have stated that it is one of the greatest single barriers to American war unity, General Marshall has made no statement denouncing the Southern senators for setting back the war time-clock and he has been silent on the effect that this measure, which denies franchise to ten million voters, has on morale.

In fact, having spent his steam on the statement that the threat of a railway strike—where not one single man-hour was lost—would set the war back, General Marshall says nothing. Neither does anyone else in government circles impugn the patriotism of the Southern gentlemen when they threaten a fifteen-month filibuster, even though it would hold up much legislation that pertains to effective pursuit of the war.

And yet, according to a statement made by the National Committee to Abolish the Poll-Tax, the Axis uses this issue to discredit the United States among "friends and allies."

The simple fact of the matter is that the twenty Southern congressmen who have formed the unholy alliance to block the poll-tax repeal could not possibly hope for re-election if the poor whites and Negroes in their home states had the right to vote.

The poll-tax which exists in the eight states—Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia—amounts to only one or two dollars per head per annum but it is cumulative, so that a prospective voter must pay off all the back tax before he can avail himself of his right to a ballot.

Poll-Tax Disfranchises Poor

In the eight states mentioned, the average yearly per capita income is less than \$350, so that paying the poll-tax would in many cases mean going without food or other bare necessities.

About two-thirds of the voters in these Southern states are therefore disfranchised by this simple mechanism, which has been branded a constitutional violation by numerous federal authorities.

Corrupt politicians in poll-tax states can buy up whole blocs of voters by paying the poll-tax for them, and this is a common practice used to buy just those votes that the politicians are sure they can swing in the desired direction. In Virginia, a machine boss can pay for a bloc of four thousand poll-taxes. If convicted for the offense, he is subject to a fine of only five dollars.

How They Control Congress

Congressmen from the poll-tax states are almost totally independent of the majority of inhabitants in their states. They can have themselves "voted" back into office almost indefinitely by their controlled group of voters. In the last three elections, the turnover among non-poll-tax congressmen was seventy per cent greater than among the poll-taxers.

The Southern reactionaries thus have a seniority status that enables them to assume the chairmanship of important congressional committees. At the last count, these poll-tax Southerners headed sixty per cent of the committees, even though they represented less than twenty-five per cent of the nation's voters.

Contrary to the general conception, the poll-tax is just as discriminatory against the poor white as against the Negro. It disfranchises six whites for every four Negroes. Mississippi, the poorest state in the country, has the largest percentage of people who are restricted from voting by their inability to pay the poll-tax.

In all the eight backward Southern states, about 10,000,000 voters are denied their right to vote. Their "representatives" in Congress are actually elected by the smallest vote of any congressman in any other part of the country. The average vote for one of these Southern senators or representatives ranges from one to five per cent of the population of the state.

Eugene Cox of Virginia received a vote equaling one per cent of the population of his state. One Illinois congressman received more votes than fifty poll-tax congressmen combined.

The most reactionary committees are headed by poll-taxers (Dies, Cox and Smith).

The average expenditure for education in poll-tax states is about half of what it is in other states. The homicide rate is usually more than three times greater than it is in the rest of the country.

Labor in the Forefront

The CIO and the AFL have been in the forefront of the forces lobbying in Washington for the repeal of this most anti-democratic law. They know from first-hand experience that if labor is to advance in the United States as a whole, it must be able to penetrate the almost closed borders of the South.

Lynching of labor organizers and police-provoked riots have retarded labor development in the South for many years. In many places, it is impossible for a labor leader to hire a hall. Persecution of the most brutal kind has been used to prevent the spread of unionism.

In spite of its splendid record, the constant frustration of labor's efforts to wipe this bit of feudal legislation off the statute books will continue unless labor develops a political apparatus of its own to make its fight effective.

Labor must be in a position to put its own candidates in Congress, candidates that will be independent of "gentlemen's agreements" like the one between the Southern Democrats and the Northerners in Congress which defeated the vote of cloture the last time it came up a few months ago, which will be the likely fate of the poll-tax repeal act the next time it comes up for a vote.

A Post-War 'Prosperity' Note-- Peace Rumor Panics Wall Street

By DAN BERGER

A noteworthy forecast of the post-war economy was presented during the week of November 8 last on the New York Stock Exchange, where a panic induced by the rumor of an early peace brought on a wave of selling. Not as confident as some deluded workers of the glorious world-wide prosperity which will "surely" follow upon victory, Wall Street reacted explosively to the reports of recent Allied triumphs.

More than two million shares of stocks changed hands in one day as speculators hastened to withdraw their investments in the armament industries. They saw the bubble bursting and, displaying distrust in the much-advertised plans for the post-war boom, they withdrew even from the so-called peacetime industries. Prices dropped more than ten points in many cases and commodity prices were, to say the least, unsteady. Cotton fell \$2.35 a bale at one point during the disastrous day.

The self-same industrial concerns whose future seems so uninviting to Wall Street speculators have led in the effort to persuade the workers that post-war prosperity will be handed out by "free enterprise." Spending lavishly, these concerns have carried on an unprecedentedly gigantic advertising campaign to ram the great lie down the throats of the workers. The cost of this untruthful advertising is being reckoned as part of the cost of armament production.

Preparations for World War III

On December 8, 1943, without any fanfare or publicity, a very dangerous bill was introduced in the Congress by Senator Scrugham of Nevada. This bill, S. 1582, known as the Minerals Stock Pile Act, is clearly designed to start now the necessary preparations for World War III. No wonder there hasn't been a word mentioning it in the capitalist press!

The preamble of the bill states its purpose: "To assure an adequate supply of strategic and critical minerals for any future emergency by holding intact in the post-war period all stock piles surviving the present war owned by government agencies and by necessary augmentation thereof primarily from domestic sources."

Why is this necessary? In the language of the bill: "To avoid a repetition in any future emergency of the shortage of strategic and critical minerals which has impeded the prosecution of the present war and to stabilize and protect the domestic minerals and metals market against post-war dumping of present accumulations."

There are thus two basic purposes: to prepare for the next war, and to subsidize the mining states.

MINERALS FOR WORLD WAR III

It is the ugly and sinister features of the "military preparedness" part of the bill, however, which will alarm most people. Section 3 is the key section of the bill and is worth quoting in full:

"The board [the Mineral Stock Pile Control Board, set up by the act, and to be composed of five outstanding members of the mining industry] is authorized and directed, after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, to proceed to estimate promptly, after appropriate survey, inquiry, and research, the quantity in which each mineral designated as strategic or critical during the present hostilities, and other minerals deemed by it

to be strategic or critical, shall be stored, stock-piled, or otherwise accumulated to supply the requirements of the United States for a total war of three years' duration, or of any equivalent emergency. Such estimate shall be revised by the board from time to time as circumstances may require, and shall reflect the cumulative experience of the present war and subsequent technological developments."

The Scrugham bill, it is reported, has some very powerful backing, particularly from mining and industrial executives. It has been referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining of the Senate, which will undoubtedly hold hearings on it, with a view to reporting it out favorably next spring.

The very fact that a bill such as this can be introduced into the United States Senate reveals how hollow are the claims of those who have hailed the "Atlantic Charter" and the Teheran Conference as harbingers of an era of unlimited peace. Still, one is somewhat appalled at the cynicism of these gentlemen. Here we are with a good deal of blood-letting still to come before the end of World War II, and plans are carefully being laid for World War III.

A PROPER QUESTION

The workers have a right to ask, and to demand to answer to the question: If we are laying the foundations of a durable peace, why must we store strategic and critical materials for another total war at a cost of billions of dollars? To be sure, the apologists for the war-makers will present the excuse that "we must be prepared for all emergencies; and, after all, we want peace, but we can't be sure of the other fellow..."

We doubt that the workers will be taken in by such miserable apologetics, but what other reply can the imperialists give?

Years of Slaughter and Poverty Bring

Strikes in Wartime Japan!

By NANCY NATHAN

Japanese war prisoners in China, former home factory workers, have told a story about the wartime struggles of the Japanese workers against their capitalists and military overlords which every American worker will understand and admire.

From Chungking, China, through Allied Labor News Service, reported in such papers as the Christian Science Monitor and the CIO News, we hear from first-hand witnesses about the great strike wave that swept Japan in 1941.

Thousands Strike

In that year, when the Nipponese militarists were preparing to extend the war from China across the Pacific and when industrial activity was at its peak, the Japanese workers fought to lighten the burdens imposed upon them.

In April, in the city of Kobe, 100,000 workers engaged in sit-down strikes. Involved were men from the well-known Kawasaki dockyard and from the factories of the Mitsubishi industrial magnates. The workers were angry about the very limited working hours, about compulsory work on night shifts—and they made demands to better their conditions.

Before striking, the men duly presented their demands to the factory owners, who treated them with contempt. Soon their hatred of the war was expressed along with their economic demands, and anti-war slogans were used by the strikers. They also combined sabotage with the sit-down. In the Kawasaki dockyard alone, one hundred lathes were smashed by strikers, according to reports.

Ordinary police suppression was insufficient against the strength and methods of these 100,000 strikers, and the military was called in to break the back of the strike. To find out who were the leaders of the movement, some 20,000 workers were apprehended and questioned. The loyalty and solidarity of these workers under the well known "investigating methods" of dictatorships was admirable. In reprisal, the government shot four workers accused of fomenting the strikes, and deported twenty-four for military construction work outside of Japan.

Another important strike occurred in August, 1941, when workers in the Mitsubishi aircraft plant, producing Zero planes, joined with other workers of the city in sit-down strikes. In the aircraft plant, strikers practiced sabotage by removing airplane parts and throwing them away. In this case a partial victory was won by the workers.

Reprisals Didn't Stop Them

Again in September of that year, in spite of the reprisals against strikers, 3,000 workers making barrels for artillery in the War Ministry ordnance plants at Kohura struck against the government itself, demanding shorter hours and better conditions.

In October, another 20,000 workers

struck at Tsurumi in a heavy industry district of Japan. Right through the year the strike wave rolled on, even the peasants taking action in what were called "rent strikes."

As in all countries at war, so in Japan the working people bear the brunt of war. In Japan, whose resources are comparatively limited, the burdens fall even more heavily on the masses than in a country like the United States, where the workers are not exactly bathing in milk and honey.

Not Scared for Long

However, after Pearl Harbor there was a lull in working class militancy. It was not that the hatred of the people against war, their militarists and their industrial magnates had grown less. It was that the propaganda machine of the Nipponese warlords for a time frightened the masses by predicting their complete destruction at the hands of the giant across the Pacific unless "all classes unite in the war effort"—very familiar language, that.

However, the fear wears off as oppression becomes worse, and even fascist organizations express alarm about the temper of the workers. Thus in the spring of 1943, delegates from industrial districts to a conference of the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, supposedly an agency of the dictatorship, were obliged to reflect the sentiments of the workers. "The feeling of the Japanese people toward cooperation in winning the war is weakening," they said. "Is not the working class the only group that makes sacrifices, while the people on top do nothing and make money?"

When the Truth Is Told

This is a true picture of the Japanese workers, but one that is not generally presented in the capitalist press or by capitalist radio commentators. Always during a war the belligerent powers seek to break the bonds of solidarity between the workers of the countries at war. Thus propagandists of the United Nations have tried very hard to make it appear to the workers of their several countries that the German and Japanese workers are made of different stuff than other workers. German workers—don't you know?—are not the victims of their

Nazi rulers, hating Nazism with all their hearts—but, according to the propagandists, they are just like their Nazi rulers. And Japanese workers are not the victims of the Nipponese military dictatorship, tired of their enslavement and acting as all workers do when the burdens get too heavy—but some special species of sub-human being, and, furthermore, with yellow skin.

Lying about the German and Japanese workers is supposed to make it easier for American workers to forget that in the enemy countries are workers like themselves—all alike hating war and suffering from it.

This lying is also supposed to lay the ideological groundwork for American workers to approve whatever form of "liberation" the United Nations may consider sufficient for such "low-down" people as the German and the Japanese masses.

However, evidence has come from various sources even through the official barriers, that German workers "embrace" Nazism in the same way that the French and all workers do. For against almost insurmountable difficulties imposed by the Gestapo, there is an operating German underground movement today. There is also an unofficial labor movement of factory workers who engage in planned sabotage, work stoppages and other mass action against the hated Nazi rulers, as conditions allow. The Nazi boot has not been able to kick out of the heads of the German masses the labor and socialist ideology which was the pride of the German working class.

Now comes the above authentic story for those who needed proof that Japanese workers also are like all others—ready to fight daringly against exploitation, regimentation, suppression and war.

India in Revolt

By Henry Judd
25 Cents Postpaid

WORKERS PARTY
114 West 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Refugees Ask Exit FROM Russia

The fate of several hundred thousand Polish refugees who fled to the Soviet Union seems shrouded in mystery, the Soviet government refusing to give specific information to Polish representatives and leaders of Jewish organizations on the ground that diplomatic relations do not exist between the Soviet Union and the Polish government in exile!

The Manchester Guardian voices a plea that the approximately 600,000 Jews estimated to be in refugee camps in Russia be permitted to emigrate, and one of its readers, in support of this view, says: "However sharp the political controversies between Russia and Poland are, there is no reason why the Soviet authorities should ignore the appeal to permit the emigration of refugees from Poland now on Russian soil, since this appeal is based on good will among the Allied nations and mercy for helpless persons."

It looks like the Man of Steel doesn't want anybody to open his trap.

Of Special Interest to Women

By Susan Green

A woman writes to the editor of the New York Sun as follows:

"Listening to the radio, I heard, purporting to come from Madame Perkins, that the cost of living had risen only three per cent. I never got beyond the simple rudiments of arithmetic, so cannot determine how this figure was arrived at. One thing I do know: whereas I could buy six lamb chops cut thinly for forty cents, now two thin chops cost forty cents. Take eggs at sixty cents a dozen against thirty-five cents; three pounds of onions formerly cost ten cents, but one pound now costs nine cents. I cannot get Secretary Perkins' three per cent rise in food costs to fit into this pattern."

Neither can any other woman concerned with feeding, clothing and sheltering a family.

Jackpot question: How can a government that doesn't even state the price situation honestly, solve that problem to the satisfaction of working people?

LABOR ACTION has been calling for the formation of committees of organized labor, organized housewives and organized working farmers to tackle on their own the food problem. At least, such committees would start with the real facts about high prices—AND THEY WOULD LOOK AT THE QUESTION WITH THE SOBER EYES OF PEOPLE LIKE THIS WOMAN WHO WRITES TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK SUN.

And here is another reason why LABOR ACTION continues its campaign for the organization of people's committees to solve people's problems.

A few days ago Mayor La Guardia bawled out Chester Bowles, head of the OPA, for not keeping his promises to protect consumers and for not keeping the skirts of the OPA clean of "political influences."

But what else could be expected from Mr. Bowles except that he should break promises to the consumers and dabble in politics?

Mr. Bowles is a top-shelf advertising executive, boss of the Benton & Bowles advertising agency. Catering to big business and pulling political strings are in the very life-blood of men with his background.

Furthermore, Mr. Bowles has given jobs in OPA to many of his former associates in the firm of Benton & Bowles, who brought with them into OPA the same qualities and methods that made them valuable as employees of a business serving big business.

As boss of OPA, Mr. Bowles' accomplishments are mainly those of catering to big business—just as he did as boss of Benton & Bowles. Thus even the Wall Street Journal is obliged to admit: "The OPA is permitting dozens of higher prices, but rolls back few."

In this way big business permeates and dominates all government departments, supposedly concerned with the problems of the working people—and that is why these problems are "solved" by big business getting more profits.

Under pressure of dire necessity, Congress en-

acted a bill providing a minimum of financial help in defraying the expenses of childbirth to the wives of men in the armed forces. Naturally, the pay of the soldier is not munificent enough to cover the unusual expense involved in childbirth.

Many sad cases of neglect brought a clamor for government help. Finally, provision was made for a physician's fee of fifty dollars and for hospital confinement of sixty dollars.

You may think now things are not so bad for the expectant mothers of soldiers' children. But if you do, you figure without the many ramifications of that atrocious institution known as "free enterprise."

One of the staunchest upholders of this system of freedom for the few at the expense of the many is the American Medical Association. With all its state and county branches, AMA is the big business organization in medicine in this country. Just as the National Association of Manufacturers protects the profits for big industrialists, so the AMA protects big fees for the big specialists in medicine.

These big shots look down their noses at fifty dollars as a fee for a delivery. They much prefer fees running into the hundreds. So they set up a shout that Congress was "socializing medicine." They went ahead and sabotaged the plan to help soldiers' wives. They as good as instructed their members to be "TOO BUSY" to take the cases of soldiers' wives. These champions of "free enterprise" threatened individual physicians with loss of all hospital connections if they did not obey orders. At this writing this shameful spectacle still goes on.

This is one of the things about the system of private profit that makes words poor instruments for expressing one's feelings. The only outlet is to grit one's teeth in determination to work like sixty to make the working people see the need for socialism as the means to end private profit in all its hideous forms.

The wives of soldiers and workers have plenty of heartches bringing their children into the world and keeping them here—and you can't any longer say: "It shouldn't happen to a dog." For the life of a dog of the social set, at any rate, is something to be envied.

There is, for example, the Dog Bath Club in the swanky Fifties off Park Avenue in New York. There a pedigreed dog or unpedigreed mutt whose owner has the do-re-mi can get sprayed with coconut oil, shampooed, dried and curled by electric dryers. A modern barber shop has been installed for the little dears, with electric clippers for manuevering their tootsies.

These precious pets have their teeth examined and scaled, and their pyorrhea treated—AS MANY MILLION CHILDREN OF WORKING CLASS FAMILIES SHOULD HAVE DONE AND CANNOT. A veterinarian is in charge. To climax this canine paradise, there is a private swimming pool where their royal highness can frolic about.

We have no grudge against dogs—not even against the dogs of the rich. But we oppose such injustice in the distribution of the wealth of the world of the nation that the dogs of the rich are

better off than the children of the workers who produce that wealth.

Over the radio the other night, Dorothy Thompson, radio commentator and newspaper columnist, declared herself to be an optimist about the post-war period. She thinks that the rate of war production can continue into peacetime, that everybody can have jobs, good wages and more of the good things of life.

It's nice to be cheerful—provided there is a foundation for it. However, when Miss Thompson began to substantiate her cheerfulness, an intelligence was being insulted.

For instance, Miss Thompson came out with whole-hearted praise of Beardley Rum's plan for a "new America in each generation." What is this new idea of the genius who devised the pay-as-you-go tax plan? Mr Rum is in favor of tearing down all factories, buildings, schools, roads, bridges, etc., every twenty to thirty years. And why engage in this orgy of destruction? To be able to rebuild it all—to be able to use up material, employ labor, pay wages, etc.

Such fantastic ideas only indicate the inability of the capitalists to give a really sensible answer to the problem of post-war production and employment—so important to every man, woman and child. Especially is this apparent when—as Miss Thompson herself pointed out—even this crazy scheme of creating work by tearing down and rebuilding everything, would employ only 6,000,000 men and cost only \$10,000,000,000. This is only one-tenth of the manpower employed today and about one-fourteenth of national war income.

The only basis for cheerfulness for the future is the revolutionary reorganization of society to produce for the needs of human beings and no longer for the acquisition of profits for the few.

However, we haven't heard that Miss Thompson is in favor of the working class solving its problems this way.

LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interests of Labor

Published Weekly by the

LABOR ACTION PUBLISHING ASSN.
114 West 14th Street New York 11, N. Y.
(3rd Floor)

Vol. 8, No. 5 January 31, 1944

ALBERT GATES, Editor

Subscription Rate: 60 Cents a Year

7 Cents for Canada, New York and Foreign

Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940,
at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1879.