

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Miners Want Local Autonomy--Without Strings

By DAVID COOLIDGE

According to the daily press, one hundred miners belonging to Ray Edmundson's anti-Lewis faction met in Cincinnati last week. This is the group formed in southern Illinois by Edmundson, allegedly to fight for the restoration of district autonomy in the miners' international.

The delegates to the conference passed resolutions condemning Lewis' "autocratic rule," his rule by his "royal family," and, according to Edmundson, "when the convention meets in September, Lewis and his royal family can take a licking on the issue gracefully or disgracefully." Edmundson declared that "liberty, independence and autonomy will be restored to the members of the miners' union, whether Lewis likes it or not."

One resolution of the conference said that the fight against Lewis will not interfere with the production of coal or become a strike movement. Another resolution calls for all supporters of autonomy to meet in con-

possible internal democracy. The opportunity to elect their own officers is an elementary democratic right of union members that should not be abridged. This should apply to districts as well as to locals and the international.

We believe that there is room for vast improvement in the matter of democratic procedure in the UMWA. We also know that the same adverse criticism can be made of the labor movement in general and one does not need to direct one's darts at the UMWA and Lewis exclusively. This is all that we can say on this aspect of the question at this time. We can, however, say something in addition on the Edmundson autonomy campaign.

"LIBERALS" HATE LEWIS

In the first place, we know that Lewis is not very popular in some quarters. He is extremely unpopular with the Roosevelt Administration and with Browder's Communist Party Political Association. He is not

Edmundson autonomy move. At present it seems faintly malodorous. We may be wrong, but we would like to know if there is anything behind this, such as the Roosevelt Democratic Party machine in Illinois. It happens that there is a miners' convention in September. There is a national election in November, and both capitalist parties would like the miners' votes. A fight against Lewis on the issue of "dictatorship" and autonomy would be as good as any for the vote hunters, provided they can get a miner to step out front and lead the fight.

We don't claim that this is the case, but such things do happen. We are

sure that if there is any possible way for the Stalinists to crawl into the Edmundson group and render aid and assistance, they will be there bag and baggage. Lewis was the same dictator in 1940 he is today but they raved for forty-five minutes trying to force him to remain as head of the CIO. Edmundson was an \$8,000 a year appointee of Lewis. It is reported that, after he resigned this post, he returned to the mines at a miner's pay.

A RANK AND FILE FIGHT

We say again that we are for the restoration of autonomy to the twenty-one districts that are today denied their democratic rights. We believe

that this is in the interest of good trade unionism. We believe that the twenty-one districts should wage a struggle in the coming convention for this democratic right. We believe, however, that this struggle should arise in the UMWA and be conducted by the miners themselves. We don't believe that capitalist politicians, whether Democrat or Republican, have any genuine interest in fighting for democracy in the UMWA or any other union.

Above all, we hope that not a single miner will let the Stalin-Browder Communist Political Association get close enough to be touched with a forty-foot pole!

Local 9 Votes Pollard Ouster--

(Continued from page 1)

"Progressive Slate." On the former, besides a few open supporters of the Communist Party line, the bulk were those who had more or less gone along with the Pollard administration, or at least had not opposed it very strenuously.

"PROGRESSIVES" ACTIVE

The "Progressive Slate," initiated by a group which has been actively opposing Pollard over a long period, attempted to pick a slate of men whose records on fighting for democracy in the union was the best that could be found among the nominees. Prior to election, this group also issued several leaflets, posing the problems of the union and advocating a program that, while moderate, was by and large progressive in nature.

Results of the election indicate that the "Progressive Slate" received

the most support. Of the eight men elected to the administrative board, six were on the slate, four of them endorsed only by the Progressives. The large executive board was elected by yards and shifts, and in some cases nominees were automatically in, as no more names were on the ballot than there were posts to be filled.

On the other hand, the United Victory Slate did not place a man on the eight-man board who received only their endorsement. In other words, each of the men elected on that slate was also endorsed by one or both of the other slates. But that slate did come out ahead in the LA Yard shift, with several men being elected to the large executive board.

At that yard, too, one of their men, Sam Goodwin, won the labor relations post, with the Progressive Slate endorsing no one for that job.

Pollard, who for the bulk of the membership was the chief issue of the election, wisely refrained from openly supporting anyone for anything. It is significant that only one member of the eight-man board has been connected with Pollard's staff, C. S. Brown, and he is a hold-over from pre-Pollard days. About the only thing that Pollard can see as favorable to his administration is the continuance in office of two labor relations men appointed by him.

The election succeeded in reviving hope and interest in the union among a substantial section of the membership. In carrying out actions that will keep this interest aroused is the chief chance of success for the new officers. To rebuild Local 9 the temporary administration must turn to the membership and utilize it to carry out the urgent tasks before the union.

Election in Rubber Local 101--

(Continued from page 1)

Dalrymple on the side of the company. Local 5 expelled Dalrymple from membership in its local and Dalrymple was reinstated by the action of his stogie international executive board.

STALINISTS ARE BANKRUPT

All these events passed Local 101 by. The Venegoni administration contented itself with a routine motion passed at a small business meeting protesting the suspensions and calling for a special convention. These measures were excellent but wholly inadequate. No effort was made to bring the facts before the whole membership and compel Marmon and his supporters to come out into the open.

It was in Marmon's interests to keep these things quiet, for he is entirely in accord with the policies of Dalrymple which led to the suspensions. In fact, last year, under Marmon's administration, well over a dozen members of Local 101 were discharged because they supported the strike of over 20,000 Rubber Workers in Akron for an eight-cents an hour increase. Marmon refused to press the fight for their reinstatement and had to be overruled by a mem-

bership meeting. During the mine strikes of last year, Marmon and his aides played an openly strike-breaking role. During the Akron strike they concentrated their fire against George Bass, president of Local 5, slandering him as a "fascist" and "Hitler-agent." For these slanders Marmon and Neil McCormick, secretary of the local, were found guilty of spreading lies by a local trial board. McCormick ducked out of the local in disgrace and is now employed by the United Electrical & Radio Workers Union, controlled by the CP, as a hatchet man whose job it is to break the MESA at Eureka Vacuum.

Is there any wonder why Marmon prefers to duck the Dalrymple case and preserve a dignified silence? It should now be clear to all that a fight against Dalrymple for the defense of Local 9 is necessary in the interests of Local 101.

AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

3. The Negro question: At U. S. Rubber, Negroes are, as a whole, restricted to the most arduous and dirty jobs. They are almost entirely excluded from the higher skilled jobs with no chance of up-grading into

them. It is an elementary duty of every progressive unionist in the plant to fight against this form of discrimination.

No group in the local has any program to correct this evil. Yet no union can remain strong unless all its members receive equal treatment.

Marmon is able to win the bulk of the Negro vote in the local by little gestures of "sympathy" for the Negro and small talk about the virtues of the Fair Employment Practices Committee of the government. He can succeed in this little stratagem only because no genuine fight has been organized against discrimination. Assured of Negro support, Marmon has done and proposes to do nothing.

Despite Marmon, despite the FEPC, discrimination DOES exist. If the leaders of both the Marmon and the anti-Marmon faction will do nothing, then let the members of the local themselves act. Real unity in the shop can be achieved only by a fight against all forms of discrimination.

Two main tasks must be met by progressive unionists of Local 101. First, a campaign to restore genuine collective bargaining by the revocation of the ham-stringing no-strike pledge. Second, to restore unity in the shop by ending discrimination.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

Enclosed find twenty-five cents. Please send me the next issue of your paper as I do not want to miss an issue of same as I like the paper very much and wish there were more people who would read the same.

J. M. (Detroit, Mich.)

Gentlemen:

Some time ago when I entered the big gate of the Ford Motor Rouge plant, there stood a lady distributing your paper, LABOR ACTION, free. I took one, and later on I was glad to have gotten one. The paper is dated April 17, 1944. From that point to the time clock I did not see any of your papers thrown away by the workers (as some usually do with printed matter at the gate).

When coming home I said to my wife, "I am going to send for that paper," but I have always been too busy; I never got around to do so, except now.

I saw your introductory offer, six months for twenty-five cents, and I enclose today a \$1.00 bill and the addresses, also two clippings.

Will you please let me know if you have received this letter OK and if you will do that. Kindly return the clippings.

I am going to mail said clippings to the Far West; they should know that too.

A. V. (Detroit, Mich.)

Dear Sir:

Here are seven more subscriptions

to your paper, which I hope you will give your prompt attention.

Keep up the good work. I enjoy reading LABOR ACTION because I believe it to be one of the few papers in this country that prints the truth. I also like your ideas.

H. T. (Chicago, Ill.)

Kind Sirs:

Enclosed please find a dollar bill as my donation for this short time.

C. G. P. (Muscatine, Iowa.)

Fascism and Big Business

By DANIEL GUERIN

339 Pages \$1.00

This book is an excellently written analysis of the workings of fascism, its origins and the people who supported its march to power.

In it are contained:

- The events in Italy which led up to Mussolini's March on Rome; The rise of fascism in Germany, the use of "anti-capitalist" demagoguery, the slogans which the Nazis used to attract a following; An understanding of the way the fascist movement operates which is indispensable for those who wish successfully to oppose fascism; The international character of fascism.

Order prepaid from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

WORLD EVENTS

By Europacus

HIGH SOUNDING PHRASES AND REAL POLICIES

How often have Roosevelt and Churchill told us that the whole aim of Allied policy was only to bring about a resumption of democratic governments in the countries temporarily under fascist dictatorship? How often did the Administration speak of this great crusade for democracy? One more illustration of the real policies, as distinct from the high-sounding phrases, is now to be seen in Italy.

After the fall of Mussolini, brought about primarily by the revolutionary demonstration of the workers of Northern Italy, the Allies immediately set about to prop up the Badoglio regime as against the workers. The Northern Italian cities were bombed and partly destroyed by Allied aircraft, whereas Badoglio was recognized as the rightful government of Italy. This whole dirty deal was then justified as necessitated by military expediency.

After the "liberation" of Rome, the leaders of the anti-fascist parties immediately sensed that the temper of

the Roman masses was in no way such that they were willing to endure further a Badoglio regime. Under the pressure of the masses, all Italian anti-fascist parties, after much hesitation, decided unanimously to kick out Badoglio. They chose instead Bonomi, the social-reformist, untainted with any attachment to fascism (though not without responsibility for its rise). Everything looked fine—until the Allies got wind of this. Churchill declared quite sharply that, insofar as he was concerned, he would not recognize a government without Badoglio.

Says the New York Times correspondent in Rome: "The new government has not been permitted to exercise its powers. This frustration is known to have been brought about at least in part by orders from London. It is being said that London does not want to see any government without the man who signed the onerous secret armistice terms, since it is feared that they might be repudiated."

ALLIES WOULD LIKE BADOGGIO IN POWER

Now an even more compelling reason for the Allies to have Badoglio in the government is the necessity to have somebody who cannot escape obligation in filling the terms of the armistice. Of course, Badoglio, without any mass support in Italy, is much more pliable to Allied demands than a Bonomi government which might be pushed forward by the masses.

Badoglio was the ideal Quisling, discredited at home and therefore completely dependent on the "liberators." It seems that finally London and Washington had nevertheless to give in and to accept the Bonomi government. The lesson of these events, however, is clear: London and Washington, in spite of all previous affirmations of not caring for the internal affairs of the "liberated" countries, have clearly thrown their weight into the balance in favor of the most reactionary, the pro-fascist, and anti-democratic forces. Far from being neutral, they openly push for the most reactionary solution.

Churchill said of Mussolini: "That he is a great man, I can't deny." Later he had the same kind words for Badoglio. It seems that in both cases, in spite of all of Mr. Churchill's enthusiasm, things did not work out as he would have liked. But he certainly tried to do his best.

The same New York Times article from which we have already quoted gives a very interesting picture of

the state of mind of the Romans only a few days after the Allied troops had entered the city. We quote:

"The Allies' efforts to force a place for Badoglio in the new government have aroused dismay and discouragement in Rome and have brought to a climax an accumulation of disappointments and unhappiness. The 'honeymoon is over'... The vast white-collar, middle class element is temporarily worse off than it was under the Germans... A sharp rise in prices is occurring here as it did in Sicily. This is partly due to the policy of fixing the lira rate at 100 to the dollar, the necessity of Italy meeting the occupation costs and the sums being spent by the troops, all imposed in the paucity of goods. The result is certain impoverishment of the middle classes."

For the Italians, "the honeymoon is over," indeed. The French peasants of Normandy, who a year or two ago, would undoubtedly have received the Allies with tremendous joy, now, after bombings and some evidence of what the plans of the Allies in France are, seem to show little enthusiasm. Says Hanson Baldwin in the New York Times of June 20: "The French attitude is mixed... There were many signs of seeming apathy and indifference, even of veiled hostility—though there were no overt acts... Prices have already risen in many sections."

ALL CAPITALISTS HAVE POST-WAR JITTERS

We are now witnessing in Denmark the first sporadic fights that inaugurate a whole period of civil wars in the period to come which will sweep the European continent. Our benevolent or not-so-benevolent post-war planners ought to take heed. Those who now fight against the Nazi overlords will hardly be disposed to take orders from AMG officers. Those who fight for freedom against the Nazis will not be content with the "law and order" brought at the point of Allied bayonets.

That those who represent vested interests are aware of this is well illustrated by an article headed "Special Committee Must Prevent Anarchy When Belgium Is Freed," recently published in the New York

bulletin of the Belgian government in exile. This article quotes from the Belgian underground paper, La Liberation, which supports the government in exile:

"As soon as our territory is liberated, we shall be faced with difficulties of every kind. We shall have to maintain order. We must arrest all suspects and put them at the disposal of the law. We must oppose by every means in our power any movement aiming at the introduction of a regime of force... Special committees must be formed rapidly in every municipality to prevent any growth of anarchy." The capitalists already have the post-war jitters. And not without reason: they are afraid of the people.



American Exploitation

Out of the Past

The workers were often cheated out of their scanty wages by absconding contractors or paid in worthless scrip or depreciated money. The hours of labor were from daylight till dark; the debtors' prisons still swallowed thousands; what few free schools existed carried with them the stigma of pauperism for the worker's child; the compulsory militia system, permitting the rich to escape service by paying a small fine, left the worker no choice between service and imprisonment. Labor organizations were prosecuted under old English laws as conspiracies; the children of the poor were being drawn into the factories and property qualifications excluded the mass of workers from voting. All this driftwood floating down from the past had to be removed by the working class, and the workers set about the task before them.

As early as 1828 the Mechanics Union of Philadelphia declared in its preamble: "Do not all the streams of wealth which flow in every direction and are emptied into and absorbed by the coffers of the unproductive, exclusively take their rise in the bones, marrow and muscles of the industrious classes? In return for which, exclusive of a bare subsistence... they receive not a thing!"

Not only was the press of that day opposed to any changes, but the politicians were either indifferent or hostile, while employers' associations were formed to oppose the workers' demands. The workers defended their general position and demands with a skill and logic that is hardly equalled by the unions today and some passages in their official utterances show that they perceived the character of capitalist society as a system that enabled a few to live off of unpaid labor.—From "The Workers in American History," by James O'neal.

LABOR ACTION fights for the interests of labor in the shops, mines, mills and offices; forearm you with facts, analyses and a PROGRAM. Here's how to get your copy every week.

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

Introductory Offer—Only 25¢ for Six Months

Clip here and mail with twenty-five cents for your Sub TODAY

LABOR ACTION 114 West 14th Street New York 11, N. Y.

Yes, I'd like to receive LABOR ACTION.

Enclosed find twenty-five cents to cover full cost of my introductory six-month subscription.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

Readers may use this blank to subscribe for friends or shopmates. Send in the quarter and we'll do the rest. Look at the last line of your wrapper. If it reads V8-25, this is your last issue. Send in your renewal with thirty-five cents before you miss an issue!

FDR's Payoff-- A Kick in the Pants to Labor

By MIKE WYLIE

When President Roosevelt last week signed the bill extending the life of the Price Control Act for another year he again demonstrated with shocking frankness the manner in which he "pays off" labor for its political support in his behalf.

He dealt Philip Murray and R. J. Thomas, leading lights of the fourth term campaign:

Another kick in the pants;

Another conscious and deliberate rebuke, of "labor pressure";

Another warning that labor can't expect "too much" in return for its expenditures of money, time and effort for "Labor's Friend in the White House."

Roosevelt not only disregarded a front-page appeal of the "United Auto Worker" for a veto of the bill and Philip Murray's desperate statement that "this bill preserves only the pretense, not the practice, of price control," but had the brass to FRAISE Congress for its "statesmanship and courage" in holding the line against rising prices!

This after Congress ripped the Administration's "price control" program to shreds! This after every last vestige of enforcement provisions was dumped into the garbage can by crippling amendments! This after the CIO report that prices had risen 45.3 per cent since 1941 and that they were still going up and up!

FDR'S PRAISE FOR CONGRESS

In his statement on June 30, Roosevelt said:

"In enacting the Stabilization Extension Act the Congress has performed a signal service... It has shown statesmanship and courage in resisting group pressure in protecting the public interest... In particular it should be noted that the Congress rejected all pleas which would require any general change in the wage, price and subsidy policies now in effect."

This was on June 30. Three days later the New York Times headlined a front-page story on the effects of the new price act and the Bankhead amendment in particular in this manner:

"OPA RAISES PRICES ON COTTON ITEMS, THIRD OF OUTPUT--SHEETS, PILLOW CASES, DENIMS, CHAMBRAYS, KNIT UNDERWEAR SENT UP BY BANKHEAD CLAUSE--FARM, PARITY, AIDS MILLS--THEY WILL GAIN \$150,000,000 A YEAR."

Commenting on another amendment which forces prices to reflect that highest average price on farm commodities during the first nine months of 1942, the Times quotes a spokesman of the Agriculture Department as saying that the new act would "require action raising the price of wheat, cotton, eggs, peanuts and possibly some other commodities."

THE FACTS KICK BACK

And for this, Roosevelt CONGRATULATED Congress. And with this knowledge he could afford the intelligence of the vast consuming public with "For more than two years... we have been fighting inflation and fighting it successfully... For a whole year the cost of living has been held without change."

Who does Roosevelt expect will believe all this misrepresentation, this unabashed cover-up for the black marketeers and chiselers who have gouged the workers' pay envelope without interference from Congress?

What will be the reaction of the Philip Murrays, the R. J. Thomases and the Sidney Hillmans to this kick in the teeth? Will the CIO Political Action Committee, include in its weekly releases to the labor press a truthful account of this latest action, or will it continue to send out such unmitigated hogwash as "The Democratic Party shows a firm, helpful association with labor. And on Election Day it's the record--not the promise--that counts."

Yes, it's the record that counts. Roosevelt's record on wage freezing, job freezing, taxation on those least able to pay, and now his signing of the vicious congressional bill to abolish "price control" marks him for what he really is--the savior and defender of capitalism and special privilege--the best friend that BIG BUSINESS has ever had in the White House.

The Murrays, Thomases and Hillmans will no doubt swallow this newest medicine of "Dr. Win the War." They have strong stomachs and implicit faith in the quick prescriptions of the Democratic Party.

But the working class of the United States is given one convulsion after another by the vile stuff. The working class is made violently ill by the medicine of wage freezing and skyrocketing prices. They are getting thoroughly sick of it, too, and will want a change of both doctor and remedy. And they don't want a Republican quack from the same graduating class as EDR.

Clean out the old and bring in the new! LABOR MUST HAVE A POLITICAL PARTY OF ITS OWN! The workers need an independent LABOR PARTY!

PLENTY FOR ALL

The Meaning of Socialism

By Ernest Lund

IT TELLS YOU:

Why This Is an Age of Plenty
Why There Is Poverty in This Age of Plenty
Who Controls the Wealth Labor Produces
Why There Are Rich and Poor
What an Equitable Society Is
How It Can Be Achieved
Socialism as the Hope of Humanity

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW

Sixty Pages Ten Cents per Copy

Published by:
THE WORKERS PARTY
114 West 14th Street,
New York 11, N. Y.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

Could Willkie Do What Roosevelt Failed to Do?

His Unsolicited Program for the GOP

By V. JENSEN

The Republican convention just held in Chicago was a very tame show indeed. In fact, it was a sideshow without a circus. It was more than the sweltering heat and the fact that the long-suffering delegates could get only six quarts of liquor each. (Hardships of war, you know.)

The boredom and apathy that hung over the convention like a pall was noted especially by the gigantic corps of reporters. There were no surprises--Dewey's nomination was certain before any delegate checked in at the Stevens Hotel. The old platitudes were dusted off, almost as good as new, and the speeches were guaranteed not to wake up the tired grass rooter. Dewey, the mediocrity, not popular even in his own party, was nominated and there is an undercurrent pessimistic feeling that the party still has no candidate against Roosevelt.

It is appropriate that over this funereal convention a ghost should hover. The ghost at the feast of the party without a candidate is that of the candidate without a party--Wendell Willkie. The last standard bearer of the Republican Party was conspicuous by his absence. The very mention of his name sent the old-line Republicans into a froth second only to the one that can be induced by the mention of Roosevelt.

WILLKIE--AN INTERLOPER

Two weeks before the convention, Willkie, who had withdrawn from the race following his decisive defeat in Wisconsin, wrote a series of articles published widely in the nation's newspapers on subjects that he thought the Republicans should consider for their national platform--in effect, his platform. The political program of this man without a party, this "radical," is not without interest. In many respects, Willkie's platform is the most radical of all the capitalist politicians. It does not differ greatly from the program of Roosevelt--as the Republicans often comment--but, with the freedom of a man who knows his campaign promises will never be tested, Willkie in many cases is more radical than Roosevelt.

Like Roosevelt, Willkie comes out for a strong central government which he considers "necessary to prevent disruption of our economic and social structure by a variety of conflicting authorities and interests." He calls the states' rights problem a relic, not an issue. "The states' rights issue in Congress has always been used by reactionary politicians, both Democratic and Republican, to oppose federal social legislation such as anti-poll-tax, anti-lynch, anti-child labor and social security bills and to preserve the strength of their own political machines." Willkie's program is the same as Roosevelt's on this point--but he wants "government administration under law." In effect, this says that "when I and my friends are in, a strong federal government is okay--when we are out, it's Roosevelt's bureaucracy."

A "PROGRESSIVE" COMPETITOR

Willkie wants the Republican Party

to come out and take advantage of the Democrats' weaknesses on the Negro question. He is for federal legislation against the poll-tax and lynchings. Pointing out the failures of the Democratic Party to raise the level of the Negroes and do away with discrimination, Willkie grandiosely calls the stand of the party on the Negro question "a test of sincerity and of moral leadership." But on this question, as on most others, Willkie is not very specific. He does not come out clearly for the ending of Jim Crow in every walk of life, for making discrimination a criminal offense. And he is significantly silent on the role of the Republican Party in the current poll-tax vote, where Republican congressmen ganged up with the Southern Democrats to defeat cloture.

Willkie is for extending the social security legislation. He is all for more and better unemployment insurance, medical and health benefits, guarantee of education for all, etc., etc. He even criticizes the Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security bill.

Who is to pay for these expensive projects? Willkie criticized the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill because the burden of paying for it fell upon the workers. Is he then, perhaps, for the capitalists paying for such a program? No! For the basis of his economic program, he says himself, lies in encouraging capital to produce, and the most important way of encouraging capital, he says, is "a drastic revision of the tax laws so as to encourage risk capital for new investment and new ventures."

In the matter of a policy for labor--Willkie points out that the Republican Party has permitted itself to be put on the spot as the "anti-labor" party by its failure to support progressive labor and social legislation. Willkie comes out against the Smith-Connelly bill, which was passed by a coalition of Democrats and Republicans and signed by Roosevelt.

Willkie is all for labor-management cooperation, even asking for a real labor representative in the cabi-

face of a boom."

porter of China's fortunes and is for including the small nations in the councils of the great at the same time that he is for using America's sovereignty. What does this mean? It means that Willkie is not interested in protecting British "sovereignty"--political and economic, particularly in countries where American investments could otherwise profit.

The core of Willkie's economic and political program lies within the following statement about "...long-term investment, particularly in the development of those countries which have not kept pace with industrial progress... with full recognition that the day of economic imperialism is over."

TRYING TO SAVE THE DEAD

In a word, Willkie's whole prospect of a free and prosperous "democratic" post-war America is dependent upon America's prosperity in foreign markets. Willkie would eliminate British influence in such places as China, which would be a fine place for American loans, etc. Willkie is very democratic and against colonial systems. Of course, of course--eliminate competition and you can be most democratic!

This, then, is the foreign policy of Willkie--to assure America's sovereignty--her markets and influence, by gathering a buffer of small nations around her under the banner of "democracy," undermining the British Empire as far as possible and opening the Asiatic market to American investment. Naturally, with the most democratic slogan possible, for, as everyone (except Churchill, and he's a very stubborn man) knows, "the days of economic imperialism are over."

In reality, this program differs very little from Roosevelt's. Roosevelt is constrained by military, diplomatic and political exigencies from such open criticism of his allies. Roosevelt, too, is no slouch about using American "sovereignty." If Willkie were President he would undoubtedly be following just such a course of action as does Roosevelt, and if Roosevelt were "out," he would be just such a "radical" critic as is Willkie--in all spheres, economic, social and that of foreign policy.

It is not a matter of doubting Willkie's sincerity. Undoubtedly he is personally sincere in his belief in extension of social security, democracy and a council of nations. But behind the wish lies the awkward and inescapable reality of all politics based on the preservation of capitalism. Preserving the capitalist profit system inevitably means increasing the tax burden of the poor, lowering their standard of living, extending and deepening Jim Crow and discrimination, and trying to extricate capitalism from its crises through foreign imperialist ventures which inevitably lead to war.

Willkie, Roosevelt, Dewey--all would be doctors at the bedside of a failing and ineffectual capitalism. The color of their pills might be different, but there is one attempt at cure they all have to make--that is, draining the working class of its blood to bolster up the old hag. They have no alternative but that.

In the field of foreign policy, Willkie is the most outstanding political critic of Roosevelt's policy, from the "left." He is the only prominent Republican to have come out against Roosevelt's deal with Darlan and in support of de Gaulle. The core of his program is the platform for the immediate creation of a council of the United Nations with representatives of China and the small nations and the understanding that "our sovereignty is not something to be hoarded but something to be used," though, of course, he piously adds, not in narrow nationalistic terms. Now, what actually does this add up to?

Willkie has been outspoken in his criticism of Churchill's statements about the necessity of preserving the British Empire and an indignant democrat about Britain in India and elsewhere. Willkie is an ardent sup-

porter of China's fortunes and is for including the small nations in the councils of the great at the same time that he is for using America's sovereignty. What does this mean? It means that Willkie is not interested in protecting British "sovereignty"--political and economic, particularly in countries where American investments could otherwise profit.

The core of Willkie's economic and political program lies within the following statement about "...long-term investment, particularly in the development of those countries which have not kept pace with industrial progress... with full recognition that the day of economic imperialism is over."

In a word, Willkie's whole prospect of a free and prosperous "democratic" post-war America is dependent upon America's prosperity in foreign markets. Willkie would eliminate British influence in such places as China, which would be a fine place for American loans, etc. Willkie is very democratic and against colonial systems. Of course, of course--eliminate competition and you can be most democratic!

This, then, is the foreign policy of Willkie--to assure America's sovereignty--her markets and influence, by gathering a buffer of small nations around her under the banner of "democracy," undermining the British Empire as far as possible and opening the Asiatic market to American investment. Naturally, with the most democratic slogan possible, for, as everyone (except Churchill, and he's a very stubborn man) knows, "the days of economic imperialism are over."

In reality, this program differs very little from Roosevelt's. Roosevelt is constrained by military, diplomatic and political exigencies from such open criticism of his allies. Roosevelt, too, is no slouch about using American "sovereignty." If Willkie were President he would undoubtedly be following just such a course of action as does Roosevelt, and if Roosevelt were "out," he would be just such a "radical" critic as is Willkie--in all spheres, economic, social and that of foreign policy.

It is not a matter of doubting Willkie's sincerity. Undoubtedly he is personally sincere in his belief in extension of social security, democracy and a council of nations. But behind the wish lies the awkward and inescapable reality of all politics based on the preservation of capitalism. Preserving the capitalist profit system inevitably means increasing the tax burden of the poor, lowering their standard of living, extending and deepening Jim Crow and discrimination, and trying to extricate capitalism from its crises through foreign imperialist ventures which inevitably lead to war.

Willkie, Roosevelt, Dewey--all would be doctors at the bedside of a failing and ineffectual capitalism. The color of their pills might be different, but there is one attempt at cure they all have to make--that is, draining the working class of its blood to bolster up the old hag. They have no alternative but that.

In the field of foreign policy, Willkie is the most outstanding political critic of Roosevelt's policy, from the "left." He is the only prominent Republican to have come out against Roosevelt's deal with Darlan and in support of de Gaulle. The core of his program is the platform for the immediate creation of a council of the United Nations with representatives of China and the small nations and the understanding that "our sovereignty is not something to be hoarded but something to be used," though, of course, he piously adds, not in narrow nationalistic terms. Now, what actually does this add up to?

Willkie has been outspoken in his criticism of Churchill's statements about the necessity of preserving the British Empire and an indignant democrat about Britain in India and elsewhere. Willkie is an ardent sup-

porter of China's fortunes and is for including the small nations in the councils of the great at the same time that he is for using America's sovereignty. What does this mean? It means that Willkie is not interested in protecting British "sovereignty"--political and economic, particularly in countries where American investments could otherwise profit.

The core of Willkie's economic and political program lies within the following statement about "...long-term investment, particularly in the development of those countries which have not kept pace with industrial progress... with full recognition that the day of economic imperialism is over."

In a word, Willkie's whole prospect of a free and prosperous "democratic" post-war America is dependent upon America's prosperity in foreign markets. Willkie would eliminate British influence in such places as China, which would be a fine place for American loans, etc. Willkie is very democratic and against colonial systems. Of course, of course--eliminate competition and you can be most democratic!

This, then, is the foreign policy of Willkie--to assure America's sovereignty--her markets and influence, by gathering a buffer of small nations around her under the banner of "democracy," undermining the British Empire as far as possible and opening the Asiatic market to American investment. Naturally, with the most democratic slogan possible, for, as everyone (except Churchill, and he's a very stubborn man) knows, "the days of economic imperialism are over."

In reality, this program differs very little from Roosevelt's. Roosevelt is constrained by military, diplomatic and political exigencies from such open criticism of his allies. Roosevelt, too, is no slouch about using American "sovereignty." If Willkie were President he would undoubtedly be following just such a course of action as does Roosevelt, and if Roosevelt were "out," he would be just such a "radical" critic as is Willkie--in all spheres, economic, social and that of foreign policy.

It is not a matter of doubting Willkie's sincerity. Undoubtedly he is personally sincere in his belief in extension of social security, democracy and a council of nations. But behind the wish lies the awkward and inescapable reality of all politics based on the preservation of capitalism. Preserving the capitalist profit system inevitably means increasing the tax burden of the poor, lowering their standard of living, extending and deepening Jim Crow and discrimination, and trying to extricate capitalism from its crises through foreign imperialist ventures which inevitably lead to war.

Willkie, Roosevelt, Dewey--all would be doctors at the bedside of a failing and ineffectual capitalism. The color of their pills might be different, but there is one attempt at cure they all have to make--that is, draining the working class of its blood to bolster up the old hag. They have no alternative but that.

In the field of foreign policy, Willkie is the most outstanding political critic of Roosevelt's policy, from the "left." He is the only prominent Republican to have come out against Roosevelt's deal with Darlan and in support of de Gaulle. The core of his program is the platform for the immediate creation of a council of the United Nations with representatives of China and the small nations and the understanding that "our sovereignty is not something to be hoarded but something to be used," though, of course, he piously adds, not in narrow nationalistic terms. Now, what actually does this add up to?

Willkie has been outspoken in his criticism of Churchill's statements about the necessity of preserving the British Empire and an indignant democrat about Britain in India and elsewhere. Willkie is an ardent sup-

porter of China's fortunes and is for including the small nations in the councils of the great at the same time that he is for using America's sovereignty. What does this mean? It means that Willkie is not interested in protecting British "sovereignty"--political and economic, particularly in countries where American investments could otherwise profit.

The core of Willkie's economic and political program lies within the following statement about "...long-term investment, particularly in the development of those countries which have not kept pace with industrial progress... with full recognition that the day of economic imperialism is over."

In a word, Willkie's whole prospect of a free and prosperous "democratic" post-war America is dependent upon America's prosperity in foreign markets. Willkie would eliminate British influence in such places as China, which would be a fine place for American loans, etc. Willkie is very democratic and against colonial systems. Of course, of course--eliminate competition and you can be most democratic!

This, then, is the foreign policy of Willkie--to assure America's sovereignty--her markets and influence, by gathering a buffer of small nations around her under the banner of "democracy," undermining the British Empire as far as possible and opening the Asiatic market to American investment. Naturally, with the most democratic slogan possible, for, as everyone (except Churchill, and he's a very stubborn man) knows, "the days of economic imperialism are over."

In reality, this program differs very little from Roosevelt's. Roosevelt is constrained by military, diplomatic and political exigencies from such open criticism of his allies. Roosevelt, too, is no slouch about using American "sovereignty." If Willkie were President he would undoubtedly be following just such a course of action as does Roosevelt, and if Roosevelt were "out," he would be just such a "radical" critic as is Willkie--in all spheres, economic, social and that of foreign policy.

It is not a matter of doubting Willkie's sincerity. Undoubtedly he is personally sincere in his belief in extension of social security, democracy and a council of nations. But behind the wish lies the awkward and inescapable reality of all politics based on the preservation of capitalism. Preserving the capitalist profit system inevitably means increasing the tax burden of the poor, lowering their standard of living, extending and deepening Jim Crow and discrimination, and trying to extricate capitalism from its crises through foreign imperialist ventures which inevitably lead to war.

Willkie, Roosevelt, Dewey--all would be doctors at the bedside of a failing and ineffectual capitalism. The color of their pills might be different, but there is one attempt at cure they all have to make--that is, draining the working class of its blood to bolster up the old hag. They have no alternative but that.

In the field of foreign policy, Willkie is the most outstanding political critic of Roosevelt's policy, from the "left." He is the only prominent Republican to have come out against Roosevelt's deal with Darlan and in support of de Gaulle. The core of his program is the platform for the immediate creation of a council of the United Nations with representatives of China and the small nations and the understanding that "our sovereignty is not something to be hoarded but something to be used," though, of course, he piously adds, not in narrow nationalistic terms. Now, what actually does this add up to?

Willkie has been outspoken in his criticism of Churchill's statements about the necessity of preserving the British Empire and an indignant democrat about Britain in India and elsewhere. Willkie is an ardent sup-

porter of China's fortunes and is for including the small nations in the councils of the great at the same time that he is for using America's sovereignty. What does this mean? It means that Willkie is not interested in protecting British "sovereignty"--political and economic, particularly in countries where American investments could otherwise profit.

The core of Willkie's economic and political program lies within the following statement about "...long-term investment, particularly in the development of those countries which have not kept pace with industrial progress... with full recognition that the day of economic imperialism is over."

In a word, Willkie's whole prospect of a free and prosperous "democratic" post-war America is dependent upon America's prosperity in foreign markets. Willkie would eliminate British influence in such places as China, which would be a fine place for American loans, etc. Willkie is very democratic and against colonial systems. Of course, of course--eliminate competition and you can be most democratic!

This, then, is the foreign policy of Willkie--to assure America's sovereignty--her markets and influence, by gathering a buffer of small nations around her under the banner of "democracy," undermining the British Empire as far as possible and opening the Asiatic market to American investment. Naturally, with the most democratic slogan possible, for, as everyone (except Churchill, and he's a very stubborn man) knows, "the days of economic imperialism are over."

Winnie Wants Less Ideology --More Empire

By SAM ADAMS

In his recent speech to Parliament, the Honorable Winston Churchill, His Majesty's Prime Minister, declared that the war was no longer ideological. The most important thing, he added, was to win the war. And, to win the war, His Majesty's government was prepared to work with anybody--Stalinist Russia; Stalin's agent in Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, alias Broz; fascist Badoglio in Italy, and that excellent representative of modern butchery, friend of the American Ambassador to Spain, the bloody handed General Franco.

Many people were excited by this speech of Mr. Churchill, but none more than the liberals. Why, this is almost sacrilegious, they whined. Everyone knows, they said, that this is a war against fascism, for liberty, democracy and a new world for the common man. They even pointed to Churchill's speeches early in the war, when it looked as though the British Empire would be torn apart by German fascist imperialism. Churchill then made long speeches about the "ideological" character of the war.

MEMORIES ARE NOT TOO SHORT

Memories can be short, especially when it is convenient. But the war is not convenient. The masses of people feel the economic difficulties of life under war. They bear its heaviest burdens. More important than that, there is hardly a workers' family that does not have one or more sons and relatives fighting in this "ideological" war, thinking that they are fighting for freedom. Many of them believed, what Churchill said, only a couple of years ago. They remember that he said, many beautiful things when England was fighting alone. They remember, too, that he said, more beautiful things, together with President Roosevelt, when they issued the Atlantic Charter and announced their devotion to the Four Freedoms.

How truly beautiful they sounded: freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of worship, freedom of organization; national independence for all nations and, lastly, freedom from fear. Eighty this war, said he, and we shall have prosperity, security and peace for all time.

Now that the war has turned more favorable to the Allies, now that it is certain that Germany cannot win in Europe, Churchill speaks more frankly. Even President Roosevelt no longer says that this war will end war only for all time; he now HOPES it will end war only for the next generation!

Because the war has turned favorable to England and the Allies, Churchill says little or nothing about early war aims. Why should he? He never intended, them seriously. They were only "ideological" pleas to the people to support him and his regime in the war and to support the Allies in general.

CHURCHILL BECOMES BLUNT

Having obtained that support from the people, unenthusiastic as it is (especially in England) where the workers, the overwhelming majority of the people in that country, want a change from the old life to a new one, want a change from Toryism which Churchill represents, Churchill, representing the interests and views of capitalism and the capitalists of the Allied countries, speaks bluntly.

But is it true that the war is not ideological? In the sense that Churchill means it, yes.

In the sense that Churchill and the Allied powers have no intention whatsoever in bringing about any change in the capitalist system, yes.

In the sense that they have no intention of changing the old system of power politics, yes.

In the sense that they have no intention of altering the profit system, yes.

In the sense that they have no intention of genuinely improving the lot of the millions and millions of workers, poor peasants and farmers, and the poor middle class, yes.

CHURCHILL'S IDEOLOGY

What Churchill plainly says is: don't believe anything we ever said about the war. We are, really, and truly fighting to retain the status quo ante. We are for the old capitalist system of unemployment, poverty and misery for the overwhelming majority of the people. We are for the old capitalist system of profits, well-being and enrichment for a few, for the great capitalists of our civilization.

We may agree to a few concessions after the war. We may build a few new homes, since the war destroyed so many. We may provide some nurseries to aid poor mothers. We may even increase unemployment allotments and social security, but we will never stand for a change in our rotten, brutal and vicious capitalist system of profits for a few and misery for the many.

Of one thing we are certain: Churchill will be fooled if he thinks the soldiers will return from the wars just to continue under the old state of affairs. He will find that promises will not be enough. The people will want a change and they will get it, Churchill notwithstanding. Reports from the front supply much evidence of this fact. Journalists who talk to the men of all armies sign the same refrain: the boys want a change. They're not going to stand for unemployment and poverty.

WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT

But make no mistake about it. When Churchill says, the war is not "ideological," he means that in his mind, and the class he represents, the war does not mean what he said it did and that it is not fought for the things he once described. He means that the war is a fight over markets, colonies, profits. Simple and practical things!

Are these things ideological? Perhaps not in the sense that we are apt to think they are. But in a real sense they are ideological. They are the things which represent capitalist imperialism. They are the "ideological" interests of the capitalist class--not the people.

The war is ideological. It is a war in the interests of capitalism and the things capitalism stands for. When Churchill says it is not ideological he only means that it is not being fought for the things the people think it is fought for nor the things they want. It is not for peace, security and freedom.

Bound in One Volume:

All 52 Issues of

Labor Action, 1943

Price: \$2.50

Send Orders to

LABOR ACTION

114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.

(CLIP AND SAVE FOR REFERENCE)

"Kill FEPC"--Senator George

"Senator Walter George (D., Ga.) complained that the FEPC was creating racial trouble. Asserting recent legislation was increasing racial and class prejudices, George said: 'Call a halt or we will register a rapid downfall of free government in America.'"

"George charged that the FEPC was communizing America by taking over management, and was contributing a long step in the liquidation of private property."--Quoted from PM, June 21, 1944.

Glad to have you, George--FDR

"He (Governor Arnall) added that President Roosevelt was 'DE-LIGHTED' to be informed that Senator Walter George of Georgia, whom the President attempted to 'purge' (on the court issue--Ed.) in 1938, would be re-elected to the Senate."--Quoted from the New York Times, June 22, 1944.

though in the main he supports it, on the ground that the burden of financing it falls inequitably on the workers. At the same time, he neglects to remind the Republican Party that this bill, inadequate as it is, has been rotting in committee with the connivance of Republican congressmen.

On post-war reconversion, as in social security, Willkie sees the necessity of provision on the part of the federal government. Willkie realizes that all talk of "free enterprise" is meaningless; that any government will have to direct the economic demobilization and prevent crushing unemployment. At the same time, he believes that the problems of post-war stability can be solved within the framework of capitalism. So he comes out for a mild sort of planning and rationalization of industry and undertaking of government projects at government expense but by private contract. He believes that government can exercise an influence against depressions by such measures, broad social insurance and most important of all, "direction of the capital market to encourage a flow of new capital when depression threatens and to discourage it in the

net. In this he is much more far-sighted than the stupid, fumbling Republican politicians. He knows that the active support of the labor leaders is necessary, not only for votes but, more important, to hold labor in line, to keep it from breaking from the capitalist parties and the capitalist system.

In the field of foreign policy, Willkie is the most outstanding political critic of Roosevelt's policy, from the "left." He is the only prominent Republican to have come out against Roosevelt's deal with Darlan and in support of de Gaulle. The core of his program is the platform for the immediate creation of a council of the United Nations with representatives of China and the small nations and the understanding that "our sovereignty is not something to be hoarded but something to be used," though, of course, he piously adds, not in narrow nationalistic terms. Now, what actually does this add up to?

Willkie has been outspoken in his criticism of Churchill's statements about the necessity of preserving the British Empire and an indignant democrat about Britain in India and elsewhere. Willkie is an ardent sup-

A Five Foot Shelf for Workers

(This is the list referred to in last week's column, "Straight Talk," by Ernest Lund)

I. THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT:

Walker--

Editorials

A Bureau of Anti-Labor Statistics

The current fight between labor and the government on the percentage of rise in the cost of living is no mere battle of statistics. It is a fight for bread and butter and meat, and a fight for an immediate increase in wages—for that is exactly what every worker in these United States has been cheated out of by the War Labor Board and its Committee on the Cost of Living.

The WLB has used the phony, discredited figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics Index as a weapon to keep wages frozen in the face of skyrocketing living costs.

Now at last the BLS statistics have been exposed both by the CIO and the AFL and by the Bureau's own admissions, as a horrible deception of the American people. The War Food Administration, the War Production Board, the Social Security Board, the Wall Street Journal, Business Week Magazine—all of them long ago discarded the BLS as an accurate guide to living costs today.

Only the WLB sticks to the worthless index of the BLS in order to use it against labor and its demands for an "adjustment."

It is high time that the Philip Murrys, the R. J. Thomases and the William Greens learned the lessons of their own surveys and put the issue point-blank to the WLB.

LABOR ACTION has long advocated that labor get off the WLB and return to genuine collective bargaining while it still has a piece of its shirt on its back.

But even at worst, the CIO and AFL must demand that the WLB cease and desist at once from its arrogant policy of freezing the war-wanted pay envelopes of working men and women.

It cannot be done by warning the WLB that they will be unable to restrain the outraged resentment of the nation's workers.

That resentment against the wage-freeze and the delaying tactics of the WLB is the healthiest feature of American labor today. We hope it grows into an avalanche that will eventually take back from the labor zombies the no-strike pledge that they handed over to the enemies of labor so blithely. We hope that it grows to such proportions that the leaders of the CIO and AFL will be compelled to stop playing pussy-foot with the open-shoppers and labor-strangers of the government agencies.

Playing the Game of Boss Politics--II

Last week we took up the general policies of the CIO and AFL relating to political action by labor and the support that both labor organizations were giving to the political machines of the Democratic and Republican Parties.

Last week, too, we indicated some of the candidates the AFL was supporting or had intended to support. Among them we named the infamous Martin Dies; Stephen Day, friend of the fascists; a notorious nincompoop and anti-labor congressman from the far North Side in Chicago named Ralph E. Church, and Senator Nye. This is labor politics only in the sense that a "labor organization is engaged in it. In every other sense it is playing the game of capitalist politics.

Now comes the news that at the Republican Party convention, which nominated little Tom Dewey, the gang-buster, for president, William L. Hutcheson, corpulent president of the Carpenters' Union and a top leader of the AFL, was aiming for the nomination of vice-president.

The head of the Carpenters' Union, who waxed fat in his highly overpaid post as a "leader of workers," a post which he has held in spite of the many attempts of the carpenters to unseat him, is a typical example of what we mean by playing capitalist politics.

The difference between the Republican and Democratic parties, as we have pointed out so many times, is not very great and certainly, whatever differences there are, have nothing important to do with such things as programs, ideas, and the type of persons which are found in them. Perhaps the Republican Party has a few more isolationists and big business men. It also has its share of race-haters, jingoists, reactionaries and semi-fascists. But then, the Democratic Party is no whit different. It probably contains the biggest bloc of bourgeois and race-haters.

But the spectacle of a "labor leader" sitting at a convention with McCormick, Pew, Taft, Hoffman, Hawkes, and their type, is no better nor worse than the spectacle of a "labor leader" sitting at a convention with Rankin, Eastland, Byrd, George or Bilbo.

Hutcheson, though there was no chance whatever of his getting the vice-presidential nomination, would not have been a labor candidate, but a reactionary candidate of the big business interests of the Republican Party. He would be another labor office boy carrying out policies of interest to capital and no labor. He would be a reactionary stooge.

The sooner labor gets rid of such over-stuffed, overpaid labor leaders who hob-nob with big business and whose chief aim in life is to be "accepted" by capital, the better it will be for the union movement and every single worker in the country.

A Judge's Cheap Exhibition

A county judge in Brooklyn by the name of Louis Goldstein recently put on a cheap and nauseating publicity stunt at the expense of ninety Negro youths. The great jurist had before him the case of a Negro youth who was about to be sentenced in a case of felonious assault. This publicity-hunting little county judge issued subpoenas for ninety colored boys and had them hauled into his court to get a lecture from the bench and to see the convicted Negro youth sentenced.

Judge Goldstein alleged that the ninety Negro youths were members of two gangs in Brooklyn. He wanted to lecture them on the wages of sin and to point out the straight and narrow path. And so, since evidently there are no gangs in Brooklyn except Negro gangs and since evidently all the crime in Brooklyn is committed by Negroes, the little county judge could not possibly issue subpoenas for anybody but Negroes.

NO CHARGE AGAINST THEM

These ninety Negro youths were not charged with any offense. It was not established that they were members of any gang. There was no contention that they had any connection with the offense in question.

"I have had you brought here," said this pompous little county judge, "for the sole purpose of giving you a warning of what will happen to you if you commit any vicious crime." He was sorry for the parents of the boys who were "heartbroken because of your lack of respect and honor for them which every child should have."

We remark again that there was no charge against any of the boys, there was no record that they were members of the two gangs in question, and their parents had not asked Goldstein's help in the rearing of their children. And yet they were hauled into what passes for a court of justice.

Goldstein had photographers from the daily papers present just as though he was about to sentence some crooked judge or display some judge who had secured his office with the support of a notorious gangster or "bum."

A BIG SHOW FOR A LITTLE MAN

It was a cheap holiday for Goldstein, lording it over ninety Negro youths who could not help themselves. This little judge evidently had a pious good time, using the protection of a judge's bench and the mock solemnity of a court room to get public attention which he has failed to gain in his chosen profession.

Suppose these boys were members of gangs. Suppose they were or are participants in unlawful activities. There is provision made for taking care of these things: a "lawful" procedure, it is claimed. It is unusual for such activities to be handled by a judge acting like a ballet master, a horn blower in a one-man orchestra, or a medieval inquisitor. It these boys had committed no offenses they had no business in that court unless they came voluntarily as spectators. If they had committed offenses, then they should have been apprehended like all other offenders and given a trial.

AND IT WENT UNPROTESTED

We are sorry to learn that the parents of these boys stood by and permitted this spectacle to go on. We simply cannot understand how a parent could allow his or her son to be subjected to such treatment.

It is even more difficult to understand how a Negro minister, the Rev. Thomas S. Harten, could be a participant in such proceedings. He said that he knew that most of the boys were not members of gangs. Then why didn't he confront Goldstein and demand that this proceeding stop? What was he there for? He pictured this cheap little judge as a "humanitarian" who was interested in their welfare. Is that why Goldstein called in the photographers to take pictures of the boys? Or did he want to make sure that his own picture would appear in the papers?

We understand that some of these boys were in military uniform. Others no doubt would soon be called to "make the world safe for democracy"—and for judges, too! These Negro youths and their parents should learn a valuable lesson from their recent experience.

War Profiteering On Child Labor

While a generation of young men is fighting and dying on the battlefields of the world, a significant section of a still younger generation is being ruthlessly exploited at home by greedy employers. We refer to illegal child labor. In New York State alone, five hundred violations a week are reported. It can only be imagined how many cases are never brought to the attention of the authorities.

Arthur J. White of the wage and hour and public contracts division of the U. S. Labor Department reported cases such as this:

Seven boys, from fourteen to sixteen years old, left school at 3:15 p.m., reported to work in a lighting-fixture factory at 3:30, and finished work at 8:00 o'clock, with no time out for rest or dinner. They worked all day Saturday from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. All this for the meager wage of \$6.00 a week! Needless to say, the boys were tired and ill-looking.

The report states that "the department inspector entered a dress factory and found girls from thirteen to fifteen years old working after school and on Saturdays. They were hand pressing garments with a steam iron and boxing them. Their pay averaged \$8.00 or \$9.00 a week."

Most abuses of the child labor laws, according to White, occur in factories making paper and wooden boxes, artificial flowers and clothing, canning works, restaurants and retail stores.

The reasons for the appalling growth in illegal child labor are simple. The war has robbed the normal labor market and caused the slackening of work standards. Employers are desperately in need of labor and are rarely unresponsive to cheap labor.

The motives for children working are not difficult to understand, either. Due to the lean years of the Great Depression and the prospect of another period of unemployment after this war, parents are willing to allow their children to "get it while the getting is good." Others need money for recreation or necessities.

The capitalist economic system does not provide the proper play facilities for children in the open air and sunshine, supplemented with useful, constructive work which they can perform without injuring their health, nor does it guarantee them a job in adulthood, nor their parents security.

An Account of the Alexandria Trial

Servicemen Fight Greek King

By JIM TANAKOS

The Greek government in exile has announced that the Navy court-martial it has been conducting in Alexandria have condemned three sailors to death, and pronounced sentences ranging from five years to life imprisonment for seven other sailors. The sailors were found guilty of "leading a political mutiny in the Greek fleet last April." The Army court-martial is still going on, and the charges against the soldiers are similar to those presented against the sailors. The "mutiny" that they are accused of fomenting occurred last April and it involved the entire Greek navy and seventy-five per cent of the army.

The causes for the uprising were many. The semi-fascist nature of the Greek government in exile, its support of the monarchy and its refusal to include members of the underground movement into the cabinet were all contributing factors.

BACKGROUND TO THE FIGHT

As far back as August of last year the underground movement in Greece sent its representatives to Cairo to insist that the people be permitted to vote on the question of the monarchy before the King be allowed to return to Greece. Prime Minister Emanuel Tsouderos had these men placed under arrest.

From then on the underground movement in Greece and the armed forces in the Middle East looked upon the Tsouderos government as nothing more than mere representatives of the wealthy class which wanted the return of the monarchy, the same monarchy which had saddled them, before the Hitler invasion, with a fascist dictatorship of its own.

The rumblings in Greece and the Middle East grew louder and louder against the government in exile (referred to in the underground as the "government in flight"). On March 31, a group of army officers visited Tsouderos and told him to resign, for he had become a symbol of reaction in the eyes of the people. Tsouderos called in the British police and had them jailed. Within the next few hours, Tsouderos tried to stop the tide rising against him and his gov-

ernment by arresting hundreds of civilians and members of the armed forces throughout the Middle East. The leaders of the Seamen's Union, the editor of the newspaper Hellenic, the directors of the Hellenic League of Liberation, were all thrown into jail.

On the following day, at a meeting of the Greek cabinet, Sophocles Venizelos, Minister of the Army, said that it was dangerous to continue Tsouderos as Premier. How can you tell the people that this is a war for democracy, when the most unpopular man is premier? he asked. The entire cabinet agreed and decided to act quickly, for who knows what those common people might do? They might form their own government and discover that they don't need the government in exile or the class that it represents. Tsouderos agreed to resign and nominated Venizelos to replace him. It was decided for Tsouderos to continue in office until King George, who was in London, received the resignation and confirmed the new nomination.

SERVICEMEN FIGHT ROYALTY

In the meanwhile the soldiers and sailors had decided to take matters into their own hands. Many of them were from the old underground movements which had fought the King George-Metaxas fascist dictatorship. There were veterans from the Italian and German campaigns who had escaped from Greece to join the struggle, as they saw it, for national liberation. After the battles of Bizerte and El Alamein, General Montgomery had spoken in the most glowing terms about them. But these men hadn't come to fight for the preservation of the British Empire and for the return of the Greek reactionary monarchy.

On April 3, over three hundred soldiers and many civilians took over a number of buildings in Cairo that housed the various offices and equipment of the Greek military staff. The crew on a destroyer that had been ordered to convoy and mine-sweeping duty refused to sail "until a new Greek government is formed." The crew warned that any attempt to board their ship would be met with force. Exactly how many ships were

eventually involved, it is difficult to tell at this time. But the reports that came in as the ship surrendered reveals that destroyers, cruisers, mine sweepers, merchant ships and "small ships" had revolted. The revolt lasted over THREE WEEKS. They eventually surrendered to Greek admirals when British warships kept the Greek ships covered with their batteries until they were boarded by Admiral Voulgaris' men. Despite the very impressive batteries of the mammoth British ships, pitched battles took place on some of the ships between the crews and the boarding parties. Ten were killed and forty-three injured.

The First Brigade of the Greek Army, almost simultaneously with the action of the crews on the ships, took over their camp and evicted the Greek high command and the British supervisors. The brigade also held out for over three weeks and then "vacated" their camp and surrendered. The complete secrecy surrounding the events of those three weeks, and under what conditions these tough and determined soldiers eventually surrendered leaves it only to one's imagination to figure out how far British imperialism went to force surrender.

A MILD CONCESSION

Since the uprising, the Greek government has held a conference with the leaders of all the underground groups and it has been decided to include them in the cabinet. Although the "unity" government has not yet been formed, and from all indications the underground is not satisfied with the agreement reached by their leaders, nevertheless the fact that the government was willing to go into a coalition with the underground and is now putting to death the soldiers and sailors who revolted for just that purpose, means that there is more underneath all this than meets the naked eye.

The men condemned to death at the court-martial in Alexandria believed that they were fighting for freedom. And yet their first demand for a government just a little more representative of the people than the Tsouderos government was met by persecution, arrests and death!

Danish Workers Strike - -

(Continued from page 1)

broke out. The Nazis replied by arresting all Danish trade union leaders (thus acknowledging that the main resistance came from the working class). But if they had thought thus to decapitate the labor movement, they were wrong. On the contrary, a general strike was proclaimed in answer and Danish labor stated that the strike would finish only after the liberation of all trade union leaders.

According to all reports, this movement was eminently successful. Copenhagen was without gas and electricity and all stores and banks remained closed. Telephones, post offices and telegraph stations were shut.

Recommending A New Song to Communists

(A friend of LABOR ACTION from St. Louis has just sent us a new version of "The International," dedicated to the new line of the American Communist Party. "The International" was for many decades a great inspiration to the oppressed of the world. It was, in addition, the song of the Russian Revolution, as it was of the international socialist revolutionary movement.

In keeping with his betrayal and destruction of the workers' revolution and the workers' state, Stalin ordered a new song, a nationalist song, to replace "The International." Stalin's foreign representatives followed suit in adopting the new song as their own.

The following, our friend's version of "The International," is offered free to the American communists. It will fit their new-found love for capitalism and free enterprise. It ought to cement their new solidarity with the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.)

Relax, ye renovated masses,
Relax, ye once down-trodden,
through,
Salvation's in the middle
classes,
Joe Stalin can't be wrong.

No more shall Marx and
Lenin blind us,
They once were all but now
they're naught;
For Franklin Roosevelt you'll
find us,
We sell out cheap, we can be
bought.

There is no more conflict!
The bosses we'll embrace!
Forget "The International"
Forget the human race!

The trains stopped running. So did the street cars. All restaurants were closed. Since all bakeries were closed, Copenhagen was without bread for five days. Milk distribution likewise stopped. No newspapers were printed. Special Nazi detachments mounted guard in front of abandoned factories.

LABOR ON THE MARCH

The movement, which started in Copenhagen, the capital, also spread to the provinces. A general strike was proclaimed in Helsingfors. The capital seems to be nearly isolated and the Nazis were only able to keep up some of the most important mili-

tary traffic.

According to press dispatches, the movement not only spread into other towns but also became much more intensive. The reports speak of barricade fighting and open warfare in the streets of Copenhagen. While some of these dispatches should be taken with a grain of salt, there is no doubt that this was one of the biggest revolts which has as yet taken place in Nazi-dominated Europe. Once again, as in Northern Italy in 1943, as in France, in Belgium and Northern France and the Netherlands it is the working class, using its chief weapon, the general strike, which is the leading force.

June New International Features Invasion Articles

"The Invasion and the Future of Europe" is the featured article of the June issue of The New International, which made its appearance last week. No worker should miss this important interpretation of recent developments.

Written by Max Shachtman, the magazine's editor and national secretary of the Workers Party, the long analytical article is sub-divided into five sections, as follows:

- "The Atlantic Charter Abandoned"
 - "What Is Being Planned for Europe"
 - "The Plan to Destroy Germany"
 - "Russia, Poland and Germany"
 - "Small Nations and Independence"
- Other articles of topical importance are those by L. Smith on the Michigan Commonwealth Federation and David Coolidge's "Toward a New Trade Union Program." The former is a critical survey of the new organization, its leaders and policies to date, and a discussion of the problems it faces. The latter calls for a

programmatic reorientation of the labor movement in the light of the economic and political needs of the working class today.

Rounding out the excellent issue is J. R. Johnson's review of Harold Laski's latest book. Entitled "Harold Laski, St. Paul and Stalin," the article discusses the disintegration of intellectual thinking among the Laskis, Hooks, Burnhams and the social democratic "weepers" of the New Leader.

Thanking those readers and friends who have already sent in greetings and contributions for the July "10th Anniversary" number of the NI, the business manager appeals to the many supporters of the magazine who have not yet sent in their contributions to do so at once. Generous contributions will make possible the publication of a forty-eight-page issue. Mail yours to The New International, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Los Angeles Forum

ON

The Communist Party -- Enemy of Labor

Why Did the Communists "Dissolve" Their Party?
How Do Their Policies Help Big Business?

Friday, July 14, 8:00 p.m. Admission Free

AT THE EMBASSY AUDITORIUM
843 South Grand St. Los Angeles, Calif.

SUBWAY MYSTERY

La Guardia Joins Gang-up on People

By CARL DAVIS

Mayor LaGuardia of New York City pulled "another beaut" in connection with the dispute over the ten-cent fare for the city's subway system. Little Butch's scheme to get out from under the pressure of the big real estate interests and their drive for a higher fare is characteristic of the Mayor.

New York City periodically witnesses a struggle between the politicians and the business interests over increasing the nickel fare. The city-owned and operated transit lines run on a deficit. This is important depending on the point of view taken.

From the standpoint of good capitalist business, anything which does not yield a profit is bad—even though socially useful and of aid and benefit to the people. From the viewpoint of the people of the city, the deficit is not too important, as long as the millions of workers get good service and cheap service.

The details of financing the subway are long indeed, and under examination would reveal that much of the trouble which exists today can be traced to the many years during which the service was privately owned and operated on the basis of a franchise from the city. The city was often not paid by the private interests, which showed this as a loss year after year, while it paid out dividends and fabulous salaries to its officials.

BIG BUSINESS BEHIND HIGHER FARE

In any case, financing of the subway and transit system requires revenues in addition to fares and these have been met by real estate taxes. These taxes have not met the deficit because they were never high enough. But any kind of tax is too high for the real estate and business interests. We are not referring to the little landlord who has his one building. He is not decisive in this situation. When we speak of real estate interests, we refer to the big corporations which own hundreds of buildings, the banks, whose properties run into the millions of dollars and the skyscraper corporations.

They have been clamoring for a ten-cent fare in New York City for many years. The doubling of the fare might greatly increase revenues that would more than cover any deficit. That's just the point, overcoming the deficit by millions of dollars would lay the basis for another squeeze play on taxes. These interests, whose spokesman is the politician and corporation lawyer, Paul Windels, are fighting for just such an aim: raise costs on the people, lower the taxes on those able to pay and thus increase profits!

THE MAYOR'S GRAND SLAM

How does Mayor LaGuardia meet this demand of the big interests? By side-stepping their challenge and offering up a proposal even more dastardly than theirs. They at least are frank. They want an increased fare. Not LaGuardia. That means political defeat in New York. He dare not raise the fare, so he proposes a program which is the rarest piece of class legislation we have seen for a long time. The Mayor proposes to tax each tenant in the city on the basis of rent paid in order to cover the deficit. And this is what the Mayor's plan looks like as a whole:

A two per cent tax on each apartment and house tenant in the city! This is to be paid monthly and collected by the landlord!

A two and a half per cent tax on every business man or manufacturer with an office, loft or plant. Also on monthly rental basis.

A two per cent monthly tax on every hotel and lodging resident.

Out of town commuters working in the city to pay forty cents monthly, to be taken out of their pay envelopes.

A one per cent tax on every mortgage holder on any money he gets as interest on property anywhere in the five boroughs.

There may be a few people in this listing capable of paying a small tax. But the vast majority of those covered by the Mayor's so-called plan will be workers and those least able to pay. If the Mayor's proposal is carried it will literally take food out of the mouths of the people.

HAS HIS TONGUE IN HIS CHEEK

In all of this discussion, the Mayor makes sure to avoid mention of the fact that real estate taxes have been cut. They have been cut thirteen points in Manhattan, fourteen points in the Bronx, twelve points in Brooklyn, twenty points in Queens and sixteen points in Richmond!

How does His Honor defend his gouge of the people? By citing how much cheaper the tax would be for the people as against the ten-cent fare.

Last year he was fighting against a living wage for transit workers on the ground of the deficit. This year he is saving the people money with a tax plan which avoids the real issue.

Certainly as against the ten-cent fare, his tax plan is cheaper. But the answer to that is simple: Reject both plans, the bankers' and real estate scheme for a ten-cent fare, and LaGuardia's scheme for a tax on rents. Put the tax where it belongs: on the banks, which are amassing untold millions in profits, the big real estate corporations and profiteering brokers.

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.
(Third Floor)

Vol. 8, No. 28 July 10, 1944

ALBERT GATES, Editor
T. R. COBB, Asst. Editor

Subscription Rate: 60 Cents a Year
75 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.

Combination Offer: THE NEW COURSE by LEON TROTSKY and in the same volume The Struggle for the New Course by Max Shachtman Regular Price \$1.50

PLUS A Year's Subscription to The New International Regular Price \$1.50 Both for \$2.50