

WAR PROFITS INCREASE TO \$8,600,000,000!

All-Time Record Above '29 Boom

Two weeks ago we published unofficial reports on the increase of the profits, AFTER TAXES, of big business. We are now in a position to present official figures which confirm the earlier report and indicate that the rate of profits has increased for the first six months of 1943.

The enormous increase of the profits of big business is in sharp contrast to the position of the American workers and the current anti-labor drive emanating from Washington.

The report of the Department of Commerce shows that for the first half of 1943, operating profits were at an annual rate of \$8,600,000,000! This is considerably higher than the profits of boom year of 1929.

In 1929, profits, BEFORE TAXES, stood at \$8,387,000,000. This amount was reduced by taxes totaling \$1,193,000,000.

Thus, profits in 1943, AFTER TAXES, are greater than those for 1929 by \$1,406,000,000!

Since 1939, profits have continuously risen. Despite increasing taxes, big business is getting the gravy out of the war.

In the face of these facts, the President persists in the infamous hold-the-line order and the wage freeze! In the face of these facts, the WLB holds fast in its refusal to grant wage increases to the workers to meet the rise in the cost of living.

Big business, through its agents in Congress, its kept press, its lobbying organizations and its friends in the Administration, is already preparing to fight any rise in taxes on its profits. Preparations, however, are being made to increase the already heavy burden on the workers, the middle class and the poor farmers.

In addition to higher taxes, as a direct form of increasing the war burdens on those least able to stand them, sales taxes and forced savings are also in the making.

Compare the good life of big business, the giant corporations and their many times overpaid officials with the situation which faces the workers under the so-called "equality of sacrifice" program.

The bosses have surrendered nothing. Their reward has been the highest profits in American history, all guaranteed by cost-plus contracts! And this does not include the enormous salaries and dividends which they receive.

In return for their sacrifices, the workers have been rewarded with a high cost of living and a sharp decline in their standard of living.

They have been rewarded with an anti-labor WLB which consistently rejects the legitimate demands of the workers for wage increases.

Confronted with a wild rise in prices and a generally chaotic price situation, they face, in addition, a White House edict ordering "sanctions," under the directives contained in the viciously anti-labor Smith-Connally bill, against all workers striking for their very livelihood.

Here is your measuring-rod, fellow workers: Look at the enrichment of big business, the financiers and industrialists, and then look at the position of the working class. It is the living picture of capitalism—a system run in the interests of the bosses and their profits!

Incentive Pay and UAW Convention

By ALBERT GATES

The wage freeze inaugurated under the auspices of President Roosevelt and the actions of the WLB in refusing to grant the demands of workers for pay increases under the hold-the-line order, have only intensified the campaign from some quarters for the adoption by the unions of incentive pay schemes.

Incentive pay, which is only another name for piecework and speed-up schemes, is nothing new to the auto workers, even though the name may be new. It is merely another way of describing a more intense exploitation of workers, getting more production out of them for little or no cost.

Interestingly enough, the idea of incentive pay and the campaign which has developed for it, originated with big business and its representatives in Washington. They first presented the plan to Washington, where it received endorsement. Big business said: Since it is impossible for the workers to get wage increases, we can promise them a few cents more if they increase their individual and collective productivity.

This wasn't the ordinary piecework and speed-up system. This was something more scientific, said these moguls of wealth. Under the old system, reward for greater production was individual; it depended on how much the worker produced. Whatever increase in production was achieved by the worker, he was paid individually.

The old piecework system, however, led to a vicious situation in the shops. Individual workers went the whole hog in trying to increase their pay by greater production. It meant driving themselves to no end. But the real nature of the piecework system was that as the individual worker increased his production, the new increase was regarded as normal and the worker, in relation to his productivity, suffered a continual wage cut.

The boss used the piecework system to create a back-breaking competition between workers in the shop. It led to conflicts between the workers. The net result of this was that the bosses obtained great productivity out of labor, which enormously increased their profits. At the end of it all, the worker had nothing to show for his intense labor except a "broken back." He found that he gave his best to the boss and then found himself out of work because he could no longer keep up the pace he set by his endeavor to get more wages through the piecework system.

Bosses to Gain

The aim of incentive pay is to create the basis for a group or collective speed-up — to reward the workers for increased production on a group basis. The essential features of the piecework, speed-up system remain the same. But faster workers, under the new system, will be counted upon to drag up to their

(Continued on page 2)

Sperry Workers, Take Note!

The net income of the Sperry Corporation for the first six months of 1943 was seventy-seven per cent higher than for the same period in 1942!

For the first half of this year, profits totaled \$4,242,813 after deductions for all taxes and post-war reserves and after \$2,500,000 was set aside to prepare for adjustments necessary when government contracts are cancelled.

This compares with a profit of \$2,394,237 for the first half of last year.

LABOR ACTION

SEPTEMBER 6, 1943

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR

ONE CENT

ANTI-LABOR FORCES PLAN TO BAR ALL STRIKE VOTES

Churchill Speech Does Not Alter Allied-Russian Crises

In his latest speech, Prime Minister Churchill presented his views of the position of the Anglo-American coalition on the next steps of the war in Europe and relations with their Russian ally. There was nothing new contained in his remarks—they confirmed the fact that sharp differences existed between Stalin and the Quebec leaders, and that these differences were not yet resolved.

Paying homage to the military campaigns of the Russian army, acknowledging the debt which the Allies owe it, the Prime Minister nevertheless added that the establishment of a second front, while never opposed in principle, will take place across the Channel when the Allied military staffs deem the time proper.

This is merely a reiteration of what Roosevelt and Churchill have repeatedly stated. It has added no new note to the dispute over the second front.

The second front, as we pointed out last week, has been used by Stalin not merely because of Russian military needs, but as a cloak to hide

Stalin's real war aims. It is the latter which is behind the Anglo-American and Russian crisis. At that time we wrote:

"Russia's absence from the planning conferences of Roosevelt and Churchill have been wrongly magnified as being part of the latter's design. Actually, Stalin has been playing a cagey game. While it might be true that Russia was not invited to Quebec (the problem of the Pacific front would seem to preclude Russian participation), it is an established fact that Stalin avoided the Casablanca conference. He is obviously not ready for such conferences until there is more general agreement on political-military questions."

Churchill's Proposals

Churchill presented three ways of holding a three-power conference:

1. A conference of Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin. The Prime Minister added that Roosevelt and he would be ready to "undertake further immense journeys" to facilitate such a meeting.

2. A meeting with Russian representatives to participate in "the political decisions which arise out of the victories Anglo-American forces have gained in the Mediterranean."

3. A meeting of the Foreign Ministers of Great Britain, the United States and Russia, preliminary to a meeting of Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin.

Stalin has already declared his willingness to meet with Roosevelt and Churchill but only after the issues which separate them have first been straightened out and guarantees are given him that he will obtain, at least, his major demands.

What Stalin Wants

But what are the demands which Stalin has in mind? They are terri-

torial. He wants Finland, or his puppet regime established there. He wants the Baltic states, Eastern Poland, a big chunk of Rumania in addition to Bessarabia, and possibly the whole Black Sea coast of that country. He wants large concessions in Asia.

There is the issue of the Balkans, which Stalin regards as his stamping ground.

There is the issue of Germany. Stalin wants a strong Germany as a barrier to the West. While Allied policy has never been officially announced, there have been enough indications that Britain and America want a dismemberment of Germany and a destruction of here industrial power.

These are not small questions. They are, in fact, the decisive issues which separate the three powers. What stands in the way of agreement is that each of the three powers desires domination over Europe.

Churchill's speech reflected fear and worry over what Stalin will do and what to offer him as a compromise. It is still too early to determine just what kind of an agreement, if any, will be reached. But this is the problem which confronts the Anglo-American coalition.

(Continued on page 4)



First-Hand Story of the Brewster Strike

Workers Hit Union-Busters

The five thousand members of Local 365 UAW-CIO at the Johnsville, Pa., plant of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation laid down their tools as one man and walked out of the plant on the morning of August 26.

The walkout was a spontaneous and unanimous reply to the arrest of four union members by the Navy simultaneously accompanied by the entrance into the plant of 200 Coast Guardsmen wearing steel helmets and armed with rifles, bayonets and tear gas.

No charges were preferred against the guards and for three days no one was allowed to see them. Their families were not even informed of their arrest!

What started as a spontaneous, unplanned protest was the next day officially designated by the Johnsville workers as a strike. Despite a warning from the union leadership that they were violating the Smith-Connally bill and were liable to arrest, immediate induction into the Army, or permanent blacklisting by the government, the workers not only refused to return to work but refused to compromise by calling their action a protest walkout, a holiday, or a demonstration. They voted to call it a strike! (with only eleven dissenting votes)—a fighting answer to the management and the government, which had tried to force them to work with bayonets at their backs, tried to smash their union by abolishing the principle of seniority!

These are the facts behind the strike: The existing contract between Local 365 and the Brewster management specifies that the union has full jurisdiction over the plant guards.

In August, 1942, the management asked union officials to permit the guards to join the voluntary Coast Guard Temporary Reserve. The union granted the request, but only after being assured that membership in the reserve was voluntary, that the guards had the right to resign at any time they chose, that none of their rights as union members would be denied them, and that all clauses in the existing contract would remain in full effect with respect to the guards.

A week before the strike, the management informed the union that it wanted to abolish the system whereby the plant guards selected their posts on a seniority basis. Union officials could see no reason for granting the request. There is only one classification for guards and no post in the plant requires any more experience or skill than any other post.

The management was obviously trying to draw the guards out of the union by abolishing their seniority privilege—the most important guarantee the union contract offers them. If the request were granted, the door would be open to using the guards as an armed, anti-union police force in the shop, and the way would be paved for an attack on seniority rights in every other classification in the plant.

Tension over the issue grew. On the Sunday night preceding the strike, Frederick J. Riebel, president of Brewster, came to the Johnsville plant himself and assured union officials that the matter would be settled amicably to the satisfaction of all concerned.

That same night, with Riebel's full knowledge, 200 Coast Guardsmen were on their way to the Johnsville plant from Cape May, N. J. At the very moment that he was hypocritically negotiating with the union, Riebel, in cooperation with the Navy, had decided to settle the issue the following morning by force!

Monday morning, August 26, a Navy officer, ignoring the fact that the guards had already resigned from the Coast Guard, and in flagrant violation of all spoken and written agreements, ordered the thirteen guards to posts irrespective of their seniority rights. The guards refused. The articles of war were read to them. Nine yielded and took their posts. Four refused. The four were immediately arrested and hauled off to a prison ship in the Philadelphia Navy Yard. Simultaneously, the armed militia, ordered up the night before, marched into the plant.

Union Solidarity Wins

At their strike meeting the following day, the Johnsville workers voted to ask their union brothers and sisters at the Brewster Long Island City and Newark plants for a vote of support. On August 26, six thousand workers at the Long Island City plant jammed the Queensboro Arena and voted to support the Johnsville strikers by filing notice with the NLRB that they wanted a strike vote taken in the plant thirty days hence, as provided in the Smith-Connally bill.

The only opposition to the vote came from the small, but well organized Stalinist faction and the few reactionaries they drew to their sup-

(Continued on page 4)

By SAM ADAMS

The anti-labor Smith-Connally bill to outlaw strikes is once more in the headlines of the boss press. It appears now that this bill has not accomplished its purpose because, under its provisions, strike votes have been taken and in all such voting the workers overwhelmingly favored a walkout.

The question now asked is why the framers of this bill included a provision permitting a strike vote to be taken after the legal thirty-day notice? Certainly the Southern Bourbons who authored the bill had no intention of permitting workers to strike for their legitimate grievances and wage demands.

Intoxicated with their own vicious propaganda that strikes were the product of some malicious union leaders, the anti-labor elements in Congress actually began to believe it themselves.

Completely divorced from the people and opposed to the best interests of the workers, they were certain that the passage of the Smith-Connally bill was enough to fight for their rights, there were ers nevertheless continued to fight for their rights, there were always the courts and the jails to take care of that.

The clause on the strike vote was merely a "democratic" cover to the real intentions of the framers of the bill.

How wrong these gentlemen have been! How little they understand American workers!

How completely uninterested they are in the well-being of those who toil!

Workers do not go out on strike just for fun. When workers strike they do so because they have grievances which need redress. It is the only means they have to assert their rights in a situation where big business, the Administration, Congress and all the politicians, the press—the whole reactionary camp—run the show.

There is hardly an industry where the workers do not have grievances. And why not?

Their wages have been frozen. Under the hold-the-line order, the WLB has served as a wastebasket in which are deposited the wage demands of the workers.

Conditions of labor have worsened with the lengthening of hours and the tremendous speed-up created by war production. To top this off, big business has organized a vicious campaign to destroy the trade union movement. Taking advantage of the no-strike pledge, they have left no stone unturned to smash unionism permanently and take away the gains made by the workers in recent years.

But workers are quick to see through this reactionary game. The NLRB, since the passage of the Smith-Connally bill, has held thirteen strike votes with the infamous and provocative question asked of the workers, if they wished to "permit an interruption of production in wartime as a result of this dispute."

In each of the thirteen instances, the workers, by majorities of sixty to a hundred per cent, voted to strike.

Why? The answer is simple. The workers cannot meet the high cost of living. The decline in their standard of living has become unbearable. They are tired of the run-around they get from the WLB, from the Administration, from Washington, and they are more than sick and tired of the advantage which the bosses are taking of them because of the no-strike pledge.

If industry does not get its big profits, it threatens not to produce. If a company produces bad war materials which endanger the lives of soldiers it gets a small fine and big praise from the press and judges attesting to its honesty! If a conscientious inspector discovers fraud committed by some officials of a large corporation, the corporation denounces the government agency involved and demands that it keep hands off, otherwise the company cannot function!

The OPA declares that it cannot really control prices and makes no real effort to do so. The food interests and the big farm interests demand no price control and they get the necessary cooperation in Washington.

But when labor demands a limitation of profits it gets a wage freeze and a hold-the-line order.

Labor demands wage increases, and it gets an incentive pay proposal designed to intensify the exploitation of the workers and to increase the profits of the bosses.

These are some of the reasons why workers strike. They know what is happening in the country. They see reaction riding high in Washington. They see the enrichment of the capitalist through the war effort, that is, through the sweat and toil of their labor. They see every demand made by them to improve their conditions rejected in Washington.

Is it any wonder that the workers vote to strike?

These thirteen strike votes resulted in a new campaign to revise this provision of the Smith-Connally bill. It was Roosevelt who first denounced the provision and demanded its elimination. Through his alliance with the labor bureaucrats, he understood better than his Southern party comrades what are the real sentiments of labor. He was told by Green and Murray how impossible it has become to hold the dissatisfied workers in line. And he knew that if the bill permitted a strike vote, labor would vote to strike.

The next session of Congress, therefore, will see a new drive on to revise the Smith-Connally bill and to eliminate this provision.

The Administration, the anti-labor leaders of both parties, the press and the bosses will get together to make sure that no way is left open for the workers to assert their rights! The Smith-Connally bill, apparently, did not go far enough to suit them. These gentlemen now propose to "improve" it. And woe to labor when they finish their job.

Labor, on guard! The totalitarians are on the march. Fight now against any further measures which aim to keep labor in its present unbearable position and seek the ultimate destruction of the labor movement.

Fight for the repeal of the Smith-Connally bill!

Fight to rescind the no-strike pledge!

Fight for your democratic rights!

Fight for wage increases and against a further destruction of your standard of living!

Defend your union organizations against all union-busters!

Build an independent political party of labor against the boss parties!

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Auto Convention and Incentive Pay Issue - - -

(Continued from page 1)
level the slower workers. After a given period, if the group fails to reach a standard set by the boss, they will get no increase of pay.

However, if the group does meet the standard, then not only does the group gain a slight increase, but the bosses, who have nothing at all to do with such production gains, would share in the increases obtained by the speed-up. Thus the scheme is another means of increasing the incomes and wealth of business.

The whole scheme is a conscious fraud on the part of big business, because increased productivity means greater profits! In the end, the workers get no further than they were in the beginning. This is borne out by the fact that for some years now, especially during the war, the workers have increased productivity at a high rate. But, as the AFL pointed out, the workers have not shared in this great increase in productivity. The bosses have taken all the gravy out of this increased production in the form of greater profits. They now want to build this system up in a big way—the bigger and more universal its application, the bigger its profits will be.

The campaign for incentive pay, however, has struck a snag in the auto industry. There is hardly an auto worker who does not know the meaning of piecework and speed-up.

He had his fill of it in the pre-union days at Ford. He knows that the auto industry was known as a "young man's industry" because of the back-breaking speed-up instituted by the auto magnates. He knows that he was regarded as an old man long before his time; that he was thrown out of work in the prime of life and could not get a job. And he knows that after all the work and production he contributed to enrich the bosses, he had nothing to show for his labor.

The great achievement of the UAW was that it busted up the speed-up system and the piecework system. The union understood that these were nothing but a clever means of robbing the workers even more than they are normally robbed by profit-hungry industrialists.

That is why the ranks and many leaders of the union are now fighting all attempts to introduce this vicious scheme to enrich the bosses in the auto industry. But the fight is becoming more difficult because of the forces now supporting the bosses. The Role of the Stalinists

Next to big business, the outstanding supporters of incentive pay are the Stalinists. They have done everything in their power to put over this boss scheme on the workers, and nowhere have they been so active as in the UAW, especially in Detroit.

The big chief of the Communist Party, Earl Browder, made it a point to intervene from the outside to try to force incentive pay on the UAW. The Communist Party members in the union and their cohorts followed up this campaign.

These enemies of the best interests of labor now argue that it is necessary that the bosses get their profits! After all, the bosses might sabotage the war effort if they are not permitted to get all they can off the backs of the workers!

But the real interests of the Stalinists, of course, is Stalin and his regime in Russia. They cry for more production, not because they give a damn about anyone or anything else. They are only concerned with more

and more production in order to increase war supplies for Stalin. What happens to the workers in the meantime is none of their concern. And that is understandable. Those who support the slavery of the Russian workers have no objections to the enslavement of the American workers.

Frankenstein's Position

The most prominent leader within the union to champion incentive pay is Richard Frankenstein. But there is a reason, even if not a good one, behind his madness. Frankenstein is in charge of organization of the aircraft industry. This industry is notorious for its low wage scales and high rate of profit.

Organization of the aircraft workers depends in a large measure on the matter of wage scales. Specifically, it means carrying on a fight against the wage freeze and the hold-the-line order which keeps these workers underpaid. It means fighting against wage differentials and for equalization of wages—bringing up the wages of aircraft workers to the minimum basic wage in the auto industry.

Since Frankenstein is not committed to a militant struggle around these issues, he seeks to overcome his problem in aircraft by championing incentive pay. By adopting the newly named and glorified scheme for the old piecework and speed-up systems, he hopes to meet the most important problem in the organization of the aircraft workers.

Such a policy is an illusory one. Production in aircraft is at an extremely high rate, as is evidenced by the great number of planes produced. The workers in this industry, as in all other industries, have never shared in the enormous production for which they are responsible. Yet Frankenstein's proposal would result in an even greater speed-up for them and a proportionately lesser share in the product of their toil.

As a matter of fact, no one has dared to criticize the American workers for their failure to produce. There is hardly a person who is not amazed with the tremendous efficiency and productivity of the American worker. Only the Stalinists have systematically spread the poison that the workers are "cheating on the job" and that incentive pay should be introduced to increase production!

Danger Ahead

There is, however, one grave danger in the present situation. The wage freeze and the hold-the-line order is making life unbearable for hundreds of thousands of workers whose wages in no way meet their needs under the constantly rising cost of living.

The conspiracy of big business, the Administration and even some labor leaders against pay increases has created a situation where the only way left open for such increases is through some form of the incentive pay schemes.

President Philip Murray of the CIO, who spends most of his time getting rebukes from the President and the Administration, already has signified his acceptance of one form or another of incentive pay.

By this action Murray is conveying to the rest of the CIO that he wants it to accept the same situation.

This is a grave danger to the union movement. For, in addition to

the fact that it is a vicious piecework and speed-up system calculated to enrich the bosses, it is also an instrument designed to bust the union movement by breaking down the wage scales and working conditions of labor that have been won after many years of heroic struggle.

The fight against incentive pay and against all those who advocate it is, above all, a struggle for the union movement, for the victories it has won and for the workers whom it represents.

Fight for the Union

There is only one genuine working class and union road open to the labor movement. Reject any and all schemes for incentive pay! Not incentive pay, but wage increases!

The hypocrisy of the Administration is revealed in its support of incentive pay schemes. Its opposition to wage increases is based on the grounds that consumer goods are not fully available and wage increases would only aggravate this condition. It would be inflationary. But incentive pay is supported on the ground that it would be based on increased production.

What the Administration fails to add is that such increased production is not in the consumer field, therefore no changes would take place. There would be no increase in consumer goods.

The Administration hopes the workers will overlook this little discrepancy behind the scheme to increase profits.

The workers are not getting anything for nothing. They are grossly underpaid.

The great wealth produced by its intense labor goes into the hands of the bosses and industry. The great increase in their productivity has been usurped by big business.

The auto workers, by rejecting incentive pay at their convention and by adopting a program of struggle for wage increases, will be giving the greatest service not only to all the

Vital Union Issues Before Dodge Local in Detroit

Eighteen thousand members of Dodge Local No. 3, UAW-CIO, have much at stake at the coming UAW convention. For it is there that it will be decided whether they are again to suffer under the inequities of the so-called "equality of sacrifice" program and be subservient to the boss-packed WLB and be bound by the no-strike pledge.

All auto workers have suffered under this program, employees of the Chrysler Corporation, of which Dodge is an important subsidiary, perhaps more than most. Of the Big Three in auto, Chrysler pays the lowest rate.

The corporation has repaid the sacrifices of the union by refusing to sign a contract, negotiations for which have been going on since last November, and by flagrant provocations which flout union grievance procedure, ignore seniority and in general refusing to bargain collectively with the union. These provocations have been so great that there have been, since the start of the war, sixty strikes and stoppages in Chrysler plants, culminating in the huge strike in Detroit last May.

Mass Voting in Local

It is no wonder then that Dodge workers should show an active interest in the coming UAW convention and participate actively in the election of delegates. Well over 7,000 votes were cast for five slates at the union hall in the two voting days. Consideration of the program will give some indication of the problems facing the Dodge workers at the coming convention.

What might be called the administration slate, headed by Earl Reynolds, president of Local 3, and Cliff Addis, secretary of the local, secured seventeen of the twenty-four seats. Running on a vague program for industry-wide pension systems, insurance plans, nonfreezing of wages and rollback of prices and profits, this group, like three others, came out for election of international officers by referendum vote and against any increase in dues and assessments. The overwhelming sentiment of Chrysler workers for these last two planks is a good indication of the distrust of the membership for the program of their international leadership.

Six representatives of a "Green" slate, headed by Jerry Ford, chairman of the plant committee, and Barney Hopkins, financial secretary of the local, were voted in. The six elected on this slate are influential union members, reputed to be members or under the influence of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists. They have in the past usually been in opposition to Reynolds and Addis, have favored more militant action and have been in the forefront of the labor movement to remove Leo Lamotte as Chrysler director.

In a showdown in the faction fight

workers in the industry but to all American workers. They will be safeguarding the union movement and the great gains made by it!

Rejection of incentive pay is a de-

Goodrich Rubber Workers Adopt Militant Union Program

Special to LABOR ACTION
AKRON—Goodrich Local No. 5 of the United Rubber Workers of America is going to the international URW convention with a real fighting spirit again this year.

At a large special meeting held August 25, Goodrich workers voted enthusiastically and virtually unanimously in favor of resolutions demanding the withdrawing of labor's no-strike pledge, withdrawal of the labor members on the War Labor Board and for the repeal of the union-busting Smith-Connally anti-strike law.

The meeting, called to consider resolutions to be presented by the local to the URW convention, which convenes in Toronto, September 20, greeted the resolutions and speakers in behalf of them with much applause.

Knowing the temper of the workers, the Stalinists keep mum on these basic issues of progressive unionism, fearing to discredit themselves even more than in the local.

Against No-Strike Pledge

The membership of Goodrich Local is well aware of the run-around they and the other rubber workers have received as a result of the CIO leaders' no-strike pledge. The big strike movement of 50,000 Akron URW unionists in May ran squarely in opposition to the "orders" of URW President Dalrymple and those of the War Labor Board.

Subsequent to May, the WLB had given the Goodrich workers such double-talk that much time had to

be spent in Washington by the local's leaders in attempting to obtain the three-cent handout that was supposed to be given them. The WLB's final ruling added insult to injury by chiseling the miserably three cents, supposed to be added to the base rate of pieceworkers on Bédoux, down to two and a half cents!

No wonder their resolution spoke of the WLB as the "War Employers Board" and instructed all URW members to resign from it, as well as calling upon other unions to do the same.

The resolution to withdraw the no-strike pledge exposed the one-sided sacrifices made by the unions and how the industrialists had intensified their labor-baiting, with the result that the government had clamped down on labor but not on capital. It concluded by appealing to all unions to rescind their no-strike pledges and function as genuine collective bargaining units as they formerly did.

The discussion on the resolution calling for repeal of the Smith-Connally law indicated how disturbed labor is about its activities and rights being crippled by the corporations, acting through the government. One member brought out the fact that the reactionary Akron congressman, Ed Rowe, has predicted that the next Congress will take up even more drastic anti-labor legislation.

For a Labor Party
Numerous other resolutions were presented, including one favoring the immediate formation of a Labor Party on a national scale, in view of the fact that labor has been "kicked in the teeth" for so long by the Republican and Democratic Parties. It presented a clear-cut case showing why labor must send its own representatives into political office in opposition to the old parties, which are dominated by the employers.

Only one speaker took the floor to oppose the pro-Labor Party speaker. The rest of the large audience remained silent, including the union leaders, who are tied up with Sidney Hillman's pro-Democratic Party "labor committee."

The vocal opponent of the Labor Party proposal contented himself with mouthing the usual Stalinist line about "this is wartime," "splitting," and so forth. His efforts, however, succeeded in bringing forth thirty or forty scattered "noes" to defeat the resolution. It was painfully obvious that, had a broader discussion occurred, the hundreds of workers who did not vote at all would have taken greater interest in this vital question for labor.

Company War
Frauds on Rise,
Says Biddle

A three-inch item buried in the inside pages of the New York Times reveals that those super-patriots, the corporations, are hanging up an even blacker record in this war than they did in the last, when their criminal practices resulted in a series of national scandals.

The item reports that Attorney General Francis Biddle, addressing a Chicago meeting of lawyers, said that war frauds by corporations "in this much bigger war than the last one, likewise are much bigger than they were in 1917 and 1918."

The July issue of the International Teamster, official organ of the Teamsters Union, commenting on the fact that the general manager of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., who pleaded "nolo contendere"—in other words, guilty—to the charge that the company had deliberately falsified tests on wire destined to be used by American troops, received only an eighteen-month sentence, which was immediately suspended, says: "This is the same sentence a Baltimore welder received for faulty work in a defense plant. But the welder will serve his term, while the Anaconda official will not."

Judge Thomas W. Slick, justice of the Federal Court of Indiana, who heard the Anaconda case and imposed sentences varying from \$10,000 to \$100 on company officials, for a five million dollar fraud involving thousands of human lives, said: "I don't think one of these defendants is of the criminal type. They are not criminals at heart. They have made a very serious mistake, but they already have suffered more than any real criminal."

The International Teamster comments: "That Baltimore welder should get a big laugh out of that."

President of Local 365 Tells Labor Action Reporter He Is For End of No-Strike Pledge

By M. WILSON

In an interview with Thomas De Lorenzo, president of Local 365, UAW-CIO, he assured LABOR ACTION's reporter that he gave full support to the strikers of the Hatboro plant of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, who protested the military arrest of four guards.

The abovementioned guards were members of the union although placed in the Coast Guard Temporary Reserve since August, 1942.

De Lorenzo added that he would take up the question of plant guards at the coming national convention of the UAW to determine their relation to the union, the company and the branch of military service in which they are enrolled.

President Supports Harbor

The present contract which Local 365 has with the Brewster Corporation gives it jurisdiction over the guards and guarantees their conditions and seniority rights, etc.

As for the strike itself, De Lorenzo said: "The strike was proper; there is no question about it." The men have since returned to work, after certifying a strike vote to the WLB and the union will continue the fight for the release of the four guards who were held for court martial and the other thirty-eight guards who were subjected to military arrest but have since been released as prisoners-at-large and are back at work.

For Rescinding of No-Strike Pledge

In further discussion of the local's perspective at the coming convention, De Lorenzo declared: "I want an outright repeal of the no-strike pledge." He said that labor without the right to strike was at the mercy of the bosses and the government, who have taken advantage of labor's weakness without its most powerful weapon, the right to strike.

He then reverted to the question of the Hatboro strike and stated it was not merely that the attack on the

guards was in violation of the union contract, but that it was the culmination of the efforts of "Skippy" Riebel, president of Brewster, to break the union. Management has been carrying on a persistent campaign against all the provisions of the union contract; it has tried to violate the clauses on seniority, promotions and classifications.

When I asked De Lorenzo if he expected to give support to the militant Bushkill program of the union, he flatly stated that he stood by the points embodied in it. He declared that he stood for rescinding the no-strike pledge, organizing the unorganized, for an Independent Labor Party and for the restoration of collective bargaining between management and the union.

Harbors Demands Militant Program

Asked about the program on which the administration ran for election as delegates to the coming convention, he freely admitted that the program was watered down, that the section on the no-strike pledge lacked force and clarity, and that he had pledged full support to the Roosevelt Administration.

De Lorenzo stated that this was in essence a compromise position but that in the light of recent events in Harbors and in the local as a whole, in their negotiations with the company, he realized that nothing but a complete repeal of the no-strike pledge was in order, that no other method could achieve any new gains for the men and women who work in the plant and that no other method could assure the maintenance of the victories so far achieved by the union.

The militant delegates to the national convention of the UAW, to be held in Buffalo on October 4, will look to see if Brother De Lorenzo will carry out this program which he outlined in his interview with LABOR ACTION.

Europe in Revolt
A Review of Political Events

BETWEEN AMGOT AND "FREEDOM" A LA STALIN

The average "liberal" suffers from a case of split loyalties: Which is the most progressive factor in Europe, Anglo-American imperialism with its Amgot, or Stalin with his "free movements?"

These "liberals," and with them the great majority of labor leaders in this country, seem unable to oppose two evils at the same time. They want to be "realistic," and to them "realism" means the lesser evil.

The differences among them flow primarily from their inability to decide what constitutes the lesser evil. They are somewhat shocked by the Amgot regime and its collaboration with fascist officials, its suppression of all native political activity, its insistence on the necessity of maintaining law and order at the price of almost complete continuance of the old fascist regime. So, many of them welcome Stalin's Free Germany, Free Yugoslavia or Free Poland movements.

FOR "MAINTAINING ORDER"

Liberal thought is always bound to rely for support on one of the powers that be and contributes only a few "progressive" amendments. Revolutionary socialists, on the contrary, know that none of the great powers can be anything but reactionary. Hope for the future of labor, even more, for the future of humanity, does not lie with Stalin's

Recently a New York Times correspondent naively described the American-British war aims as being "a kind of limited revolution—an overthrow of the fascist and Nazi militarist regimes, but not an overthrow of all authority capable of maintaining order."

Many liberals expressed their indignation at this. But, on the other hand, the idea that Joe Stalin would extend his domination over great parts of Europe, bringing the kind of freedom Captain Eddie Rickenbacker has so enthusiastically described as now reigning in Russia, makes others shiver. Reinhold Niebuhr, the liberal mouthpiece of the Union Theological Seminary, has welcomed the constitution of the fake German National Committee in Moscow, and The Nation crowd is enthusiastically following suit; another "liberal" wing welcomes Amgot and wants only certain alterations in its functioning.

gangsters, nor does it lie with the program of the Allies.

Intervention from the outside can only breed new wars, new oppressions, new hatreds. Democracy, true liberty, can only come when the people decide for themselves. True democracy will come when the socialist forces slowly rebuild their organizations for the freedom of tomorrow.

WORKERS WILL ASSERT THEMSELVES

The Third Camp is already more than the hope of a few revolutionaries the world over. It has raised its voice in the streets of Milan and Turin. It fights less spectacularly, but with the same effect, in Germany and in all the other countries now under the Nazi heel. Even in the comparatively peaceful Denmark, people have gone out on strike and are demonstrating against the Nazis. Since the Italian events, a wave of unrest has swept over all of Europe. Thus, the deals in Quebec, in

Washington and Moscow, trading with the future of Europe, are a matter of spheres of influence and of power combinations. Entire countries are being distributed and redistributed—according to the exigencies of the diplomatic game—by hard-boiled imperialists. But there is an old saying that it is bad policy to sell the bear's skin before he is caught. The people of Europe will be more decisive for Europe's future than any number of conferences.

Europacaps.

Chicago UAW Locals Elect Delegates to Convention

CHICAGO—The Buick local of the UAWA has started the ball rolling in the Chicago area in the campaign to rescind the no-strike pledge. In the elections for delegates to the national convention of the UAW slated for Buffalo, October 4, ten out of eleven candidates for election who signed a statement to the membership calling for the repeal of the no-strike pledge were elected. There are eleven delegates in all from the Buick local.

The statement distributed by this slate covered four points—all of them of crucial importance to the labor movement and to the UAW in particular.

In addition to the demand for repeal of the no-strike pledge, the statement called for removal of UAW representatives from the War Labor Board, replacing the "equality of sacrifice" program with a rising scale of wages to meet the rising cost of living, and 100 per cent opposition to the incentive pay plan or any other kind of piecework.

Even though this statement was distributed only one day before the elections, it was instrumental in electing the slate pledged to carry out this program at the convention.

CHICAGO—By the time this issue appears, Electro-Motive Diesel Local 719 of the UAWA will have elected its delegates to the national convention of the union. The main issue before the membership was the no-strike pledge. Candidates for election took their stand on this issue

and if the workers in the plant were informed in time on who stands for what the election should have gone to those who are against this destruction of labor's rights.

Concrete meaning was given to the no-strike pledge by a walkout of the crane operators and hookers three weeks ago and the subsequent firing by the company of two men who the bosses claim were the instigators of the stoppage. With the no-strike pledge in force the company can make these firings stick if it convinces the umpire of the responsibility of these men. With the present policy of the international, the hands of the men are tied when it comes to a real defense of these men.

At the next meeting of the local on September 12, resolutions will be discussed and voted on relating to the issues before the UAW convention. If the sentiment of the men in the plant is reflected in the voting one can expect the delegates to go to the convention bound to vote against the no-strike pledge, against incentive pay and to withdraw the UAW members from the War Labor Board.

Also to come before the meeting will be a motion to pay the two men for the time they are off pending a decision by the umpire. The men in the shop favor this overwhelmingly and are prepared to see that their will is carried out by the local.

LABOR ACTION will cover the results of this election in a subsequent issue.

Introductory Offer

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

SIX MONTH SUBSCRIPTION 25¢

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Hull-Welles Conflict and the Liberals

By Robert Klein

The American "liberals," whose political program is based on soap bubbles and toy balloons, have been beating their breasts and howling in pain this past week. Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, it seems, is about to be kicked out of the State Department.

The howling is not because Sumner Welles is a liberal. On the contrary, he is decidedly conservative and many times in the past the liberals themselves have stamped their foot and called him an old so and so!

But in the camp of the liberals it is considered high and bold policy to select as your champion the cleanest scoundrel in a den of thieves. If Welles is given the gate they will be rocked to their heels, because, bad as he is, they consider him better than the other members of the State Department.

WHY THE WELLES DISMISSAL?

Welles' dismissal is of considerable importance. When reactionaries and conservatives start shooting at one another, important issues are usually involved. The Welles incident is worth examining as a reflection of the political pressures currently operating on the Roosevelt Administration, and especially of the ferment going on in the State Department.

Welles favored closer collaboration with Russia, preferred de Gaulle to Giraud, and advocated some kind of post-war federation of nations. Secretary of State Hull, that state spinster of American politics who has been knitting his way through every world crisis since 1933, has little sympathy for these policies.

The "inside" stories from Washington appearing in the press say this is what happened: Hull's distaste for Welles' policies, along with a lot of personal jealousy of his suave subordinate, caused Hull to tell Roosevelt: "Either Welles goes or I go!" Roosevelt, although sympathetic toward Welles and his ideas, was supposedly forced to kick him out for fear of losing the support of the Southern bloc in Congress, which Hull controls.

BEHIND THE LIBERAL MYTH

This story has one tell-tale mark that brands it a phony: it perpetuates the biggest and cleverest myth of the Roosevelt Administration—the idea that the State Department and the White House represent two factions constantly at one another's throats.

The Roosevelt supporters work themselves into a tizzy thrice a week trying to explain (mainly to each other) how it can be that a great liberal like the President can be saddled with a State Department which ten times out of ten picks the most reactionary policy possible. Great is their wrath when anyone makes the simple suggestion that perhaps the State Department's policies are Roosevelt's policies, since he can appoint or dismiss the heads of the department at will.

The conduct of the liberals is ludicrous. Roosevelt reaps glory as the champion of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms, while the State Department executes his real, anti-democratic foreign policy and takes the rap for it.

ROOSEVELT'S TRUE POLICY

The chief criticisms leveled against the State Department by its liberal critics are (1) its policies are confused; (2) it has no policies. From the fact that the State Department supports Franco against the Spanish people, encourages Otto of Hapsburg to regain his throne, builds up the semi-fascist Giraud to foist on the French nation, tacitly sides with the King and fascist Badoglio against the Italian people, the critics deduce that the State Department is confused, lacks a policy, needs more efficient organization, etc. Actually it is the critics, not the State Department, who are confused. What could be clearer and more consistent than the State Department policy? It never defines that policy for the very good reason that if it ever did accurately define it the masses would instantly reject it. It might even shock the liberals who refuse to recognize that in the sphere of foreign policy, the terms "State Department" and "Roosevelt Administration" are interchangeable.

Seen against this background, the reason for the dismissal of Welles becomes clearer. It is a move BY THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION to strengthen its reactionary foreign policy by removing even so mild a critic of that policy as Sumner Welles. Roosevelt knows that in the struggle between the United States, England and Russia for domination of post-war Europe, victory will favor the nation which most successfully keeps the European workers in check. And Roosevelt knows that his State Department is pursuing the only policy which might achieve that goal—alliance with the old rulers, or new ones pulled out of a hat, against the oppressed masses. Welles, with his baubles of post-war collaboration and federation of nations, could be easily sacrificed to make the path smoother for Secretary Hull.

War Labor Board Again Rejects Mine Contract

The details on the WLB rejection of the agreement signed by the United Mine Workers and the Illinois Coal Operators Association have now been given. There is more to the bare story than that the board, by an eight-to-four vote—industry and the public lined up against labor—rejected the Illinois contract.

Once again the majority opinion was reported by the "impartial" chairman, William H. Davis, who declared that the contract did not constitute a "genuine settlement of claims" arising under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The majority, persistent in its refusals to grant wage increases, held that this agreement between the miners and the operators, which reached a compromise on the question of portal-to-portal pay, was a hidden wage increase! This has now become the official excuse for not granting the legitimate wage demands of the mine workers.

No wonder that Labor, official organ of the railroad unions, declared that the WLB "continued this week to construct a ring of steel" around John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers.

Lewis' contention that the WLB was stacked against labor, said Labor, seemed borne out by its latest action. To top off this action of the WLB, Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, has started returning the mines to the coal operators. Thus he too has joined "in weaving a web around the union by returning, piecemeal, bituminous mines that have been in government hands."

The WLB has given another sample of its policy, and it means Labor has no place on the board! Labor representatives must get off the WLB! Otherwise they become party to the continuous anti-labor decisions of that body!

How the Government Serves Its Class

Holding the Price Front Against Labor

By WALTER WEISS

Throughout this year, the top labor leaders have been threatening to desert the Administration's so-called stabilization program, but they have never got beyond the stage of words. In January, Prentiss Brown, succeeding Leon Henderson as OPA director, calmly announced that prices would go up in "an INEVITABLE, slow, well-ordered rise" (our emphasis).

Thereupon, R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers, declared that the Little Steel formula had never been fair and demanded a thirty per cent increase in wages. Messrs. Murray and Green personally told Roosevelt that they were dissatisfied with the Little Steel formula (and also, no doubt, they feared John L. Lewis would win over their rank and file unless something were done).

WHAT THE PRESIDENT DID

The President, an expert talker himself, having already talked big about stabilization on three occasions in 1942 (seven-point program of April, Labor Day message, general stabilization order of October), obliged them with his hold-the-line order of April, 1943. The labor leaders, protesting a little for the record against the job freeze, proceeded to try to sell their members on the bright prospects for a price rollback.

Unfortunately for them, reality showed that wages were really frozen while prices kept going up. Murray, to satisfy the CIO members, had to talk tougher than ever: he actually fixed July 15 as a deadline for rolling prices back to the level of September 15, 1942. Really, this in itself was a retreat, for the unions had earlier demanded the level of May, 1942, since the Little Steel formula took into account price rises to that date only.

The next step of the labor leaders was to blame the whole situation on Congress, which was refusing to permit subsidies for price rollbacks. When Congress finally agreed that some money might be used for such subsidies, the President was loudly hailed for his "personal victory over the profiteers" (Donald Montgomery in the United Automobile Worker of July 15).

"The President has turned at last to the home front," said Montgomery. "He is commanding a battle to put prices down and keep them down."

LABOR LEADERS MERELY TALK

The ink was hardly dry on these brave words

before Montgomery, in the very next issue, was taking them back, and Murray and Green, in a state of great alarm, were again visiting the President on July 22. Their statement to him said, in part:

"We are unable to find ANY steps being taken at the present time to carry out your objectives. If YOUR administrators have decided not to carry out in full the program which YOU proposed and which Congress permits, it will, of course, be impossible for organized labor to continue in its support of the wage and price stabilization program as now formulated" (all emphasis ours).

Before, Congress was the cause of all evil. Now it became clear that the President's own administrators (that is, the President himself) had a part in the conspiracy. Reporters, probably amused, asked Murray if he hadn't fixed a July 15 deadline, and he agreed that he had, but he went on to say that "we want to give the President an opportunity to apply the rollback permitted by Congress" (New York Times, July 23).

Not satisfied with this, reporters asked "if this was his last notice to the President." To which Murray, having just backed down on one ultimatum, replied that he was "not in the habit of issuing ultimatums to the President of the United States."

WLB HITS AT LABOR

Seeing how tough the labor leaders really were, the War Labor Board on the very next day stated that it would not grant wage increases "on the ground that other sectors of our battle line against inflation (that is, prices—W.W.) are not being held (and then a very contemptuous conclusion—W.W.), at least to the satisfaction of labor."

Earlier the WLB itself was reported to be very "restive" at the job of holding wages while prices went up. But having felt out the quality of the labor leaders over a period of months, the public members of the Board experienced a decided stiffening of the spine. By comparison, they decided they themselves really were tough.

The President, however, was willing to make further VERBAL concessions to help out his labor friends. On the same day that the WLB got tough, July 23, the President expressed sympathy with labor on the rising cost of living, "although he said that costs of essential articles of food had been

held fairly level" (New York Times, July 24. Emphasis ours). He added that a new program was being drawn to hold down the cost of living.

AN UNDELIVERED PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH

Meanwhile, a big speech on stabilization by the President, promised ever since July 23, remains to be delivered; and the press, reporting an oversupply of the once scarce potatoes, suggests that the government may buy them in large quantities to keep prices from DROPPING (!) too much.

On August 21, Business Week summed up the situation very adequately by observing that the program was to please farmers and business men "without seriously offending labor."

"The head men in the War Food Administration and the OPA," it says, "who recognize but ARE NOT OVERWHELMED by the importance of the labor vote, believe that the APPEASEMENT program toward farmers and business men can be carried through without seriously upsetting the price stabilization program" (all emphasis ours).

REACTION ON THE MARCH

Appearance in the full swing. Professors are being fired and hard-headed business men are replacing them. Mr. Bowles of the OPA promises an end to "needless meddling, snooping and Gestapo methods." (Where have we heard that before?) He is going to educate, not punish, merchants. They are going to police ceilings to a large extent themselves. True, fresh fruits and vegetables are very high, but there will be retail ceilings on these "in a few months" (New York Times, August 25). He doesn't say where the fruits and vegetables will be by then.

Mr. Jones thinks that the whole trouble is that the food problem gets too much space in the papers. Probably most Americans wouldn't even know that there was such a thing as food, if they didn't keep reading about it. Just forget about it for a while, advises Mr. Jones, and everything will come out all right.

Why not appease labor for a change? Absurd! The labor leaders are self-appeasers. They just open their mouths every so often and let off a little steam. After all, what can they do? They have solemnly promised not to strike and not to form an Independent Labor Party. Practical politicians are "NOT OVERWHELMED" by the importance of their vote!

Canadian Labor Wins Election Victory

By MIKE STEVENS

The victory of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation of Canada in the Province of Ontario has the capitalist class of Canada and the United States sitting-up and taking notice.

The elections were for membership in the Ontario Legislature. In the 1937 election, the Liberal Party took 67 seats and the Conservative Party 23. Thus these two parties took all of the 90 seats in the Ontario Legislature.

The Liberal Party was in control of the Legislature and of the government. W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, and Harry Nixon, Ontario's Premier, are both from the Liberal Party.

But in the present election, the Liberal Party won only 14 seats—a scathing rebuke to the party of the Prime Minister and the Premier for its do-nothing policies.

The Conservative Party—seeing the handwriting on the wall, changed its name to the Progressive-Conservative Party, adopted a progressive-sounding platform, dumped the old-line leaders who stood out openly for British imperialism—and came through the election with 38 seats.

The CCF, which had not a single seat in the last Legislature, won 34 seats in this election.

The CCF victory is a big step forward for the Canadian workers. Modeled after the British Labor Party (though somewhat more left), it has a program which leaves much to be desired. Nevertheless, this victory represents a clear, clean break by large sections of the working class from the old capitalist parties.

Trade Unions Behind CCF

One of the big factors in the victory of the CCF was the backing of the AFL-CIO-RR Brotherhoods and the working farmers' organization. The trade unions were active in the building of the CCF in the province of Ontario and played an important role during the elections.

For example, in the Windsor area, out of the four CCFers elected to the Ontario Legislature, three of them were trade unionists: A. Nelson Ailes, from Ford Local 240, UAW-CIO; William R. Riggs, International Typographical Union; and George Bennett, AFL, Street Carriers' Union.

Although the CCF is politically immature in many ways, nevertheless it recognizes the danger of Sta-

linist infiltration and refuses to have anything to do with them.

The Communist Party considers the CCF too radical and therefore ran its own delegates under the name of Labor Progressives, and received two seats in these elections.

Issues in Election

One of the big issues of the campaign was government ownership of industry and full recognition of labor's economic and social rights. The leader of the party, M. J. Coldwell, has carried on a brilliant battle in Canada against the government's relations with the Aluminum Company of Canada, and was largely responsible for the exposure of the Ship-saw scandal.

The CCF victory is a complete repudiation of the King-Nixon regime. The Aluminum Co. deal mentioned above is only one of many instances which revealed the true character of the capitalist parties. Whereas the policy of the government toward the rich has been one of generosity and bountifulness, its attitude toward the workers has been one which continually worsened their condition.

The cost of living has been steadily rising and under Canadian law

wages are to rise with the cost of living. The cost-of-living indexes have been challenged time and time again as being false. A number of consumer goods producers in Canada have been subsidized and the workers realized that they are being cheated on both ends.

On the one hand, these subsidies were paid by the workers indirectly in the form of taxes while, on the other hand, their cost of living kept going up. Their wages under the government system were pegged at the depression level and it was impossible to get wage increases from the various governmental boards.

Canadian Labor Fights Back

But the workers in Canada do not take it lying down. They are organizing rapidly into trade unions and virtually every industry in Canada has had strikes for recognition and higher wages.

In this they very much resemble their American brothers. But the Canadian workers have gone one step further: they are not only organizing themselves in the economic field—they are organizing themselves into their own independent political party, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.

Of Special Interest To Women

By Susan Green

Every housewife will be just too, too delighted to learn that the V campaign of the bosses on the domestic front is doing very well. Here are a few indications:

The professors on the OPA have been replaced by business men. This augurs very well for the profits of the big four farm organizations and of the food industry—though not for the housewife. Even the restrictions of the very mild and absent-minded professors will now be removed.

The latest reports have it that the 1944 "plans" for food administration will be about what they were for 1943. The status quo of rising prices is being maintained because the big four farm organizations and the food industry prefer it that way, according to Samuel B. Bledsoe in the New York Times of August 22.

Starting August 5, you have been paying more for eighty food items and a trifle less for thirty-five—the balance being all in favor of the food bosses. This increase to the consumer reflects more allowances by the OPA to the food dealers.

In New York City the landlords have been upheld by the OPA, which, for some occult reason will not place ceilings on rents because New York City is not a "defense area"—whatever that may mean, since the city is full of defense workers.

The only light on the horizon is that here and there the housewives are waking up and taking action. In Coney Island the gypping was so bad that the housewives formed a committee, for reporting ceiling violations. In Brooklyn the women of an apartment house where rents are being raised, picketed the property, carrying slogans such as "Pay Frozen—Why Not Rent?"

Such action is the real McCoy. It must become much more extensive and much better organized—and kept free of the deadly Stalinist influence.

Mrs. Helen Robar, working in Baltimore for the Koppers Co. and producing piston rings for the "war effort," is almost as good at having babies as the proverbial oriental peasant women, who have their babies in the fields and continue working as if nothing happened. This, by the way, is not necessarily an indication of womanly pro-

ess, but rather of a condition of servitude leading to physical exhaustion at an early age—as evidenced by the way most peasant women get wizened and old before their time.

But to return to Mrs. Robar. She gave birth to a child at four in the afternoon, and eight hours later was at work on the midnight shift. Of course, this could not be kept secret from the other women on the job. They talked, and finally company officials heard the story. Whereupon the latter insisted on Mrs. Robar going home to get a doctor's examination and perhaps to stay there for two months—to rest up.

But it isn't rest Mrs. Robar is worried about. "I can't just sit around and do nothing, with all these kids to support... I can't get another job without a release from the company, so what am I to do?"

Some women have illegal abortions—take the chance of ruining their health that way—in order to continue supporting their dependents. Mrs. Robar emulated the female slaves of the Orient.

What a shame and disgrace! The government, which spends \$265,000,000 EVERY DAY, and the bosses, who reap fantastic war profits, make no provision for the millions of women workers so they can have their babies as civilized women should.

Every company should be compelled to grant maternity leave with pay so dependents won't suffer and so their jobs will be there for them when the women get back. Who's going to make the bosses do this?

THE ORGANIZED LABOR MOVEMENT!

Not only are practically no new protective measures being taken for women workers, but the reactionaries are aiming to weaken or remove such laws for women as now exist.

These reactionary forces working for the bosses are so wily about this that they seek to accomplish their aim under the benevolent guise of what is called the Equal Rights Amendment, now pending in the Senate.

Those equal rights that working women now want they will not get by this amendment nor by

any law on the statute books. Women should get equal pay for equal work, equal conditions of labor, equal priority rights. They will get such equal treatment on the job only by becoming active, militant union members and influencing the unions—in the interest of all labor—to raise the level of the women workers.

What this Equal Rights Amendment, if passed, would do is to give the boss-controlled judges the opportunity to declare unconstitutional every existing law that requires sanitary protection for women, limits their night work, compels certain industrial safety devices. For if women have equal rights with men, there should, of course, be no laws giving women these "special privileges."

See the point—an Equal Rights Amendment to allow the bosses unhampered exploitation of womanpower.

Laws regulating night work for women and the like have, as it is, been "suspended for the duration." The bosses would delight in extending the "duration" into peacetime.

The whole labor movement must be up in arms against the passage of this fake Equal Rights Amendment.

A union militant who is a devoted reader of LABOR ACTION writes in about "wife trouble" in the labor movement. He is alarmed by the inactivity of rank and file unionists and points to the small percentage of union members who attend their meetings. He thinks that the wives of union men discourage their husbands' activity—and to keep peace in the family the men stay home.

Wives of union men, hear ye, hear ye! You are being called by that old term of endearment: "Ball and chain!" But this is not in jest and is indeed no laughing matter.

United Nations' Policy Dooms European Jews

By Joe Leonard

The Nazis have murdered over three million Jews since 1933. They have shot them, tortured them, deported them to starvation, driven them to suicide. They have massacred them in officially inspired pogroms; they have massacred them in extermination centers.

The Nazis are not the only ones to blame. The United Nations have done nothing, absolutely nothing, to help these Jews. The Hitler butchery has been going on for ten years—six years the United Nations were at peace with him, four years at war. Peace or war, the Allies, by their failure to act, have given an answer to the "Jewish problem," which virtually said: Let Hitler handle them.

THE ALLIED RECORD

Roosevelt took office at almost the same time that Hitler came to power. Roosevelt, however, who has spoken sympathetically about the plight of the Jews, has done nothing in a practical way to help alleviate their condition.

Stalin's record, for that matter, is no better. When the political leaders of England and the United States pointed to Russia to take in the fleeing Jews, the Daily Worker explained that if Russia did this it would seem to prove Hitler's contention that the Jews were communists. So to prove Hitler a liar the slaughter was allowed peacefully to continue!

A few years ago England offered to sell to the penniless refugees part of British Guiana. Not being able to make any real profits out of that jungle and swamp, the British figured they might do better to "squeeze" the desperate Jews for it. The British finished their efforts at aiding the Jews by prohibiting all further immigration to Palestine.

Three million men, women and children! Not soldiers, not criminals. Just victims of Nazi brutality. And the callousness of the political leaders of the "democracies." This is the picture!

WHAT BERMUDA ACCOMPLISHED

A few months ago a conference of American and British leaders was held in Bermuda to determine ways and means of aiding the Jews. The conference was ten years in convening, and it accomplished—absolutely nothing! The proceedings are being kept secret. Evidently the Jews should not know what was said about them.

The British and American political leaders gave another example of their interpretation of democracy: this time in North Africa. General Giraud, the fascist and Vichyite whom Roosevelt has been trying to palm off as a democrat, abrogated the Vichy laws in North Africa, after the Allied military victory. But the anti-Semitic General Giraud ALSO abrogated the laws of 1876 giving Jews citizenship rights. Hitler is not the only one who has turned back the clock of political and personal liberty. Roosevelt and Churchill, by their silence, gave their consent to the actions of Giraud.

There were 8,300,000 Jews living in Europe ten years ago. Today there are 3,300,000. The greatest mass slaughter of helpless victims in modern history has been used by the authors of the Atlantic Charter to stir up war fever against Germany. That is the only significance that the plight of the Jews has for the leaders of the two greatest "democracies." Let anyone who thinks this is an extreme statement point to anything that Roosevelt or Churchill has DONE, or tried to do, or even promised to do.

The Rumanians have offered to sell their Jews at so much per head to any country that will take them. The Jews of America and England would raise the ransom in a week. But the Allies say, in effect: "Sorry, immigration quotas, you know."

IS THERE ANY ROOM FOR JEWS?

In all of Europe there are only five million Jews left. As matters now stand, only a minority of this small number of people can be saved from Hitler's hangmen. When and where can they go?

The answer to the first part of the question is: When the United Nations decide to let down their bars against immigration and permit the exodus of the Jews from Europe. If they are willing to agree to take the Jews from certain death in Europe, the means of effecting such emigration are easy to be found.

Where can they go? Well, take a look at this world. The United Nations are made up of powers having great areas at their disposal: the British Empire, the United States, China and Russia. In addition, other vast territories are within their reach and influence. Is it not possible to settle the Jews in North Africa, South Africa, the United States, Australia, Canada, South America? Obviously, the Jewish population could easily be absorbed in these enormous territories.

But there is nothing but silence contributed by the great statesmen. In an utterly cynical manner and on holiday occasions they pay homage to the suffering Jews but when it is suggested that something be done, they raise their hands in horror, pointing to one difficulty after another as proof why nothing can be done. This isn't exactly a pogrom on the Jews, but it fits in nicely with the murderous conduct of anti-Semites the world over.

The pleas of the Jews fall on deaf ears!

NOW ON SALE: THE PAMPHLET 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 _____

Editorials

Russian Workers

When Captain Rickenbacker returned from Russia and advised the nation that Russia was the real hope of the world; that it was taking the place of America as an example of capitalist democracy, while the United States was fast moving toward where Russia was twenty years ago, it was not merely a case of the president of Eastern Airlines expressing his profound ignorance of economics, history and politics.

No; Rickenbacker believes in the slavery of the workers. He believes in long hours, low wages and unbearable working and living conditions. He hates unionism and any organization of workers. What he saw in Russia pleased him; he wants the same kind of slavery here.

The London Economist outlines what these conditions are:

1. Russian wages have remained stationary even after war began.
2. The prevailing work day is twelve hours!
3. Workers' wages average three hundred rubles a month, while the bureaucrats and the Stakhanovites (the speed-up leaders) get as high as four thousand rubles. Technicians (supervisors, engineers, etc.) get one to six thousand and more rubles a month. The same differentiation is to be found in the army.

4. "... There has been no outcry of 'profiteering' or 'exploitation.' For such outrages are not and cannot be permitted under a totalitarian planned economy. . . ." —New York Times. (Instead of "totalitarian planned economy" read "totalitarian regime"—Ed.)

In addition to these features, it should be added that trade unionism has been destroyed by Stalin, no right to workers' organizations exist—in a word, there is no free speech, free press or free assemblage under Stalin's reign.

This is Rickenbacker's kind of state . . . and Browder's. But it has nothing in common with socialism!

Rulers of America

The Southern California Teamster, dealing with the power of big business lobbies in Congress and state legislatures, gives a partial answer to this problem.

It published a list of the largest industrial and financial monopolies to show their ramifications and how it is possible for them to run the big show in Washington.

Examining the reports of the National Resources Planning Board, it shows that eight monopolistic combines dominate two hundred and fifty corporation and through them control ninety-six per cent of the assets of all railroads, seventy-five per cent

of all public utilities, forty-eight per cent of all commercial banks and thirty-four per cent of all manufacturing corporations in the country.

They control, in addition, industrial and bank assets of \$61,025,000,000, that is, sixty-two per cent "of the two hundred largest industrial concerns and fifty largest financial concerns in this country."

These eight monopolies are the House of Morgan, the Mellon group, the Chicago group, the du Ponts, Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and the Boston and Cleveland groups.

This isn't the whole story, but it is a good beginning to explain who runs the United States.

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. 7, No. 36 September 6, 1943

ALBERT GATES, 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.

ALP Rejects Independent Campaign Juggling Figures On Cost of Living

By STANLEY HOLLAND

The American Labor Party has abandoned all attempts to place itself in the field of the current New York State elections as an independent political party. Instead, it has chosen the dishonorable task of delivering the labor vote to the top political machines of the Democratic Party.

The whole question of which way to turn—toward independent political action or support of the Republican or Democratic Party—came up again when the ALP had to decide on a candidate for Lieutenant-Governor of New York State when that post was vacated by the recent death of Republican Thomas Wallace.

Playing Boss Politics

The ALP, at the same time that it had to resolve this question, was faced with an old but nonetheless sharp factional fight between the Dubinsky-Rose (Social-Democratic-trade union bloc) wing and the Connolly-Marcantonio (Stalinist) wing.

For completely different reasons, both factions are waging a neck-and-neck race for the purpose of steering the party away from independent politics. The Dubinsky faction as a pro-New Deal group, feels that the New Deal has taken quite a licking in the halls of Congress and throughout the rest of the country in the past year, and is terrified by the thought that labor's "friends" are diminishing at a rapid rate.

Their answer to the anti-labor elements which are gaining tremendous headway and to their discovery that their friends of yesterday are not their friends of today, was not to try to elect their own labor candidates but to try to tame down the blows at labor by demonstrating their loyalty to Roosevelt.

Stalinists Beat the Jackass Drum

The Stalinists, on the other hand, are trying to extend the Kremlin's foreign policy to the shores of Amer-

ica by maintaining their boot-licking policy of support to the Roosevelt Administration as long as it is running the war. Coupled with that is its opposition to an Independent Labor Party.

The first step of the ALP was to nominate former State Comptroller James V. O'Leary. But they never for a moment thought of keeping O'Leary (an old Democratic politician) as their candidate and running a labor ticket. Had they done this their whole policy of steering the workers' vote for Roosevelt might have been endangered. It might have strengthened the idea of running independent labor candidates in '44, just as the Dean Alfange campaign (despite the fact that Alfange was unknown) demonstrated the strength

ment. He is willing to work with the Stalinists or anyone else who would help him gain leadership over the ALP for the Roosevelt group. He wants no extension of the ALP into other states. Now he is busy issuing ultimatums to the ALP on the type of organization it must have, etc.

The Dubinsky faction is afraid of Hillman. The Stalinist faction sees the chance, through Hillman, of gaining control of the state ALP machinery. But Hillman has made himself clear on the political stand he wants the ALP to take when he issued statements through the CIO Political Action Committee which he has just formed. He wants a united ALP movement to support the Democratic Party in '44 and to kill any attempt at independence. He wants

The Dubinsky-Rose faction wanted O'Leary to be their bargaining point for their "friend of labor candidate" in the Democratic Party. No sooner was O'Leary nominated than Alex Rose announced that he would withdraw O'Leary if the Democratic Party would nominate Lithgow Osborn, state conservation commissioner and a New Dealer. But the Democratic Party realized the weakness of this position. They didn't bother to appease the ALP. Instead, they patched up their own differences in the Farley-Roosevelt feud and nominated a candidate acceptable to the reactionary and New Deal wings of the Democratic Party, the political unknown, General William N. Haskell.

Breathlessly the Stalinists in the ALP, through Marcantonio and Connolly, rushed statements to the press that they would support Haskell. Nor did they wait for the ALP to withdraw O'Leary. They had to prove that they were the best boot-lickers of the Roosevelt Administration in the ALP.

The Dubinsky-Rose faction waited only a day. The "investigated" Haskell's past, and found it a complete blank. They said that Haskell had to his credit the fact that he never broke a strike when he was a general! This is what is called a clear record! They are still in doubt, however, as to whether Haskell is a New Dealer. At any rate, the ALP formally withdrew O'Leary and supported Haskell.

Need for Real Independence

Unless some rank and file movement for independent political action gains hold of the ALP and completely repudiates the Stalinists, the Rose-Dubinsky crew, the Hillmanites and all other agents of the boss parties, the ALP is doomed to certain death.

Its conduct has nothing in common with true independent political action of labor.

The Company They Keep--

At a nominations meeting of the New York American Labor Party, on Monday, August 23, the question of a candidate for Supreme Court justice came up on the floor.

The ALP had a candidate. It did not go much for the candidate of the Republican and Democratic Parties, Magistrate Thomas A. Aurelio. Instead they put up their own man, Ira Palestin.

But the Stalinist faction of the ALP, under the leadership of Representative Vito Marcantonio, opposed even the slightest kind of indepen-

dence by the ALP. They called for support of Aurelio, but lost.

A few days later, District Attorney Hogan revealed that Aurelio was the candidate not only of the Democrats, Republicans and Stalinists, but actually placed in nomination by none other than Frank Costello, czar of the slot machine racket, gambling entrepreneur and former business associate of Lucky Luciano, Lepke, Gurrath (Murder, Inc.) and of the "Bug-Meyer" mob.

Nice judge, this Aurelio. Perfect companion for the Stalinists!

of organized labor in politics last year by the tremendous vote he drew for Governor of New York State.

The Role of Hillman

Into the picture walked Sidney Hillman, who left the ALP last year to support the Democratic Party when the ALP ran Alfange. Hillman is a Roosevelt man and has been acting as his whip in the labor move-

no extension of the ALP to other states for he fears that it might give rise to a truly Independent Party of Labor and thus break the Roosevelt front and it hold on the labor movement.

O'Leary didn't last long as a candidate. The Stalinists were opposed to his original nomination for they didn't want even to pretend that the ALP would put up an independent candidate.

Report on the Brewster Strike --

(Continued from page 1)

port. The Stalinists tried to obstruct the meeting by bringing in irrelevant issues and accusing the leadership of "playing politics." They booted the delegation from the Johnsville plant which had come to the meeting to appeal for support, booted the militants who urged union solidarity and wildly applauded the WLB telegram demanding that the workers return to the shop.

They violently opposed even so mild and legal a measure as invoking the strike vote permitted under the anti-labor Smith-Connolly bill. Their only program seemed to be—kiss the foot that kicks you and ask for more of the same. The final vote clearly demonstrated that the racket they raised was out of all proportion to their real strength.

The Newark plant also voted to support the Johnsville strikers by calling for a strike vote after a thirty-day period.

The following day, August 26, despite the fact that, in addition to the original four, seven more guards had been arrested, and then thirty-one more, bringing the total to forty-

two, the Johnsville workers voted to return to work pending a strike vote in thirty days. All but the four guards originally arrested have now been released, with the stipulation that they remain within one hundred miles of the plant. Four of the guards are still in jail and there are still no charges against them.

A Fight Against Union-Busting

If these facts could leave any doubt in any worker's mind about what was really behind this strike, a telegram sent by Riebel to Secretary of the Navy Knox while the strike was on should make the issue crystal clear. Riebel, ignoring the almost unanimous strike vote, stated in his telegram that about forty unionists, acting through the steward system, which permits one steward for every seventy-five men, are obstructing production in the plant. He further said that he can double production at Brewster if the government can find some way of abolishing the "trial boards" guaranteed by the union contract, which grant the worker a union hearing before he can be fired.

Riebel, in short, in cooperation

with the Navy and the government, is out to smash Local 365 by destroying the only safeguard the worker has against attacks by the management. Local 365 is being used as a "guinea pig" to test the strength of the unions throughout the country!

The attack on the guards' seniority rights at Johnsville is part of a nation-wide drive on the part of the corporations (in this particular case in cooperation with the Navy) to

remove all plant guards from union jurisdiction and use them as strike-breaking, union-busting "storm troopers" both during the war and after it is ended.

The fight of the Johnsville workers is of the deepest concern to all workers—they are fighting for the whole trade union movement and need and deserve the support of all labor in their fight against the union-busting campaign of the bosses.

389,000,000 People in Revolt!
India's masses in revolt against British imperialism. . . The astounding facts and figures behind the rebellion of the most cruelly exploited victims of world capitalism. . . The story you have never read before.

INDIA IN REVOLT
100 Pages By HENRY JUDD 25¢ Postpaid

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

According to Economist, Not 20,000,000 But . . .

23,500,000 Will Be Jobless

By SUSAN GREEN

Most capitalist opinion on post-war unemployment is based on the assumption that after the immediate freak boom, the demand for goods will not fall below the 1939 level. Just why this assumption is made is hard to figure out. For this simple reason:

The year 1939 was, by no means a typical peacetime year. In 1939 American business was supplying considerable of the war demands of the belligerents and was already stepping up production for domestic war demands. But, for the sake of argument, let us take this baseless hope for the 1939 demand for goods, as our starting point also.

Do you know that in 1939-40 there were still 9,500,000 unemployed workers? Well, that's a fact.

Dr. Julius Hirsch, the capitalist economist quoted in last week's article, states that jobs will be needed for "fourteen million or so more persons than in 1939." This, of course, makes his estimate of twenty million post-war unemployed a bit too low. By simple arithmetic, fourteen million plus nine and a half million already unemployed in 1939, equal twenty-three and a half million workers eligible for the army of post-war unemployed.

Where Will They Find Jobs?

Will any number of these employable workers find jobs in agriculture? Dr. Hirsch believes that "as a result of improved techniques and equipment, the number of persons really needed will be less than in 1939."

So that, instead of agriculture absorbing more than the 10,700,000 farm workers it did in 1939, it is likely to need less, and thus increase rather than decrease the figure of twenty-three and a half million unemployed.

How about distribution (department stores, etc.), finance (banks, brokerage houses, etc.) and the service trades (cleaning, laundering, repairing, etc.)—a group of industries which used 10,500,000 workers in 1939? Will these industries have openings for any of the 23,500,000 jobless?

In these fields, labor conditions during the war have compelled the use of labor-saving techniques and of a higher degree of individual efficiency. So that, with the possible exception of the field of repairs, the existing channels of operation can handle a considerably increased volume of goods and business. And if the increased volume does not materialize, even the existing staffs of workers will not be needed.

Will more men and women be required to run the railroads or to man the ships than in 1939? Here, too, the answer is negative. Dr. Hirsch says: "No additional employment, as compared with 1939, may be expected from the railroads." As to ocean shipping, after the last war it took ten years for this business to recover its 1913 level. After demobilization and the immediate post-war shipping needs, a similar slump in ocean traffic is expected this time also.

Well, let's try mining. Any bet-

ter luck here? Dr. Hirsch states simply: "The industry as a whole has constantly lost manpower, primarily as a result of mechanization, which has made very considerable progress during the war."

How about oil production? "As for the petroleum industry, it is, doubtfully that it will require more hands, because it is already highly developed," says Dr. Hirsch.

Facts Against Fancies

Perhaps the reader wonders why so much stock is placed in the opinion of this Dr. Julius Hirsch. Here is why: He wrote the article from which extensive quotes are taken, for the business men who read Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly. He wrote this article to give business men the real low-down on the "optimistic group of planners" who are "solving" the unemployment problem as fast as their glib tongues can wag or their fleet fingers can typewrite.

The facts, figures and opinions seriously presented for the guidance of the business world are more reliable by far than the demagogic speeches of the Wallaces and Willkies, who don't care what they promise to get worker support—and than the wild-eyed "plans" of the well-wishers who take their wishes for facts.

So to go back to those 23,500,000 post-war industrial orphans. Will they perhaps be able to get asylum in the production of consumer non-durable goods? Again the job-seekers will be greeted with the "No Help Wanted" signs.

In this branch of manufacture the number of workers employed to get out the great mass of consumer non-durable goods is almost unbelievably small.

For instance, in 1939 only 1,009,000 workers were required in the manu-

Prisoners for Profits!

Under the excuse that a critical labor shortage exists in the various farm areas, farm owners are obtaining war prisoners and soldiers to do the work. This is, in fact, a way in which wages and other conditions are broken down.

In Clarksdale, Miss. E. J. Mullen, a large plantation owner, attempted to hire local workers at \$2.00 for a fourteen-hour day. Local workers refused to work for such wages and hours. The prevailing wage on all of the other plantations in the vicinity is \$2.50 to \$3.00 for a ten-hour day.

Mullen, through the War Department, was given Italian war prisoners to work his plantation at the rate of eighty cents per day and board.

In a confidential report of the War Manpower Commission it is revealed that peon wages are being paid to the war prisoners. Over two hundred and forty private concerns which have contracted with the War Department in the past two months to hire war prisoners are paying wages ranging from ten to nineteen cents an hour.

Churchill's Diplomacy --

(Continued from page 1)

Behind the great diplomatic struggle between the three powers stands a Europe whose people are in revolt against the unbearable conditions created by the war. They are in revolt, too, against the totalitarian regime of German fascism.

First there was Italy, and now Denmark and the Balkans. The struggle is still going on in Italy and it will continue in Denmark and the Balkans. The movement of the workers and peasants of all the European countries is beginning to show itself.

facture of boots and shoes, men's and women's clothing, tires and tubes, cigars and cigarettes, meat packing. For about a million workers to turn out this big list of commodities for domestic and export trade tells the story of the wonders of modern mass production methods—even before the great technological strides made during the war period.

One of the starry-eyed planners, by name Stuart Chase, "expects" the addition of 1,000,000 more workers in the manufacture of clothing. Dr. Hirsch tells his business men readers not to expect anything of the kind, saying: "As for one million additional clothing workers, they could produce, with the help of mechanization, the fantastic amount of four or five times as much as was bought in 1939." WHEREAS, REALISTICALLY SPEAKING, THE DEMAND WILL BE LESS BY FAR THAN IN 1939.

No, there will not be any openings for workers in the field of consumer non-durable goods, either.

Why Unemployment?

Of course, the reason is not that the population of this country does not need and cannot use four or five times the amount consumed in 1939. Quite the contrary.

Many millions of the people live far below the bare subsistence level. Millions more get by only by the skin of their teeth. And even the so-called well-off workers do not begin to live the good life that this machine age could provide for them and their families. Definitely the reason for unemployment is not that there is no need for the goods and services that the unemployed workers could be producing.

The reason is that the wages of the working people are too low to create a demand for the things that the working people need and that the unemployed could be making. In cutting the pie of national wealth, the capitalists give their workers a thin little sliver, keeping the hog's share for themselves. THE PROFIT SYSTEM PREVENTS THE FULL EMPLOYMENT OF LABOR TO ITS FULL PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY.

Furthermore, under capitalism, the big corporations—which Mr. Wallace thinks are "harmless or beneficent"—utilize all improvements in labor productivity in their own interest. They reduce their wage bill and increase their profit-take by firing workers. Whereas the civilized method of a socialist society would be to shorten the hours of toil, thus lengthening the leisure and the life of the workers.

The next article in this series will take up the manufacture of automobiles, refrigerators, radios, etc., from the point of view of how many jobs it can provide for the 23,500,000 post-war jobless. These fields of production that the "planners" expect will give a new lease of life to the capitalist system—such as airplane manufacture and the construction industry—will also be considered from the same point of view.

These struggles of the masses are against the old order of militarism, oppression and poverty. They want to get rid of all oppressors and they will not cease their struggle for freedom until they attain victory.

In the light of the growing mass movement in Europe, we have a complete picture of Allied policy as presented by Churchill. The Allies had a chance to pull Italy out of the war. But their fear of the masses, of workers' power, of a new society, drove them to seek an agreement with the rotten regime of that miserable little King Victor Emanuel and his flunkey, Marshal Badoglio.

And now Churchill promises the fascist King George of Greece that an Allied victory will guarantee his throne, as well as the throne of the totalitarian monarchy of Yugoslavia.

A grave danger faces the European people: a danger that the Allies will foist upon them the rotten remnants of the old, corrupt and incompetent dictator regimes which exploited them. But this time the masses will have something to say about this. They are now indicating what their reply will be.

From an FSA Project In Southeast Missouri

One of the things that's being said by the bosses in most places is "\$1.75 per hundred pounds" and that they will get their crops gathered by prisoners of war. They are also saying that they won't use colored labor next year. There is just a little picking now; the crop is short and also late. It will be October before the picking is good. Only premature cotton is opening now.

The people are still leaving. Some that have small share crops are leaving them. The ginner is only offering twenty-one cents per pound in some places.

Here at home, it seems that we will be frozen here or thrown off—I don't know which. The manager tells us that every man must be home here by the first. Most men are off working, and if they return now, there's nothing for them to do here. But if they are not home, their families will be put off the project.

The back rent is to be paid up, and beginning from the first of October, the rent will be \$6.00 per month. We have a few old people who receive old age pensions, and they are being told by the manager that if FSA can get enough families to fill the houses, they will have to give up their houses. The manager said that the orders came from the main office and, as far as he knew, must be carried out.

Some of the women here are writing for their men to come home, while others are asking their men to send for them. The cost of living is some higher than it was two months ago, and nothing here to do. Our prayer is for the backing of a strong union. We will do the rest. Even if we got \$3.00 per hundred pounds for picking, and \$4.00 per day for chopping, as soon as the war is over we would be back to seventy-five cents to a dollar a day for chopping and seventy-five cents for picking—if we didn't have a union. As things look right now, I don't think it would take much to convert the white workers.

R.

Coming Attractions

- Republican Foreign Policy, by Henry Loring.
- Issues Before the UAW Convention, by Albert Gates.
- Post-War Unemployment, by Susan Green.
- War Manpower Problems, by Robert Klein.
- Events in Bolivia, by Reva Craine.
- Political articles, labor news and other features.