

Cost of Living Is Only a Joke To the WLB

By MARY BELL

This is the Era of the Wage Freeze. The theory behind the wage freeze is FDR's "equality of sacrifice" program. The wage freeze has been translated into a bitter fact, as every working man and woman knows. Equality of sacrifice was never more than oratorical fireworks to dazzle and blind American people while the profiteers were coining money out of the blood and devastation of the war.

Now that the war in Europe is drawing to a close, a more complete balance sheet can be drawn of the debits and credits of labor and capital in the war. Labor sent its millions to the battlefield. Its birthright, the right to strike, was sold to Roosevelt by its leaders for the mumbo-jumbo of "equality of sacrifice." It suffered high prices and shoddy goods, since the price ceilings did not hold.

Labor enters the fourth year of the war decidedly in the red.

Elsewhere on this page we find representative figures showing how capital has fared under the "equality of sacrifice" program. Contrary to the assertion of Roosevelt that "there will be no new war millionaires," these have appeared, while the sacrifices of big business are invisible. Their profits beggar all description.

Business enters the fourth year of the war decidedly in the black.

THE WAR ANTI-LABOR BOARD

The thermostat to keep wages frozen, controlled by FDR, is that object of hatred and subject of curses by all union militants, the War Labor Board. The CIO and AFL have presented the figures to show that prices have raced past the ceiling imposed by the Little Steel formula. "Too bad," says the WLB in effect, "but FDR says no wage raise." And what do the labor leaders do? Tell the rank and file unionists to tighten their belts, sit it out for the duration, keep the no-strike pledge, and, of course—elect the sponsor of the wage freeze, Roosevelt.

The AFL has gone a little farther, recently, in refusing to sit on the board during the hearings on the CIO steel workers' case. The steel workers can get a few crumbs in retroactive pay under the "wage stabilization" clauses in their contracts, while the AFL can get practically nothing until the whole matter of the revision of the Little Steel formula is taken up. The CIO members of the board are content to argue for a few cents' increase, believing it will satisfy the rank and file a little because of the retroactive clauses in contracts. After all, the salaries of the officials are not involved; they are guaranteed by the dues of the members of the union.

The recent move of the WLB to refuse even to recommend a wage increase, to state that the matter of upward revisions is outside of its province since it doesn't know what the effect will be on the rest of the economy and to put the question into the hands of Roosevelt is a bald revelation of who his master is. And when FDR has spoken on wages, which is a rare thing these days, it has been against any revision.

Roosevelt's silence speaks louder than promises who his master is. Every worker knows the wage freeze benefits the capitalist. Less wages, more profits. This babbling about "equality of sacrifice" is just to confuse us.

To buttress the case of the WLB and Roosevelt, the Bureau of Labor

WDL Tests Law Licensing Union Organizers

NEWNAN, Ga. (WDL)—"The Workers Defense League will file an amicus curiae brief in the Georgia Superior Court supporting the current appeal of the arrest and fining of W. F. Barker, Textile Workers Union national representative, for violation of the Newnan ordinance requiring union organizers to pay a \$5,000 registration fee," said Morris Milgram, national secretary of the Workers Defense League.

Barker arranged his own arrest to begin a court test of the Newnan ordinance after a similar law in Mill-Edgewood, Ga., was declared unconstitutional by the Georgia Superior Court.

TWUA's attorney in Newnan, who represented Barker in court, charged that the TWUA representative's conviction was a clear violation of the civil liberties provisions of the U. S. criminal code.

Barker himself has filed notice that he will appeal his conviction "to the highest court in the land, if possible."

LABOR ACTION

NOVEMBER 13, 1944

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR

ONE CENT

Vote Proves Labor Can Build Its Own Party!

We Know This Isn't News, But War Has Made Big Business Bigger!

Do you want to know what "equality of sacrifice" means? Well, we tried to tell you that it meant labor sacrificing everything for the war effort while big business enriched itself. We published figures on profits and wages to illustrate our point. All of this material showed a tremendous growth in profits. We also showed that wages, in relation to production, declined sharply. We also showed that millions of workers were greatly underpaid and had received no wage increases since the outbreak of the war.

The report of *Business Week* shows that forty-one business enterprises had assets of \$1,000,000,000 or more each at the end of 1943, as compared with thirty-eight companies in 1942 and thirty-two in 1941.

But remember, as you read these figures on their swollen wealth, it came as a result of the intense labor of tens of millions of American workers producing at tremendous speed for low wages frozen by a presidential edict.

	Assets as of		Gain Since 1939
	Dec. 31, 1943	Dec. 31, 1939	
American Tel. & Tel. Co.	\$6,813,000,000	\$5,227,000,000	11%
Pennsylvania R. R.	2,812,000,000	2,359,000,000	19%
Standard Oil Co. (N. J.)	2,328,000,000	2,035,000,000	14%
General Motors Corp.	2,265,000,000	1,323,000,000	71%
Southern Pacific System	2,237,000,000	1,908,000,000	17%
U. S. Steel Corp.	2,106,000,000	1,769,000,000	19%
New York Central R. R.	2,102,000,000	1,820,000,000	15%
Union Pacific R. R.	1,456,000,000	1,219,000,000	19%
E. I. du Pont de Nemours	1,115,000,000	858,000,000	30%
Bethlehem Steel Corp.	1,045,000,000	733,000,000	42%
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	1,030,000,000	930,000,000	11%
Ford Motor Co.	1,009,000,000	692,000,000	24%

The fourteen non-financial leaders, on basis of annual sales or revenues are:

	1943		1939
	1943	1939	
General Motors Corp.	\$3,796,000,000	\$1,377,000,000	176%
U. S. Steel Corp.	1,977,000,000	904,000,000	119%
Bethlehem Steel Corp.	1,903,000,000	414,000,000	360%
American Tel. & Tel. Co.	1,648,000,000	1,107,000,000	49%
Swift & Co.	1,490,000,000	757,000,000	97%
Armour & Co.	1,490,000,000	715,000,000	98%
Standard Oil Co. (N. J.)	1,303,000,000	934,000,000	40%
General Electric Co.	1,358,000,000	305,000,000	345%
Curtiss-Wright Corp.	1,295,000,000	49,000,000	2543%
Douglas Aircraft Co.	988,000,000	28,000,000	3429%
Pennsylvania R. R.	980,000,000	431,000,000	127%
Chrysler Corp.	886,000,000	550,000,000	61%
Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Co.	831,000,000	16,000,000	5444%
Bendix Aviation Corp.	823,000,000	42,000,000	1860%

(Ford Motor Co. and Aluminum Co. of America may properly belong in this group but no sales figures are available.)

Franklin D. Roosevelt was re-elected President of the United States for a fourth term in what appears at the time of this writing to be a record vote. He defeated Thomas E. Dewey, the candidate of the Republican Party.

Roosevelt was elected, as the voting clearly shows, because of the support given to him by labor. But he was not a labor candidate. He was and is the leader of a capitalist political party. The same applies to Dewey.

Labor had no candidate of its own in the elections; it merely supplied the bulk of the vote for one; it elected the representative of another party!

The heat of the campaign will quickly subside. Roosevelt has no obligation to anyone. His election promise was that he would continue the policies he pursued prior to the campaign. What this means is continued prosecution of the war in the same way as hitherto. It means the continued international expansion of American capitalist power, guaranteeing big business in this country the lion's share of world profits.

Navy Mutiny Convictions Due to Jim Crow

NEW YORK (WDL)—"The Workers Defense League joins in support of the request of NAACP Counsel Thurgood Marshall for a thorough and impartial investigation by the Navy Department of the action of the singling out fifty Negro sailors to be charged with mutiny for refusal to load ammunition at the Mare Island Depot in California, August 9, 1944," states the Rev. Aron S. Gilmartin, national chairman of the Workers Defense League, in a letter to Secretary of the Navy Forrestal.

The letter further states that "the only Naval personnel loading ammunition regularly were Negroes, with the exception of their officers and petty officers. Although many of these men have had special training in such schools as gunnery schools,

The same will hold true on the home front. He will continue the domestic policies which preceded the election. That means the maintenance of the seven-point stabilization program, of which only one point, the wage freeze, kept in line by the War Labor Board, has actually been carried out. In reality, nothing important will have changed.

Labor, through the PAC and the officialdoms of the CIO and AFL, gave unstinting support to Roosevelt without asking anything in return. They carried on a crusade as though the world were coming to an end and the one person who could save it was Roosevelt. Their campaign resembled anything but an independent struggle for labor's interests. No, labor's representatives, on



(Continued on page 4)

(Continued on page 4)

CIO CASE FOR PUTTING THE HEAT TO THE WAGE FREEZE!

Steel—By Philip Murray

"The public members of the panel have found that there has been a minimum rise in the retail prices between January 1941 and July 1944 from 28.2% to 29.7%. In addition, the public members find that there is a further but unestimated increase in the total living costs since January 1941. The President in September 1942 stated that if a further 15% increase did occur, it would constitute a 15% sales tax upon wage earners and could not be tolerated.

"Corporate profits for 1944, after taxes, increased 198% over the 1936 to 1939 peacetime era. Corporate profits for the same year, before taxes, show an increase over the peacetime era of 449%."

"But what has happened to the wage earners and what provision has been made to protect them?"

"Savings? I have already pointed out that the OPA study showed that 66.4% of the spending units, which includes families and individuals, earned \$2,500 a year or less and this number has only 11.6% of the total savings. The study made by the Steelworkers Union of the expenditures of the average steelworker shows that he is not saving but rather is incurring a weekly loss. This in spite of the fact that the study covered the period when he was working longer and thereby earning more weekly pay.

"Depreciation accounts? The steel worker has no such account although he has worked harder and longer and certainly has been severely depreciated during the war period.

"Reserves? The steelworker has no swollen reserves such as one may find in the reserve accounts established by the steel corporations and others during this war period.

"On the contrary, all that the steelworker has facing him is cutbacks, decreased working time, decreased weekly earnings, decreased purchasing power, and possibly unemployment."

"If the U. S. Steel Corporation were to break even in 1944 it would be entitled to a refund under this legislation (including its adjustment of its 10% refund) of \$49,200,000. The U. S. Steel Corporation had average net earnings, after taxes, during 1936-39 of \$44,732,000. If the industry breaks even during 1944 this refund will be \$12 million.... These refunds can be used for any purpose, including the payment of dividends."

Auto—By R. J. Thomas

"In terms of net income to stockholders, auto industry profits rose from \$261 millions in 1939 to \$432 millions in 1943.

"A special study made by our union reveals that profits after taxes for 27 major aircraft producers skyrocketed upwards by 448% between 1939 and 1943. Profits for these companies before taxes had increased by 1,503 per cent.

"Recently the Office of Price Administration has released indexes of output per man-hour. These estimates show an increase in man-hour output in durable goods manufacturing amounting

The justification for the fight which LABOR ACTION has made against the wage freeze, the Little Steel Formula and the War Labor Board is supplied by the latest report on wages and post-war prospects by Economic Outlook, a publication of the CIO.

The report, which is a compilation of profits and wage conditions in four major industries, as well as a forecast of post-war unemployment, is a damning indictment of Roosevelt's domestic program. Since the statements come from the labor leaders themselves, they are a double indictment of the labor officialdom's political support of an Administration which represents one of the two capitalist parties, the political arms of big business.

Elsewhere in this issue, LABOR ACTION supplies a political answer to the terrible contradiction in which the labor leaders find themselves in condemning the domestic policies of Roosevelt and his machine, while at the same time giving him their complete political support.

to nineteen per cent since 1939 and over ten per cent since 1941. ...In co-operation with labor, new production techniques and processes have been developed. According to K. T. Keller of the Chrysler Corporation, technological progress made by his company since 1941 is equal to about twelve years of normal peacetime development.

"We recently completed a survey of employment changes in 447 basic war plants in the auto and aircraft industries. Employment in these plants was approximately one million at their peak of war production. By July, employment in these plants had declined by 160,000 or sixteen per cent. One hundred and ninety-seven of the 447 had suffered production cutbacks."

Aluminum—By N. A. Zonarich

"Now, cutbacks are in full force in the aluminum industry. Thousands have been laid off. Hundreds if not thousands have been demoted from their regular jobs and assigned to lower-paying occupations. Others have been stopped in the midst of upgrading programs. Draftees and quits are not replaced. The entire aluminum industry is dominated by an atmosphere of retrenchment. The Aluminum Company of America claims that nearly one-third of its employees have been laid off."

Rubber—By G. L. Patterson

"Wages in the rubber industry are predominantly based on wage incentive systems. In many instances the rubber workers have found their rates being cut since the stabilization policy was adopted. Wages in the rubber industry prior to the war were based upon a six-hour day and thirty-six-hour week. In order to attain the wartime production required, rubber workers have maintained

the six-hour day-thirty-six-hour week efficiency even though they are now working forty-eight to sixty hours per week. When the rubber industry reverts to the pre-war six-hour day and thirty-six-hour week, rubber workers will inevitably sustain a loss of fifty to sixty per cent in take-home pay."

Low Rate of Increases

General increases in wage rates amounted to only sixteen per cent from January, 1941, to April, 1944, according to a study of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics dealing with urban factory wages. This is only one per cent more than the Little Steel Formula provides. It is only a little more than half the increase in the cost of living conservatively reported by the Mitchell Committee of experts.

The War Labor Board has authorized adjustments for inequalities and inequities of wage rates and for sub-standard rates. Merit increases and in-grade promotions have also been permitted. Greater output under incentive payment plans has added to the hourly earnings of some workers. When these factors are included in addition to general increases, the total rise from January, 1941, to April, 1944, in urban factory wage rates is only twenty-eight per cent, according to the BLS.

The War Labor Board panel in the Steel Case analyzes the factors that have led to a \$344,000,000 increase in weekly payrolls from January, 1941, to April, 1944. It allocates the causes as follows (in percentage points):

Effect of general wage rate changes	15.3
Effect of increased employment	42.8
Effect of longer hours of work at straight time	14.7
Effect of overtime	6.1
Effect of shift to higher paid industries	7.5

Effect of piece rate earnings, merit increases	13.6
Effect of general wage rate changes	15.3

As the nation changes back from war to peace, many of the special conditions that contributed to increased earnings and total payrolls will cease. Indeed, only the general wage rate level will not immediately be affected by shorter hours, layoffs and shifts back to peacetime patterns of employment. And even basic rates are not safe from employer pressure.

The Plunge of Payrolls

It isn't only labor which should be interested in seeing wage rates raised. The entire country, for the sake of its future, should be concerned in maintaining and increasing the purchasing power of millions of workers. The effect on that purchasing power if rates are not raised is shown in a study recently completed by the OPA. This study takes 1943 wage and salary payrolls in various industries and shows what will happen to them if 1939 conditions are approximated: (1) if overtime is cut down, (2) if the number of hours worked per week drops, (3) if the workers return to the industries they came from and to the wage rates prevailing in those industries, and (4) if employment drops. These estimates are conservative since they do not reflect the disappearance of night shift and incentive premiums.

THE BIG DROP

At full employment and present wage rates, but with 1939 hours and employment pattern, payrolls would fall by fourteen billion dollars from the ninety billion dollars now being paid in civilian non-agricultural industries. If we go back to the 1939 level of employment, they will fall by thirty-three billion dollars, or to sixty-three per cent of their 1943 level. This cannot happen if we want to avoid severe and perhaps chronic depression.

MANUFACTURING HARD HIT

Payrolls in manufacturing will drop by twenty-three billion dollars, or to forty-two per cent of the 1943 level, if present rates are maintained but other 1939 conditions prevail.

No one knows whether employment will drop to 1939 levels. We do not know that there is a good possibility that hours will drop to pre-war levels and that employment will be distributed among industries as it was in 1939. If this happens, even though we have full employment, manufacturing payrolls would drop to three-fifths what they were in 1943. Payrolls in durable goods industries would fall to only forty-one per cent of what they were in 1943.

Purchasing power of people working in the transportation equipment (except automobiles) industry would drop to just seven per cent of the 1943 level. We cannot allow these holes to be torn in the nation's purchasing power if we expect to maintain prosperity. Wage rates must be raised.

A Study in Imperialism:

How U. S. and Britain Helped Japan to Power

By DON BATEMAN

(Reprinted from the British New Leader)

A modern history of Japan, of her rise to power as an imperialist nation capable of seriously menacing British and American power in the Far East, could be aptly summarized as a record of British Far Eastern foreign policy. The skillful employment of the balance of power policy of the Foreign Office has resulted in the creation of a new world power in the Pacific in the short space of eighty years.

This one-time land of cherry-blossom tranquility is now the industrialized nation which prior to the war was undercutting British and American exports in all the world's markets.

EARLY BEGINNINGS

At the end of the nineteenth century Britain reigned supreme in China, satiated with the spoils of the Opium Wars, and the possessor of Hong Kong and Shanghai. This phase of the opening up of China and the world dominance of British imperialism was also the curtain-raiser for the emergence of France, Germany and Russia as maturing imperialisms seeking outlets in the East in the shape of markets in China. As a counter to these menacing challenges, British diplomacy stretched out a hand to the immature rulers of Japan, who had only recently awakened (1868) from a feudal torpor, and deposed the Tokugawa Shogunate. Its successors, the military class who laid the foundations for the present status-minded monopoly capitalism, gained much from their contemporary experience of Bismarck and his unifying of the

German state and creation of imperial power.

The year 1894 saw the first Anglo-Japanese agreement. The ink on this document was scarcely dry before Japan sallied into China in her first modern war of aggression. Today, fifty years later, Japan still regards "nibbling at China" as the cornerstone of her foreign policy of expansion.

JUNIOR PARTNER

This open pillaging of the feudal carcass of China was sponsored and inspired by Whitehall, who realized the advantages of a junior partner in the East who was capable of affording serious diversions to other European competitors. The direct advantages to Britain were the opening up to trade of Shanshi, Chungking, Soochow and Hangkow, and the forcing of the Yangtse-Kiang for navigation.

Open opposition by the Czar and diplomatic pressure by Germany and France compelled Japan to disgorge some of her loot, thus serving as a direct example of the inspiration of this first Anglo-Jap agreement.

The 1900 national uprising in China (i.e., the "Boxer Rebellion") seriously challenged the position of the foreign exploiters. Britain was fully occupied with the Boer War in South Africa, which bogged 200,000 of her troops and the bulk of her available merchant shipping, and, fearing Russian and German penetration into China under the guise of a "punitive expedition," she blithely suggested that Japan should take charge of the campaign.

Not unwisely, nor unexpectedly, the European powers declined the offer!

A full treaty of alliance between

Britain and Japan in 1902 included provisions for the financing by London, of Japanese industry and armed power. A specific clause that Britain was only to aid Japan should the latter be at war with two other powers left the path clear for the Japanese attack upon Russia in 1904.

This was the first modern war of swift annihilation. Without a declaration of war, the Japanese sank the Russian fleet at Port Arthur, blockaded the scattered naval remnants and routed the Eastern armies of the sleepy, feudal, Czarist bureaucracy in the Battle of Mukden.

This event, the first defeat of a Western power by a nation east of Suez, precipitated the first (1905) Russian revolution. Under cover of the conflict, and with Czarist forces tottering from anemic weakness, the British government dispatched expeditions to Tibet and Afghanistan, thus securing the frontiers of India. Hitler is truly an apprentice at the bloody game of power politics!

CASHING IN

Japan's forcible penetration into world politics, sponsored by Britain, her "alma mater," can best be epitomized in the sharp rise of her exports of manufactured goods from zero in 1900 to \$73,500,000 in 1910. In these years her railway mileage and shipping tonnage both doubled, and her foreign trade rose from 265,000,000 yen in 1895 to 810,000,000 yen in 1905.

The German naval law of 1900, which was the first serious emblematic challenge to British maritime supremacy, necessitated British naval concentration in the West. To defend the Eastern Empire and the trade routes, a new naval ally was necessary. That ally was Japan.

The big naval dockyards of Yokohama, the heavy steel industry, and all the appliances of war were inaugurated in the Japanese islands with the backing of British capital, British munition firms and British technicians. Leading personnel for the Navy were trained by the British Admiralty and battleships for the land of the Rising Sun were built in our dockyards. When the propagandists howl "Remember Hong Kong" and "Remember Pearl Harbor," our answer is "Remember the Anglo-Jap Alliance."

On the eve of the First World War, Sir Edward Grey bargained for Japanese support in the conflict. The price demanded by the now-maturing Nippon was a free hand in China. It is impossible for any nation to finance and encourage a weaker ally without that junior partner reaching adolescence, strength and self-confidence. Japan was growing up and becoming self-assertive.

Gaily fighting on the "China Front" Japan looted most of the German possessions in China and sank her merchant shipping at will. Britain was hard pressed on the Western Front and in the Middle East and struggled for Japanese support in the Mediterranean. Japan was not enthusiastic — her historic destiny lay in the Pacific.

In 1917 she secured a secret treaty with Britain, guaranteeing the preservation of her China conquests. This followed the notorious "twenty-one demands" made by the Japanese upon a weakened China in 1915, which were largely frustrated by American intervention. The U. S. A. drew attention to the Root-Tanaka agreement of 1908, which guaranteed the "Open Door" in China, and Japan eased up.

China entered the war in 1917, her bourgeoisie being pushed in by America. She hoped, at the peace conference, to obtain pledges of independence and sureties against Japan. Britain promised these (in contrast to her pledges to Japan), but at Versailles Japan was given mandates

over stolen "German" territories. The Washington Conference of 1921-22 was, however, the deciding factor. America, now the creditor nation, and still expanding her industrial and military might, curbed Japan by insisting upon "no naval parity for Japan" and her "expulsion from Shantung.

The next twenty years are a record of Japanese expansion and struggle to break the bonds of foreign empires and "go slow" appeasement policies of the "democracies." Appeasement is not merely the foster-child of pro-fascism (or the "Munichites," as some "Left" circles would avow). It was the logical policy, in an epoch of declining world markets, for capitalist nations which had plundered the valuable portions of the earth's surface and now kept them under lock and key against all competitors. But even blackmail has a limit, as recent events have shown. The 1931 Manchuria "incidents" received the notorious acquiescence of Simon at Geneva. As long as Japan would subdue the North of China, where Communist influence was very strong, Britain was prepared to buy off aggression, for she had bond-holding interests to the value of two hundred million pounds sterling in the Yangtse Basin. The protection of British interests demanded stable government and the suppression of the revolutionary movements.

In 1939, 10.6 per cent of all U.S.A. exports went to Japan. In the same year, 65 per cent of Japan's petroleum imports came from the U.S.A. and 8 per cent from British Malaya. The following further details of Japanese imports are also for 1939:

- 92 per cent scrap iron and steel from U.S.A.
 - 92 per cent copper from U.S.A. (and 7 per cent from Canada).
 - 42 per cent rubber from U.S.A. (and 32 per cent from British Malaya)
 - 8 per cent aluminum from U.S.A. and 70 per cent from Canada)
 - 91 per cent nickel from Canada
 - 97 per cent ferro alloys from U.S.A.
- These figures speak for themselves. Lads from the U.S.A. and the British Empire have been slaughtered by weapons of war directly and indirectly sent to Japan by their own countries. How hollow and sham is the hypocrisy of "ideological" war.

JAPAN IS UNIQUE

The internal economy of Japan possesses several unique characteristics. Side by side in a modern corporate state stand monopoly capitalism, early mercantilist practices, feudal landlordism and Oriental mysticism. Japan never felt the impetus of a bourgeois revolution. Her manufacturers never conquered power and subdued the landowning class, for the simple reason that the industrialists ARE the feudal landlords. There never was a period of unmitigated

free competition and laissez-faire: no struggle for power by a rising bourgeoisie, and consequently no period of effective parliamentary democracy.

In the short period of twenty years, the feudal rulers of this centralized bureaucracy have grafted onto their economic system the hybrid products of modern monopoly capitalism. The large landowning families have become the big trusts, monopolies and bankers. The large Zaibutsu ("money cliques") trusts have a strangulating grip upon the whole economy of Japan. The big four family trusts—Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Sumitomo and Yasuda—controlled in 1938 sixty per cent of the twenty-one billion yen invested in joint-stock companies. Mitsui controlled five billion yen.

The "Big Four," plus the Shibusawa and Kawasaki concerns, owned fifty-seven per cent of the funds deposited in the banks, trust companies, life, marine and fire and accident insurance companies. In 1929 this figure was forty-five per cent.

Mitsui, Mitsubishi and Sumitomo control half of Japan's copper production, half of the coal production, half of the tonnage of merchant shipping. The Oji Co. (Mitsui) owns seventy-five per cent of the paper industry, and Mitsubishi the remaining twenty-five per cent. These figures show the domination of Japan by monopolistic family enterprise. This patriarchal system, with its emperor and ancestor worship, is deeply ingrained in Japanese society, for "the ideas of any society are the ideas of its ruling class."

The Mitsui trust, as an example, consists of eleven families, the head of each being a member of the family council, and only the family may vote at council meetings. The head of the main family is ipso facto the head of the council, and the other ten families have strict and traditional family rank and status. The council is governed by a constitution drawn up in 1722 and modernized in 1900, the details of which have never been authentically published. The training of all the children in commerce, law, etc., is rigorously practiced, and simplicity and economy of living considered a virtue. The expansion and success of the ancestral line is the divine impetus for life—hence the ruthlessness of Japanese society.

In spite of the wholesale suppression of all opposition parties, there has been abundant evidence that the groupings of the Left have maintained an illegal existence. Ever since the outbreak of the war, American Left journals have carried evidence of Japanese socialist activity. Their opportunity is fast approaching. Military defeat and a Carthaginian peace loom on the horizon for the blood-stained Japanese imperialists—their hour of defeat can be the moment of victory for the workers.

WLB Antics - -

(Continued from page 1) Statistics continues to issue its phony figures on the cost of living, trying to prove that it has not risen substantially above the fifteen per cent range allowed under the Little Steel formula. Its latest statistics say that while the cost of living has risen 26.5 over the base years of 1935-39, the increase since the formula was adopted has been only a little over nine per cent. But while even the BLS figures show labor is entitled to an increase over and above the Little Steel formula, the figures of the AFL and CIO show labor is entitled to an increase of AT LEAST A THIRD OF THEIR PRESENT WAGES! Any small increase FDR gives labor as a "reward" for its support can never begin to make up this figure, let alone

the retroactivity of labor's loss in wages.

No "foxhole" arguments can defeat this claim of labor. Not while profiteering exists. The references all the labor leaders made at the recent conventions to "our boys" in order to retain the no-strike pledge are beside the point. While the sons, brothers and husbands of working people are fighting in the jungles and foxholes, they are being let down by their relatives here when labor gives up the fight against the profiteers.

There's only one way to fight for higher wages, to maintain standards for the boys who are coming back from Guadalcanal, Aachen and all the far-flung battleposts of this war:

1. Withdraw from the War Labor Board.
2. Rescind the no-strike pledge.



The Lawrence Strike Out of the Past

By RUTH PHILLIPS

Twenty-five thousand men, women and children in Lawrence, Mass., answered the call of the Industrial Workers of the World, in January, 1912, to a general strike in the textile mills of Lawrence and vicinity. These 25,000 workers were spinners, weavers, loom-fixers and wool-sorters. They were of twenty-eight different nationalities and they spoke forty-five different dialects. But they were united in their efforts to remedy the intolerable conditions under which they sweated away their lives in the textile mills.

For months they had been flocking into the Textile Workers Union set up by the IWW. When the Massachusetts Legislature passed a law reducing the work-week in the state from fifty-six to fifty-four hours a week, the textile bosses announced a proportionate reduction in wages. A two-hour reduction in wages for these workers was a catastrophe. The average wage for fifty-six hours (including the wages of skilled workers) was \$8.76 for the men and \$7.42 for the women. The average for the unskilled was \$6.00 a week. There were no paid vacations or holidays. In order to eat, whole families had to work, including the children.

THE GREAT STRUGGLE

The workers had no alternative but to strike when the wage-cut went into effect. They demanded a fifteen per cent increase in pay, a fifty-four-hour week, extra compensation for overtime work, abolition of the bonus system, and no discrimination against workers for participation in the strike.

The textile bosses brought out the local police and the state militia against the strikers. Pickets were beaten up. Hundreds were thrown into jail. Two pickets were killed, a young Syrian boy and an Italian girl. Two union organizers, Etor and Giovannetti, were arrested as accessories to the death of the girl. They were refused bail and kept in jail for seven months. This, despite the fact that there were nineteen witnesses who had seen a policeman murder the girl!

The women workers were active alongside the men during the strike. One day, at a strike meeting, the women decided to form a picket line of women and girls only for the next day. They thought that the police would not dare to attack women. The leader of the women was an Italian woman who was going to have a baby. There were other pregnant women on the picket line. The Italian woman and another pregnant woman were so terribly beaten by the police that their babies died in premature birth, and they came near death themselves.

Still the strikers held firm. The IWW raised money all over the country for the strike relief fund and the defense fund for the two organizers. The strike committee arranged to send the strikers' children to the homes of sympathizers to be cared for during the strike. Bill Haywood came to the aid of the strikers when Etor and Giovannetti were arrested. Ready to take the place of the strike committee of fifty-six, if they should be arrested, was a substitute committee of fifty-six. The mass picket lines were out every day, replenished by sympathizers from nearby cities.

The mill owners were desperate. They pulled their last trick. Their henchman, the county coroner, planted dynamite with the idea that it would then be "discovered" and the strikers accused of planting it. But the workers uncovered the plan. The coroner was arrested and convicted.

The bosses had failed to break the strike. They came to terms with the workers. Every demand in whole or in part was won.

WHAT THE STRIKE ACHIEVED

The Lawrence strike had far-reaching effects on the textile industry. New organizers were at work in textile centers throughout the country. When the Lawrence strike was settled, 250,000 textile workers the country received wage increases.

The Lawrence strike was a victory in terms of dollars and cents for the textile workers. It was also a victory for the idea of the general strike, the mass picket line and, above all, a victory for the idea of class solidarity.

State Anti-Union Laws

(WDL Release)

Organized big business has been using the war emergency to place on the statute books of the federal, state and municipal governments legislation crippling the activities of the labor movements. Most labor people are only conscious, however, of national anti-labor laws such as the Smith-Connally Act and do not realize that much state and local legislation is just as dangerous.

Two states, Colorado and Alabama, have already outlawed the closed shop. Their law provides that no one may require union membership as a condition for employment. Three states, California, Arkansas and Florida, are submitting similar laws to a referendum vote in the November elections.

\$5,000 LICENSE FOR ORGANIZERS

The most spectacular attempt by a local government to prevent the organization of labor entirely occurred recently in Georgia when the Newnan City Council enacted a law requiring organizers to purchase a \$5,000 a year license. Similar ordinances have been passed by at least three other towns in Georgia and Tennessee. In other states, such as Florida, Kansas and Texas, organizers must be American citizens, without criminal record—and in the winter vacationland they must be approved by the governor also.

Some states have passed laws limiting the right to assembly, as an added hindrance to organization. In Idaho and South Dakota no agent or representative of a bargaining unit may enter an employer's premises without the owner's consent, while in Alabama and Arkansas assembly at or near a place of labor to prevent work is prohibited.

And if a union is successfully organized, in spite of these many obstacles, its activities are carefully limited. In Colorado, a strike, labor's most effective weapon, may be called only after thirty days' notice to a farmer, or twenty days' notice to any other type of employer. In the same state, the labor relations act forbids striking unless authorized by the majority of workers in a bargaining unit, secondary boycotts, hindering the pursuit of any lawful work by mass picketing, threats or force. Kansas and Florida outlaw jurisdictional strikes, sympathetic strikes and secondary boycotts.

CONTROL UNION FUNCTIONS

Other laws controlling the functions of trade unions have also been enacted in South Dakota, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Mississippi. And in many other states, reactionary groups are lobbying constantly to pass restrictions on unions.

The Workers Defense League and many trade unions are fighting some of these laws in courts; but the best answer to such anti-labor legislation is to extend the influence of labor both industrially and politically, and for all liberal Americans to help put pressure on their representatives to defeat all anti-labor laws.

Readers Take the Floor...

CP Unions in the Commerce Chamber

Dear Editor:

Over a year ago the San Pedro Longshoremen voted down a recommendation of their executive board that they join the local Chamber of Commerce. The Bridges men and the Communist clique of the People's World were the strongest supporters of this recommendation. Later the NMU, the Fishermen and the Shipyard Workers, all CIO, followed the reactionary lead of the Communists and joined the Chamber of Commerce. The AFL unions in this area had better sense. Since then the Shipyard Workers Union has withdrawn.

Now comes the payoff. Last week the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce came out in support of Proposition No. 12, "The Right to Work Amendment," as it is treacherously labeled. This is an initiative measure on the ballot which would do away with the closed shop. In fact, Proposition No. 12 is so raw that even the State Chamber of Commerce has come out against it. The big money behind this anti-union measure is the Merchants & Manufacturers Association of Southern California.

The NMU, still a member, is trying to get the Chamber of Commerce to reconsider. Why any union would

ever want to be a member of this body is difficult to imagine. But NOW—well, words fail me. I hope you will be able to print this letter, which will give your readers another example of where the reactionary communist line leads to. A Longshoreman.

Blasting at the Bureaucrats

Dear Sirs: Keep up the good work and keep blasting the UAW-CIO international. I am a union worker and I like your style of coming out in the open and expressing your views and laying your cards on the table. Mrs. A. P. K.

Our reader has reference to our criticisms of the policies pursued by the officialdom. We will keep up the working hammering away for progressive and militant unionism as the best way to advance and protect the interests of labor and the union movement against the bosses.

Letter from a Colombian Friend

Esteemed Sirs: With true pleasure I address myself

to you to ask that you do me the favor of sending me the newspaper entitled LABOR ACTION, for which I thank you heartily. Without further ado it is a pleasure to close as your friend, G. G. V., Bogota, Colombia.

Interested Reader Wants Old Copies

Dear Sirs: I have read a back copy of your publication and am quite interested in being a subscriber. I am enclosing a \$1.00 bill to be put on your mailing list. I would also appreciate it if you have a few recent back copies of your paper on hand to send me a few so that I can start catching up on your interesting articles. Thanking you for the same, I remain J. J. P., Chicago, Ill.

We're Taking Care Of It Right Now

Dear Sirs: I am sending the sum of sixty cents for which start my subscription of the LABOR ACTION as quick as hell. Yours for action, E. B.

Two Cities Beat Quota in Sub Campaign; Spurt Needed to Put Drive Over the Top

Two cities have gone over their quotas, Akron and Streator. Akron eight per cent over its goal and Streator twelve per cent. We congratulate them and have already begun wrapping up the prize of \$10 worth of books for the one that finishes out ahead. Not that we would mind handing out the prize to another city that came out of the rear like a dark horse to cop the race. We are impartial and our concern is only with more and more subs coming in from all the cities.

We are a few percentage points behind the figure we should be at for this week of the campaign. The fault is that of a few cities which have let branches like Detroit, Buffalo and Akron carry the brunt of the drive. We refer to Philadelphia, Reading, St. Louis, Cleveland and New York.

What can be done by other branches can be done by you also. Besides sticking to the house to house canvassing whose results show up only after the initial hard work, all the friends of LABOR ACTION must go over in their minds the potential readers of LABOR ACTION in their shops, yards and neighborhoods. Those people won't approach you. You have to contact them, show them the paper and talk it up. Our friends all over the country have gotten results that way and if it's good enough for them it will be good enough for you.

City	Quota	Week	Total	Pct.
New York	1,000	14	423	42
Akron	150	54	162	108
Buffalo	150	38	141	94
Chicago	300	48	200	66.6
Cleveland	200	13	39	19.5
Detroit	750	27	602	80
Los Angeles	200	—	119	59.5
Louisville	25	—	25	100
Philadelphia	175	12	62	35.4
Reading	50	—	16	32
St. Louis	50	—	16	32
San Francisco	200	15	102	51
Seattle	150	—	104	69
Streator	50	9	59	112
Youngstown-Warren	50	—	0	—
National Office	500	41	123	24.6
Totals	4,000	271	2193	55

SUB BLANK

YES, I want LABOR ACTION. Please send it to me regularly. Enclosed find twenty-five cents in stamps or coin for a six-month subscription or fifty cents for a year's subscription (Check which.) Name _____ Address _____ City _____ Zone _____ State _____

China: What's Behind Return of Gen. Stilwell

By L. K. LOW

Few diplomatic events during the course of the war have stirred up as much speculation as the recent recall of General Stilwell from the China theater of the war. Of all the explanations given, one at least may be ruled out at the start. That is the official interpretation of both Roosevelt and Chiang Kai-shek to the effect that "Vinegar Joe" had temperamental differences from the slower-moving Generalissimo. Among American people, this crude explanation should only result in more intensive efforts to get at the root cause.

The basic reason for Stilwell's return is beyond a shadow of doubt the many-sided internal crisis in China today. Economic, political and military bankruptcy stares Chiang in the face. The signs of the crisis are so numerous that only a few can be mentioned. For example, there has been in the recent past a series of executions of high ranking Chinese officers. (This is a significant departure from the usual Chinese procedure, which is to punish military incompetence or rivalry by sending the culprit to the United States on a good-will tour. The merit of the former practice, from the point of view of the Chinese ruling class, was that it got rid of troublesome warlords while saving their face and that of warlords in general.) Also, in the recent period, there have been desertions to the Japanese by Chinese officers and men—the former anxious to be on the winning side and the latter desirous of full rice bowl which is a rarity in the Chinese army (for the private).

Then too, that political jackal, Sun Fo, has begun to criticize Chiang Kai-shek's regime and fish around for a re-alliance with the Chinese Communists, agents of Stalin—a sure barometer of the Kuomintang's waning self-confidence. Finally there are the recurrent visits to Chungking of some of America's highest officials—Vice-President Wallace, Donald Nelson and General Hurley, unquestionably pressuring Chiang to make peace with the Communists and work more closely with Stalinist Russia.

CORRUPTION IN CHUNGKING

On the road to its complete domination over China, American imperialism has come up against an obstacle created by its own corruption, lies and material support. For years Chiang Kai-shek has been presented to the American public as the upright and cherished leader of China's national unity and heroic struggle against Japan. Now that his bankruptcy, corruption and incompetence to lead China are so obvious, the U. S. must find a new maneuver to maintain Chiang as the medium for its control over China.

The recall of Stilwell has saved Chiang's face in China. In the current social crisis, it is necessary for Roosevelt to preserve in China the facade of national leadership by the Kuomintang. If that is cracked, all the latent mass discontent of China's millions could break out in the upheaval which America fears no less than does Chiang.

Meanwhile, however, Chiang's face is being systematically blackened in the American press. These stories are not only true. There is much more that the American press is afraid to print. But it is significant that until recently much has been suppressed and concealed under praise and exaltation of the Generalissimo. Already, however, Brenden Bracken, British Minister of Information, has attacked the American press for its assault on China. The current rumors indicate that, under the guise of military necessity to fight China's battle for her against Japan, the U. S. hopes to inveigle the American and the Chinese masses into accepting actual, if not formal, American control over China.

DISUNITED NATIONS

Finally we must realize that, America's rivals in China—Russia and Great Britain—have not been sleeping while America was taking over the military and economic reins in China. A few months ago, the U. S. demanded from Chiang that he permit an American to become over-all commander of the Chinese forces. Today, when military affairs are so closely tied up with economic, this ultimatum was in effect a demand for complete American control in China. Chiang, pressed on all sides by internal rumblings and military disasters, acceded. That he changed his mind while Churchill and Stalin were conferring in Moscow may be much more than a coincidence. It is not impossible that Chiang received promises of material support from the London-Moscow axis if he stiffened his back against American domination. Through the Communists in Northwest China, Stalin has both a geographical and a political route to aid Chiang Kai-shek. Britain has credit to offer, and an army in India to press her demands.

Stilwell's recall thus brings to light the internal bankruptcy of the Kuomintang, a crisis in the domination of American imperialism in China, the contradiction involved in settling relations between the Chinese Communists and Stalin.

There is no doubt that the Chinese masses ardently desire freedom from Japanese occupation. They have been fighting for years to prevent Japanese victory. Many American workers, in fact, the whole labor movement, are keenly interested, not in the imperialist rivalry between Japan and the United States, but in helping the Chinese masses to get rid of Japanese and all other imperialisms.

The posing of the problem contains the key to its (Continued in last column)

The Aftermath of U. S.-British Recognition

DeGaulle's New "Order" in France

By V. F. JENSEN

The recognition of the de Gaulle provisional regime in France by the Allies and de Gaulle's present struggle with the National Council of Resistance mark a new stage in de Gaulle's campaign to stabilize his regime and disarm the French masses militarily and politically.

When de Gaulle came to Paris following the winning of that city, not only Paris but all of France was in revolutionary ferment. The French people, particularly the French working class, had suffered under the Nazi oppression and heroically organized its members into an underground movement of resistance. It had watched precisely those corrupt politicians and the rich industrialists, whose tools the politicians were, who had brought France to military, political and economic collapse, find a way of living and living profitably in collaboration with the Nazi victors. Mine owners and automobile manufacturers were making handsome profits providing for the German war machine while the French workers were starved, oppressed and sent into forced labor by the thousands.

DE GAULLE, CAPITALIST AGENT

It is only natural, then, that with the ousting of the Germans, the French masses should demand punishment of traitors and collaborationists and an end to the most obvious evils of the capitalist system. There was a general demand for government expropriation of the property of such collaborationists as Renault, the auto manufacturer, and for the nationalization of the banks, insurance companies and mines. The French masses did not see clearly that such a program demands, for its successful outcome, a break with capitalism and its politicians and for the most part they gave support to de Gaulle's regime and wanted it to be recognized by the Allied governments. After all, they had not fought the Germany military and its Vichy puppets only to substitute them with an Allied military government. Yet it is clear that the masses regarded the de Gaulle regime as only a provisional regime.

In the ranks of the FFI, the underground army, there was and continues to be opposition to the merging of the FFI into the regular army. The pressure of the ranks has made itself felt into the top underground organizing committee, the National Council, which, although it supports the de Gaulle regime, told a mass meeting of 25,000 in Paris' Winter Garden that it intended to continue as an organized force until a new constitution came into being. At this meeting one of the spokesmen for the Council voiced the sentiments that "irresponsible capitalists have too long ruled French affairs" and that workers must share in the management of economic enterprises and in the benefits flowing from this. These sentiments met with enthusiastic response.

De Gaulle, the outstanding representative of French imperialism, thus found himself faced with several difficult and complex problems if he was to maintain his position of political supremacy. He had to win the support of the French masses; first, so that he could disarm, politically and militarily, the militant mass threat to the French capitalist system and private property and restore "order" in France; secondly, he needed the support of the masses to strengthen his bargaining position with the Allies, for de Gaulle's main aim is to reestablish the French capitalist to a position of leadership on the international scene. At the same time, de Gaulle remains dependent upon Allied support and must convince them that he has the situation in France well in hand and can restore "order." In particular, he has to convince the British and Americans who are jockeying for position on the Continent with Russia, that he has the influential French Stalinists under control.

De Gaulle's first big move to win popular support came with the arrest of Renault, the collaborationist auto manufacturer, and the naming of a provisional manager (a prominent industrialist, significantly enough) to run the plant which was to be held as a state trusteeship. This was followed

by the government taking over the mines, a step necessary to avert a nation-wide coal strike. These moves were followed by de Gaulle's speech in Lille, in the industrial heart of France, in which he called for a "planned economy." In this speech, he spoke brave words against trusts and for the need of economic reconstruction but proposed nothing more startling than that "the state should take over the direction of the great sources of the common wealth and should control certain other activities, but, of course, without excluding the stimulus of just profit and initiative." (Our emphasis.)

The lack of success of that not very stirring appeal can be measured by the speech that he was forced to make just two weeks later in Paris, which the press generally regarded as the most important speech he had ever made besides his 1940 speech urging resistance to the Germans. This radio speech was a call to the people to abandon "spontaneous action" of a revolutionary type taken during the uprising against the Germans, and the "illegal" powers assumed in resistance groups, and to rally behind the national government and its local representatives as the sole source of both military and civil authority. Thus de Gaulle for the first time took cognizance of the fact that there was organized opposition to some of his appointed officials, and that local resistance groups had been making their own selection of officials.

In striking out against what the called "usurpations of authority" (although he himself has been adamant against listening to the PEOPLE'S authority by calling elections which might endanger his hand-picked representatives) de Gaulle tried to blackmail the French people by saying that these moves threatened "the international position of France." In other words, warning that these moves would alienate the Allies. At the same time, he tried to win support from the masses by taking a strong position on France's importance on the international scene and hinting to the Allies that if France weren't given concessions and a prominent voice in the peace settlement, the Allies' anti-German coalition on the Continent would be threatened.

STRUGGLE WITH COMMUNISTS

In this speech, de Gaulle attacked the French Communists, accusing them of being the instigators of the opposition to his regime in the affected areas. The Stalinists undoubtedly have great strength and influence among the French resistance movement. The details of just what their game it, is not at present fully clear. It is obvious that de Gaulle's relations with Moscow have cooled considerably since that Algerian speech in which he called Russia "dear and powerful."

The French Stalinists, as Stalinists everywhere, exert their influence to make sure that Stalin's man is foremost. They have no substitute for de Gaulle, of course, but it looks like Thorez, the French Stalinist leader, is coming back to be a living reminder to de Gaulle about the practical necessity for Russo-French "collaboration." The Stalinists in France, of course, would go to all lengths for Moscow, but it would be wrong to conclude that this movement of opposition is entirely a Stalinist plot. It represents a movement of discontent among the militant underground forces that the Stalinists are willing to exploit against de Gaulle but not willing to let get out of hand lest it boomerang into a real revolutionary movement.

The Stalinist press was significantly silent about de Gaulle's speech blasting them. No word came from Moscow, and in France, their paper, L'Humanité, stressed only de Gaulle's points about France becoming an international power, omitting entirely his remarks against the underground movement.

De Gaulle's present fight with the National Council of Resistance over the question of the militia is further evidence that the opposition is not merely the plot or property of the French Communists.

On October 23, the Allies, including the Soviet

Union, formally gave recognition to de Gaulle's provisional government. The interpretation of the event in the world capitalist press was unanimous in regarding it as an act which strengthened de Gaulle's hand against the forces of "disorder and dissent." As the New York Times put it: "They have given the de Gaulle government their stamp of approval at a moment when it needs an increment of authority to weld under its sway a country divided by broken communications and the ambitions of certain local groups into whose hands power has fallen in the revolutionary situation resulting from the breakdown of Vichy and German authority."

In this respect the American recognition is particularly ironic. The State Department has always declared that it withheld recognition from the provisional regime because it was not sure of its support among the French people. This democratic sentiment is less impressive now that they have recognized the regime precisely when its support among the masses is weakest and when it needs bolstering against genuine revolutionary possibilities.

That de Gaulle understands that he was granted recognition in order to strengthen his fight against the organization of the masses is made amply clear in his present dramatic struggle with the National Council of Resistance.

REVOLUTIONARY FERMENT

Since de Gaulle entered Paris he has been trying to disarm the FFI and local militia groups and dissolve them into the regular army. The 350,000-400,000 fighters, the bulk of whom are young workers and students, have consistently resisted this move, refusing to give up their arms or be integrated into the army of the French imperialists. All sorts of arrangements were announced but no substantial dissolution of the militia resulted. All over France, following the "liberation," the militia, known as the Patriotic Militia and later as the Patriotic Guard, went ahead to implement their program, acting as vigilantes against collaborationists, making arrests, etc., functioning more or less under the loose direction of the National Council of Resistance.

Five days after recognition, de Gaulle's provisional government announced the dissolution of the Guard, making it illegal for them to carry arms and providing for the punishment of those making "illegal" arrests. Immediately the National Council of Resistance objected to any measures against the Guard being taken without consulting it. The Council recognized this move as a rejection of its authority. Up to now it has been tacitly accepted by the government as a sort of Council of State that the government must heed. Now de Gaulle feels himself strong enough to function without it, desiring to centralize authority fully and finally in his own hands. This is a crisis of authority—who shall rule France, the underground fighters for its liberation through their own organization or de Gaulle's provisional, Ally-supported government and its hand-picked appointees.

The National Council of Resistance lags far behind its militant local committees. Although protesting the act, it has issued a statement asserting "its constant desire to collaborate with the government." It is looking for some sort of compromise and prefers to work out a plan of its own for disarming the militia, backing down from its original demand that the militia be given legal status. Thus far the Stalinists have been silent, merely publishing the government's decision and commenting that it was "surprising!"

The French revolutionary movement stands at the crossroads today. If it permits de Gaulle to disarm its groups politically and militarily, its long and heroic fight against the German oppressor and for a new, better France will have been in vain. If it must break from de Gaulle, the tool of French and Allied imperialist interests, elect its own government and go forward on its own toward a truly democratic and socialist France.

An Italian Noblewoman "Suffers" War

By WILL GORMAN

We know pretty well what has been going on in Italy. Whole towns and cities are leveled to the ground by German shells and American cannon as both armies slowly and tortuously battle up the Italian boot. Economic life is almost at a standstill. Hunger and disease pervade every corner of Italy. Working class women are forced to walk the streets. Amog has become AMG, then Allied Control Commission, then simply Allied Commission. All the masquerading cannot help its unpopularity, since the change of names does not mean any change of conditions for the better.

Land hungry peasants seize the large estates. The Bonomi government, tottering in Rome, gathers enough strength to drive the peasants off at the point of a gun. Italian Partisans are thrown into jail if they keep their guns. If they give them away, they receive in exchange a summary "thank you" or a certificate. Police shoot into crowds in Sicily, where the British are trying to get in with both feet. The Vatican, which blessed Franco's rebellion in Spain, pleads, begs and warns against social revolution. The Minister of Transport can't get gasoline for his own car but taly declares war on Japan. Such are the mad and maddening results of Allied "liberation"—peace with reaction, war against the masses.

PINK NEGLIGEE, WHITE-COATED SERVANT

But we were absolutely enlightened by a story in the New York Times, November 3, conclusively entitled "Italian Countess Ignores the War." When the American soldiers arrived, Countess Lavinia Filo Della Torre, "unperturbed as usual," was "in her boudoir clad in a pink negligee." Five thousand miles away, here in this country, old clothes are being collected for the almost naked masses of Italy. Isn't that a comforting thought that the Countess isn't even short of—a pink negligee?

"A white-jacketed retainer brought us, fine Italian red wine." The Countess said: "I've simply ignored the war—despite some difficulties." Such modesty! But she was no doubt a very experienced hostess. Indeed, "...in February there came two hundred troops of the Herman Goering Division. They brought three German dancing girls..." This "élite" German division robbed and destroyed at every town. They shot many Italians, deported others. This is strenuous work, so for relaxation they went to the villa of the Countess who "ignored the war!"

COUNTESS HAS HER PRIVATIONS, TOO.

But the Countess has her troubles. No water in the swimming pool, pieces of shrapnel in her tennis court. Most bothersome were the fifty peasants who had come to her estate for refuge during the terrific shelling of the countryside. "Grumpy-faced children were dabbling their feet in her goldfish fountain." (Whom are we supposed to feel sorry for, the goldfish or the Countess?) The Countess complained of the peasants: "I don't think they want to move. They like it here." The peasants are a little jealous of the Countess' good luck. They're obviously hungry and homeless, not having succeeded in "ignoring the war."

"The Countess smiled and ordered more wine. She turned to Lieut.-Col. Phelan: 'Would you please tell all those people living in my cellars and barns that they can go home now.'" And if you don't catch on as yet—Lieut.-Col. Phelan had dropped in to help put her estate "in order."

What a marvelous occupation for the American Army in Italy! The bloody battles at Cassino, Anzio, the Gothic Line! And now doing their best for secluded estates, guarding goldfish pools, pink negligees, white-jacketed servants, red vintage wine and the rare and precious Counts and Countesses!

CONCLUSION

The Italian workers and peasants will be free from economic misery, criminal injustice, the agonies of war only when they throw from their backs that pack of assorted idles and exploiters—the aristocracy, the capitalists, the old monarch Victor Emmanuel, the young one, Crown Prince Umberto, and those useless windbags who make up the theatrical Bonomi government.

C. P. and Fallacy of the "Hard Peace"

By BEVA CRAINE

In last week's LABOR ACTION we discussed why it was dangerous for the working class to adopt the position that the entire German nation is responsible for the war and the crimes of Hitlerism. We pointed out that this idea is deliberately sponsored by the ruling classes of England, America and Russia for the purpose of diverting the attention of the masses of people from the real causes of war, which are rooted in the capitalist organization of society; and secondly, in order to facilitate the imposition of very stringent peace terms upon the German people.

The labor leaders who foster this idea that all the German people are guilty of Nazism are really helping the capitalists to escape the responsibility for war and fascism. These leaders claim that a "just" punishment of the Germans, even if it is "distasteful," is necessary for the sake of avoiding a Third World War.

But then along comes William Z. Foster, leading spokesman for the Communist (Political Association) Party with an added reason for the imposition of a "hard" peace upon the German people. Such a peace is necessary not only to insure peace after this war, he writes in a recent article in the Daily Worker, Stalinist mouthpiece in the United States, but also in order to strengthen democracy inside Germany. So you see, all proposals for the occupation of Germany by Allied troops, enslavement, forced labor in foreign countries, payment of huge indemnities, loss of territory—all these are really set forth for the good of the German people themselves! They will not only bring peace to Europe and the world, but they will also cleanse Germany and the German people of reaction and fascism, and therefore they should be greeted warmly by the German masses.

Now these punitive measures are not to be confined to a small section

of war criminals in Germany. They are so conducive to democracy that they are intended for the whole nation. After paying some lip service to the idea that the "peace terms cannot be directed uniformly against the whole German people," Foster goes on to say what he really wants to get across:

FOSTER'S LIE

"True the German people as a whole are responsible for the Nazi government and its maraudings. And it is not simply that they passively allowed this deadly regime to fasten itself upon them. Huge sections, probably a majority of the population, including a large percentage of workers, have been so deeply corrupted by Nazism that they have actively supported Hitler and been eager to share in his imperialist loot, seized by shedding the blood of other peoples."

And further: "While thus recognizing the national responsibility of the German people as a whole for the murderous Hitler regime of cut-throats..."

We might note here that these slanderous remarks about the German workers are being made by a man whose party only some four years ago declared that "fascism was only a matter of personal taste," and whose boss, Stalin, found it perfectly feasible to combine with the "murderous Hitler regime of cut-throats" for the joint invasion of Poland.

What are Foster's proposals for a "hard" peace which is supposed to restore democracy in Germany? The same ones that are now being prepared by the imperialists who are interested in crushing Germany as an economic rival and don't give a rap about bringing or restoring democracy for the German people. They are the proposals made by the very people who assisted Hitler into power and thanked their lucky stars for fascism as a preventive against workers' revolution and socialism. The peace terms, which according

to Foster should have "a democratic orientation from the beginning" include: Military occupation by British, Russian and American forces for a long period; dismemberment of Germany through the return of such territories as East Prussia, Sudetenland, Schleswig-Holstein and Silesia to their "rightful owners"; imposition of large indemnities in money, machinery and other goods; and rebuilding of war-devastated areas in invaded countries by German labor. These are the measures which Foster hopes to make the "democratic forces in Germany" understand as "necessary for the creation of a prosperous, democratic Germany."

THE "HARD" PEACE

Military occupation after unconditional surrender should be carried out "in the spirit of democracy," says Foster. The troops should support the "democratic forces." Just who these forces are, after Foster excludes "a majority of the population, including a large percentage of workers" who have been "deeply corrupted by Nazism," is left to the reader's imagination. To Foster, of course, the "democratic forces" will be those people in Germany who advocate subservience to Russian foreign policy.

The dismemberment of Germany on the basis of "returning" parts of that country to "rightful owners" (these, of course, to be determined by the imperialists of the Allied countries, and not by the peoples who inhabit these territories) means re-creating the very conditions which have helped bring about World War No. 2.

Imposition of large indemnities in money, machinery and other commodities is a more monstrous repetition of the Versailles Treaty which has always been called by the labor movement a "Robbers' Treaty." Foster tries to polish up the old remedy by insisting that the "main burden should be loaded on the backs of the wealthy classes," through capital le-

gies and confiscatory taxes. War reparations and indemnities, payments in commodities and machinery, are always made through the most intense exploitation of labor. Socialists have ever been opposed to peace through annexations or indemnities because they know that it is not the rich who suffer by this, but the toiling masses who are thus doubly robbed of the product of their toil.

"NATIONALIZATION"

At one point Foster sounds almost radical, as if he were opposed to capitalist exploitation. Prevent the German capitalists from preparing for another war by nationalizing industry, he says. Nationalization, however, is not proposed as a measure to be taken by German labor in order that industry might be run to furnish the needs of the people, but as a measure under Allied occupation so that the payment of war reparations and indemnities can be made more efficient. The German workers are to toil in the "nationalized" factories in order to supply the goods and commodities for the imperialists, in the first place, of Stalinist Russia. German labor is to be squeezed and oppressed through taxation, work, occupation, enslavement in order to pay for a war which was not its own making any more than it was the making of American, British, or Russian labor.

And finally, German labor is to rebuild war-ravaged Europe! Foster suggests that even this act of enslavement of at least twelve million German workers can be turned to the advantage of democracy! Foster realizes that it is going to be a difficult task to convince the German workers that these prospects are calculated to help democracy triumph in that country. But there are always prison camps, the occupation armies and other "convincing" ways of doing this. And these are the methods of the imperialists and their agents.

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 _____

Stilwell's Recall - -
(Continued from first column)
The history of China has shown that it is only the independent struggles of the Chinese masses that have kept China from being divided like Africa among the imperialist powers. The Boxer Rebellion in 1900 and the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27 show that it has been the Chinese masses who have initiated and consistently carried out the struggle against foreign imperialism. The cowardly and corrupt Chinese capitalists and landlords have always vacillated and maneuvered between rival imperialisms and thus brought military disasters and continued loss of Chinese sovereignty.

The future of China as is so abundantly revealed in the Stilwell incident, rests now in the struggle and organization of the Chinese masses as an independent political force. The American masses have one great contribution to make toward this end. That is, by using the powerful organizations and means of publicity at its disposal to make it clear to the Chinese masses that there is another America besides that of Stilwell and Roosevelt, the America of organized labor which has no other interest in China than the complete independence of China from all imperialisms.

Bound in One Volume:
All 52 Issues of
Labor Action, 1943

THESE ARE FUTURE COLLECTORS' ITEMS AND PRICELESS REFERENCES FOR WELL-INFORMED UNIONISTS AND SOCIALISTS

Price: \$2.50
Send Orders to
LABOR ACTION
114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.

Editorials

Labor Vote Strength Shows What A Genuine Labor Party Could Do!

The re-election of the Democratic incumbent, President Roosevelt, by the majority of the voting population in a huge turnout of voters illustrates the greatest paradox of our time. That paradox is: *The organized labor movement in this country, which is the largest labor movement the world has ever seen, and hence the greatest force for social progress, has not yet made its declaration of independence from capitalist politics.*

The pre-election contest of Roosevelt versus Dewey was a contest between two capitalist politicians. There was little illusion that Dewey was backed and financed by the representatives of big business. This was especially exposed since labor and the liberals were in Roosevelt's camp. However, "Labor's friend in the White House," Roosevelt, is a capitalist politician, too. While most working people recognize that these candidates come from "the other side of the tracks," millions of them vote on the theory of the "lesser evil."

The "lesser evil" idea worked for either Dewey supporters or Roosevelt adherents. A good proportion of voters, middle class people, farmers and many workers chose Dewey because they were fed up with the pro-big-business legislation of the War Deal, and hoped for a change. The larger

proportion succumbed to the unfounded campaign propaganda that Roosevelt is the "common people's" friend. The latter group would rather "bear the evils that we have than fly to others that we know not of."

The theory of the "lesser evil" shows by its very name a cynicism of politics, that is, CAPITALIST politics, but shrugs its shoulders and says we must put up with some evildoer in office; therefore it might as well be the "lesser evil." But such thinking does not go far enough to ponder over what evil we are putting up with.

That evil is the system of capitalism, of private profits amassed while our sons, brothers, husbands and fathers of children are dying in the war.

It is a system which has brought two world wars in the space of one generation.

It is a system which bred poverty in the midst of plenty.

It is a system which burned up and plowed under the necessities for life while millions faced starvation.

It is a system which came out of the biggest and worst depression in history only by making and selling the weapons of war.

It is a system which led to fascism in Germany and Italy.

Was President Roosevelt Really Labor's Friend?

The vast and overwhelming majority of the voters in this country are the "have-nots," the mine, mill and factory workers, the small farmers, the middle classes—all of whom have no stake in the profit system. The tide that turned the balance in Roosevelt's favor, all analysts are agreed, was the tremendous voting strength of labor, organized through the Political Action Committees of the CIO.

Why, then, did labor in this country put Roosevelt into office?

Roosevelt's record since the New Deal became transformed into the War Deal has been anything but favorable to labor. He promised in exchange for labor "peace," that is, the surrender of the strike weapon for the duration, the maintenance of "equality of sacrifice." All the sacrifices have been labor's. *The only freeze that held was the wage freeze. Corporate profits for the year 1944 increased*

198 per cent over the 1936 to 1939 peacetime era. But wage increases lag far behind the rising cost of living.

While federal legislation under the Roosevelt regime has guaranteed profits to business if it operates at a loss or only breaks even, FDR did not move a muscle to help pass even the insignificant Kilgore bill for unemployment compensation.

While Roosevelt accepted with open arms the support of the Southern poll-tax states to guarantee his election, he did not embarrass the Democratic machine there to speak out for the anti-lynching bill.

The little farmers have not benefited under the Roosevelt Administration, while the farm monopolists have been subsidized and enriched. Small business has been squeezed smaller by the tremendous growth of monopoly.

Labor Must Declare Its Political Independence

We stated that labor had not yet made its political declaration of independence. While the capitalists act as a class politically, labor does not. On the economic front, in the struggle to organize unions, obtain higher wages, labor does act as a class. No worker would expect an employer to represent his grievances to management on his job. But he still elects employer-minded and employer-backed politicians. And labor is going to pay for its "red-apple" politics.

One of the biggest issues that will face us in the future is the matter of jobs in the reconversion and post-war periods. Capitalism, on the basis of past practices, expects up to twenty million unemployed. Who walks the streets? Labor!

Another issue, not secondary to the first mentioned, is the question of an enduring peace and world-wide security. Capitalism is organizing a world police force to take care of future "aggressors," and does not make even a pretense this time of eliminating war. Who pays the price of war—in economic suffering, in material and physical destruction? Labor!

Security and peace. Capitalism and its candidates can offer neither. But labor, once it makes its political declaration of independence, can. Labor, having no stake in the profit system, can eliminate the profit motive of industry and plan production for use. Having no stake in profits, it will not go to war every so often over rivalries of the market.

Now Is the Time to Build an Independent Labor Party

We repeat: the biggest single organized force in the country is the labor movement. The members of the CIO and the AFL, together with their families and sympathizers are the backbone of the nation. Organized into an independent Labor Party, they could run the nation—not as in the past, for the few, but for the vast majority.

Something new in this election showed that labor has the power. That was the INDEPENDENT organization of labor through the CIO-PAC—not in a Labor Party, to be sure. The leaders of labor used the PAC to support the Democratic Party. But the very fact that labor had a separate organization shows a significant trend in a new direction. The leaders of the PAC say they are not going to dissolve it following the national elections. That, too, lays the groundwork for future good.

Politics is not something that confronts us every two or four years when an election takes place, but is a daily activity. The government has so intervened into every phase of our lives, telling us what we may or may not eat, what prices we shall pay, whether we can strike or not, how much we get in our pay envelopes, whether we can change our jobs, etc., that almost every action we undertake is bound

up with the government and political action.

The members of organized labor should take a further step. They should make the Political Action Committee the Independent Political Action Committee for a Labor Party! They should run labor's own candidates in city, state and national elections and prepare the great nation-wide party of the American workers!

LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interests of Labor

Published Weekly by the

LABOR ACTION PUBLISHING ASSN.

114 West 14th Street New York 11, N. Y. (Third Floor)

Vol. 8, No. 46 November 13, 1944

ALBERT GATES, Editor
MARY BELL, Asst. Editor

Subscription Rate: 60 Cents a Year
75 Cents for Canada, New York and Foreign

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

What They're Fighting For:

THE BIG 3 AND IRANIAN OIL

By ALBERT GATES

In a previous article we pointed out that the Russian demands on the Iranian government for concessions of their Kevir and Khurian oil deposits in the northern part of the country, paralleled the imperialist method of expansion by the capitalist powers. These concessions were refused by the government of Premier Said, who declared that it was his cabinet's policy to postpone the question of such contracts until after the war when the situation in the world would become more clearly settled.

Having been refused these concessions, Stalin has organized a series of actions against Said's government which will, in one way or another, result in obtaining these coveted oil areas. The government of Said was denounced as a pro-fascist regime and an enemy of the United Nations. This government, said the Russian paper, Trud, was incapable of keeping order in the country. Russian interests were not properly defended and her supply trains were regularly attacked. The aim of Stalin is to create such a disturbance inside Iran as to prepare a coup and seizure of the oil areas he desires.

All of this is quite characteristic of the Russian regime, and the methods used are not unlike those employed by the imperialists of the world against weak and defenseless countries. They are of a pattern with those methods employed by Stalin when he seized the Baltic states and akin to those which are now in preparation for a division of Poland. This will be amply borne out in the facts which follow.

RACE FOR OIL

Behind the Russian demands for these oil concessions is an inter-allied conflict over this black gold. New facts disclosed since the first public denunciations of the Iranians show that Russia was not the only nation to ask for oil concessions. The British and Americans also asked for concessions in the southeastern part of the country. The course of action obviously dictated to the Iranians, and no doubt suggested by the United States, in view of the differences existing between the three big powers and their separate demands for the same natural resources, was to postpone the whole question until after the war.

About a year ago two American companies, Socony-Standard and Vacuum, and the British Shell company tried to obtain concessions in the section of Iran along the Afghanistan and Baluchistan borders. They were interested in the same concessions. The Iranian cabinet refused these concessions, especially in view of the pressure of nationalist elements who demanded that the oil deposits of the country be exploited by natives and all profits retained in the country. The Premier, however, was favorable to the idea of granting rights to either the Americans or the British. But when the Russians requested the northern fields, the Cabinet decided against all concessions and for a postponement of the whole question until after the war.

According to PM, this decision was well received in the country and Parliament passed the military budget by an overwhelming vote as an expression of solidarity with the action of the government. While the United States and Great Britain were agreeable to a postponement (the reasons are clear: they both have more than enough

oil for the time being), the Russians decided to pressure the Iranians into a surrender of the northern fields. Washington is frankly disturbed by the Russian action because it regards any concessions which the Russians "squeeze" out of Iran as discriminatory unless negotiations with the United States are reopened simultaneously.

Another aspect of the situation which disturbs Washington is that the Russians may take such steps as would, in effect, end Iranian "sovereignty." This latter is, of course, ludicrous, since Iran does not enjoy genuine sovereignty now. The country is occupied by British, American and Russian troops. Its economy has been subjected to the war needs of the Allies. Its stability is dependent in these circumstances on agreement among the Big Three. What Washington fears is not the loss of Iran's nominal sovereignty but Russian control over the country and seizure of all the resources at the expense of any and all other powers.

STAKING A CLAIM

This is not mere supposition. As justification for Russian demands, Stalin's mouthpiece, War and the Working Class, prints figures on the world distribution of oil which show America controlling fifty-seven per cent of the world's oil resources, Great Britain twenty-seven per cent, Russia only seven per cent. The conclusion to be drawn from these figures is that Russia is really entitled to such concessions in Iran in order to equalize the respective oil shares of the big powers.

Russia approaches Iran with a "mutually satisfactory" deal. It is of a piece with all deals which powerful nations try to make with weaker ones when ready to gobble them up, seize their resources and exploit them for profit. In this case Iran apparently should have had nothing to say about it, except in the most formal sense. But, in this case, Iran did say something; it rejected the Russian proposal for a concession. No doubt the Iranians felt strong because they knew if the differences which existed between the three imperialists. No doubt the Premier felt he could get some support from Great Britain and the United States. Thus, standing on the right of Iran to determine what shall be done with oil deposits on its soil, Said rejected the Russian proposal.

What has happened in the past weeks is the swift development of a frame-up against the country to prepare some form of seizure, or to overthrow the government through native figureheads pushed to the forefront by Russian experts and occupation forces.

Washington reports that Russian troops have already blockaded the Iran garrison at Tabriz. The Russian press, while omitting any reference to such a blockade, charges that Iranian soldiers opened fire on a peaceful pro-Russian demonstration—that is, a demonstration protesting the government's postponement of action on the Russian oil-concession proposal. And, according to the same Stalinist press, the action of the Iranian soldiers "aroused general indignation in Tabriz."

Note, of course, that there was no "general indignation" by the Iranians against a foreign aggressor, against a power which now helps to occupy the country and threatens it further. No, the "general indignation" is against the government which attempted in

its feeble way to defend the independence and the right of Iranians to determine their own affairs.

As part of the general frame-up, the Russian press continues to write threateningly about Iran. It reports mass protest demonstrations in various parts of the country, naming Meshed-i-Sar, Sultanabad, Isfahan and other cities. We have no doubt that these demonstrations were inspired and organized by the Russians. According to Tass, official Russian news agency, all these demonstrations adopted resolutions demanding the resignation of Premier Said and the establishment of a new government friendly to Russia. Iranian newspapers are also reported to have demanded acceptance of the Russian demand.

If you look at a map you will see that the cities in which these demonstrations took place are all located in the areas containing the oil deposits demanded by Russia. If the government is unable to keep order in these areas in which Russia has interests, then a new government must be chosen. This is the demand made by Stalin. If a new government is not forthcoming, then the country faces a total occupation and control of the disputed territory by the so-called Red Army.

What kind of a new government is Russia demanding? Obviously a government that will be completely subservient to it, a government that will yield to all its demands!

STALINIST IMPERIALISM

Wherein does this policy embraced by Stalin's Russia differ from the traditional policies of imperialism? In no essential way. A demand is made on a small nation, a backward one at that, with little power and no possibility of lasting resistance. If the demand is rejected, then the nation is threatened; internal dissension is stirred up; national elements are organized through bribery; demonstrations are directed by the big power. All this is designed to lead to the breakdown of the government and replacement by one subservient to Russia, or the seizure of the whole country, or at least of the oil-bearing sector.

This is typical imperialist policy by a Russian state which has long since ceased to be a workers' state and which has nothing in common with socialism or a socialist policy. The policy of Russia reflects the tremendous changes that have taken place since the workers' revolution of 1917, since the time that Lenin and Trotsky were at the helm. Only one fact need be cited to prove this:

Before the Russian Revolution, when the Czar ruled, Russia had oil concessions in Northern Iran. But when Russia became a Soviet nation, it abandoned these concessions on the theory that it was against working class principle for a powerful nation to exploit another nation, especially a weaker and defenseless country.

Stalin today is using the same measures—imperialism, robbery, exploitation of other peoples—that Lenin and Trotsky rejected when they were used by the Czar for the benefit of Russian capitalists.

Stalin is plundering for Russia's new ruling class, the bureaucracy, which owns the state and controls the wealth of the country and which reaps all its benefits. The Iran "incident" is only another example of how Stalin is trying to increase "the power, prestige and revenues" of their new ruling class.

CAPITALIST JUSTICE

Minneapolis Case: Six Free; No Pardons Heard

Six of the defendants in the Minneapolis Case have been released from prison after serving almost ten months. Three of the defendants served sentence in Danbury, Conn., and three at Sandstone Federal Prison in Minnesota. They were the first to be released of eighteen members and leaders of the Socialist Workers Party who were jailed for their socialist views in as deliberate a frame-up as ever took place in this country. Some were also members of Truckdrivers Local 544-CIO.

The Minneapolis Case and the conviction of the aforementioned eighteen grew out of the struggle between the militant truckdrivers union of Minneapolis and the reactionary president of the Teamsters International, Dan Tobin. It was he who asked and got assistance from Roosevelt and his Administration to fight these militants and to take the union away from them. He asked for this assistance when he failed to wrest the union from its leaders. It was then that the trumped-up charges were made and the men tried. They were tried under the provisions of the infamous Smith-Connally "gag" law.

Since then Tobin has joined hands with the American agents of Stalin, the Communist Political Association, to war against the "Trotskyists," that is, the militants and progressives in the labor movement who threaten the high-paid posts of such reactionaries as Dan Tobin and who are opposed to the boss politics pursued by such labor misleaders.

The men of Minneapolis were fighters in the interest of labor in general. They were also fighters for socialism. That is why they were convicted. But in order to convict them, the due process of law had to be violated. Their many appeals were rejected. The exalted Supreme Court, hailed by liberals as the most democratic in history, didn't have the courage to hear the case. Twice it turned down petitions to review the conviction because such an action would have put the Smith-Connally law up for final review and this is something that this less than courageous body of jurists did not want to do. So the men went to jail.

They later asked for a presidential pardon on the grounds that the conviction was unconstitutional and threatened not only socialists but the whole labor movement. It was this latter fact that brought such a large protest from unions and union leaders all over the country who joined the Civil Rights Defense Committee in behalf of the Minneapolis defendants. The President refused to even consider the case! Thus was the case completed and thus were we given another example of capitalist justice.

LABOR ACTION greets the six comrades who were released from jail and expresses its solidarity with them as well as with the twelve other defendants imprisoned at Sandstone.

Presidential Election Results - - A Magazine Every Union Militant Should Have - -

(Continued from page 1)

bended knees. We were thankful that Roosevelt ran for office so that they could vote for him.

In his own behalf, Roosevelt did not promise labor anything. He said nothing about lift-war burdens from the shoulders of an overworked labor population, whose standard of living, because of the Little Steel Formula, has declined in a period when prices were generally uncontrolled.

He said nothing about curbing the war profiteers and the new millionaires mushrooming up all over the country. On the contrary, he defended every measure introduced on domestic affairs which has hurt labor. He said nothing against the Southern Bourbons who run his party. He said nothing about removing racial practices and discrimination in the armed forces. He said nothing about establishing a permanent FEPC to guarantee full rights to all peoples regardless of race, nationality, color or creed.

Yet he receive labor's vote, delivered to him, lock, stock and barrel,

through the efforts of the PAC. Without that support, without the PAC, Roosevelt could not have won the race.

The vote polled in the large metropolitan centers of the country established that the PAC had done a job.

What the PAC proved is that if all the energy, skill, time and finances expended in the Democratic campaign, in support of capitalist policies, were directed toward labor politics and the organization of a Labor Party, the political interests of the workers could be advanced a thousandfold.

Hillman announces that he does not intend to liquidate the PAC.

Sailor Convictions - -

(Continued from page 1)

they were relegated to the duty of loading ammunition without any training whatsoever in the dangers or methods of loading ammunition.

"The Workers Defense League is concerned with protecting the rights of all workers, regardless of race. We feel that segregation of Negroes in the Navy works to their detriment and should be ended. Use of an all-Negro group for such hazardous work naturally redoubled the proper re-

Good! This is a grand opportunity for the rank and file worker. There are hundreds of PAC clubs throughout the country. Transform these clubs into clubs for a Labor Party! Take the money now at hand and use it for building a party based on the unions, the millions of producers in the country. Organize the time, energy and skill of the workers in their own political interests and labor will really have come of age in America.

Given a Labor Party, the American worker could meet big business on an equal plane politically just as he now can carry the fight to the capitalists on the economic field.

segmentation of the Negroes at their segregation. Segregation at any time is an insult. When the work is dangerous, segregation is a distinct violation of the right of live of the minority involved.

"The facts of this case indicate that these men would not have been involved in a mutiny charge if their skins were white. We feel certain that an impartial investigation would support this claim, and hope for your early action on this urgent matter."

A Magazine Every Union Militant Should Have - -

The October issue of The New International, which was delayed because of a special twenty-four page supplement accompanying the regular number, is off the press and ready for sale.

Featured in this issue is a review of five important international labor conventions. The articles analyze the situation in the labor movement through the war, and union prospects in the post-war period. They deal with the rising movement of the rank and file seeking to change the present course of a labor officialdom tied to the Roosevelt Administration. The featured articles are:

- The Elections and the PAC, an editorial.
- The Auto Workers Union, by Max Shachtman.
- The Mine Workers Convention, by David Coolidge.
- The Shipyard Workers' Parley, by Ernest Lund.
- The UE Convention, by Albert Gates.
- The Rubber Workers Union, by Mary Bell.

In addition to these important articles is the twenty-four-page supplement entitled: Capitalist Barbarism or Socialism. This is a contribution by the International Communists of Germany. It is a review of present capitalist society showing how the struggle for and victory of socialism is inevitable.

Get your copy for twenty cents by writing to The New International, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.