

# FDR FOR ANY ANTI-LABOR BILL

## Soldiers Against Labor Draft

"The voices of these soldiers speak out very clearly today in demanding that all Americans accept the same liability which a soldier must accept for service to country."—SAYS STIMSON.

Says Staff Sergeant John O. Raney, 388th Bomb Group, 563rd Squad:

"In our army paper, the 'Stars and Stripes,' we have been following the debate on the national service law and, as crew members of the Flying Forts of the Eighth Air Force we feel we have a right to a few words.

"We would like to state—and we may be quoted—that we are firmly against this bill. . . .

"We were led to understand that the

subject in question once caused a civil war and was settled for all time. We are sick and tired of hearing a few politicians try to bring slavery back to the United States.

"If anyone would care to see how miserably that same law has failed in England, tell them to come over. It has ruined thousands of women and broken thousands of homes. . . .

Says J. E. Brown in "Labor"—Brown having served eighteen months in the Army:

"...I have never yet heard of an American soldier who died because he ran out of ammunition or some other combat necessity. . . .

"There were, of course, shortages in the Philippines, due to someone's failure or shortsightedness—but not labor's, and we remember the incident at Pearl Harbor—blackest blot on our escutcheon—which was due to the negligence of high-ranking military and naval officers.

"Oh, no; we don't believe Mr. Stimson was quoting the soldiers when he said they wanted fathers, wives and brothers back home to be regimented and controlled as they—the fighting men—are. . . .

"To know that the people back home are controlled and ordered by petty Fuehrers would not raise the morale of our fighting men."

By MAX SHACHTMAN

The story of a bitter meeting between President Roosevelt and Philip Murray, president of the CIO, which revealed the determination of Roosevelt to draw the chains tighter around the neck of the labor movement and the lack of determination of Murray to fight back was made public last week in the pages of the New York Post.

The article was written by Victor Riesel, labor editor of the Post, in its February 1 issue. Riesel is in close and intimate contact with the Murray leadership of the CIO and, like his paper, is himself a supporter of Roosevelt. There is every ground for accepting the authenticity of the Riesel account in every respect.

In his article, Riesel writes:

"A bitter feud between President Roosevelt and CIO Leader Philip Murray is embarrassing Sidney Hillman, CIO political boss, and his new left wing allies.

"Murray's fight with the President began the morning after Mr. Roosevelt called for a labor draft law. William Green, AFL head, and Murray were in the President's study listening to him complain vehemently about labor's attitude toward the national service proposal.

## Disgusting Antics - - Including Anti-Semitic Jabs - - As Congress Stalls On the Soldier Vote

Step this way, ladies and gentlemen of this "greatest democracy on earth," and see the best sideshow of the centuries. It would be truly side-splitting if only it didn't involve the basic democratic rights of some eleven million citizens of the United States.

Behold in the House of Representatives that worthy poll-tax veteran of twenty-three years, Rankin of Mississippi. Hear him wise-crack fit to make the "representatives of the people" roll in the aisles. Hear him refer to a newspaper man, Walter Winchell, as "THAT KIKE I TOLD YOU ABOUT YESTERDAY." Fit to howl, isn't it?

Not one "representative of the people" rose in protest against this anti-Semitic filth in the seat of government. Not even in the Reichstag of pre-Hitler Germany did the Nazi members stoop to indulge in such open violation of all decency. We have also to report that none of the "great" newspapers of this country saw fit to attack Rankin.

And when all the monkey-business in the House is over, the representatives stand up and let themselves be counted 168 in favor of providing a federal ballot so that the men and women in the armed forces may exercise their right of franchise, and 224 solidly against their doing so.

Then the matter goes to the Senate for similar treatment.

A great muddle of amendments and counter-proposals is brought in to make confusion worse confounded.

Senator Ellender, poll-tax Democrat, wants to know if it is necessary for the bill "to make sense" before passage. "I am very confused," he says.

Twice the Senate votes to throw out the bill for federal balloting.

On a third vote the Senate seems to reverse itself, but doesn't really because what is happening is an attempt to force the Rankin bill of the House before the Senate as "pending business"—or something like that.

Senator Taft, Republican from Ohio, asks for a recess to "study" several amendments. The Senate roars with laughter because these amendments have been up two or three times already.

To fill in time—to make sure that the matter of the soldier vote will not be settled for the 1944 elections—rules of order are debated at length.

The result of these antics in the Senate, at this writing, is that both the "states' rights" bill and the federal balloting bill have been adopted, the latter as an amendment to the former. Such cynicism is hard to beat.

Thus the whole question goes back again into committee.

What is it all about? It is the filthy game of politics as it is practiced under the capitalist system. Each bunch of politicians for himself—and the devil take the eleven million in the armed forces.

The Republicans are afraid the soldier vote will swing Roosevelt into a fourth term. And the Southern Democrats, an essential and much-coddled contingent of Mr. Roosevelt's party, are afraid the federal ballot for the soldier vote may upset their prettily-arranged poll-tax apartheid.

We have a word for this: Political cesspool, we call it!

Disinfection of the most drastic kind is called for—and quickly.

We say it can be had only through labor taking the needed step into independent class politics—by forming a national Independent Labor Party based on the unions and attracting to it all the elements in society which are hurt by the capitalist filth and will benefit from labor's bold political leadership.

This is the lesson of the sideshow of the centuries.—S. G.

## Progressives Win Brewster Election

NEW YORK, Feb. 9.—The progressive administration of Brewster Local 365, UAW-CIO, headed by Tom De Lorenzo, defeated the Communist (Stalinist) and other reactionary forces in the largest election turnout in the history of the local.

The De Lorenzo administration swept every office in the Long Island City plant and all but one position in the Johnsville plant. With more than eleven thousand votes cast, the keen interest of the membership in the election was demonstrated.

What the Issue Was

The question at issue in the election was either to retain the militant unionism that had made Local 365 an example for the rest of the labor movement, or to accept the leadership of those whose policies would reduce Local 365 to the status of a weak and ineffectual union.

The election struggle dates back several months. It started with the Vinson Committee's phony investigation of the Brewster Local and its attempt to smash the union by blaming De Lorenzo and the rest of his administration for the failures of

corrupt and incompetent management to fulfill contracts. At that time, the Communist-reactionary combination took the side of the anti-union Vinson Committee and attempted to "do a job" on the administration.

The membership then overwhelmingly voted confidence in their president. Only a handful of the most reactionary members of the local dared to raise their voices in protest against his defense of the union movement against its congressional enemies.

Frankenstein's "Frankenstein"

A few weeks ago a new man appeared on the scene, Al Olerio, who had formerly been joint shop committee man in the local but who had failed to be re-elected when his term of office expired. The Addes-Frankenstein faction of the international took care of its man, Olerio, and gave him a job as international representative.

Olerio was sent back into the local by the "piecework" Frankenstein faction because it was Local 365 that

(Continued on page 2)

## American and German Cartels Combine For Profits

# No "Enemies" in Business Deals

By V. JENSEN

On some of the bloodiest and most desperate battlefields in the world, German and American soldiers are fighting to the death. They have each been told what a threat the enemy is to them, their country, their way of life. On both sides, thousands are giving up life and limb because for the most part they are still convinced that this is true.

An item that should be of interest to the battleworn soldiers of all the armies who are eating and sleeping, fighting and dying in the Italian mud is one about fraternization among the powers that be in their respective countries.

It is the story of the "cooperation" between the American and German firms which make up powerful international cartels. It is one more evidence that the stream of profits is a more precious fluid than the sweat of blood that engulfs the world.

The facts on the "cooperation" given by American and Nazi companies in cartels has been revealed in the reports of the Kilgore Senate Committee.

The American and Nazi branches of some of the world's greatest cartels continue to communicate and cooperate with each other even though the United States and Germany are at war. Their agreements extend even into the field of the materials of war. So far their dealings have been undisturbed by the American government. None of the United Nations has interfered with these activities.

### The Philips Cartel

An outstanding example has been the case of the Philips cartel, a world-wide combination of about eighty companies, manufacturing and distributing radio equipment, light bulbs and electrical supplies. Before the war this cartel enjoyed close relations with Radio Corporation of America, General Electric and Westinghouse.

Before the war the branches of the Philips cartel were controlled by the N. V. Philips Co. of Holland, which in turn was controlled by a Dutch holding company with only ten voting shares. Through these top Dutch

companies have been taken over by the Nazis, their network—which extends into the United States, Britain, France, Belgium, Austria, Italy, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India and many other countries—has so far been untouched. It has not been blacklisted by the United Nations nor has its property been seized.

Cooperation continues between American and Nazi branches. For example: In Sweden, Philips and a German "cartel" partner, Telefunken, became involved in a patent lawsuit against Swedish companies in 1942. The Philips interests in the United States assisted the suit by sending their power of attorney to the Philips interests in Stockholm.

In Spain, in 1942, an effort was made to transfer the ownership of various patents owned by Spanish Philips Co. to Philips interests in United Nations territory. After protest by the Axis-controlled Philips in Holland the United States Philips interests apparently transferred to the Spanish company all the Spanish patents held by the Philips main of-

ice in Curacao, with which it had an agreement.

An even more sensational disclosure reveals that the highly developed German military communications system is based on information supplied to the Nazis by an American cartel partner with an access to knowledge of experimental work in the laboratories of the United States Navy and Army Signal Corps. This particular cartel has also stifled production of Diesel engines in this country, now so much in demand for both tanks and naval vessels.

The American Bosch Corporation, a majority of whose stock is owned by the German Robert Bosch Company, supplied the German company with information as to developments in short-wave and high-frequency radio, which means the basis of inter-tank, ground-air and infantry radio communication in the German army. The American company got this information from Army experimental laboratories with which it had contracts.

The Kilgore report also says: "The production of Diesel engines in the United States was apparently retarded by the arrangements between American Bosch and Robert Bosch of Germany."

The Bosch Company makes fuel injection equipment essential to the manufacture of Diesel engines. In 1939, the American company asked its German partner for a reduction in royalty rates, complaining that the high cost of Diesel engines was retarding their development. The equipment that Bosch made was particularly high-priced and Bosch was afraid of new competitors coming into the field.

### Germans Are Polite

The Germans sent a polite letter saying that they'd be delighted, but adding that "every situation of this kind" had to have the approval of the German government. They requested that the American company set up in documentary form costs, selling prices and other data. The "other data" seems to have been very full information on the entire Diesel industry in this country.

The Germans refused to lower the royalty rates. Even after the war started and there was a blockade on the German company made use of its American subsidiary to make royalty payments to Bendix Aviation Co., with which it had relations, by instructing the American company to pay to Bendix sums which it owed as royalties to Robert Bosch.

The Kilgore report only begins to scratch the surface of international cartel activities. What it may accomplish will probably be no more than nominal punishment of one or two of the more flagrant offenders. As yet no four-star general has made a speech against these "respectable traitors."

The international cartels are not easily squashed. The Philipses, the Boschses and the others have many faces and many monstrous shapes. If one tentacle is cut off, a new and perhaps more respectable and more evasive one grows to take its place. In truth, the advance of the Red Army into other countries of Eastern Europe is a grave threat to the working and peasant masses of those regions.

## What's Stalin Up To Now?

What is Stalin up to now? This is the question everyone is asking since the press announced that at a recent meeting of the highest ruling body in Russia it was decided to alter constitutionally the form of the present "Soviet Union."

Under Stalin's direction, Premier Molotov introduced a proposal which was unanimously adopted, creating sixteen "constituent republics" out of the present Russian state, each with its own government, finances, army and diplomatic representatives.

In last week's issue of LABOR ACTION it was pointed out that this step was taken for at least two reasons. One reason, and a minor one, is that it might increase the weight the Stalin's representation in any post-war peace conferences. The creation of sixteen diplomatic posts in other countries to represent the Stalinist bureaucracy would give Stalin a greater field of operation in the countries of the world. This aspect of the change is of some importance, although at the present time it is difficult to ascertain exactly

how the new diplomatic status of the sixteen republics will work out.

### The Important Aspect

The first reason given in LABOR ACTION, namely, that the establishment of the sixteen republics will grease the way for the incorporation of new territories under Stalin's rule is, however, the most important aspect of the change. A great deal of ink is being used up in the press of the world to illustrate what possible changes are in store.

There is no doubt that Stalin wishes to create an enormous empire. It is no secret by this time that he will incorporate large parts of Finland and Poland, all of the Baltic states, seek a greater Ukraine, and grab other territories in Europe and Asia. The existence of the "constituent republics" will create a "natural" basis for the inclusion of these territories. The protests of "War and the Workingclass," unofficial mouthpiece for Russian policies, that Stalin seeks no territorial gains from the war, is completely and purposely

misleading, since Russian diplomats all over the world have announced the minimum territories which Russia will insist on.

Political experts have pointed out that Stalin will seek control and domination of Europe, cutting across Germany and the Baltics, and leaving the Western part of the continent under Anglo-American influence. Stalin is prepared, however, to assert his dominance over great areas of Asia and the Near East.

### Some Speculations

Recently a popular columnist asserted that some such "agreement" was reached at Teheran and that the agreement further called for a division of Germany into four main parts, Stalin assuming control and influence over a greater Prussia.

It is impossible to state with certainty now what agreements were reached at Teheran, or whether any agreements were arrived at. But it is clear from the statements made by government officials and writers close to the governments of the United Nations, that the so-called principles of the Four Freedoms is just about finished. Hardly anyone refers to them except to point out that they will never be carried out.

The main feature of Allied diplomacy today is power politics—the struggle over economic, territorial and political spoils of the war. Stalin has an enormous imperialist appetite and means to get it satisfied. The struggle in the "family" of "United" Nations is indeed sharp, though inconclusive. It will get sharper as the days go by.

Yet some people can still write of Stalin's Russia that his armies will bring socialism, peace and security to Europe, and that his victories must be hailed as victories for the oppressed and downtrodden of Europe. In truth, the advance of the Red Army into other countries of Eastern Europe is a grave threat to the working and peasant masses of those regions.

## Funds for the 18

The eighteen Minneapolis trade union and socialist leaders are now behind bars in three federal penitentiaries.

These eighteen people were tried and convicted under the Smith " Gag" act, not for anything they did, but for their opinions alone. Three times the Supreme Court refused to review the case, which would have tested for the first time the constitutionality of this anti-labor act. Thus by these imprisonments people can now be deprived of their freedom to think and speak, this precedent having been set.

The Civil Rights Defense Committee, which is the authorized representative of the eighteen, needs funds to carry on its national campaign to secure the pardon of the eighteen and to provide relief for their wives and children while they are in prison. In some of the families there are babies and children of school age, who need food, clothing and medical care.

We ask our readers to aid by contributing to the Minneapolis Prisoners Pardon and Relief Fund. Money can be sent to the Civil Rights Defense Committee, 160 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., or to LABOR ACTION.

"The President, according to reports, sharply attacked Murray for calling the proposal 'quack medicine,' an obvious reference to the President's use of the term, 'Dr. Win-the-War.' "Murray then asked Mr. Roosevelt:

"Do you expect to get a realistic tax program?"

"The President said no.

"Do you expect to get a good subsidy program?"

"Mr. Roosevelt said no.

"In such a case," Murray asked, 'would you sign a national service bill if Congress passed it?'

"The President said he would sign it.

"Murray grew red-faced while Bill Green fidgeted.

"Suppose Congress were to pass a severe Smith anti-strike bill instead of a national service law . . . Murray queried.

"The President said he would sign that, too.

"Murray then said he would tour the country and speak in opposition to the President's proposal. Mr. Roosevelt declared that Murray did not speak for the CIO. The President then waved a telegram which endorsed his views.

"It was signed by a prominent left wing CIO leader.

"Murray saw red in more ways than one—and left shortly after."

There is the eloquent story of the meeting between the President and the two outstanding leaders of the organized labor movement over the most vital questions facing the American working class at this moment—taxes, the cost of living and the proposed slave act.

Roosevelt owes his high office, three times in a row, to the millions of votes mobilized for him in every campaign by the leaders of the trade unions. He counts upon those votes for success in his coming campaign for a fourth term. Neither he nor his party can hope to retain control of the legislative and executive branches of the government without them.

The Baron and Boss

Yet when the official spokesmen of the labor movement come before him in the most friendly and docile way to discuss problems which are of the most urgent importance to the working class, he treats them with the contempt a feudal baron showed his serfs, or a powerful political boss shows a winning ward-heeler.

The recent White House meeting is not the first time that Roosevelt has acted toward labor and its opinions and demands with this confident contempt. Murray, Lewis and Green have been treated by Roosevelt as

(Continued on page 4)

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Dalrymple Now Faces Expulsion By Union

By BILL FORD

AKRON, Feb. 7.—Dictator Sherman H. Dalrymple, president of the United Rubber Workers of America, CIO, today stands face to face with formal charges which will undoubtedly lead to his expulsion from his own local union.

Word of this action, taken at Goodrich Local No. 5, spread swiftly throughout Akron today, following announcement yesterday at the local's business meeting that charges have been filed in the local against Dalrymple for his wholesale violation of the union's constitution and the democratic rights of the membership in the case of his expulsion of seventy striking workers at General Tire Local 9 here recently.

Workers Take Action

Action is what thousands of Akron rubber workers have been demanding against Dalrymple since his infamous, bureaucratic move to throw these workers out onto the streets almost a month ago, got them blacklisted by the rubber barons and brought on unsuccessful attempts to have some of their leaders railroaded immediately into the Army.

Plants throughout the city have been flooded with petitions, signed

A Reader Likes Our Ideas

Dear Editor:

The editors of LABOR ACTION, as well as the people associated with the Workers Party, have many good ideas about what to do in the post-war period.

Why not write them out in the form of a congressional bill and have it introduced by some congressman who can be induced to introduce it as a "request bill"?

I believe that this will give your ideas substance. Instead of being merely theoretical, it would make them much more real to your readers.

No doubt you remember what effective use was made of the American Youth Act, etc., by left wing organization.

A broad campaign in the unions and outside can be conducted around such a bill, which can easily rival the niggardly Beveridge Plan.

It's not essential to have all ideas in one bill. The program may be incorporated into a series of bills.

One can be pushed more or before the others, i.e., a thirty-hour week bill. I would like to see the Workers Party take the lead on this issue now.

M. A., Brooklyn.

The Workers Party does not have any "friends" in Congress. Its bold pro-labor and revolutionary program precludes that. The post-war program of the Workers Party must be pushed by labor itself.

However, labor as a whole and all branches of the organized labor movement have today nothing but a quiescent base politically. The two capitalist parties through which labor still hopelessly tries to project its interests are only concerned about labor's voting power at election times.

The post-war program of the Workers Party, including the thirty-hour week, is the only one that squarely meets the issues before us. What the situation requires is for the organized labor movement of the country to set up its independent class political party—on a nationwide scale—as the instrument to accomplish the program of which you think so much. That's what we are rooting for.—The Editor.

by thousands of union men and women, demanding the immediate restoration of these union men to their jobs, the holding of mass meetings to discuss the issues, and the like. The Akron Beacon Journal of February 6 finally admits that "the situation may be more serious than many persons realize."

Dalrymple was called before the Executive Board of Goodrich Local last week to explain his union-wrecking deeds. Brazen, ignorant blusterer that he is, he moved nobody for all his threats, apparently, for at the next local business meeting he will have an "opportunity" to face the aroused membership regarding the formal charges against him. Not even he can doubt that he will receive a hot reception!

In a seven-page letter sent out on January 22 to the membership on behalf of the international union's General Executive Board, L. S. Buckmaster and C. E. Lanning, respectively vice-president and secretary-treasurer of the international, attempted to counteract the offensive begun by the ranks of the rubber union against Dictator Dalrymple. This letter only succeeded further in inflaming the membership by the boldness of the GEB in backing Dalrymple and the scurrilous attack it leveled against the thousands of members who supposedly "permit unfair management to provoke us into the position of betraying our patriotism." This letter stated that General Local 9 has been brought to "a state of chaos and anarchy" by disruptive actions. The natural desire of the General Local membership to protect its own members and their rights is, of course, "disruptive" to the top officialdom of the URWA and the management of the company!

Swartz Follows Dalrymple

Meanwhile, events at General Local 9 have been making headlines in the local press. Carl Swartz, appointed "administrator" over the local by the GEB, has continued to carry through the heavy-handed tactics begun by Dalrymple. He finally got around to calling a meeting of the local last week, after more than a month, and promptly ruled out of order a resolution condemning Dalrymple's expulsion of the seventy unionists and demanding their immediate reinstatement.

Swartz's bureaucratic ruling brought forth a tremendous roar of boos and cat-calls from the seven hundred members present. One of the rank and file leaders of the lo-

cal, a former president of the local, took the platform to call for a standing vote on the resolution. Every member there rose to support the resolution, with the exception of a handful of office-holders.

After a slight melee, in which nobody was struck or hurt, Swartz and his tiny clique retired from the hall and the membership remained to hold a second meeting. A resolution was then passed demanding the resignation of the officers of the local and four of the seven members of its executive board. Charges asking expulsion of those officials for neglect of duty have been filed by the so-called "insurgent" group.

As a result of this demonstration

by the rank and file group of General Local that they have a clear and overwhelming majority of the several thousands in the plant behind them against Dalrymple and his stooges, Dalrymple again rushed into print in the next few days with the notice that Ray Sullivan and Howard Haas, leaders of the "insurgent" group, must appear before the GEB meeting on February 14 to answer "charges" of "inciting to mob action" and committing "assault and battery upon certain officials of the General Local."

In reply, Sullivan declared: "I am glad to appear before the international board, a privilege that has been denied me until this date, although I have made both telephone

and telegraph appeals to be granted a hearing in regard to the injustices done to the workers of the General Tire & Rubber Co. by our international board."

Further, he declared that he regarded Dalrymple's move as a continuation of the threats "to stop us from making appeals to other local unions to aid us in carrying on the fight for these seventy expelled workers."

Haas replied in addition that he was anxious to appear before the board and would demand to know why the members of the General Local had been denied the rights guaranteed them under the URWA constitution.

Piling Insult on Injury

This piling up of insults to the rights of the membership by Dalrymple's crew only has added further fuel to the ranks' indignation. In his mad effort to rule, Dalrymple now appears to be getting ready to take disciplinary action against these leaders of the ranks for merely the expression of opinion and active support to those workers already expelled!

Already on February 6 the Beacon Journal, which has backed Dalrymple to the hilt throughout his messy dealings, is beginning to speculate on the probable outcome of this first "serious split" in the URWA.

Harold Lengs, labor reporter, in his weekly column points out that the "anti-Dalrymple forces within the URWA, who have never had a real issue with which to campaign, were given something with which to work. And working they are." He consoles the URWA top bureaucrats with the thought that in the past at conventions Dalrymple could muster sufficient support from numerous smaller locals about the country to defeat the big and more advanced Akron locals.

In this connection it might be mentioned that the international officers are now beginning to lose sleep about loss of support from enough of these little locals to lose their jobs. Consequently they are fighting with their backs to the wall—like cornered rats, and from every indication given so far they won't stop at any constitutional provisions standing in their path of rule or ruin.

Fortunately, this fact is slowly being grasped by the members, and when it finally is clearly seen—probably within a short time following the formal hearings of appeals from the seventy expelled workers—the membership will know how to extract a just and conclusive retribution.

The Tasks Ahead

Now that the anti-union forces have been routed, it is time again for progressive unionists in the plant to get together for the job of strengthening their union. The administration is not perfect, but its weaknesses can be overcome only by the dependency of the administration on a progressive rank and file that will push it forward.

The rank and file must actively fight the dangers ahead. It must get behind the fight against time-study. As a means of offsetting the layoffs the unorganized must be organized.

The membership must insist on a reconstitution of educational activity in the local so that the membership can be prepared for the future problems that face them. The Bushkill program must again be the watchword of the progressives.

The Melon and the Rind

In 1943, Bethlehem Steel cleared \$32,124,592 in profits. Naturally, taxes and every other means of pulling down the "net" had been deducted.

In 1942 the "net" was \$25,387,760.

At a glance you can see that Bethlehem did almost thirty per cent better in 1943 than in 1942.

The dividend distribution reflects Bethlehem's war prosperity. For 1943 it was \$8.58 a share to each holder—JUST FOR HOLDING IT—whereas in 1942 it was \$6.31 a share.

Eugene G. Grace, president of the company, naturally got a nice slice of the war melon in "salary and special incentive pay." Although the executive officers of the company "volunteered reductions in their incentive compensation"—DOUBTLESS FOR TAX REASONS—still Mr. Grace's share was \$221,645. After making tax and other deductions, Mr. Grace still had to the good \$42,546—not counting his share in dividends, interest on bonds, etc.

In contrast, the average yearly income of workers in war industries—before tax, bonds, social security and other deductions—is \$2,589. After these cuts in workers' wages, the take-home averages \$2,158. This is roughly one-twentieth of Mr. Grace's \$42,546.

The workers get the rind of the war melon.

Progressives Win In Brewster Election --

(Continued from page 1)

had opposed him so vehemently and successfully at the UAW convention last fall. Then the slander against De Lorenzo and his administration began anew. Olerio announced himself publicly as a candidate for president to oppose De Lorenzo. The Communists and their reactionary friends immediately joined hands with him. From that time on the Olerio forces began to blame the administration for everything.

"Two-Cent All" Olerio, as he was known to the membership because of his desire to settle a wage increase for two cents without militant action—despite the fact that the shop committee was able to get three times that when the contract was finally signed—tried at this time to become the defender of the office workers at the plant.

The office workers have had months of run-around by the WLB. The union has been fighting for increases for them but the WLB turned a deaf ear to their needs.

Olerio has accused the administration of being unable to get more money for them. But when asked directly what he would do to help the office workers get their increases he became strangely silent.

Unlike the administration, whose program has been that it is necessary to fight the WLB and its vicious Little Steel formula, Brother Olerio could only renew his no-strike pledge. Instead of placing the blame on the WLB and the company for refusing to bargain on the question of the office workers' rates, he blamed the union.

Like the Vinson Committee, Olerio blamed the union for every failure of management. Layoffs, which have recently taken place because of the Vinson Committee, have suddenly become the administration's fault.

The administration had to battle against heavy odds. Olerio was the

direct representative of the Adhesion-Frankenstein faction in the UAW. He entered the election campaign heavily backed by this faction and with the powers of two international officers behind him. He was an ally of the Stalinists, who saw in him their hope of killing a militant local that was ever a thorn in their side.

Olerio was the hope of the anti-union elements in the local. He was the hope of the reactionary Vinson Committee. He was the hope of the company that doesn't like militant unionism. But despite all this power and finance, despite mud-slinging, lies, distortions, introduction of extraneous issues, threats of police interference, anti-Semitism in the Johnsville campaign and a score of other anti-union acts, the membership was clearly able to come out the victor and re-elect real union men to office.

\$28 to \$30 a Week For a Family Man

By R. PHILIPS

"Help Wanted: Typist-switchboard operator, 5-day week, \$85 monthly." This is a typical ad from the Help Wanted column of a New York newspaper.

It illustrates graphically the plight of a large section of American labor—the white collar workers.

Deduct from that \$85 monthly the withholding tax, social security, war bond purchases. The white collar worker goes home with a pay envelope that, at prices during the "great depression," would have permitted him to live at a mere subsistence level. Today it means that millions of white collar workers are living below a subsistence level, below even the standards set by the Little Steel wage formula.

These workers, through their CIO union, are asking the city for a \$400 yearly raise, an increase of only the fifteen per cent allowed by the Little Steel formula.

Mayor La Guardia and the city fathers, whose chief concern is paying the bankers their yearly interest on loans to the city, have so far turned a deaf ear to the pleas of these workers.

The "Forgotten Army" Speaking for white collar workers at later hearings of the subcommittee were representatives of the AFL, who called them "the nation's forgotten army in this war." They submitted testimony to show that where white collar employees were organized, they had been in a better position to maintain their wages against rising living costs.

New York City Employees The difficulties of white collar workers in government employ in

New York City were revealed at hearings before a Senate subcommittee investigating the cost of living.

Sanitation workers, most of them heads of families, take home an average of \$28 to \$30 per week. One of their number, John Alessi, appeared at the hearings to give his story of the difficulties of supporting his family of five on his salary of \$2,236 a year.

These workers, through their CIO union, are asking the city for a \$400 yearly raise, an increase of only the fifteen per cent allowed by the Little Steel formula.

Mayor La Guardia and the city fathers, whose chief concern is paying the bankers their yearly interest on loans to the city, have so far turned a deaf ear to the pleas of these workers.

The "Forgotten Army" Speaking for white collar workers at later hearings of the subcommittee were representatives of the AFL, who called them "the nation's forgotten army in this war." They submitted testimony to show that where white collar employees were organized, they had been in a better position to maintain their wages against rising living costs.

Some weeks ago, that outstanding capitalist paper, the New York Times, featured news stories on the underpaid white collar workers. Examination of these stories showed that the Times's tears were strictly crocodile.

The real purpose of the stories was not to aid white collar workers in remedying their conditions. It was an attempt to prejudice them against factory workers, who, according to the Times, are rolling in wartime dough, while respectable white collar employees starve.

The fact is, of course, that factory workers have taken a wage cut due to the startling rise in the cost of living during the last three years.

Organization of the Thing

If they are better off than the white collar worker, it is because they are ORGANIZED into unions which achieved wage gains before the war. The factory workers fought and sacrificed to win these gains, as they are fighting now to protect themselves against the encroachment of rising living costs.

The way out for the white collar worker is through unionization and solidarity with the industrial worker in the fight to break the Little Steel stranglehold on wages.

WORLD EVENTS

By Europacus

What Goes on in North Africa?

There is no domain where official hush-hush policy is more effective than in colonial affairs. It has become nearly impossible, for example, to get any picture of what has been going on in French Morocco. Apparently large-scale manifestations have taken place there and clashes with French military police. For a number of days martial law was proclaimed in Morocco. The Moroccan Arabs, apparently in contact with similar movements in Algeria and Tunisia, are asking for self-determination. A Morocco Defense Committee has been established in Cairo, and appeals for support to the cause of Arab North Africa in Egypt and the other Arab countries of the East.

The tension must be very great all over North Africa, since the de Gaulle administration has recently made a number of small concessions to the Arabs. Following a time-honored practice, they have granted

citizenship rights to a couple of thousand rich Arab leaders, hoping thus to stave off the most conscious of the Arab leadership and to buy them for their cause.

At the same time a shameless campaign has been launched by de Gaulle, picturing Arab nationalist agitation as German and fascist inspired.

The New York Times last week, following up this campaign, printed a long dispatch from Algiers purporting to show connections between Arab leaders and German agents. Now we have no means whatsoever to find out if the allegations with regard to these two or three Arab nationalists are based on fact. We do not even know if these nationalists—allegedly paid by Germany—play any role in the genuine nationalist movement, but the procedures of slander here employed deserve in any case to be exposed.

A Classical Method of Discrediting

The method is exactly the same which was employed in the Moscow witch-hunts and other classical amalgams: Mr. X is an agent of Germany, Mr. Y knows Mr. Y. Mr. Y is an active nationalist. Therefore, the nationalist movement is paid by Nazi.

It is not at all unlikely that this or that Arab nationalist got into contact with Nazi agents—just as Bose, one of the leaders of the Indian Congress Party, went over to Japan—but is the Indian Congress Party therefore an agency of Japan?

The Arab nationalist movement of North Africa before the war was a left wing movement. It had established close links with the Popular

Front. After the hopes of the peoples of North Africa had been deceived by the French Popular Front, after they had found out that, Popular Front or not, the oppression of the Africans remained basically the same, they had turned toward the French revolutionary parties (Trotskists and PSOP) for help. Today, insofar as can be ascertained, these nationalist leaders are still not allowed to publish their papers in "democratic" de Gaulleist North Africa. They have still no freedom of assembly nor of organization. Some of them are still banished into the unhealthy swamps of French West Africa and into the Sahara.

De Gaulle's Brand of "Democracy"

There is a tendency, even among radicals, to hail de Gaulle and his followers as moving toward democracy. Nothing is further from the truth. The de Gaulle administration in North Africa follows the line of previous French colonial imperialism, and no hypocritical "liberal" declarations can change this. De Gaulle tries to streamline French colonial administration, give it a slightly more modern slant, but basically his oppression is in no degree different from the previous one.

A French colonial conference is now taking place in Brazzaville, Congo, with the alleged purpose of increasing the participation of the natives in the administration of the French colonial empire. This conference proposes to give citizenship to the natives. Good...but "This citizenship will be distinguished from French citizenship on the one hand and from no citizenship on the other." In other words, the natives

will still have no say in their own affairs, which will still be handled by the French.

The President of the French Consultative Assembly in Algiers—Mr. Gouin, a "socialist"—recently summed up the character of this whole democracy very nicely: "How can we liberate the natives?" he said. "This would imply that we ever enslaved them. We never did anything of the sort..."

Ten million Arabs in North Africa want to get rid of the yoke of oppression of the French. They want the right of self-determination, for which the Atlantic Charter allegedly stands. It is the job of the labor movement in this country to see to it that this voice is not choked, that the Arabs are at least allowed to present their case. Where are all our liberals when it comes to exposing the infamous slanders of the New York Times and other valets of American imperialist designs?

Plenty of Paper for Anti-Semitic Lies

A sordid picture of the sham and hypocrisy that dictates British policies is drawn by the following news item which appeared in the New York newspaper, PM:

During the same time when shipping space was avowedly non-existent for sending much-needed food to the starving in India, tons of anti-Semitic literature, printed in Great Britain, was carried in precious cargo space to Canada and other parts of the British Empire.

The Ministry of Economic Warfare refused to spare newspaper for the Free French newspaper in London and other progressive publications, but great quantities of good quality paper were allotted for the printing of the forged "Protocols of Zion."

The latter are merely a part of the barrage of race propaganda sent to Canada by the semi-fascist and racist organizations centering around the British Israelite World Federation.

This inflammatory material was cleared by the Canadian customs, although it has been branded a forgery in courts and accepted as such throughout the world. It is being sold openly in Toronto at one of the busiest intersections of the city.

The British Israelite World Federation is a religious-political organization which advocates a British version of the master race theory. It has a strong following in Canada and the British Empire. Its American counterpart is the Anglo-Saxon Federation.

New York

Workers Party School

MID-WINTER SESSION

8:15 p.m.

History of the American Labor Movement By DAVID COOLIDGE

Also at

8:15 p.m.

Elements of Marxian Political Economy By JOSEPH CARTER

FRIDAY EVENINGS

Feb. 18 through March 24

Six Sessions per Course \$1.00 per Course

LABOR TEMPLE 14th Street and Second Avenue

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

I wish to enroll for the following course (check one). Enclosed find payment.

( ) American Labor Movement ( ) Political Economy

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Address \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

THE PAMPHLET PLENTY FOR ALL

The Meaning of Socialism By Ernest Lund

IT TELLS YOU:

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

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW

Sixty Pages Ten Cents per Copy

Published by:

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Address \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

# 'Common Man' Wallace Can't Fight Fascism

By RALPH MARVIN

Vice-President Wallace, bursting with the spirit of good will and concern for the "common man," delivered himself of another of his faith, hope and prosperity speeches the other day. Being the good fellow that he is, he had a word of praise for everybody.

Labor has done a splendid job during the war and "has come of age." Big business—except for a few naughty capitalists who insisted on making profits for the sake of money and not the general welfare—has, by and large, done a noble job in "increasing production and thereby serving humanity." "Big agriculture" too has made no small contribution to the interests of "humanity."

## A NEEDED WARNING

After handing out the bouquets, like some kind uncle, Mr. Wallace then issued a word of warning. The children in the family must not fight with each other.

"The big three—big business, big labor and big agriculture"—in the struggle to grab federal power for monopolistic purposes, are certain (!) to come into serious conflict unless they recognize the superior claims of the general welfare of the common man.... Each of the big three... can save itself only if it learns to work with the other two and with the government in terms of the general welfare. To work together without slipping into an American fascism will be the central problem of post-war democracy."

We are not interested right now in the personal taste or political ambitions that prompt Mr. Wallace to speak out as he does. But of immense importance for the American worker are the problems he raises. First he correctly indicates that the major problem of post-war America is preventing fascism. Secondly, he offers a way (we will prove it is ineffective and worthless) to fight the coming American fascism.

Before we can proceed to discuss the matter, it is necessary to understand just exactly what we are talking about. What is fascism? How did it arise in other countries? After knowing the character of the brute and how it was born, we can proceed to find means of fighting it.

## WHAT IS FASCISM?

Fascism, in a nutshell, means the annihilation of the working class as an organized force in society. In the two major countries where fascism ruled, Germany and Italy, the first acts of the fascist regimes on taking power were to smash the trade unions and workers' political parties, and to wipe out freedom of the press, speech and assembly. It is because fascism is directed mainly against the working class that it is primarily a worker's problem.

Now fascism is no accident in history. It does not happen because nobody is looking nor does it "slip in" unnoticed, as Mr. Wallace delicately suggests. In the two countries where fascism took its most developed form, Italy and Germany, the fascist regimes came to power as a result of a conscious, well-planned policy of the big capitalists to smash the labor movement in an effort to preserve the profit system.

The capitalist economic system, that is, the profit system, had collapsed in both countries. There were millions unemployed in Germany and the standard of living of the working class had dropped considerably. The economic crisis was acute and the capitalists could no longer afford to make the concessions to labor they begrudgingly hand out in better times.

Furthermore, the capitalists could no longer solve the problems of the economic system under the old parliamentary "democratic" form of government. The only way capitalism could save itself was to cut down on the cost of labor and prevent the trade unions from fighting for better wages. That could be done only with the iron fist of fascist dictatorship.

In Italy, the working class scared the life out of the capitalists by seizing the factories. In 1919, 600,000 metal workers took over the industries in the major industrial cities. From that time on, the Blackshirt organization led by Mussolini grew enormously.

## BIG BUSINESS GAVE THE DOUGH

Hitler's coffers were filled by German big business. Mussolini's lackshirts were built up and supported by the finances of the big Italian magnates. In both cases it was a life-or-death question for the capitalists. They planned to smash the labor movements and they armed the fascist organizations to do it.

As one writer put it, the fascist dictatorship is the iron hoop with which the capitalists try to patch up the broken barrel of capitalism. This iron hoop means the death squeeze for the working class.

Now let us examine the peace offering of Uncle Henry. He wants labor to collaborate with capital in order to stave off fascism. But that is a capitalist maneuver to weaken labor's main weapon—its independent strength and organization.

Labor is and can be the ONLY effective fighter against fascism. In a time of crisis, the capitalist partners that Wallace now offers labor will choose fascism to solve their problems rather than give in to labor's basic demands. It was so in Germany and Italy, and will be so again. In the fight against fascism, labor can depend only on itself.

## ENTER THE "COMMON MAN"

Wallace would like to see collaboration between labor and capital in the interests of the "common man." But who is this mysterious fellow, the "Common Man"?

Certainly not the capitalist! Scratch 9,999 out of 10,000 people on the street and you can't find a capitalist!

The common man is the working man, the general welfare is the welfare of the masses of people, not of the capitalists.

Wallace wants labor and capital to embrace each other in the interests of the common man. But the capitalists only embrace the workers in order to tie their hands. The real meaning of collaboration is to weaken labor's independent class organization and action.

Labor's first move, therefore, is to assert its independence from the capitalist parties. "Organized labor has come of age," says Mr. Wallace. That is true, but not, as he says, in order "to ask for fair and honest treatment."

Wallace would keep labor in its old menial position of beggar at the table of the capitalists. He would have labor "ask"—when it has the power to TAKE. He would tie it to the apron of big business, the organizers of fascism. That is because Mr. Wallace speaks in the name of the capitalists and of the profit system.

Labor's "coming of age" must take form in independent political action. It needs its own party, free from the twin-brother representatives of American capitalists, the Republican and Democratic Parties. That means the formation of an Independent Labor Party. By moving in the direction of INDEPENDENT political action, labor prepares itself for its effective struggle against American fascism.

# U. S. Government Subsidizes Big Business in Near East

## A Pipeline To Carry Oil and Profits

By STANLEY GREY

The United States government has decided to "actively participate" in the development of pipelines and oil refineries in the Near East.

Concretely, this means that the government will lay out huge sums of capital required for these projects, will give political protection to the investments of the private companies having the oil concessions, and make the American oil companies more powerful as bargaining and business agents on the world market. This is a major victory for big business, the spoils to be bigger and safer profits for the large oil companies.

## Oily Worries

The American oil industry has been very concerned about what the government's policy would be with respect to foreign investments and the development of American business abroad. At the rate at which American resources are being used now, there would be only enough oil in this country to last another twelve to fourteen years. It became absolutely necessary for American oil companies to get control of foreign sources. Standard Oil already had dominant control of the wealthy oil supply of Venezuela. The next move was in the direction of the Middle East, whose present crude oil reserves are estimated at about twenty billion barrels, or about the same as that of the United States.

In recent years, the Standard Oil Co. of California, the Texas Co. and the Gulf Oil Corp. have obtained vital concessions in Saudi Arabia, the Behrein Islands and Kuwait in the Persian Gulf. But this was not enough. American oil had to extend its influence and power if it was to dominate this very fertile oil region. The big question for the oil companies was whether the government would protect their investments with its political support and contribute capital for the huge developments necessary—in a word, GUARANTEE THEIR PROFITS.

On November 5, 1943, the Foreign Operations Committee submitted a

report to Secretary Ickes, who is president of the government Petroleum Reserves Corp., asking for a statement of policy by the government on a number of important points. The chairman of this committee is Oliver Harden, vice-president of Standard Oil of New Jersey and a leading figure in the Standard Oil-I. G. Farben cartel.

Among other requests of the report such as abrogation of the anti-trust laws and the transfer to private oil companies of the facilities developed by the government during the war, was the request that the government expand its oil activities and protect them against "the political risks involved in the use of private capital abroad."

## Another Cost-Plus Scheme

The recent government decision to enter the oil business is a clear-cut answer to the demands of big business. The American oil companies can proceed full steam ahead, the government—with the people's money, of course—will support them financially and politically. They don't have to worry about their profits from foreign investments. A new form of "cost-plus" arrangement is being worked out on a world scale.

What precisely is the character of the government's "participation" in the new Near East enterprise? A network of pipelines from the Persian Gulf area to Mediterranean ports and several oil refineries are going to be constructed in the next eighteen months to two years. The cost will be "several hundred million dollars." The government is going to lay out most of the money for this development. As the report in the New York Times of January 27 stated, "Since other interests have laid the groundwork for this development, it is expected that the necessary funds for the expansion will be furnished almost entirely by the United States government." The agency for this supply of capital will be the Petroleum Reserves Corp. Thus the private oil companies are going to reap the profits from devel-

opments constructed at government expense!

## The Flag Behind the Dollar

Another way in which the government will help increase the profits of the large oil companies is by putting political pressure, as the most powerful nation in the world, behind the demands of the oil companies.

An excellent example of this is the government's bargaining with England on behalf of the Gulf Oil Co. This company has the Kuwait concession on the shore of the Persian Gulf. It had an agreement with the Anglo-Iranian Co. in which the British government has a dominant interest, that oil produced from that concession would not be marketed in areas now served by the British company.

But the United States Department of State has now stepped in and is taking up with the British government the question of revising that clause in the agreement. Where the Gulf Oil Co. as a private enterprise was unable to invade Britain's market for oil, the United States government will probably succeed. That will mean less risk and more profits for the Gulf Oil Co.

The step taken by the government to participate in oil developments in the Near East, is a very important indicator of the role of the government in the post-war period. Heretofore the government has never on any large scale been a direct PARTNER of the big capitalists in their investments in foreign countries. The government has almost always PROTECTED the capitalists' investments by exerting its political and economic force in any situation.

## A New Situation

For example, the relations between the United States and the Philippines or Cuba were determined largely by the interests of the large sugar magnates in this country. However, in this new situation the government is becoming a junior partner in the firm. The Petroleum Reserves Corp. has been trying for

months to get a forty per cent interest in the concessions of the American oil companies in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the island of Bahrain.

The main prospect seems clear. The United States government is going to take an active and direct part in the imperialist activities of big business.

The government's direct participation in imperialist economic ventures will lead to a more direct and immediate conflict between itself and the governments of other countries. In the example of the Gulf Oil Co. given above, it is the United States government which is bargaining with the British government. It is doing this in the interests mainly of the Gulf Oil Co. Nevertheless, it is the government as a NATION that is directly asserting the interests of American capitalists.

The government becomes the shield and the armor bearer of the capitalist enterprises. It acts to secure their profits. As such it will have to accept the challenge of competition from other capitalist countries as a direct challenge to itself—and where the economic issues are great enough it will have to fight for domination.

In a word, the hidden and subtle character of pre-war imperialism assumes a more open and direct form. There will be no mistaking the fact that the government acts abroad in the interests of the big capitalists—and is in fact, on major issues, the direct tool of big business to guarantee its profits and its economic dominion over foreign territories.

## ICKES OUGHT TO KNOW

"Tell me the sort of agreement that the United Nations will reach with respect to the world's petroleum resources when the war is over, and I will undertake to analyze the durability of the peace that is to come." —Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, in January American Magazine.

# Of Special Interest to Women

By Susan Green

The extreme shortage of low-priced textiles has been felt by every housewife trying to keep her end up. Take children's panties, for instance. Those nice soft garments in white or pink that you could buy for ten or fifteen cents in Woolworth's or at almost anywhere else—they have gone with the wind.

But here comes the War Production Board to your rescue. It has allowed material for the production of these indispensable panties. But wait a bit. It's too soon to rub your hands in anticipatory glee. There's a catch.

The WPB order says that panties from sizes two to twelve may be manufactured, not to cost more than FIFTY CENTS retail. How do you like that? Do you think any manufacturer is going to make them to sell for ten or fifteen cents?

You will pay three, four and five times as much for your textiles. The textile manufacturers will make three, four and five times as much profits.

Would you like to know why the WPB is so very considerate of the textile manufacturers? Would you like to know why this so-called government agency, supposed to represent the interests of the people, works hand-in-glove with the war profiteers? Live and learn.

The man at the head of the WPB in charge of textiles, clothing and leather is J. Spencer Love—whose love for his own interests surmounts all else.

For this man Love is the president of Burlington Mills Corporation—WHICH PRODUCES TEXTILE GOODS. No two-by-four concern is Burlington Mills Corporation. It has forty-four plants in North Carolina and is worth \$50,000,000.

On the WPB Mr. Love is paid one dollar a year. In 1942, however, he received from his connection with Burlington Mills a remuneration of \$196,340. That was made up of his base salary of \$52,800 a year and the balance of \$143,540 was his 3% per cent slice of the net profits of the corporation.

Why wouldn't Mr. Love be in favor of charging fifty cents for ten or fifteen cents' worth of pantie? THE MORE NET PROFITS FOR HIS CORPORATION, THE MORE "TAKE-HOME PAY" FOR MR. LOVE.

Want to know something else about Mr. Love and his Burlington Mills Corporation?

HE AND HIS OUTFIT ARE RABIDLY ANTI-LABOR AND ANTI-UNION.

As president of this great manufacturing chain he has put up a die-hard fight against labor organization—and he still fights labor. All of his plants are on an open-shop basis.

In the last two years the Textile Workers Union, CIO, succeeded in winning collective bargaining rights through a War Labor Board election in three of the corporation's plants. Then what happened?

So rock-bedded is Mr. Love's opposition to labor's rights to organize and bargain collectively that he closed down those three plants in which



the union won recognition—rather than deal with the union!

This is the type of man who is placed at the head of the important textile, clothing and leather department of the WPB—presumably to protect the "public" interest, including that of labor and the consumer.

Every department of government is honey-combed with the gentry typified by Mr. Love of Burlington Mills Corporation. It is high time to throw them out—together with these government agencies which are camouflages for big business.

Throughout the length and breadth of the land should arise a cry of angry protest. Let us demand that committees of workers, housewives, working farmers and the common people take charge of the business of supplying consumer needs at fair prices.

This column's hat is off to the 2,700 workers in the Roebing's Sons Company plant at Trenton, N. J.

Recently they walked out on strike in sympathy with nineteen women employees whose demand for equal pay for equal work had been refused by the War Labor Board. The women involved are wrappers of wire, who are getting fifteen per cent less pay than men doing the same job.

Charles Kovacs of the United Steel Workers, CIO, called this flagrant injustice a "minor grievance." The 2,700 fellow workers of the nineteen aggrieved women, didn't think so.

Kovacs tried to do the dirty work heretofore done exclusively by the capitalists, namely, break the strike. "Only the nation's enemies can profit from this walkout," he said.

However, looking the situation squarely in the eye, the 2,700 men and women workers saw clearly that only the enemies of labor profit from wage differentials between men and women workers.

Readers of this column have become acquainted with "We, the Mothers, Mobilize for America." The outfit smells to high heaven with America First and other fascist connections.

Now it is planning to hold a national convention in Chicago in the near future—to call for "an immediate armistice and a negotiated peace."

"Peace" is a wonderful word—and the contents of real peace we all yearn for. Already this monstrous war has taken a world toll of 25,000,000 missing, wounded and dead. We shudder away from visualizing this gigantic mass of human carnage.

The share of the United States in this useless human sacrifice is still comparatively small, but from all sides come official warnings that casualty lists of American boys are going to increase and multiply to what ghastly figure nobody knows.

It is only natural that the mothers of American boys in the armed forces should be interested in armistice and peace. But they must keep away from "We the Mothers, Mobilize for America" and similar fascist organizations. Their purpose is only to utilize the honest suffering of mothers in a DISHONEST, REACTIONARY CAUSE.

What is that cause? The cause of Coughlin, of Gerald K. Smith, of McWilliams. The cause of the anti-Semitic gangs. The cause of the Jim Crow pogromists. The cause of the union smashers. The cause of the fascists in this country.

What kind of peace can these enemies of human progress stand for?

Does LABOR ACTION want "an armistice and a negotiated peace"? Yes, indeed—but with the realization that peace to be lasting and to give the world the real contents of peace cannot be had with the existing powers.

The armistice must be made by workers' governments that have replaced the present regimes in all belligerent countries. The terms of peace must be negotiated between such workers' governments talking for the suffering peoples of the world.

LABOR ACTION appeals to the mothers of America to help in the struggle for a workers' government in America—to set the example for all working people to follow.

**LABOR ACTION**  
A Paper in the Interests of Labor

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

Volume 8, No. 7 February 14, 1944

ALBERT GATES, Editor  
GERTRUDE SHAW, Managing Editor

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

Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1946,  
at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the  
Act of March 3, 1879.

# A "Lasting Peace" Based On Exploitation

By LEON GORDON

Hitler's dream of world empire, even of European empire, has been shattered. His latest speech was, for so tireless a word-spouter, unbelievably brief and, besides, altogether defensive. The United Nations will probably have their opportunity to organize a "lasting peace."

From the very first day of the war, and long before, we said that neither Hitler nor the Allied capitalists and Soviet bureaucrats could possibly establish an enduring and a just peace, that they could only fight for markets, raw materials, areas for investment, for bases, power and prestige—in short, for imperialist aims. All the vague agreements made public and all the noble slogans are fine phrases—nothing more.

Were we right? Are we right? Let's examine in a summary fashion some of the international developments of the past month alone, on the Allied side of the fence. All quotations are from that great source of light and truth, the New York Times, and so, we trust, are free from any influence of Hitler's propaganda machine.

## CZECHS AND RUSSIANS

On February 3 in London, Dr. Benes, President of the Czechoslovak government in exile, made a two and a half hour speech, praising the "new" and still changing Russia and the recent Soviet-Czech treaty. Friendship with Moscow, said he, "is the guarantee of our frontier... of our independence." Stalin, he added, is a very great statesman.

On February 4 in Washington, Jan Masaryk, Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, asked to comment on the Benes speech, stated:

"We are very close to Russia geographically and have to act accordingly. If there were 130,000,000 Czechs, it would be different... When you're small, things are more difficult. That's why we have to play penny-ante."

## BRITAIN MANEUVERS

On January 24 in Toronto, Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, said that the dominions must be more closely united with the mother country after the war in all ways—foreign policy, economic affairs, defense, colonial questions. Why? Because Britain alone "could hardly claim equal partnership" with such great powers as the United States, Russia and China.

A few weeks ago, Prime Minister Smuts of South Africa, Churchill's right-hand man in imperial affairs, suggested that the small nations of Western Europe tie up in some way with the Empire. Why? Same answer as given above by Halifax.

Prime Minister King of Canada reacted coldly to the Halifax proposal. Halifax and Smuts were suggesting, he said, "an inevitable rivalry between the great powers. Could Canada, situated as she is geographically between the United States and the Soviet Union and at the same time a member of the British Commonwealth, for one moment support such an idea?"

For Czechoslovakia, you see, it's unpleasant but easy, for only Russia is near. The Canadians are really in a spot.

## MOLOTOV COCKTAIL

The British seek to tighten up their empire. At the same time Stalin has proceeded (in words) to loosen up the Soviet Union—to make space for a few additions. On February 2 "responsible United Nations officials" in London told the New York Times correspondent that Stalin was evidently laying the groundwork for a greater empire and for a world divided into four great spheres of influence. The Russian move, says the Times correspondent, was the "most explosive 'Molotov cocktail' thrown into the world-political sphere since... the Russo-German pact of August, 1939."

## A LITTLE DEAL PERHAPS

In connection with the Russo-Polish quarrel, Foreign Minister Eden was asked whether Britain still held to the Atlantic Charter. Yes, he said, but of course territorial changes could be made with the free consent of both parties (not, observe, with the consent of the people of the territory involved). Surely you don't mean, said a Conservative member of Parliament, that this Atlantic Charter applies to enemy territory? Of course not, said Mr. Eden. In other words, perhaps a little deal can still be arranged whereby the Russians get what they want and the Poles in return can be compensated by being handed a slice of Germany (January 27).

## DE GAULLE FISHES

Here's what appears at first to be a happier note. Recently de Gaulle and Churchill, for some time past on less than friendly terms, met and became rather chummy again. Why? One reason, repeated again and again in dispatches from Algiers, is that cooperation will be necessary if France is to be "saved from civil war" (January 31). The Allies have been anxious "about the revolutionary character of some de Gaulle groups" (January 18). De Gaulle has been anxious, too.

We are informed (February 1) that Churchill "talked 'turkey' in a friendly but very frank manner and General de Gaulle came away highly pleased." In this "friendly talk" Churchill used "severe language," but de Gaulle was pleased just the same.

The Russo-Polish dispute, in which the British have been giving the Poles some support, also has something to do with the Anglo-French reconciliation. De Gaulle's (Algiers, January 29) feel that the Western Allies will need the French more now because of Moscow's attitude on Poland. The Times correspondent in London (January 31) thinks that it is not "coincidence" that the British have been trying to draw not only the French but also the Norwegians, Dutch and Belgians closer to themselves. No, it is not coincidence.

## THE AMERICAN WAY

Even the "American Empire" has been heard from recently. From Puerto Rico on January 31, Representative Cole of New York stated that Congress would not pass President Roosevelt's proposal to allow Puerto Rico to elect her own governor. Such action would be "the equivalent of independence for Puerto Rico." Mr. Cole wants to abolish poverty in Puerto Rico but thinks it should be done "the American way." The American way means no independence, it goes without saying, and not even the election of a governor.

There is a summary—only a partial summary—of the past month. It's the old story of bulldozing the small nations and the colonies, of conflicts among the imperialists for control of the small nations and colonies and even of each other's "possessions." The story cannot change until the profit-seeking imperialists are overthrown and replaced by governments of the workers in the great nations and of the liberated slaves in the colonies.

## Roosevelt Whitewashed at FEPC Meeting But Audience Senses Need For More Effective Action

By F. FOREST

NEW YORK—The National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission held a public rally in Town Hall on Monday, February 7. The Rev. Allan Knight Chalmers, co-chairman of the Council with A. Philip Randolph, presided over the meeting, at which there were no less than twenty-nine speakers. Unfortunately, the twenty-nine speakers included only two trade union representatives: Mr. Minkoff of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL, and Mr. Wolchok of the United Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Employees, CIO.

### A Bad Bill

The National Council for a Permanent FEPC is urging passage of the Scanlon-Dawson-Coffee-La Follette Bill (H. R. 3986), which would forbid discrimination in employment because of race, religion or nationality. However, the bill would also permit the meddling of the government into the practices of labor unions.

Readers of LABOR ACTION know that we have been consistent fighters against all discriminatory practices against Negroes or other minority groups, and have urged labor to lead the nation in the fight against discrimination. But we do not want the government meddling in union affairs.

The government itself does not have clean hands. Its Army and Navy are the greatest offenders in this respect. Yet not a single speaker, including the socialist, Norman Thomas, had a word to say about the necessity to eliminate that clause from the bill. On the contrary, the representative from the Workers Defense League openly, and the other speakers implicitly, urged the passage of the bill in its entirety.

### Whitewashing Roosevelt

Representative Scanlon, one of the authors of the bill and one of the major speakers at this rally, revealed just exactly how tied this whole commission is to the Roosevelt regime. Mr. Scanlon's entire speech was a complete whitewash of the very man who heads the most vicious anti-Negro party in the South—the Democratic Party, to which Mr. Scanlon also belongs. Listening to Scanlon, one would have thought that it was not Roosevelt's "white man's" Democratic Party that ruled the Jim Crow South, nor that it was Roosevelt himself who is Commander-in-Chief of a Jim Crow Army and Navy and Air Force, but some unidentified villain.

But right there on the same platform with Representative Scanlon was a Negro nurse who stated that the fight for the employment of Negro nurses in the United States Army has gone on since 1941, but up to date there are only 202 Negro nurses in the armed forces. The govern-

ment's SOS for student nurses must sound hollow indeed to these trained nurses fighting to get work in this "democratic" Army.

Mr. Scanlon, on the other hand, claimed that no less than one million Negroes were "integrated into the war effort." He did not cite proof of this nor could he have, unless by "integrated into the war effort" he meant, not working in basic industries, but as soldiers in a Jim Crow Army.

Mr. Scanlon did, however, admit that those who were "integrated into the war effort" unfortunately occupied menial jobs. He failed to explain why it is that the President, if he is serious about his Executive Order 8802, "reaffirming the policy of the United States that there shall be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defense industries or in government because of race, creed, color or national origin," failed so much as to send a follow-up letter to his government agencies, asking why they were not putting the order into effect. Yet Representative Scanlon called the order nothing less than the "Emancipation Proclamation of the Twentieth Century."

But just as the Emancipation Proclamation only technically freed the Negroes while it kept them bound to the Southern plantation economy as semi-serfs, so the present Executive Order 8802 is not effective in bringing the mass of qualified Negroes into basic industry, and where they already work there, does nothing about upgrading them.

### How the Audience Felt

The reactions of the audience, though it was mainly middle class rather than working class, were quite instructive.

This was particularly noticeable in its attitude toward the speech of Roy Wilkins, assistant secretary of the NAACP. In appealing for funds to work for the passage of H. R. 3986, he pointed to the fact that the NAACP has been urging the passage of an anti-lynching bill for a quarter of a century and is still unsuccessful. However, he felt the tide of public opinion was turning against lynching. And then, regarding the stimulation of discussion about the rights of Negroes, he said, "There is nothing to stimulate discussion as a riot here and there." There was applause.

Mr. Wilkins quickly added that, of course, he did not advocate riots, and most assuredly was opposed to anyone in the audience ever rioting. But the fact that this petty bourgeois Negro leader and the preponderantly petty bourgeois audience felt the effectiveness of direct action, if Negro leaders really wished to lead a militant struggle against discrimination, not, of course, via so-called riots, but in such mass actions as a March on Washington, they would have both the Negro masses and white labor behind them.

## Atrocity Posters For Speed-Up

Striking while the iron is hot, the Army has released for display in war factories, atrocity posters. These were printed some time ago but were being held for release at a propitious moment. The official report on Japanese horrors against war prisoners is evidently that moment.

The point of the posters is, of course, to stimulate a speed-up in production. One poster reads: "Make 'em pay—keep producing." Another says: "We'll make them pay if you keep up production."

Funny how limited are the ideas of the issuers of these posters who apparently believe in the agitational value of horrible events. Why not issue posters to agitate the rich into bearing some of the burdens of the war? For instance, the Senate and House of Representatives might be plastered with posters urging the worthy congressmen to pass legislation limiting all war incomes to \$25,000 and taxing every cent of war profits?

## Wilkie's Plan Would Mean 40% Withholding or 15% Sales Tax

By GERTRUDE SHAW

In some circles Wendell Wilkie is regarded as the "New Dealer" of the Republican Party. Not only has "Information Please" taken him to its bosom as a "true liberal." Certain sections of the labor movement are playing with the idea of accepting him as the very latest edition of "A Friend of Labor in the Capitalist Camp."

When Mr. Wilkie spoke the other night before a conference on the subject, "American Plans and Dreams," he was holding forth on his political program in case he is the presidential nominee of the Republican Party in the coming election. What has he to offer?

For the war period Mr. Wilkie's foremost idea is to raise \$16,000,000,000 additional annual tax revenue. This is a figure of the boldest proportions, considering that the Treasury asked for a mere \$10,500,000,000—while Congress saw fit to produce only the mite of something over \$2,000,000,000.

However, Mr. Wilkie is not fazed. We must "tax ourselves now beyond any limit that we have hitherto imagined possible," he says. We must "actually lower materially the American standard of living," he says—and the New York Times editor proclaims Mr. Wilkie's arguments are "unassailable."

### Workers Have Reached Limit

Immediately after Mr. Wilkie's speech, a few arithmeticians picked up their pencils and calculated that an additional annual tax of \$16,000,000,000 would mean EITHER A WITHHOLDING TAX OF FORTY PER CENT OR A UNIVERSAL SALES TAX OF FIFTEEN PER CENT.

Speaking as a member of the privileged class, Mr. Wilkie can not know how tight a squeeze the working people of this country are already in. Take-home wages are actually far below the normal subsistence level set by economists. When he talks about "the change of our habits to the use of things that constitute necessities living," he is obviously talking like one used to luxuries.

As for the working class, RIGHT NOW it cannot afford many of the things "that constitute necessities living." That is why the organized labor movement has started the fight to bury the Little Steel formula which freezes wages 28.5 per cent below the cost of living. What would happen to the workers' "way of life" if Mr. Wilkie's tax plan were in effect and the workers were subjected to either a one hundred per cent increase in the withholding tax or to a fifteen per cent sales tax?

Vaguely Wilkie included "every group" in his zeal for "major and in some cases dangerous sacrifices." But did he say a word about limiting salaries to \$25,000? Did he mention taxing all war profits made out of this global blood-letting? Neither he nor any other capitalist politician stands for making the capitalist class pay for the war—the only people who can afford to!

As for the workers of this country, they have reached the limits of "major" and "dangerous" sacrifices. From here on, labor must shift the sacrifices onto the shoulders of the wealthy. This point is "unassailable," to use the word employed by the New York Times regarding Mr. Wilkie's argument.

So much for Mr. Wilkie's war-time plans. What are his "dreams" for the future?

### A Worker's Nightmare

First, he visualizes a post-war national income of \$120,000,000,000 per annum. Think of that! Today the national income is \$165,000,000,000—and there are some 11,000,000 men and women in the armed forces who are not participating in the productive enterprises of the country.

Mr. Wilkie, while giving lip service to expanded production and the rest of that palaver, actually figures on contracting the annual income by \$45,000,000,000 at a time when the working force will be increased by those 11,000,000 returning soldiers.

Can this mean anything but a reduced standard of living for the American working people? And isn't it just this that Mr. Wilkie wants to prepare the workers for by stepping on them now?

Secondly, Mr. Wilkie estimates a national peacetime budget of government expenditures amounting to \$20,000,000,000. This, be it known, is about one-fifth of the present national war budget.

And how does Mr. Wilkie allot the \$20,000,000,000 national budget? For the interest on the national debt, \$6,000,000,000; for a military establishment to police the "peaceful" post-war world, another \$7,000,000,000; the remaining \$7,000,000,000 is to be used for all other government expenditures, including public provision for returning soldiers and for "better housing, broader education, sounder health" for everyone.

A post-war millennium in which two-thirds of the national budget will go for war purposes!

This is "our standard of living in the future" for which Mr. Wilkie tells us "our standard of living must go down." His figures do not bear out his grandiose words—but only prove that a lower standard of living for the working people is the "dream" of the ruling class for the post-war period.

What has been hailed in many quarters as Mr. Wilkie's political bravery in coming out for reducing still further the standard of living is simply the reflection of his belief that the working people should be made ready now for the retrogression capitalism has in store for them in the future.

### Our Answer

Mr. Wilkie wound up his speech with the usual hackneyed comparison of civilian "comfort" to soldiers' discomfort: "There is not much comfort in the foxhole. There's little comfort wait-deep in the mud of Guadalcanal. It is not comfortable to crash-land a flaming plane. There is small comfort in the cold sea. There is no comfort as a prisoner of the Japs. Why should we be comfortable?"

To which the working class must answer: "We are not responsible for having sent the youth of the world into foxholes, waist-deep mud, flaming planes. That is the doing of the capitalist system. But if we allowed the standard of living of the working class to be beaten down as the capitalist class wishes to do, we would be responsible to our brothers in the foxholes, mud and flaming planes."

"We figure it will be more 'comfortable' for those of them lucky enough to return home, to find a standard of living that will permit them to assume their position in society as self-respecting workers and not as sweat-shop slaves."

Readers of LABOR ACTION understand that in showing up Wendell Wilkie, the "New Dealer" of the Republican Party, we do not do so to add prestige to the ex-New Dealer in the White House. We do so because sections of the labor movement, disillusioned with Roosevelt, are looking hopefully toward Wilkie.

This folly of choosing between one or the other side of the same counterfeit coin is suicidal to the labor movement. Capitalist politics is the coin. Its two sides are the Democratic and the Republican Parties—neither is worth a tinker's damn to the working people.

For American labor to move progressively onward, the organization of an Independent Labor Party is imperative NOW.

## Respect for the Nazi Mind

The German American, a liberal German-language weekly published in New York, has been barred from the prison camps in this country by the War Department.

The Office of Censorship felt that "the extreme anti-Nazi views expressed" in the publication "might be misunderstood."

Now, really? We don't know what the German American is like—but can a true anti-Nazi possibly consider any anti-Nazi views "extreme"—or subject to misunderstanding by anyone but a Nazi or a pro-Nazi?

This banning was a direct slap in the face to a German prisoner at McCain, Miss., who, having read a copy of the German American, wrote: "We like it very much.... We have a great need for good German literature which was banned in Germany after 1933. Maybe you can help us."

This incident has probably taught at least one German prisoner that all the banning privileges have not been monopolized by Hitler—and very possibly he wonders why officials of the "greatest democracy" on earth are so eager not to disturb the Nazi mentality of German prisoners of war.

## A COST-PLUS WAGE

By MAX SHACHTMAN, Nat. Sec., Workers Party

PRICE: 5 CENTS IN BUNDLES: 3 CENTS

WORKERS PARTY

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

## FDR Anti-Labor--

(Continued from page 1)

butlers or beggars a dozen times before.

But there has never been a case of Roosevelt speaking that way to the representatives of big business, of the profit-swollen monopolists. When THEY come to Washington, they soon appear as the bosses of the War Production Board, as the heads of this department or that one, as the spokesmen and directors of one branch of the government after another. When THEY come to Washington, they get exactly what they want, or close to what they want, or else they go back and fight openly for their maximum demands.

The labor leaders get kicked around the way you would not ordinarily treat a dog.

Why? Why does Roosevelt express himself toward them with such contempt?

Because he feels that the labor LEADERS are "IN THE BAG."

Because he feels that no matter what he says to them, or what he does to them and to the men and women they represent, these labor leaders will continue to come back with their tails between their legs and the offer of political support always in their paws.

Because he feels that although "Murray grew red-faced while Bill Green fidgeted," he has little to worry about from them. Murray's face has grown red before, but he still asks labor to vote for Roosevelt. Green has fidgeted before and will fidget again, but he will also continue to try corraling labor support for Roosevelt.

Because he feels that he can rely solidly on the so-called "left wing" labor leaders, who are not left wing in any sense whatsoever, but rather the most reactionary wing of the American labor movement. This particular branch of the American labor leadership is composed of the Communist Party gang—Curran, Bridges, Quill & Co.—who are ready to hogtie and gag the labor movement and deliver it helplessly to the Roosevelt machine because such a policy happens right now to serve the interests of the Stalin regime in Russia.

Murray can attack these union-busters at a national CIO meeting for five hours or fifty hours—it makes little difference. He offers no real alternative to their consistent and determined policy of crippling and paralyzing the labor movement so that it may be dealt the heaviest blows that capitalist reaction can deliver without being able to fight back.

All Murray does is "grow red-faced." All Bill Green does is "fidget."

### Like Voting Cattle

They do not call upon the powerful labor movement to fight back the capitalist attack in an organized and militant way. They do not call upon labor to fight seriously and resolutely for its legitimate demands and for the rectification of its countless grievances. They do not tell the workers what Roosevelt's real plans are against the labor movement. Instead, they "reiterate" their no-strike pledge and send their Hillman all over the land to drive labor into the Roosevelt political column like so much voting cattle.

If labor is to acquire the respect of others and its own self-respect, if labor is to gain its objectives and not be trampled on like dirt on the street, it must put the fear of its great strength into the hearts of its enemies and of its self-styled "friends."

Labor must regain the right to strike which was stolen from it!

Labor must establish its political independence and thereby its political power!

Taxes are on the increase, the cost of living is on the increase, but wages are not at all keeping pace. Capitalist profits, the greatest in all history, continue to rise, in spite of taxes.

Wherever labor has insisted on its RIGHT TO STRIKE, it has achieved its demands, in whole or in part. Wherever it has bowed down to the ground, it has been kicked in the teeth.

Now, in addition to everything else, Roosevelt, the "friend of labor," says he will sign not only the labor slave act, but even "a severe Smith anti-strike law." He is not afraid of labor's power to stop him, because up to now that power has been used to bring him to office and keep him there.

The capitalists and their government would sing a different tune if they had a really independent labor movement to deal with, particularly on the political field.

The first step in that direction, whether Murray and Green want it or not, is the organization by the American unions of an Independent Labor Party, with its own platform and its own candidates for office. The workers of this country cannot afford merely to "grow red-faced" or to "fidget." They must act immediately to save themselves and their labor movement.

Restore the right to strike, the right to enforce labor's demands by organized action!

Organize a national Independent Labor Party, completely free of the capitalist politicians, the capitalist parties and the capitalist programs!

## Lynn Case Decision

NEW YORK, Feb. 3—The Winfred Lynn case, the only legal test yet made of the United States Army's racial policies, today overcame the last hurdle in its progress to the Supreme Court. The Federal Circuit Court of Appeals here handed down a two-to-one split decision against Lynn. The fact that one of the three justices dissented in Lynn's favor means that a firm legal basis has been laid for an appeal direct to the Supreme Court. Both Arthur Garfield Hays, Lynn's attorney, and the National Citizens' Committee for Winfred Lynn expressed themselves at gratified that the road to a clear-cut Supreme Court decision on the basic issue of racial segregation in the armed forces is now open.

Winfred Lynn, who is now a corporal in training in a West Coast camp, brought his suit a year and a half ago when he was inducted into

the Army. He claims that because he was drafted in a segregated Jim Crow, all-Negro quota, his induction was in violation of Section 4(a) of the 1940 Draft Act, which states that "in the selection and training of men under this act... there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

The government lawyers attempted to short-circuit Lynn's case by resorting to legal technicalities. Lower courts accepted these technicalities and ruled against Lynn on that basis. The Circuit Court of Appeals, however, unanimously rejected these technicalities and agreed that the case, as claimed by Lynn's lawyers, raises the basic issue of racial segregation. This in itself is a great advance and means that the Supreme Court will have to face the fundamental issue in the Lynn case, of whether segregation is or is not discrimination.

# Hillman and Stalinists Bring ALP to Verge of Crack-Up

By ALBERT GATES

The American Labor Party of New York is now wracked by a sharp internal struggle which threatens its very existence. For some years, the Communist Party in this country has sought to take over the ALP and to use it for its own purposes. Thus we have observed a long struggle between the present conservative leadership of Dubinsky-Counts-Rose and the even more reactionary group led by the American representatives of Joseph Stalin.

This struggle over control of the ALP has been joined by Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and head of the CIO Political Action Committee. Hillman formed a bloc with the Communist Party for the purpose of taking over the ALP and reducing it to a pro-Roosevelt bargaining agency, bargaining with the Democratic Party machine in the State of New York.

### HILLMAN ENTERS THE MELEE

It is obvious that Hillman could not accomplish this task without concealing his main purpose behind supposedly "progressive" measures. The "progressive" measures he employs in this struggle is the demand that the American Labor Party should be reorganized on the basis of the trade union movement and that the direction of the party should be turned over to the AFL and the CIO unions in New York. This, he argues, would take the ALP out of the hands of its present liberal-labor leadership and transform the party from an individual membership organization to one based upon the powerful unions in the state.

On the face of it the Hillman proposal (previously made by the Stalinist-controlled unions in New York) appears to be a thoroughly progressive measure and a reflection of the progressive demand for an Independent Labor Party. For it is obvious that the great political need of American labor is the organization of its own party, an independent party of labor based upon the trade unions. This does not mean the exclusion of other elements, but the strength of such a party would derive primarily from that powerful base of the mass unions in the country, which would, in turn, give it a driving power great enough to threaten the political monopoly of big business, expressed through its Democratic and Republican Parties.

Hillman's "plan" has gathered a little strength because of the utterly stupid and reactionary opposition waged against it by the Dubinsky-Counts-Rose leadership. They oppose the Hillman proposal on completely incorrect premises and thus play into his hands. They are against a real party of labor based on the trade unions on the absolutely laughable grounds that a party based upon the mass unions would "narrow" its base! Secondary reasons for opposing a Labor Party based on the trade unions are that it would not conform to the election laws of the state and would exclude many "progressive and liberal" elements who are not of the trade unions.

### ALL THIS IS NONSENSE

All of these reasons are nonsense. A Labor Party based on the trade union movement would be the broadest kind of party with a mass following and would make possible the creation of a more democratic political party. Such a powerful Labor Party would have the effect of drawing into its ranks thousands upon thousands of "liberals and progressives." The existence of such a party could not possibly violate election laws any more than the present ALP set-up violates them.

Many people do not understand this fight because both wings in the ALP are ardent supporters of Roosevelt and a fourth term. Yet there is a difference between the two factions. The Dubinsky-Counts-Rose group would retain the ALP as an independent third party—not a genuine Labor Party—whereas the Stalinist-Hillman combination would destroy the ALP and turn it into an appendage of the Roosevelt machine of the Democratic Party. A victory of the Dubinsky group would still make it possible to fight for the transformation of the ALP into a genuine Labor Party, whereas a victory of the Communist Party-Hillman group would mean the virtual death of the party.

How is it possible, some may ask, to declare that Hillman would destroy the American Labor Party when he makes a proposal which admittedly would strengthen the organization? This is the heart of the problem.

### THE HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The most important fact about the present dispute is that the proposal for transforming the ALP into a party based on the trade

unions comes from the person, and the faction allied with him, who is the most avowed opponent of a Labor Party!

Hillman is against a Labor Party! The Communist Party is against a Labor Party. Hillman and the Stalinists have done everything in their power to prevent the formation of local and state Labor Parties, or even conferences and meetings organized for the purpose of considering steps toward the formation of such parties!

Hillman and his Communist Party allies have utilized the CIO Political Action Committee, organized to hogtie American labor to Roosevelt's machine and for a fourth term, to prevent genuine independent politics by labor, and the formation of a genuine Labor Party.

Hillman does not belong to the ALP, and the union which he heads long ago withdrew from the party. In the last gubernatorial election in New York, he and the Stalinists supported the regular Democratic ticket against the ALP-Democratic coalition ticket.

These facts clearly establish that Hillman and the Communist Party are championing the plan for trade union control of the ALP for the sole and foul purpose of liquidating it. This has concrete meaning when it is remembered that in the counties of New York City the CIO unions are dominated mainly by Communist Party leaders or followers. To turn the party over to these elements would mean the abolition of the ALP.

### STRUGGLE OVER CANDIDATES

Thus the fight over the Hillman proposal led naturally to a struggle over candidates for the ALP primaries. Hillman proposed a slate of candidates made up of his followers plus out-and-out Stalinists and their fellow-travelers. For a time it looked as if the "right wing" would give up the ghost without a fight. But pressure from the outside helped to galvanize the Dubinsky-Counts-Rose faction and they are now out to win the primaries from the Hillman-Communist alliance. They rejected the Hillman slate of candidates and committee members and publicly announced their determination to defeat that combination.

The decision of the Dubinsky faction to carry the fight to Hillman and his group does not set aside the significance of the fight over the Hillman proposal. One of the reasons this leadership of

the ALP has fallen into this difficult situation is precisely because the ALP was not organized on the basis of the trade unions of the state and is not a genuine independent Labor Party, representing the interests of the working class against the Republican and Democratic Parties. Several months ago, when LABOR ACTION first commented editorially on its opposition to the Hillman proposal it said:

"...the present ALP is a distinct labor political organization. That it does not pursue the course of political independence in campaigns is unquestionably true. Our criticism of the ALP is precisely on the ground that it has failed to use its great power to extend the independent character of the party for genuine independent labor political action against the rotten political machines of the Republican and Democratic Parties. In other words, it has been playing cheap capitalist machine politics."

It is necessary to add to this that the ALP can never become a genuine Labor Party until and unless it is based on the trade unions. But how can the ALP do this and still avoid the pitfalls of the Hillman-Communist plan? By one simple measure:

All unions that stand unequivocally for independent labor political action, i.e., for an independent Labor Party, become part of the American Labor Party. Such a measure should close the door to the Stalinist-controlled unions, to Hillman and to the union he controls. It would bar any union which is opposed to independent political action and a Labor Party.

On the other hand, the influx of unions into the ALP on the basis of support to an Independent Labor Party would enormously strengthen the organization and transform it into a genuine Labor Party, which it is not at the present time.

The fight for this kind of party means not only a struggle against the Hillman-Stalinist combine, but also against the Dubinsky-Counts-Rose group, which likewise stands in the way of a genuine Labor Party. It is necessary to emphasize again, however, that the difference between the two is clear: a victory for the Hillman-Stalinist faction means the virtual death of the ALP. A victory for the present leadership leaves the possibility of transforming the ALP into a real Independent Labor Party. This is of enormous importance for the future political development of the American working class.