

CONGRESS VOTES PRICE RISE

WLB Actions, Marshall's Blast, Give the Tip-off - -

Roosevelt Planned Smear-Labor Campaign

By WALTER WEISS

So Roosevelt was fooling when he proposed a labor draft? We answered this bright idea of the weekly news magazine, like Life, in a recent issue by tracing the history of Roosevelt's labor policy, and showing that it led straight to the draft proposal. What he was fooling about was the rest of his five-point program. His Secretary of War Stimson came right out before a Senate committee and urged the labor draft, whether or not the other four points went through. Still, you may say, Congress will not pass a national service act in an election year, and Roosevelt knows this. Climax to Anti-Labor Campaign Perhaps. But even if this is so, the mere suggestion of such a law had a serious purpose, especially since the President described it as a measure to prevent strikes. It served to climax a big campaign designed to terrorize labor—a campaign in which the ferocious statement of General Marshall concerning even the threat of strikes also played a large part.

And Stimson wasn't satisfied with testifying before a committee. He went on the radio over an NBC network on January 25 to repeat all his talk about the alleged effect of strikes on the morale of the armed forces. That isn't all. The Senate on January 18 finally made up its mind to include in the new tax bill the requirement that unions must make financial reports to the Treasury. Labor men have always said that such a requirement could only help employers, who could in this way find out how strong or weak a union is. Before the Senate vote, Bailly of North Carolina, one of the prize Southern labor-haters, shouted that General Marshall was right in saying the threatened railroad strike was a "damned outrage." According to the New York Times, "no one attempted to reply to Senator Bailey." We all know that the Senate boasts at least a few so-called "friends of labor." WLB Getting Tougher That isn't all, either. The War Labor Board is talking tougher ev-

ery day. This outfit used to punish strikes by refusing to consider a case while the strike was on or by putting the case at the bottom of its docket or by refusing to grant a maintenance of membership clause. Sometimes they would tell a union to punish its own members. If this was done, maintenance of membership was given as a reward, because the union was "responsible." But now the WLB itself is fining unions. Its shipbuilding commission has told Cramp workers at Philadelphia that they will lose one month of retroactive pay because of a recent strike. The fine would have been bigger if the national officials of the union hadn't given so much "cooperation" in breaking the strike. Everybody knew that the company had behaved in a very provocative way. About this the public member, following the line often taken by the National War Labor Board, brazenly proclaimed, "With or without provocation, a strike is a strike..." In other words, management can do what it pleases. As the New York Times of January 26 said, these are the "first financial penalties ever imposed by a

WLB agency." Roosevelt gives the signal. His faithful slaves sharpen their willing knives to cut labor's throat. The shipbuilding commission's decision can be appealed to the national WLB. What will they do? They have just taken to threatening unions in a new way, too. On February 2 they told a striking Washington state local of the International Wood Workers, CIO, to show cause "why the full penalties provided in the law and in Presidential Executive Order 9370 should not be invoked." They also used the same language toward striking members of

Matthew Smith's Mechanics Educational Society. As was pointed out previously, Executive Order 9370 states that the War Labor Board may deprive a defiant union of any—yes, any—benefits, privileges, or rights which it enjoys under a contract or a WLB decision. It also says that individuals may lose their draft deferments and be put on an employment blacklist. This order was issued on August 16 and until lately very little was heard of it. Who gave the signal to use it? Who prompted the Marshall and Stimson speeches? Who asked for a labor draft?

Stiff Fight by Labor Can Halt New Jump in Cost of Living

The fight in Congress over subsidies is reaching a climax. All indications point to a defeat in the Senate of an Administration bill for subsidies in the Senate. This will merely duplicate the action already taken in the House. As the readers of LABOR ACTION know, this paper is opposed to subsidies as an unwarranted boost in the profits of large groups of monopolistic, profiteering food merchants, big landlords and rich farmers at the expense of the people. LABOR ACTION says that these profiteers in food are making more than they deserve, dealing in goods supplying the needs of the people, and we have published figures to substantiate this fact. Several months ago, LABOR ACTION published the figures issued by the People's Lobby showing that profits in food were high even without subsidies. We also published figures on canners' profits that bore out this charge. Our program called for a hundred per cent tax on all war profits, and profits in food in the midst of the war, and the rising cost of living is war profits. We called for a program of absolute price ceilings, rigidly enforced and a real control of the cost of living. None of these things have materialized in the President's stabilization program. The only thing FDR stabilized were the wages of the workers. Of the famous seven-point program presented by Roosevelt, wages alone were frozen. But the attitude of LABOR ACTION is poles apart from the position and action taken by the Senate and the House. They are against subsidies on grounds which are just as objectionable as the Administration program for them. They want no subsidies because they want unlimited prices and the unlimited profits that go with them. They are against any rigid price control. They are against keeping down the cost of living. The CIO News says: "Either we must have substantial subsidies to keep down the cost of food, or, without subsidies, living costs will speedily rise far higher than they are already." The CIO News is right, but for another reason, namely, that it accepted and still accepts the President's stabilization program. Under that program, subsidies MIGHT (there is absolutely no certainty that it will, any more than it has up to now with subsidies) stop a sharp price rise. But it is dead wrong if it believes that it is subsidies or nothing at all. There is a way of keeping down the price rise and the cost of living. There is a program that could accomplish such a purpose. But it is not the program of the Administration. A real labor program, effectively applied, could stop all this nonsense about subsidies. What kind of labor program? A program which calls for an end to all price increases and a reduction of prices to the level of September, 1942. A program which demands rigid enforcement of price ceilings and control of the cost of living. Who would enforce such a program? Not the dollar-a-year men, not the advertising agents who infest the OPA offices, not the representatives of the big chain stores, not the officials of the big monopoly companies! (Continued on page 2)

No Ballots for Soldiers

The "great men" in Congress got together again to vote down the Worley bill in the House granting the soldiers a vote in the coming presidential election through the simple, uniform federal ballot. The senators got together and did the same thing in their chamber to a similar bill. Now a compromise committee is meeting to see if a joint bill can be brought to a vote. Are these representatives of the "peepul" against a soldier vote? Oh, no! They are willing to grant the soldier his vote, but they must protect their "states' rights," whatever that may mean. Among the protectors of "states' rights" is the Republican Party of big business, which, as one writer put it, discovered the doctrine in the last twelve years! The Republicans undoubtedly fear that a free and unencumbered soldier vote might go to Roosevelt and help re-elect him.

The Southern poll-tax Democrats are against the soldier vote because it might break their hold on the Southern states and give Negroes and poor white workers votes. Who knows? Let the soldiers vote and then everybody down there will want to vote. We are not particularly interested in Republican fears. It might be as they say. What we are concerned with is the democratic right of the boys in uniform to a free and unencumbered vote. We are against the manipulation of this vote by the "states' rights" advocates, the poll-taxers and the disseminators of Hitler's racial doctrines in this country. We are for more than that, however. We are for full political and democratic rights of all soldiers. We are against the monopoly of the "two-party system" which takes the right to speak to and propagandize the soldiers with the profit philoso-

phy and hate-labor doctrines of big business which the Republican and Democratic Parties advocate. We are for the right of every soldier to vote. If a youth of eighteen is mature enough for the rigors of military life and battle, he is mature enough to vote. There is not the slightest doubt in our minds that youths of eighteen are fully able to participate in political action and campaigns. Examining the level of American politics, especially the antics of a Taft, Smith, Cox, Rankin, Bilbo, Martin and the like, we are certain that even those much younger than eighteen could make more lasting and important contributions to the elevation of society than these voices of big business. We say: OLD ENOUGH TO FIGHT, OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE! FOR THE RIGHT OF ALL SOLDIERS TO VOTE!

THE "BIG STEAL" FORMULA



"Seaman" Walsh Is A Phony!

Some weeks ago a letter written by "Seaman" Walsh, addressed to "Mr. Striker," was widely publicized by anti-labor newspapers. In the letter, Seaman Walsh attacked the labor movement for fighting for wages and better conditions during wartime, when men were dying in foxholes without thought of time and one-half or overtime. It was a letter of attack on the labor movement and part of a nationwide campaign to foster antagonism between workers in industry and workers in uniform. In a reply entitled "Now YOU Look Here, Seaman Walsh," written by Max Shachtman, national secretary of the Workers Party, published in LABOR ACTION, it was pointed out that labor is fighting to preserve a decent standard of living, not only for the workers at home, but for the men and women in uniform who will return from the war. Labor was fighting for what rightfully belongs to it. Shachtman pointed out that there were no profits, no fat cost-plus contracts in the foxholes, and that it was the capitalists back home who in their greed were profiteering at the expense of the lives of the soldiers. The letter of Seaman Walsh is now being used as the major anti-labor agitation of a newly-formed National Citizens' Committee, which is organizing a union-busting drive on a nationwide scale. That is the logical use for which the letter was destined. If Seaman Walsh had been a sailor who was honestly and genuinely disturbed by strikes but just didn't understand what it was all about, it would, in a sense, be unfortunate that his letter should be so misused by labor-baiting reactionaries. But the fact is that SEAMAN WALSH IS NEITHER A NAVY MAN NOR A TRADE UNION MAN. The letter was originally distributed under false pretenses. Seaman Walsh was described as "a sailor aboard a WARSHIP in the South Pacific." But... The other day, Bernard Walsh, father of the seaman, said that Kenneth Walsh had never been in the Navy. He has been in the merchant marine since 1928. On top of that, Kenneth Walsh was not a union man. He had once belonged to the National Maritime Union, CIO, but was not now a member. Remember: Seaman Walsh is not a Navy man! Seaman Walsh was not "aboard a warship"! Seaman Walsh quit the union to which he once belonged! Seaman Walsh is a tool of the big business, anti-labor, anti-union forces!

Labor Action Subscriptions Hit New High

LABOR ACTION has hit the goong again. Since our last appeal for renewals and subscriptions, America's greatest labor and socialist weekly had a record month in subs without a special drive. The business office of LABOR ACTION reports that during the month of January, it received 326 subscriptions. This is a mighty good start for the year 1944. Even though this is good, it's not good enough. You see, we're kind of hoggish in this matter of subscription readers for our paper. And what's more, we'll probably never be satisfied! We want the subs to keep rolling in! We have a pretty good slogan too: IF YOUR SUB HAS EXPIRED—RENEW IT! IF YOU HAVEN'T A SUB—GET ONE! The leaders in new subs are New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, Los Angeles, Seattle and the Dakotas. Here is the way they stood in January: New York 121, Philadelphia 35, Detroit 28, Cleveland 25, Chicago 23, Buffalo 20, Los Angeles 20, Seattle 14, Dakotas 13. We had some also-rans, but we expect to hear more good news from them. Now, what about the places that haven't sent in any subscriptions? We'll hear from you next time, you say? Okay, send them in!

Stalin 'Finds' Vatican Pro-Fascist

By CHRIS SIKOKIS

The recent attacks on the Vatican by the newspapers of the Russian government, namely, Izvestia and Red Star, have raised many questions as to why Stalin should pick this moment to attack the Vatican. The Vatican's connections with fascism and the fact that it openly aided every single dictatorship to get into power and remain there, have been known for years. Stalin and his Communist Parties throughout the world were aware of it. Yet during the "People's Front" period a few years ago, he spoke well of the Vatican and even made open overtures to it. Why, then, this sudden attack? Stalin's insistence that the Vatican has been working hand-in-glove with fascism is obviously timed with the war map changes in Europe and has at least a four-fold purpose: 1. With the Allied armies approaching Rome it is obvious that a crusade spirit will be built up around the military campaign. It will be to "liberate" Rome, the Vatican, and His Holiness; these are

President Roosevelt's own words. After Rome is taken, the Pope, who by then will have been built up as an anti-fascist (like the King and Badoglio) will be able to speak with some authority on the war and post-war plans. Stalin hopes that by publicizing the Vatican's pro-fascist record it will be difficult for the United States and Great Britain to utilize the Pope in any way detrimental to his own schemes. The Polish Issue 2. Stalin expects to annex part of Poland and to be the dominating factor in the rest of Poland. If Great Britain and the United States consent to this, and from all indications they will consent, the only other power which will challenge his attempts at domination is the Vatican. Poland is one of the Vatican's last real strongholds. The overwhelming majority of the population is not only Catholic but the influence of the clergy is tremendous. The Catholic hierarchy throughout the world

has been loud in its condemnation of Russia's suggested new borders for Poland, and Stalin realizes that the Pope's voice will be added tomorrow. 3. Stalin's support in Yugoslavia rests mainly upon the Catholic sections of the population, and he does not want the Pope to be given an anti-fascist label. On the contrary, he wants the Pope to be known as a fascist, so that if the "liberated" Pope attempts to undermine Russia's influence, the people of Yugoslavia will associate him with Hitler and Mussolini and all the native fascists that they have been fighting against. 4. During the past year all the Catholic periodicals and spokesmen have been insisting that a representative of the Pope should be present at the peace table. Stalin wants to destroy any possibility of Papal influence in deciding when borders and policies are being agreed upon. What Is Stalin's Concern? Russia is really not concerned with the Vatican's alliance with fascism all these years, or else she would have spoken out sooner and would

not have attempted to woo the Vatican during the "People's Front" period. If Russia were really concerned about such things, she would not have made a pact with Hitler as she did, nor would she have aided Mussolini during the Ethiopian war by selling him oil. Stalin is only interested in the expansionist policy of his ruling class, the enslavement of more and more peoples under his rule. It is only when this policy is encroached upon that Stalin objects. Sometimes his objections and attack may be against reactionary institutions such as the Vatican, but it is more often against the progressive forces of the people who want freedom from their oppressors. Next Week: LABOR ACTION will feature a story on the International Labor Congress to be held in London in June.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

WORLD EVENTS

By Europacus

How the WLB Prepares to Crush the Unions

By WALTER WEISS

"The union now reports some 12,000 dues delinquents under the 1942 agreement, as of September, 1943."

So states the chairman of the War Labor Board's Shipbuilding Commission. The union? CIO's Marine & Shipbuilding Workers at Federal Shipbuilding in Kearny and Port Newark, N. J.

This union's story furnishes an amazing case history of the workings of maintenance of membership clauses in the war period.

Soon after Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt secured from a conference of top CIO and AFL leaders and important industrialists a no-strike, no-lockout pledge. Disputes were to be settled by a War Labor Board.

The industrial leaders had insisted that closed and open shops be frozen for the duration, as in World War I. The union leaders refused to agree. The President left the matter to the WLB to decide.

Lewis and the miners stood firm. Roosevelt sought a way out. Dr. Steelman, stepping from his role in the government's Conciliation Service for the occasion, became arbitrator. The union was granted its demand (not by the government—oh, of course not) and the NDMB was done for.

Workers Get Run-Around

For Federal Shipbuilding, the WLB's predecessor, the National Defense Mediation Board, had ordered maintenance of membership; the company, one of the units of U. S. Steel, had refused to comply. The Navy ran the plant for over four months. Roosevelt then returned it. The company still had not complied. WLB renewed the order and a contract embodying this provision was finally signed in May, 1942. The employer members dissented, contending that members of the union who were in good standing should at least be given an "escape period" to decide whether they wanted to be members under the new contract.

Soon after, in June, 1942, the public members announced that they had been converted to the "escape clause" idea of the employers and that they had persuaded the labor members to agree (Ryan Aeronautical Case). From that time on the regular procedure was to grant a fifteen-day escape period. Even so, only two of the four employer members voted for maintenance in the Ryan case and all of them insisted that a competent worker ought not to be fired for quitting the union. This was a broad hint to the companies not to "cooperate" in enforcing the provision.

At Federal there had been no escape period, but the corporation, a tough customer, as you can see from its earlier attitude, took the hint

about how to act on union delinquents. In November, 1942, the union submitted a test list of 180 for discharge. The company refused to act and, under the contract, the dispute went to an arbitrator. It was finally decided nine — yes, nine — months later, in August, 1943, by which time, because of quits, inductions and returns to good standing, only six of the original 180 remained on the list. Meanwhile, a week after the Ryan case, employer members of the WLB were once again ALL voting against maintenance clauses even with the escape provision, now demanding that as a prior condition the board determine the "responsibility" of unions, financially and otherwise.

The public members were soon persuaded of the justice of this new demand. In August, 1942, there was decided the first case (Monsanto Chemical), in which an "irresponsible" union was denied maintenance. There had been a strike and the union's leaders had encouraged, instead of tried to stop, it. Labor members of the board agreed to the new policy—"reluctantly," of course.

Penalties Against Unionists Since that time, the WLB has added all kinds of new penalties against striking unions—refusal to consider their cases until the strikes end, postponing decisions even longer than usual, demanding that the unions discipline strikers by fines or by consenting to discharges. Recently the board itself imposed a fine, depriving Cramp Shipyard workers of one month's retroactive pay. Even more severe penalties are in prospect. The worst offenders of all, however, the United Mine Workers, have so far suffered none of these indignities. Their union was too strong for the WLB, and — above all — their leadership did not bow and cringe. Federal Shipyard was another matter. Here the leadership, especially the national leadership, headed by President John Green (once a fighting union man), was, and is, as meek as could be — except toward the union members.

On January 31 of this year LABOR ACTION carried a partial reprint from The Nation of January 15 of an excellent inside story of the recent relations of the union at Federal to the WLB. In June, 1943, the 1942 contract expired. The company stalled, was provocative. The WLB stalled. Slowdowns, sitdowns, the threat of big strikes — visits by the local leadership to the WLB, where they were given some soft-soap, some threats — delay, two weeks, a month, men quit for other jobs, dues go unpaid — two months, countless short sitdowns and slowdowns, all kept from the public. Finally a sitdown that lasted — John Green appeals to the men, is heard in silence, leaves — the WLB threat-

ens — the strikers go back "temporarily."

The strike brought action. A week later, on September 22, 1943, the Shipbuilding Commission issued a decision. Most of the money demands were denied, but maintenance was renewed and a check-off was added to it. "Excellent gains for the union as an organization," says Shop Committeeman Johnson, The Nation's narrator. For the men — no gains to speak of.

As a matter of fact, not even for the organization, not even if we understand by that merely the union treasury. Out of gratitude to a strike-breaking leadership, which the WLB feared might be displaced, the maintenance clause was renewed and the check-off added, despite all the strikes.

Cutting-Under the Union This was, however, a key case in another respect. It was the first where this question arose: Shall contracts, on renewal, contain an "escape clause"? The Federal contract, remember, had not contained one in

the first place. The public member of the Shipbuilding Commission, after a tortured debate with himself, sided with the industry member against the labor member and decided that there should be such a clause. The national board later sustained him.

He said that he was aware of the "practical problems" faced by the union in its attempts "to fulfill its responsibilities." He admitted that it might be better to allow no escape for the duration, "if that would strengthen the hand of the responsible union leadership."

In other words, he was asking himself: Can I break this troublesome union best by letting the disgruntled members quit or by keeping them under the control of the present union set-up? He compromised: I'll try to cut the membership (escape clause) and still tie the leadership closer to us (guaranteed dues by check-off from those remaining).

The Shipbuilding Commission also granted a meager vacation pay clause. The company appealed this, as a hidden wage raise, to the na-

tional board. Little stoppages and slowdowns — a month passes, no decision, a strike of 13,000 despite union officials — President John Green ordered by Davis to stop the trouble — workers know Green will denounce, then publicly and will do anything to keep that precious check-off — workers go back before Green arrives. WLB, impressed nevertheless, promptly approves vacation clause.

And now? On January 31, the Shipbuilding Commission ruled that 2,000 members who were delinquent last September but failed to resign in the escape period are to have a new escape period of three weeks! The union demanded that they be subject automatically to the check-off, which became effective on January 1 of this year, but the public and employer members of the commission refused, holding that many members probably considered delinquency the same as resignation and that it would be wrong to force them to remain in the union.

As a "concession" to the union, delinquents who resign must pay back dues up to last September. Those who remain may settle the question of back dues with the union. The company is permitted to write to the 12,000, informing them that they must resign in writing or go under the check-off.

A pretty situation! Are you willing to pay to get out of the union? It appears as if the union officialdom is interested only in dues.

Need a Fighting Program We ask: Are these really "excellent gains" for the "union as an organization"?

Isn't the WLB game clear? Tempt the leaders by maintenance of membership and even by check-offs; tie them to the WLB, separate their interests from those of the membership. Then, when the members become disgruntled, kick the leaders in the pants — encourage the members to quit.

Here are 12,000 members who had one chance to quit and didn't. They know the WLB, they know the company — so they know they need a union, but a REAL union.

The dues strike as a form of pressure on leadership has become a very common occurrence in this war period. It is not a good enough solution to the problems of the workers. If no more is done, the WLB will succeed in its program of gradually strangling the union.

We suggest this program: 1. Reinsure the no-strike pledge. 2. Get the labor members off the War Labor Board. 3. Organize a Labor Party, independent of all capitalist parties and politicians, to represent the political interests of labor and to fight for a labor government.

Real Issues Involved "At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

shall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

There are certain facts which should be considered," the letter said, "(1) these men did not make any complaints — they only discussed the matter when called in by their immediate superior officer for an off-the-record conference; (2) they were never given an official hearing; (3) their ability to do the work required of them has never been questioned.

At the conference with their immediate superior officer, at his request, the men discussed such problems as the fact that Negroes were not promoted to the rank of petty officer, segregation in Navy stores and other facilities, barber shops and canteens, and the fact that punishment for breaking regulations was uniformly more severe for Negroes than for white men.

"Your letter does not touch at all upon circumstances leading to the release of these men. We therefore urge a reconsideration of the release of these men in order that they may not be penalized by dishonorable discharges."

In the new protest Thurgood Marshall, NAACP special counsel, pointed out that the ability of the men to perform their duties had never been questioned, that they were all efficient in their specialized duties, and that many of them were college graduates.

"War Guilt" Trials Then and Now

There is currently much talk about how we are going to punish Nazi criminals. But isn't there already much evidence of how "war criminals" and fascists are to be treated when they are in the power of the Allies: Franco has been receiving thousands of tons of American products to buttress his tottering fascist regime; the "moronic little King" and his Badoglio have just seen their powers in Italy extended by the Allies; when de Gaulle was considering hanging some of the most outspoken Vichyites, the State Department made a very strong protest in the name of "humanity."

All this talk about punishing war criminals is just so much eyewash. It would be a real calamity for Allied imperialism if all those responsible for this war were punished. Then nobody would remain with whom to deal. The Allies are set on using many of those who are now denounced as criminals when they will need support against threatening forces of "anarchy."

In this connection it might be interesting to recall some facts of the last war. The British "New Statesman" recently published a few documents with regard to the "Hang the Kaiser" campaign which was conducted in the First World War to whip up popular feeling against Germany. The "New Statesman" pointed out that the belief in monarchy or dictatorship as a safeguard against revolution, even in countries where the people have the best reasons for dispensing with it, is not a new idea that springs from Churchill's or Roosevelt's brain. Precedents can be found in Woodrow Wilson, for example. Official histories of the First World War, of course, ignore this evidence, but private papers published subsequently are more explicit.

During the armistice negotiations in 1918, the German plenipotentiary, Erzberger, reported to his colleagues that "Even the English are afraid

that the result of the Kaiser's abdication would be Bolshevism in Germany." Actually the Allied policy went much further than mere apprehension. They hoped to be able to keep the Kaiser on his throne. For example, a member of Wilson's cabinet noted in his diary in October, 1918, that the President "said he was afraid of bolshevism in Europe, and the Kaiser was needed to keep it down — to keep some order." Doesn't that sound very familiar?

American statesmen were thinking along these lines as early as 1917. On May 20th, Colonel House wrote to Wilson: "I think that care should be taken not to include the Kaiser in an indictment of German militarism." The situation in Russia will accentuate the feeling that it is better not to make too violent a change from an autocracy to a republic."

The French expressed exactly the same point of view. Jules Cambon, one of France's leading statesmen, for example, said in an official interview in April, 1917: "I agree that, however much we would like to see the Hohenzollerns discredited, any attempt to set up a republican Germany would be fraught with grave risks for us."

We do not know about the secret deals which are being conducted right now; we do not yet know about all the repugnant diplomatic arrangements which are being made while millions die on the battle fronts of the world, but the little we can surmise makes it only too clear that history — in this respect — indeed repeats itself.

In the last war they shouted "Hang the Kaiser" yet acted to keep him on his throne; in this war they shout "Down with Nazism and fascism" but prepare to set up regimes not too different from fascism. Today the King of Italy, tomorrow some "decent" Nazi — that is how they conduct their war for "democracy."

Some Facts from Inside Germany A Zurich dispatch to the Stockholm paper, Aftonbladet, of February 5 stated that many Italian "military internees" (Italian soldiers disarmed and taken to Germany by the Germans) had been hiding for a long time among the population in Bavaria and Austria. The population aided them from place to place, indicating that organized German underground groups stand behind the action, the dispatch added.

According to a recent announcement by Nazi authorities, help extended to an Italian internee will henceforth be considered as on the same level with help given to a prisoner of war (high treason).

DNB (Nazi press agency) announced on February 5 that the people's court sentenced to death Stefan Rambausch, forty-eight-year-old worker in an armament factory, who made "inflammatory speeches" in the presence of a large crowd of people and openly expressed his sympathy with Germany's enemies. Rambausch was executed.

They are the ones who are directing Roosevelt's program!

Labor, the working people, the consumers of the country, should enforce this program and operate it. They could keep prices frozen. They could prevent sharp increases in the cost of living. They could ini-

Some Facts from Inside Germany

tiated and carry out the necessary penalties against all violators of such a program of the people!

Roosevelt may veto the congressional action. But it will not mean very much unless a real labor program on prices and the cost of living is effected. It cannot be done by playing cops and robbers with Roosevelt programs or the congressmen.

They could keep prices frozen. They could prevent sharp increases in the cost of living. They could ini-

tiated and carry out the necessary penalties against all violators of such a program of the people!

Roosevelt may veto the congressional action. But it will not mean very much unless a real labor program on prices and the cost of living is effected. It cannot be done by playing cops and robbers with Roosevelt programs or the congressmen.

They could keep prices frozen. They could prevent sharp increases in the cost of living. They could ini-

tiated and carry out the necessary penalties against all violators of such a program of the people!

Roosevelt may veto the congressional action. But it will not mean very much unless a real labor program on prices and the cost of living is effected. It cannot be done by playing cops and robbers with Roosevelt programs or the congressmen.

They could keep prices frozen. They could prevent sharp increases in the cost of living. They could ini-

tiated and carry out the necessary penalties against all violators of such a program of the people!

Roosevelt may veto the congressional action. But it will not mean very much unless a real labor program on prices and the cost of living is effected. It cannot be done by playing cops and robbers with Roosevelt programs or the congressmen.

They could keep prices frozen. They could prevent sharp increases in the cost of living. They could ini-

tiated and carry out the necessary penalties against all violators of such a program of the people!

Roosevelt may veto the congressional action. But it will not mean very much unless a real labor program on prices and the cost of living is effected. It cannot be done by playing cops and robbers with Roosevelt programs or the congressmen.

They could keep prices frozen. They could prevent sharp increases in the cost of living. They could ini-

tiated and carry out the necessary penalties against all violators of such a program of the people!

Roosevelt may veto the congressional action. But it will not mean very much unless a real labor program on prices and the cost of living is effected. It cannot be done by playing cops and robbers with Roosevelt programs or the congressmen.

They could keep prices frozen. They could prevent sharp increases in the cost of living. They could ini-

tiated and carry out the necessary penalties against all violators of such a program of the people!

Roosevelt may veto the congressional action. But it will not mean very much unless a real labor program on prices and the cost of living is effected. It cannot be done by playing cops and robbers with Roosevelt programs or the congressmen.

They could keep prices frozen. They could prevent sharp increases in the cost of living. They could ini-

tiated and carry out the necessary penalties against all violators of such a program of the people!

Roosevelt may veto the congressional action. But it will not mean very much unless a real labor program on prices and the cost of living is effected. It cannot be done by playing cops and robbers with Roosevelt programs or the congressmen.

FEPC Charges Discrimination by Sailors Union

By SCOTT BYER

The Fair Employment Practices Committee has started proceedings against the Sailors Union of the Pacific and the Seafarers International Union, both AFL, charging them with discrimination against Negro seamen.

There was no specific cause for the action of the FEPC, although it is true that the SUP and SIU have followed the generally backward policy of excluding Negro seamen from their unions.

A Flank Attack on Unions

The FEPC has shown no real interest in the Negro, and in this particular case it is taking advantage of the narrow outlook of the SUP and SIU in order to reinforce from a seemingly "progressive" flank the general attack of the ship owners and the government against organized seamen.

The FEPC is taking advantage of the chief weaknesses of what are otherwise the most militant unions in the maritime industry.

The short-sightedness of the SUP-SIU with respect to the Negro seamen led to their being put on the spot, not by the workers, but by those who are its greatest enemies.

Since the beginning of the war there has been a concentrated attack on organized labor in the maritime industry, because of the almost complete military control over it during wartime. The maritime unions today receive the brunt of anti-labor legislation and regimentation, and the seamen are purged on the ships themselves by the maritime Gestapo — the U. S. Coast Guard.

Realizing this and the fact that the government has never willingly done anything for the Negro — that the FEPC is the check-valve on the

pressure brought against the government by the Negro workers — that the FEPC has accomplished little for the Negro to date — that it has brought proceedings only against trade unions, and not employers, we can only believe that their present action against the SUP and the SIU is nothing more than a continuance of the attempt to smash union labor and not a sincere effort to help the Negro.

Why They Pick on SUP-SIU

The seamen of the SUP-SIU have long enjoyed the best working conditions in the maritime industry — conditions which the Stalinist leadership of the National Maritime Union have

never been obtain for their seamen because of their strict obedience to the orders of Mustache Joe and their lackey-like support of the war. The Stalinists help the government carry on an all-out fight against labor. The one progressive policy of the NMU is that it enables colored seamen to find employment through its hiring halls.

Yet it is believed that this union, which has always followed the policy of

Navy Yard, Army Camp, Red Cross—All Discriminate

By Ruth Leonard

There is a growing list of instances of intolerance in the "arsenal of democracy." Here are three cases of discrimination against Negroes and Jews which have come to the attention of LABOR ACTION within the last week:

NAVY YARD DISCRIMINATION

In the government-owned Brooklyn Navy Yard, in New York City, Negroes' seniority rights are flagrantly violated. Although there are many qualified for supervisory and leadmen positions, no Negroes have been promoted. White workers with less seniority and qualifications are given the supervisory jobs. Out of 3,000 Negroes in the shipfitters shop, not one is a supervisor.

Negroes are denied upgrading and salary increases due them according to seniority. They are kept from filing complaints and grievances through open intimidation by superiors. Negro women workers are the victims of the worst discrimination. They are given the dirtiest and least desirable jobs and are asked to quit when they try to get a transfer.

Not only Negroes, but Jewish employees as well, are discriminated against at the Yard. They, too, are denied upgrading opportunities and are baited by certain of their fellow employees, with the approval of the Management. After a Jewish holy day, numbers of Jewish employees were suspended for days, or demoted, for taking the day off for religious observances.

To top off these Hitler-like practices by management at the yard, identification badges carry racial markings—W for white, C for colored workers. This is the nearest thing in this country to Hitler's orders that Jews in Europe wear the Star of David on their sleeves.

Charges as to the above practices were brought to the attention of the Fair Employment Practices Committee by the American Jewish Congress and the United Federal Workers' Union, Local 187, CIO, in a joint complaint. The FEPC said it had been investigating the Navy Yard since December 17. That is two months ago, but to date no action has been taken against the Navy Yard.

RED CROSS JIM CROW

Far away from Brooklyn, in the very heart of the "battle for democracy," in North Africa and the Middle East, Negro soldiers are Jim-Crowed by the Red Cross. This charge was made by John H. Faulk, a former Red Cross assistant field director in Cairo, Egypt. Mr. Faulk said that Negro soldiers are excluded from Red Cross dances and discouraged from attendance at clubs at furlough centers, and that he was told by his superiors that he was there to "maintain the status quo." The Red Cross publicity director in Washington made this comment on Faulk's charges: "It is disagreeable to the white soldiers when Negroes enter the clubs, that's not our fault." It is implicit in this reply to Mr. Faulk that his charges are true.

AT AN ARMY CAMP

Jim Crow is "in the Army" at the camp at Westover Field, Springfield, Mass. A committee of Springfield citizens, protesting discrimination against Negro soldiers, sent a delegation to Colonel Jones, commanding officer at the field.

The committee charged segregation at the post movie theater and at the chapel. They said that sick Negro soldiers were denied treatment on the ground that no beds were available and were then ordered back to work. Of the five hundred Negroes at the camp, almost all are assigned menial jobs, even when they have special training. Negroes are ordered to make beds for white soldiers, in violation of Army rules, and are denied leave passes. Negro soldiers at camp report that since the protest, some of the Jim Crow rules have been lifted.

These instances of discrimination should make it clear to every member of a minority group in this country that the "war for democracy" is often being fought with the weapons of fascist race hatred. Committees of protest, public exposure of these conditions are useful, but they are not enough. The masses of Negroes and Jews, together with organized labor, must join their forces in a mighty protest against these conditions. Racial discrimination, segregation and race hatred are weapons against the whole people, especially the workers and the labor movement. It is on the basis of such divisions that the profiteers wax fat.

New International for February Features Review Of American Labor Party

For anyone who wants the full story on the struggle in the American Labor Party, the February issue of the New International is indispensable. Max Shachtman, editor of the NI, really goes to town in his review of the factional fight between the present state leadership of Dubinsky-Counts-Rose and the Hillman-Stalinist Communist Party bloc.

It is really a penetrating analysis of the basic differences between these groups, what unites and separates them, and why they are now fighting.

In tracing the importance of the struggle for the whole labor movement, Shachtman shows how the fight for a nation-wide independent Labor Party is reflected in the ALP. And he points a way out: the labor movement must get into this struggle between the "upper layers" to make its weight felt in formulating such a policy as will result in the transformation of the ALP into a genuine Labor Party, truly independent. Such an intervention would require a struggle against both factions of "leaders."

This issue of the New International has other interesting and important features: There is the article by Harry Young entitled "Toward a New Versailles Treaty"; "The Psychology of Jim Crowism," by Alfred Freeman; the beginning of a new series, "China: Colossus of the East," by Ria Stone; the second installment of A. C. Higgins' "Inside Stalin's Prisons"; and the concluding chapter of R. Fahan's study of "Machiavellianism."

Defending Tin Magnates and Profits

Why U. S. Does Not Recognize Bolivia

By PAUL ULLMAN

What is the nature of the recent Bolivian revolution and what is at the bottom of the United States government's non-recognition of the new regime? A great deal of confusion, based on an amazing scarcity of information, has been spread on the question by the capitalist press.

The official reason given by the State Department for non-recognition is the fact that the revolution of December 19 was Nazi-inspired and supported. The regime is said to be undemocratic and numbers among its leaders people with well known sympathies for fascist governments.

The cloak of democratic words ill fits our hardened and experienced Secretary Hull. That these arguments are an obvious fraud is amply demonstrated by Hull's previous practices. Did he not embrace General Franco? Did he not play the lover's game with the French fascists and Vichyites? Is he not now setting up house for Badoglio in Italy? And does he not support and work with the most ruthless dictator in South America, Vargas of Brazil?

The "democratic" character of any foreign government has never been the deciding factor in determining recognition by the United States government. If that were the case, a majority of the honored members of the United Nations would have been disqualified from recognition. The only thing Hull refuses to recognize is Franco, the Vichyites, Giraud and the South American dictators, among others, is precisely their undemocratic character.

What determines U. S. policy toward Bolivia is the interest of the American capitalists in the rich tin mines of that country. The pressure of the government has been exerted on the Bolivian regime to secure American investments and profits from these mines. In carrying out its policy in Bolivia, the United States has had a direct hand in crushing the Bolivian labor movement and "stabilizing" to use a Roosevelt term, the Bolivian standard of living at an animal level.

Peneranda and the Tin Moguls

It is necessary to examine the United States relations to the overthrown Peneranda regime before one

can understand its current attitude to the new regime.

General Peneranda was a puppet of the tin mine owners of Bolivia. Tin, which is Bolivia's major industry, is dominated by three native capitalists, Patino, Hochschild and Aramayo. Patino, who is the largest, has not lived in the country since 1934 and owns thirty per cent of the stock of a Delaware corporation. This AMERICAN corporation has an authorized capitalization of fifty million dollars and owns more than one hundred and fifty mining concessions.

The masses of the Bolivian Indians who work the mines live a miserable and persecuted existence. The average life span of the tin miner is thirty years, only a few years better than the figure for British India. The rate of tuberculosis and silicosis among the mine workers is very high. Thus, the average daily wage of the industrial worker in 1940 would have enabled him to buy one quart of milk, one pound of meat or two pounds of potatoes. The workers are forced to buy from company stores.

The Workers Fight for Life

The Bolivian workers are organized, but find themselves fighting the bosses and the government at the same time. In 1926, the railway workers struck for fifty cents a day, U. S. currency. In 1928 and 1930 the tin miners went out on strike. There was a general strike in 1936. In 1938, there were more miners' strikes.

In all these attempts of the Bolivian workers to get a better wage, the government played the chief role of strike-breaker. Union leaders were exiled and jailed; workers were shot, martial law declared and civil liberties outlawed.

The uprising of the Bolivian workers culminated in the strike of the Catavi mine workers, which was suppressed by government machine guns. For five hours on December 21, 1942, bullets were rained on a group of 8,000 workers. At least 400 dead were unofficially counted.

That was the Peneranda government which was recognized and approved by the State Department. On December 8, the Bolivian Congress approved a labor code for minimum wages and other conditions. The United States Ambassador, Boal,

played a direct role in preventing this code from going into effect.

Ernesto Galarzo, chief of the division of labor and social information of the Pan American Union, said: "On the day immediately preceding that date (December 8), the Ambassador of the United States in Bolivia, communicated to the President of Bolivia the viewpoint of the big mine operators and presented arguments and suggestions the object of which was to delay or prevent the improvement of working conditions as set forth in the code." Relations to Villarreal

The United States thus favored the Peneranda regime because it operated in the interests of the tin owners. Any regime which threatened the security of profits from tin would be bound to clash with the State Department. That is the key to the current policy of non-recognition.

The day after the new regime, led by the nationalist revolutionary movement, came to power it announced that it would adhere completely to the foreign policy of the Peneranda regime. It would remain in the United Nations and take its place in the Pan American Union. But it differed from the previous regime in its attitude toward tin.

The revolutionary movement capitalized on the mass sentiment of the people of Bolivia against the Peneranda regime and against "foreign" capital in Bolivia. It swept into power with the tacit approval of the people. Its policy toward the mines was "Bolivia for the Bolivians" and "Down with Foreign Capital."

Victor Paz Estenssoro, who was at the head of the revolutionary movement and is its Finance Minister, was known for his antipathy to the vested interests controlling Bolivian mines. Others prominent in the government were opposed to "Yanqui" imperialism in Bolivia. And, at the time of the revolution, many of the tin owners had to go into hiding.

It should not be thought that the Bolivian revolution was a popular revolution, democratic in purpose, whose main aim was to throw out native and foreign oppressors and give the people the right to their own government. Nothing could be further from the facts. The revolution was a coup executed by a handful of militarists and Bolivian na-

tionalists. They would have liked to nationalize the mines and put them under the control of the government, that is, themselves.

But democracy was far from their minds. Civil liberties were reduced and anti-Semitism suddenly flared up in the country. The condition of the workers was not improved.

Tin Is the Barometer

The anti-democracy of the new regime did not concern the State Department. American capitalists carry their sentiments in their pocketbooks and that is where the threat to their tin interests was hit hardest.

Latest developments indicate that the weight of State Department pressure is beginning to tell. On February 11, three members of the new Bolivian government were dropped. One of them, Senor Montenegro, Minister of Agriculture, was known as an opponent of Yankee imperialism. He had been largely responsible for the expropriation of the Standard Oil holdings in Bolivia. It is significant that United States Ambassador Boal (the same) had been conferring with Villarreal, President of the regime, and left for the United States after the men were dropped. The probable course of developments is continued concessions to the United States, since the Bolivian government can't go on too long with American economic weight against it, until recognition is granted.

Thus the key to an understanding of the Bolivian affair lies in America's economic interests in that country. The fact that the new regime was allegedly helped to power by the Nazis and is itself undemocratic, is incidental to America's real motivation and is used as camouflage. This is proved by the very harmonious relations the United States maintains with other semi-fascist governments and also by the fact that the new Bolivian regime has the same foreign policy as the Peneranda government.

The critical difference, therefore, was the danger to profits from tin that was lodged in the extreme nationalist domestic policies of the new regime. The Administration continues in its role of influencing and manipulating South American affairs according to the need and investments of American big business.

Italy's Fascists Hop AMG Bandwagon

By JESSIE KAAREN

A description of black market conditions and inflation in southern Italy is contained in a letter from Naples to an Italian in this country. Most significant of the facts contained in this letter is that "Allied" flour commands the highest black market price of any, 140 lire, or about \$1.40, in occupation money for a kilogram (2.2 pounds) of bread.

Life Is Terrible

"How is it that so much Allied flour is to be found on the black market? you will ask," the letter goes on. "In Naples, everything is in the hands of the old fascist leaders and their satellites. The Allied Military Government is entirely surrounded by old fascist elements, which form a gang of mutual support."

"Because of the inflation, the fixed income class is slowly dying of starvation and the workers see thieves and pillagers become rich and prosperous while they starve. As a consequence, since they feel that things could not be worse than they are, they are turning to communism. 'Our life is truly terrible at present. We are sometimes without electricity, there are no street cars, there is no gas.'"

Most newspaper correspondents writing from Italy are agreed that Premier Pietro Badoglio's government could not last a week without

Allied support, but the fact remains that AMG is still reluctant to deal with any other form of government that might succeed it.

The "Re-Educators"

"While the spokesmen for the State Department in this country talk in grandiose terms of 're-educating' the Italian people to democratic processes," the fact remains that all political activity was specifically banned by AMG until a few weeks ago. Since then another directive has been issued, giving the commanding general in each locality discretion to allow political meetings.

But when one remembers that the local officials are still the old-line fascists and that they work very closely with the military occupation forces, it is obvious that the Italian people will be given little opportunity to see at first hand how "democratic processes" work.

The present type of government cannot be stabilized, no matter how desperately the brass hats try to sit on the lid. The King, the Crown Prince and Badoglio are hopelessly unpopular, according to a dispatch in a newspaper as conservative as the New York Times. That the King and the Crown Prince are already losing favor as a stop-gap government is apparent from many sources. It is reported that the new policy of the State Department involves ditching the King. Even Badoglio

may have to be shelved by the State Department, although AMG is trying very hard to maintain his shadow government in power.

It is obvious, too, that the State Department (since the United States is taking the lead in the direction of European affairs) is trying to find a safe liberal savior to help it out of its present predicament. The State Department wants someone capable of stemming the revolutionary tide of the Italian workers. But it fears, once the floodgates of democratic processes are opened, Allied-capitalist control of Italy will be swept away by the upsurge of the Italian people.

Fascists on the Bandwagon

In the meanwhile, scores of fascists are getting a free ride at the expense of the Italian people and with the blessing of AMG. It is interesting to read the list, published recently in the New York newspaper PM, of biographies of well known fascists transferred to government jobs in Southern Italy.

Incidentally, the fascists are trying desperately to call in every copy of Chi E (the Italian version of our Who's Who) so that it is a common sight to see an ad in the local newspapers, "Wanted: Chi E, price no object." Every fascist official is now trying to hide his cloudy past, so that he can fit in better with a regime that pays lip service to democ-

Here are a few of the biographical sketches:

"Signor Sovrano, former fascist prefect of Naples, who collaborated whole-heartedly with the Germans during their occupation of the city. The first thing the people of Naples did when the Anglo-American forces approached the city was to kick their prefect out of office and out of town. He went to Bari, only to be sent by Badoglio to another town, Taranto, again to be prefect."

"Ghinelli, former secretary of the Fascist Federation of Bologna, who became notorious when he slapped Toscanini after a concert in Bologna, lives quietly in Naples, completely at liberty, on an excellent security he received with a large insurance company."

"Filippo Naldi is chief of press in the Badoglio government. He was formerly editor-in-chief of the fascist newspaper, Popolo di Roma. It was in his office, that the gang of Amerigo Dumini, the Chicago gangster and close friend of Al Capone, plotted the kidnaping and murder of Giacomo Matteotti in June, 1924. In the payoff, naturally, Naldi received his share."

And so on ad nauseum.

This collaboration between the "democratic conquerors" and the fascist dictators of yesterday demonstrates that only the Italian working masses can save Italy for themselves.

Negro Children Manhandled by Cops

By C. W.

NEW YORK—The repeated mistreatment of Negro children at the hands of the local police has become intolerable. The most recent incident, which received some publicity in the Negro press, is the case of Miriam Punter.

Little Girl Is Slapped

On January 19 the child was brutally slapped by a hefty cop in the school yard of P. S. 40. At the hearing the usual whitewash was in evidence. The lawyer for the complainants was not permitted to attend the hearing. Those present stated that the policeman involved did not testify, and made no comment about slapping the girl. Witnesses who did see the actual blow was dismissed at once. Those who claimed they saw the child struck were asked questions totally unrelated to the case, and questions which made an effort to discredit the complainants. The Mayor asked for and got a report on the case. It is a long report and undoubtedly very interesting, but it makes no reference to the slapping. So much for the Punter case. How-

ever, there are many Negro families in the Prospect Avenue section of the Bronx whose children have had similar experiences with New York's "finest."

Other Instances

One man was present when a cop broke up a street fight between a group of boys, ages seven to ten, with his nightstick. Another saw a

kid slapped and pushed into the gutter for shining shoes in front of a theater. A small boy was caught stealing in a Woolworth store and was dragged and shoved out through the crowd by a cursing and threatening cop.

The school and police authorities stress the fact that the kids are "bad" and have a "vicious" attitude. They

skim over the conditions of crowded apartments, of a low standard of living and of daily insults, that foster this "vicious" attitude in these children as soon as they are old enough to understand.

Professor William Bonger of the University of Amsterdam, in a recent study called "Race and Crime," finds that it is the social environment that is the decisive factor in criminal acts. That seems to make the solution of the problem very simple:

Put an end to the segregation of the Negro. Put an end to the miserable conditions under which they live and work.

Perhaps this solution has not occurred to the authorities, or perhaps, it has—but they feel that slapping is the easiest and "safest" method.

The situation is indeed serious when such incidents are dismissed casually. The capitalist press has come to the point where it shrugs its shoulders and brushes the matter off. The working class, however, must realize what is behind this race brutality and must bring about unity between black and white workers for their common good.

Rail Profits Come Before Safety and Progress

By Eugene Vaughn

An old sore on the American scene, railroad malpractices and monopoly, has been pried open once again by Wendell Berge, an assistant Attorney General of the United States, in his report to the Kilgore Committee of the Senate, which is presently investigating the railroads.

The monopolistic and lucrative practices of the railroads are not new. The story told by Wendell Berge is very old. The only difference between this investigation and previous investigations resides in the time element.

Past investigations of the railroads led to the passage of such acts as the Sherman Anti-Trust Act and the Clayton Act. Today, in the year 1944, fifty-seven years since the passage of the original Sherman Act, particularly aimed at the railroads, they and their monopolistic relatives continue to show no concern for the anti-trust laws, evade prosecution, squeeze money out of the pockets of the public and make mighty profits through their malpractices.

HOW THE RAILROADS MANIPULATED IT

The facts presented before the Senate committee portray very clearly the scheming of the railroads.

In the midst of the depression, the railroads blocked the introduction of new improvements, such as air-conditioned cars, which would have created jobs for the many unemployed at that time and would have raised the standard of the service rendered.

Technical improvements, including safety developments, were delayed to protect the profits of the railroads. Dr. Herbert Schimmel, the research director for the Kilgore committee, submitted reports showing that most of the train wrecks could have been prevented by the use of more modern equipment. Two of these, which cost the lives of a hundred and fifty people, the Pennsylvania wreck near Philadelphia, and the Atlantic Coast Line wreck near Rennert, N. C., could have been prevented by the use of the two-way radio.

Rate reductions, which would have increased traffic during the depression years and consequently increased employment, were blocked.

The Pullman Company used its monopoly of sleeping car production to slow down the adoption of new streamlined trains and thus forced the public to use the old equipment.

To top off all of these malpractices, the Western railroads, through their control of their Railway Express Agency subsidiary, have forced extraordinarily high rates on air express to restrain the development of air transport. Their aspiration for a two-way monopoly trust of railroads and airways is being pushed by the railroads in their campaign to revise the civil aeronautics act to permit them to buy and operate airlines.

A FEW BUSINESS "PRACTICES"

Wendell Berge told the Senate Committee that the Western railroads entered into an agreement on December 1, 1932, to "avoid practices which dissipate railroad earnings in the West." To implement their agreement, the railroads appointed a Western commissioner to act as chairman of the Western Association of Railroad Executives and to police their understandings. Any failure to abide by the decision of the association was reported to a committee representing the financial interests back of the roads. This committee of bankers held regular meetings at the Bank of Manhattan, 40 Wall Street, New York.

An interesting example of how monopoly control based upon interlocking directorates keeps new technologies from being introduced was presented before the committee. The Pullman company has a complete monopoly in the manufacture of sleeping cars. By virtue of this monopoly it has kept the streamline cars from entering the railroad service en masse.

In 1936 Pullman staved off competition from the Budd Company, which proposed to manufacture a streamlined Twentieth Century Limited for the New York Central Railroad. Harry S. Sturgis, a Pullman director and a vice-president of the First National Bank of New York, wrote David A. Crawford, president of the Pullman Company, that it looked as if the deal between Budd and New York Central would go through, and that something had to be done about it. Sturgis then contacted George Whitney, president of J. P. Morgan & Co., who was also a director of both the Pullman Company and New York Central. A little pressure was exerted by Mr. Whitney, and things smoothed themselves out. The Pullman Company got the contract to make old style cars and the train travelers retained the dubious pleasure of traveling in a tired and true Pullman rather than a modern streamliner.

MORE OFFICES AND PROFITS

It is these railroad magnates who wish to make the world safe for "free enterprise." It is these people who wish to underwrite, on their own terms, full employment in the post-war period. It is these people who wish to have the welfare of the American workers and farmers consigned to their hands.

The government, in turn, is quite magnanimous and quite liberal in its exposure of the railroad malpractices. Senator Kilgore says that "monopolistic repression of new developments seems clearly to be one of the factors in the technological old age of this industry." In his next breath, Senator Kilgore proposes to open another office: "an office of scientific and technological mobilization," designed to promote the use of scientific developments.

The answer to the chronic abuses of the railroads does not lie in the creation of a new office, even if there still is some office space in Washington's Pentagon Building.

The reason for monopoly is profits. The arbiter of profits is monopoly. Selling the consumer down the river is also due to the lust for profits. In the all-embracing power of the monopolists, monopoly, profits and abuse of the consumer all go together and are cut from the same cloth.

Nationalization of the railroads under workers' control is the only solution to the railroad problem. The concern of the consumer is the concern of the workers, for the worker is also a consumer. The worker is not concerned with super-profits and he is quite willing to do away with monopoly.

Time Out--To Bury the Dead

Two men—an American captain and a private—carrying a Red Cross banner tied to two sticks, marched through a battered no-man's-land to the edge of the bloody Rapido River today and crossed into German territory amid a deadly silence.

They walked on across the stricken land—the scene of the heaviest fighting since Salerno—until they came to a barbed-wire barrier, where they were soon greeted by a German officer. They were there in response to a German request for a battle lull to evacuate casualties.

After the terms had been agreed on, both sides withheld their fire while seventy-five American medical officers and a smaller number of Germans removed the dead and wounded. Some had been lying under heavy artillery fire for three days.—From an AP dispatch from Italy.

Editorials

The N. Y. Times -- A "Refined" Labor-Hater

The New York Times is an important capitalist newspaper. While its editorials are about the dulllest things imaginable, they are important because they reflect the considered opinions of a representative section of American capitalism. When the New York Times expresses its opinions, it is not exactly news because it can generally be expected that the viewpoint will not favor labor in any important way.

Its reputation as a liberal, fair and consistent paper is largely fiction. The Times can be these when issues are unimportant, such as where to place a bridge, whether noise should be permitted in a large city, or whether a sanitation department is doing its job. When, however, it expresses itself on the important issues of the day, especially on subjects relating to labor, the cost of living, wages, unionism, socialism, etc., it reveals itself only as a more "cultured" offspring of capitalism and the interests of the profit system, whatever that may be worth.

The fact that the New York Times does not write in the style of the Hearst papers does not mean that it is not as venomous toward labor as is the "chief" of the Hearst enterprises.

The fact that it is not as blatantly anti-union as Roy Howard does not mean that it differs essentially from that male clothes-horse who runs the Scripps-Howard sheets.

The New York Times is really an "opinion" paper for an upper crust of readers and a policy-setter for other papers which consciously or unconsciously follow its lead.

A BIG BUSINESS CAMPAIGN

Since the war began the Times has carried on a consistent and persistent campaign to place the main burdens of the war on the American working class. Its opinions on every question of domestic economic policies have been with an eye on the profits of the capitalists, whose opinions and ideals it truly represents. Thus its differences with the Roosevelt Administration, which it once wholeheartedly followed, arise from the fact that FDR has not gone anti-labor fast enough to suit them, and has been contradictory in his actions.

The New York Times program can be summed up somewhat as follows: For increased taxation, but this should be made "more equitable" by spreading it to broader layers. This is another way of saying tax the workers, the poor farmers, the poor people, the one-third of the workers of the nation who have not received a single wage increase since the war broke out.

On the cost of living, the Times has followed a consistent policy of denying that it has risen to any important extent. A rise

was not only expected by these solons of capitalist thinking, but is even a good thing, they add. Halts inflation, and all that sort of thing.

Its attitude on the question of wages links up completely with its attitude on the cost of living. Just as it practically denies a tremendous rise in the cost of living, it paints a picture of a phenomenal rise in wages which is at complete variance with the truth. But one thing is clear: the New York Times is unalterably opposed to wage increases, even if the cost of living has far exceeded any rise in wages.

It is against subsidies, but not for the reason LABOR ACTION is against them. We do not want to hand out anything to the profiteers and we are for real price control—which means no price rises. We are for freezing of profits and a hundred per cent tax on all war profits. The Times does not want subsidies because it is in favor of no genuine price control whatever, i.e., it is for unlimited prices and profits.

Conforming to these opinions, this "educated" scribble-sheet sheds pious tears on its editorial pages on how this is really a profitless war for big business, while its financial pages are full of reports demonstrating exactly the opposite.

A "NEW" OPINION

A few days ago, the Times delivered itself of another pronouncement on the subject of wages. The theme was the same as earlier editorials on the same subject.

For "facts" on the cost of living, it accepts the government statistics of a 23.1 per cent rise, rejecting out of hand the joint AFL-CIO survey showing a 43.5 per cent rise in the cost of living.

For the rise in wages it takes total payrolls to show an enormous increase. But it deliberately falsifies the picture because it does not mention the fact that this rise in total payrolls includes "millions of new workers, overtime, holiday and Sunday works. It neglects to mention the millions of workers who live on sub-standard wages.

But suddenly it comes to the defense of the underpaid white collar workers, as if this were the fault of organized labor and not of the bosses of the profiteering insurance combines, the skinflints of the commercial and mail order houses, and the speculating stock brokers of Wall Street.

The same Times would work itself into a lather if the white collar workers would organize so that they could present wage demands. And if these workers do get wage increases, it will be due in a large measure to the standards already set by the organized unionists of the country. The Times is not really interested in the low wages of

white collar workers—what it really meant to say was that the wages of all other workers should be reduced to the level of the white collar workers.

But most important of all on the question of workers' wages, the Times omits any reference to the fact that the workers pay a twenty per cent weekly withholding tax, which is, in effect, a wage cut. While it cries out loudly about the taxation of profits, which in no way prevented big business from filching the greatest profits in history, it says nothing about the taxation of wages which leaves the real wages of the workers at a low level.

THEIR PROGRAM

What does the Times propose? Inequalities in pay should not henceforth be eliminated!

Wages should not be kept in line with the rising cost of living!

Only the lowest-paid workers should be given "consideration" for slight wage increases!

Sub-standard wages must be defined (on the theory that since there won't be too much agreement on this, it will forestall wage increases)!

No changes must be made in the Little Steel formula!

And finally, wages should not conform to price increases. On the contrary, prices should rise above wages and thus... prevent inflation!

Here, in a nutshell, is an anti-labor program which big business really wants. It is the kind of program which the Administration, despite its words, is actually carrying into effect. The New York Times is really warning against any weakening of this program.

The organized labor movement must turn its guns on this program—otherwise American labor will pay a tremendous penalty to the vultures of big business.

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. 8 February 21, 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, 1940,
at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1879.

Nazis Study AMG Rule in Italy --

To Prevent a German Revolt

By SARA KLEIN

As a blueprint of how the Allied occupation forces (once Germany is defeated militarily) will be enabled to collaborate with an underground Nazi machine to control post-war Germany for the purpose of preventing a social revolution in that country, the article in the January issue of The Protestant, by Heinz Pol, is an excellent job.

However, when the author, who is a former editor of the Berlin Vossische Zeitung and is now a refugee from fascism, complains that the Allies do not realize how such a collaboration would inevitably tend to pave the way for a Third World War and begs the Allies to make a clean sweep of the fascists after they defeat Germany, he is making the mistake that most liberals make. He confuses the actual war aims of the Allies with the propaganda which goes out in the name of "democracy."

AMG in Italy the Model

The author is alarmed over the way AMG is acting in Italy, where former fascist officials are being used to suppress local populations just as in the old days under Mussolini. When he sees from British intelligence reports that the German fascist leaders are studying closely the pattern of government set up in that part of Italy occupied by the Allies, and that they have already begun the process of sending their best men into local police forces and into municipal services, he is worried that the same thing will happen in Germany.

Mr. Pol's information is based on reports prepared by the British Intelligence Service. It reveals that cells of loyal Nazis are now being placed in many branches of civil service, the customs department, the tax office, the welfare service and various other municipal departments. The SS men who are not now in the Army, older reservists generally, are being hidden away in these civil service jobs and in local police forces so that they may be ready to take over when the OFFICIAL Nazi Party

ceases to exist.

In addition to using Italy as a model, the Nazis are also studying closely the methods used by the Allies when the occupied Germany after the First World War. As Mr. Pol writes: "Reports about that period are studied closely in the Germany of today... They prove beyond any doubt that the Allies in their fear of a REAL REVOLUTION... did everything to strangle democratic development in the newly-born German republic and thereby played into the hands of the new social democratic leaders in Berlin who ALSO WERE NOT INTERESTED IN A REVOLUTION."

More Corroboration

A report by Colonel I. L. Hunt of the American forces in Germany, in 1919, helps to prove the point. "Most of the ex-imperial officers of the Kaiser remained at their posts. In occupied territory their retention in office was made a condition of the armistice. In many cases, our arrival was welcomed by the officials, who regarded our coming as being of great assistance, enforcing their authority, which had been weakened by the revolution."

"One of the first decrees issued by the AMG of 1919 was to prohibit all soldiers and workers' councils in the Rhineland. This also gave the Social-Democratic leaders in Berlin an excuse to deal ruthlessly with these councils and other revolutionary groups in unoccupied Germany, on the threat that otherwise the Allied troops would take over all of Germany."

AMG's Methods in Italy

The same type of suppression is being practiced in Italy today by AMG. For the sake of "order and quiet," revolutionary groups are being prohibited. In the villages, towns and provinces, Italian fascists are still governing jointly with Allied military officers.

Thus the German Nazis have ample assurance that their efforts to preserve German capitalism will not

be wasted on the Allies when their turn to be "occupied" will come. They have no doubt that the Allies will welcome their cooperation, and vice versa, when the threat of a German mass movement becomes reality.

Although the author of the article in The Protestant realizes that the last thing in the world that the Allied capitalist governments want is a democratic workers' and peasants' regime in Germany, he does not follow his thoughts through to their logical end. That is why he sounds ridiculous when he cautions the Allied governments to "watch their step." The Allied officials know very well why they deal with fascists. They know that in this particular instance their interests are as one with the Nazis against the masses.

The Only Sensible Thing

In this whole business of foreign occupation, the only sensible thing to say is that an American or Allied occupation of Germany will not solve any of the problems of poverty and degradation which the German masses suffer now. In fact, the only role such an Allied occupation can play is to reduce still lower the status of the Germans—to make a colony of Germany. In fact, most post-war plans are built on this idea.

Only a government built by the free workers and peasants in Germany can prevent a Third World War and bring decent living conditions and democracy to the people there. This the German masses understand very well, and it is with words of encouragement to them that we should concern ourselves and not in cautioning the Allies to change their ways.

When the German workers, soldiers and peasants, as one mighty whole, burst the fascist-capitalist bands which encircle them, the petty officials of both camps will feel the point of the boot. The mass movement will know where to find the fascists and foreign "democrats" regardless of how deeply they try to bury themselves.

Teaches Tolerance--Gets Fired

By JULIAN STERN

Dr. J. Ernest Wright, since September of last year an economics teacher at the Natrona (a district of Pittsburgh) Har-Brack Union High School, has been fired for using "profanity" in his classes. But this excuse is even sillier than the one given in the MacMahon case last year. The real reason is that he has been combating anti-Semitism and racial hatred in general in the midst of Pittsburgh's "really mixed" population.

Dr. Wright's "Crimes"

Attacking the minority and racial problem right in his classroom, he discussed anti-Semitism, and even went so far as to take a copy of the New York newspaper PM with the big headline—"Anti-Semites Do Hitler's Work Here"—on the bulletin board.

By quotations from the Bible, Dr. Wright tried to demonstrate that anti-Semitism runs counter to Christian morality. He invited a Negro minister and his family to dinner at his home across the street from the school. He defended the "Hunkies," the workers of Slavic extraction against their traducers and spoke at a Slavic meeting.

Dr. Wright, before his dismissal, made such an impression on the student body by his efforts that the high

school's seven hundred and fifty students staged a walk-out for two days over his firing, and would have stayed out longer if he hadn't asked them to go back. They discounted the "profanity" charge and understood the issues involved. Dr. Wright admitted that he used an accidental "damn" when countering anti-Semitic talk in the classroom.

Most of the students' parents work in the mills of Allegheny Ludlum Steel and of Pittsburgh Plate Glass works. It is not surprising that, with these factories as the industrial center of the town, some of the members of the school board which fired Dr. Wright, are bosses in these plants.

A Perilous Racial Situation

Among the factors which make for a perilous racial situation and which Dr. Wright in his own way was trying to alleviate, are the 50,000 Negro workers and thousands of Poles and other Slavic peoples who do the dirty work in those factories. Their second generation, now that they know English, refuse to be treated as second-class citizens. And in this struggle for economic and social equality, it is inevitable that these racial frictions arise.

Hence there was a large America First chapter in Pittsburgh before the United States entered the war. Gerald L. K. Smith, the fascist and anti-Semite, often went there to

speak. In addition, from across the Allegheny River, in New Kensington, Technocracy, Inc., an organization with fascist tinges, broadcasts regularly on Station WKPA. More than just the spirit of the Ku Klux Klan hovers over the city.

Dr. Wright, a staunch believer in his principles, continues to protest his firing, although he has been offered two other better paying jobs. Said he: "I really think this is important. I think we have got to stop this matter of race hate now before it gets too big. The way the boys and girls have stood with me is touching—and it's most encouraging. They have been coming to my room every day, just to tell me they understand what I am driving at, and to tell me how strongly they feel about it."

The case has received the support of many of the minorities in the area. The American Slav Conference has passed resolutions condemning the board's action. The Rev. Dr. Camille Orelmanski, Polish Roman Catholic priest, spoke up similarly. The Negro and Jewish press have published letters decrying the school board's action, as did the Pittsburgh daily papers.

The students and their parents have sent petitions to the school board, with no result. Clement Wood, chairman of the school board and a steel department superintendent, has refused to comment.

Cropper Fights Illegal Entry

"The United States Supreme Court will soon be called upon to decide whether or not an Arkansas sharecropper's cabin constitutes a home which a citizen has a constitutional right to defend against illegal entry," H. L. Mitchell, president of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, said when he announced that an appeal would be taken in the case of Tee Davis.

A sentence of ten years in prison was upheld last week by the State Supreme Court of Arkansas against Davis, convicted of assault on a plantation owner, Harold Weaver of Edmondson, Crittenden County, Ark. According to the trial record, Weaver had joined two other plantation "laws" deputy sheriffs in a raid on homes of all sharecroppers near Edmondson, searching for a cattle thief.

The last cabin in the settlement, occupied by Tee Davis and his wife, was reached about 10 p.m. just as the sharecroppers were going to bed. The dogs of neighbors were barking. Someone called out in the darkness: "Open the door, you black s--- of a b---," and began kicking the door down. Davis grabbed his shotgun and fired through the door at the intruder. Pistol shots answered the shotgun. Weaver was hit in the hand but was not seriously injured. The other two raiders arrived and upon a demand to open the door in the name of the law, Davis opened it and was taken to the Crittenden County jail and held from March 22 to November 23 awaiting trial.

A jury composed of plantation owners heard the case. It was brought out that Davis in 1936 had

been involved in a strike of cotton choppers. Despite the instructions of the presiding judge as to the law, the jury promptly returned a verdict of guilty and imposed the heaviest sentence under the law for assault.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Workers Defense League and other organizations concerned with the preservation of civil liberties of citizens are interested in the Tee Davis case. K. T. Sutton of Helena, Ark., chief counsel for the STFU, representing Davis, will handle the appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court.

Harold Weaver, the plantation owner, is the defendant in a civil suit brought by thirty union members, whose property, consisting of houses and land near Edmondson, was taken away from them through illegal tax sales during the depression. The case has been in court for two years and attorneys for Weaver have fought a delaying action to prevent a decision from being handed down.

It is alleged that Weaver is the front for a group of Crittenden County planters who seek to drive out all remaining small property owners. Two years ago several Crittenden County officials were convicted in Federal Court for depriving numerous citizens of their civil rights. These individuals are now serving their sentences.

Restless British Workers Breaking Political Ties With Churchill Tories

By NANCY NATHAN

There has been deep restlessness and sporadic mass action among the workers of Great Britain throughout the year 1943. The year's strikes numbered 1,775 in spite of the laws for compulsory arbitration and for labor conscription.

Many of the strikes were short-lived, fifty per cent lasting only two days and even less. The strain of four years of war is indeed great, and workers walk out not only for wage increases but for various reasons unrelated to the immediate question of wages and conditions.

"Courtesy" an Issue

For example, it is reported that 1,765 miners in Kent struck over a dispute involving a foreman alleged by the workers to have sold fascist literature. Later the strikers refused to return to work because "management had shown a lack of courtesy."

The past year also saw the mass demonstrations against the release of the fascist Mosley from jail—implying, as it did, great dissatisfaction on the part of the workers with the government as a whole but more especially with the members of the Labor Party in the government.

Dissatisfaction with the national coalition government is now finding expression in the by-elections. This is the only way in which it can find expression, since general elections have been suspended for the duration.

General elections are out and there is an agreement between the Conservative and Labor parties for freezing the parliamentary status quo. If a vacancy occurs in the House of Commons, by-elections take place, but such elections are merely "coupon elections."

For in a district where a Tory candidate was formerly elected, a Tory

is again put up with the endorsement of the Labor Party. Contrariwise, where a Labor Party candidate previously carried the election, the Tories give their okay to the new Labor Party candidate for the existing vacancy.

This arrangement of mutual back-scratching has been slightly upset by the need of the people to give expression to their discontent. In at least four by-elections, independent candidates have been put up against the Tory-Labor candidates.

Prime Minister Churchill has taken alarm at this development. He has seen fit to intervene personally in the Brighton by-election, where an independent candidate was running against the Tory-Labor man.

Churchill upbraided the independent candidate for an "attempted swindle" in declaring himself for Churchill but against the coalition government. "If," said Churchill, "he is trying to defeat the National Government candidate and thus bring the government and the coalition of which I am the head into weakness and discredit, he has no right whatever to call himself a supporter of

mine and to pretend he is coming as a friend and helper."

The Prime Minister is anxious to stem the anti-coalition trend, fearing for the stability of his frozen Parliament. "Although a seat or two either way makes no real difference to the parliamentary majority, there is no doubt that if the electors of Brighton and Hove vote against the National Government as did the electors of Skipton the other day, it would strike an unsettling blow at those on whom the task of bringing the country back to safety and peace rests."

Churchill omitted to mention, however, that in Yorkshire an independent candidate also won in the by-election against the Tory candidate. The independent candidate, a Lieutenant Lawson, is a member of the Commonwealth Party. This party professes Christian Socialist ideals, according to James B. Reston, London correspondent of the New York Times. The Commonwealth Party appeals to middle class and independent radical groups.

However, in Yorkshire, it was the coal miners who elected Lawson. Such a liberal middle class outfit as the Commonwealth Party seems to be, does not and cannot represent the class interests of the miners and of the working class. However, in the circumstances, voting for the independent candidate was the only way the miners had of expressing their discontent with the coalition tactics of the Labor Party as well as with the whole coalition government. "Quality" Votes

Mr. Reston also reports a growing demand for changes in the whole electoral system of England. Some of the information he gives makes the reader think of the poll-tax states of this country.

"Under the British electoral system all things are not exactly equal," writes Mr. Reston. "An ordinary worker and his wife get their two votes for their member of the House of Commons, but down the street another man may get two votes, one because he is a sane adult and the other because he is a graduate of one of the big universities or because he owns a piece of business property in another constituency. The rich man's wife may also get two votes, one of which is also due to the ownership of property."

By such other "quality" regulations, the net result is that "The Commons is now so far from proportional representation that in the 1935 election 1,500,000 electors in the United Kingdom managed to be represented by nine members, whereas only 630,000 electors in other parts of the country managed to put twenty-one members into the House."

It seems that the Conservative Party is preparing to "present" the people with electoral reforms—possibly before the war is over—in an effort to forestall more revolutionary demands from the deeply dissatisfied working people.

Not the Truth -- Just Advertising

Everybody has noticed how big business is spending oodles of money on full-page ads in which it boasts itself to the sky. Much of this money is charged up to cost-plus government contracts. At any rate, an idea of the veracity of these ads can be gleaned from the following:

The Bituminous Coal Institute, the coal owners' organization, asserts in a recent ad that: "American coal mines are the safest in the world. ... Fatal accidents in the mines have been reduced approximately forty per cent in the past fifteen years."

The United Mine Workers Journal points out that in the year 1935, the latest figures available, "the accident rate per 1,000 employees shows that the fatal accident rate in the United States coal mines is from 2.50 to 3.75 times that of any of the European coal producing nations."