

# FDR Has No Real Plan for Post-War Full Employment!

By WALTER WEISS

Making his traditional tour through territory near his Dutchess County estate on the day before Election Day, President Roosevelt stopped at the yard of the Eureka Shipbuilding Company in Newburgh, There, according to the New York Times, the following interchange took place:

"We need more ships," a worker shouted, meaning the yard needed more work.

"We're going to keep you busy at least until the end of the war," the President declared.

"And after the war, too," a worker shouted.

"Yes, and after the war, too," the President answered, nodding.

An extremely significant little scene. The workers know that reconversion cutbacks have already taken place, and they fear much worse to come. The President assures them that war, the great employer, still offers security—at least for a few months longer. Then, like an actor who has forgotten his lines, he has to

be prompted by a fearfully hopeful worker into promising much more.

The official estimate is that war production will be cut forty per cent after the defeat of Germany (V-E Day). There is considerable skepticism about this in business circles. Speaking to the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on October 6, Alfred P. Sloan, chairman of the board of General Motors, suggested that seventy per cent would be nearer to the truth.

Workers everywhere have been subjected to a flood of contradictory statements about the future. The design of this propaganda seems to be to lead them to wonder whether the axe will hit their particular plant and to stop them from thinking about a program to meet the general crisis which is surely coming.

The Maritime Commission has told workers that there will be no cutback of cargo ships on V-E Day, but top men in the War Production Board say there will be a cut of fifty per cent. Public statements have been made that the Army will take all the heavy trucks that can be turned out even after Germany collapses, but WPB Chairman Krug predicts a cutback of seventy-two per cent. The two instances just cited are reported in Business Week maga-

zine of October 7. Many similar cases are to be found without much research.

The Office of War Information has a report about "dislocations" (their word—that's the kind of thing the OWI's gang of publicity experts is paid to concoct) after V-E Day. Unfortunately, it's a "restricted" report. In simple English, workers aren't supposed to see it. Elmer Davis has distributed 4,000 copies to advertising agencies to help them in planning advertising campaigns for the OWI, but he refuses to make it public. Government agencies which gave him the information pledged him to secrecy.

However, the Associated Press of October 5 stated that the report contains a prediction of "dislocations...likely to be widespread and, in some quarters, serious." Yet the unemployment problem (or, in language you can understand, the "dislocations") between the end of the German and Japanese phases of the war will not be "unmanageable." And after that?

Big industrialists are not too unhappy about their prospects. Donald Douglas, for example, has already landed orders for civilian aircraft which Time magazine of September 18 describes as "the fattest airline contracts ever placed in the U. S. aircraft in-

dustry." He now has a post-war backlog of orders amounting to well over \$100,000,000—more than three times as much as he sold in his best pre-war year. Operating at wartime levels, his plants could keep busy for one whole month on these orders. Naturally he won't operate at wartime levels. He is quoted as saying: "We'll have enough work for fifteen to twenty per cent of our workers."

In its issue of September 16, Business Week reports a study of the Buffalo area, made for the War Production Board by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The article is very aptly headlined, "Post-War Jobs—Facts Versus Hopes." Thirty-five plants, taken as a sampling, now have 110,000 workers and expect to use 54,000 after the war. "Most of them were fairly optimistic," we are told. In fact, manufacturers of transportation equipment, including aircraft, have rosy hopes of a ninety-six per cent gain in employment over pre-war levels. This would keep one out of ten of their present workers busy.

In this particular article we are not going into detail on steps that have been taken and on plans that have been offered to meet the "dislocations." We are only asking here what the general ap-

(Continued on page 2)

## Allies Bolster French Rulers Against Masses

By MARY BELL

The "Big Three" has now become the "Big Four." Following closely the Allied recognition on October 23 of the French provisional government headed by General de Gaulle, formal invitation to sit in full membership on the European Advisory Commission in London was tendered France on November 11.

This step, after long delay, in addition to early American-British jockeying over Giraud versus de Gaulle, repeated missions of the self-appointed and self-styled messiah, Charles ("Clemenceau" - "Joan of Arc") de Gaulle, came as a necessary culmination in Allied strategy to prevent a second French Revolution.

The French people desire a change, not only from pre-war conditions, but from the chaos that exists in France today. They have gone through four years of occupation, during which time they have seen the rich fare well through collaboration while they bore the brunt of forced labor, conscription of goods, and material, physical and moral privations. The French workers, the "little people," organized into the French Forces of the Interior (FFI) helped liberate the country and are today the only genuine and reliable anti-fascist force in France.

As an abject satellite of the Allied powers, the de Gaulle government would lose face with the workers. Yet France today is bankrupt; its army and navy are disorganized and weak; nobody knows how much the franc is worth; shortages of goods are so severe as to cause looting of Allied army supplies. Therefore, France must be helped to "independence" and "sovereignty" in order to forestall a workers' seizure of power. This the Allies fear, and thus they waited to see if de Gaulle was their man.

PROMISES AND REALITY

De Gaulle's promises before returning to France resembled somewhat those of the early New Deal period. De Gaulle professed to speak for the common man, flung invectives against the "200 Families" who control the wealth of France, spoke against the trusts and hinted at nationalization of big industry. But this long-standing friend of the Vichy Petain has nationalized only where an industrial crisis exists, to prevent

strike action by the workers, workers' control of the factories or to prop up a sagging industry — and then only TEMPORARILY.

"Expropriations" by the government of factories of collaborationists are either indemnified, or handed back. Further proof of his virtue to the Allies was his order for the surrender of arms by the French Forces of the Interior, since they all fear the armed strength of the workers. (No matter if the prematurely disarmed FFI soldiers were attacked by Nazi forces which had not yet been expelled from the country, as happened in Brittany.)

Punishment of collaborationists, which worried the Allies at first because it seemed to be "too thorough," has been toned down so that apologies are now being made for the thorough-going pro-Nazi, Pierre Laval. The French provisional government is out to maintain "order," i.e., to uphold and secure the domination of the "200 Families." Yes, France, under de Gaulle, well deserves a place in the Allied scheme of things.



THE NEW "BIG FOUR"

Now that it's the "Big Four," Germany is to be divided into four zones. France will no longer be a jackal but a lion at the imperialist feast which the Allies are counting on after Hitler's defeat. While the Foreign Minister of France said that she was opposed to any "artificial" dismemberment of Germany and the inclusion of a German minority within her borders, she is prepared to ask for annexation of all German territory on the left bank of the Rhine. (This is not "artificial," obviously, since the claim was presented at Versailles, after the First World War, when it was turned down.) Also, she will probably demand military occupation of the Rhineland and the Ruhr Valley, the heart of German industrial concentration. She will also ask for rights over labor and industry in Germany along with Russia, (Continued on page 3)

# LABOR ACTION

NOVEMBER 20, 1944

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR

ONE CENT

## PAC Can Pave Way for Genuine Labor Party

By DAVID COOLIDGE

There is one valuable lesson that millions of workers should have learned from the recent political campaign. That is the fact that politics does somehow creep into unions and into union meetings. I remember through the years many, many workers taking the floor and making the assertion: "We've got to keep politics out of here." "This is not a political organization." "If we let politics in here we won't have a union long." There were many other ways of formulating the question but they all meant the same thing: "No politics."

The labor movement and individual workers can't talk this way any more because we have just witnessed the biggest open display of politics, political talk and political activity in the unions and by the unions in the history of labor in the United States. Union meetings had politics. All the union conventions had politics. The union papers all over the land were filled with politics—and politics of the most practical sort.

The CIO formed the PAC, a political organization which got its money, its officers and the main body of its campaign forces from the CIO unions and their members. The PAC issued millions of pieces of literature and sent its organizers and

NEW YORK — While the greater part of the labor movement, especially that section mobilized by the CIO's Political Action Committee, concentrated its attention on the presidential campaign for the re-election of Roosevelt, it lost sight of an extremely important issue affecting unionism which came before electors in three states. In California, Arkansas and Florida, reactionary business forces organized through the Christian American Association under the leadership of Senator Pappy O'Daniel, sponsored measures banning the closed shop.

The state constitutional amendments proposed, which would make it unlawful to establish a closed union shop, were buried under the heavy emphasis given to the campaigns of Roosevelt and Dewey. The labor unions failed to make the necessary fight against them, except in California.

The failure of the unions to recognize in these amendments a most serious threat to the cause of unionism and their failure to organize a campaign for the defeat of these measures, led to the passage of the amendments in Florida and Arkansas. In California, however, the union movement, somewhat belatedly, organized the fight against the opening and defeated it.

The state constitutional amendments proposed, which would make it unlawful to establish a closed union shop, were buried under the heavy emphasis given to the campaigns of Roosevelt and Dewey. The labor unions failed to make the necessary fight against them, except in California.

The failure of the unions to recognize in these amendments a most serious threat to the cause of unionism and their failure to organize a campaign for the defeat of these measures, led to the passage of the amendments in Florida and Arkansas. In California, however, the union movement, somewhat belatedly, organized the fight against the opening and defeated it.



SIDNEY HILLMAN

propagandists into thousands of voting precincts to do political work.

The CIO really did a wonderful job. We have to say CIO, because that is the correct way to put it. The PAC was only the CIO using another name in this particular campaign. When one says that the PAC was only a committee, that is not quite correct. This way of putting it leaves out or ignores what is important. The PAC was the CIO; it was six million organized workers from the mass production industries. Without them the PAC would have been nothing and could have done nothing.

(Continued on page 2)

## Didn't You Promise No Excessive War Profits, Mr. President?

By RUTH PHILLIPS

Half a million textile workers are earning less than \$20 to \$23-\$24 a week, or below the level of mere subsistence, according to Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers Union, CIO.

President Rieve, in presenting the union's case for a ten-cent hourly wage increase and a 60-cent hourly minimum, before the National War Labor Board, stated that a survey of five typical textile towns revealed that \$33.70 a week was just enough to enable the workers to live at a maintenance level. Today, ninety per cent of all cotton-rayon textile mill

house, just a house. No water, no toilet, no light, nothing. I've worked thirty-five years for the Dan River Mills. Now I'm getting fifty cents an hour. Sure could use that sixty-five cents; sure would help."

When confronted with these scan-

house, just a house. No water, no toilet, no light, nothing. I've worked thirty-five years for the Dan River Mills. Now I'm getting fifty cents an hour. Sure could use that sixty-five cents; sure would help."

It is no wonder that thousands of textile workers are leaving the mills to look for other jobs. This has produced a labor shortage which in turn has meant a serious shortage of cotton goods for the fighting forces. The union leaders are appealing to the patriotism of the employers to get them to raise wages as a means of remedying the labor shortage in the mills. The employers, of course, turn

## The Government Cares for It's Own!

While the textile profits are enormous and the employees are being ground between depression wages and war-rocketed prices, another example of government aid to big business is before us.

Surpluses of cotton, wheat and wheat flour have accumulated, according to the War Food Administration. American products, however, are higher in cost than foreign products. Cotton, for instance, is four or five cents above foreign competitive cotton, while wheat is priced between thirty-five and forty cents above Canadian and other wheat.

In that event, the big cotton and wheat producers would be left holding their surpluses and unable to sell them—if the government did not step in. And it is stepping in. It will make up the difference between the higher domestic price and the lower foreign price. Therefore, the cotton and wheat producers will be able to sell at a lower cost than foreign producers to gobble up the market somewhere, but their costs will be made up by the government. Which means that in large measure the people will be paying for this subsidy to textile manufacturers!

But to the workers and farmhands who are not able to keep up with the cost of living, the government says: "Sorry, you can't go beyond the Little Steel formula. A raise in wages would be inflationary." The government takes care of its own: big business, not labor.

employees in the South and seventy-five per cent in the North are earning below that level.

UNLIMITED PROFITS

While 500,000 textile workers struggle to live, the textile companies are reaping profits which, compared to the huge wartime profits of other industries, reach fantastic heights. For 1943, the textile companies reported a profit 815.5 per cent higher than in the years 1936-39. The industry made more money in the single year of 1942-43 than in the twenty years from 1920 to 1939. Compared to other industries whose profits per employee were one-half of each employee's annual earnings, the textile industry's profit per employee was three-quarters the annual earnings of each employee.

dalous profit figures as proof of their ability to pay increased wages and a sixty-cent minimum, the manufacturers replied with loud protests that a ten-cent wage increase will "ruin" them. They are callously unimpressed by the stories told by textile workers brought to Washington by the union to testify at hearings on the Pepper resolution for a sixty-five-cent minimum wage.

HOW THEY LIVE

A typical case was that of David Hardy, of Virginia, father of five children, earning \$18 a week, who said: "It's hard, with rents and food and clothes and everything so high, but in a way I'm lucky. I got a house that costs me only \$10 a month, and we get by. What's in the house? Friends, there ain't nothing in the

a deaf ear to such non-paying patriotic appeals.

THE FUTURE

The union meanwhile is tied by the no-strike pledge of the CIO, given on the basis of "equality of sacrifice." In textile towns this means homes without electric light for the workers, and 815 per cent profits for the bosses.

If ever a union was in a position effectively to threaten a strike and, if necessary, carry through strike action, it is the Textile Workers Union in this situation. Instead, the union officials must plead with the War Labor Board, which will hem and haw, and, maybe, after months of red tape, come through with a tiny wage increase and, more likely, with nothing at all.

## Incentive Pay Behind Continental Strike

DETROIT—The "strike-lockout" of members of Local 280, UAW-CIO, of Continental Motors Corp. from November 3 to 6 was another skirmish in the conflict between the union and the company over the elimination of the insidious incentive pay system. The action was precipitated by the collective absenteeism of certain departments and resulted finally in the company locking out the whole plant.

The outcome was a partial victory for the union. The management

agreed to sign Form 10 jointly with the union, thereby certifying its agreement to throw out the bonus plan and requesting the approval of the War Labor Board. Incentive pay is now before the board awaiting a decision.

Incentive, alias piecework, has been a long-standing grievance to a majority of the local. It was first introduced into the plant against the majority vote of membership meetings. Ever since, in addition to bringing greater profits to the owners of

Continental, it has succeeded in shattering the unity of the men in the plant. Department was set against department. Every month, the large dose of bonus bribe money the company handed out to a few production departments intensified the bitterness and resentment of the many departments receiving a very small share.

The tension in the shop mounted until it exploded one day over three months ago when non-production went on its "fishing trip." The com-

pany quickly agreed to a referendum on the bonus plan and stated that it would file jointly with the union on the result of the vote.

The vote was against the bonus. The membership was fed up with the trouble-maker! But the company, clinging to the profit-making incentive, reneged on its word and refused to sign. The desires of the workers in the plant meant nothing—as against their profits. Their pledge? A few hasty words, to be forgotten if they interfered with union-wreck-

ing and profits.

Once again, the union, shackled by a suicidal no-strike pledge, could only turn the other cheek and persist with its pleading. And once again, only militant strike action forced the issue. Certain departments, notably cutter grind and test house, did not report for work. They had had a bellyful of bonus. After a short time the plant was shut down and the rest of the shop sent home. "Strike," the anti-labor press said. (Continued on page 2)

## Bass Defeated in Goodrich Local

By BILL FORD

AKRON, Nov. 12—Delivering strong blows below the belt of Goodrich Local progressives, a conservative-reactionary bloc smeared its way into power last week in this rubber union's annual election of officers.

It was the largest turnover of worker voters in the local's history, totaling 5,600 votes. The majority was gained by the ticket headed by John Saylor, running for president against George Bass, who has served four terms in that office.

Bass, as the leader of the anti-Dalrymple forces in the past year, had been expected to gain re-election since his supporters constitute the great bulk of the ACTIVE union membership. Relying solely on their past record of militant activity, the adherents of the Bass grouping seriously underestimated the present situation. They refused to believe that the membership could be swept off its feet by the unprincipled sniping and outright lies of the anti-Bass crowd. Consequently, they defended themselves during the pre-election campaign ONLY by word of mouth.

REACTIONARIES ORGANIZED

Because thousands of people cannot be reached by word of mouth alone, the conservatives' appeal, launched three weeks ago by a printed sticker throughout the plants, began to stir up the backward, non-meeting-attending elements. The slogan of "Decency, Honesty and Respectability

Pays"—borrowed almost word for word from the anti-labor, Bass-baiting Akron Beacon Journal—became a battlecry for every scissorbill in the plants.

Followed up by three more leaflets playing variations on this theme and making the most obvious implications in regard to the Bass regime, the smear tide of the Saylor-Benner-Delaney-Perrine clique rose. Backbone of support to this outfit came from the engineering division, composed of skilled craftsmen resentful of higher rates the rubber production workers have won over years of militant struggle.

On the eve of the election, supporters of this power-mad clique issued an unsigned scandal sheet entitled "Let's Check the Audit," falsely representing the local to be in deplorable financial condition and making clearly libelous statements regarding the pro-Bass opponent of crafty Jack Delaney. This touched off a final salvo of wild rumors and brought on a stampede.

With the election over, the count stood 3,102 votes for Saylor to Bass' 2,496. Delaney won his twelfth reelection for treasurer by a vote of 3,662 to 1,714 for Lowe. Benner defeated Dockery, a Bass supporter, 3,013 to 2,394, for vice-president. Only one member of the executive board received a majority of votes cast, necessitating a run-off election later.

At the present writing the situa-

(Continued on page 2)

# FDR Has No Real Plans for Post-War Employment

(Continued from page 1)

proach of the Roosevelt regime is. An answer to this question will at the same time cover both the labor leaders, who have stated that Roosevelt is a synonym for full employment, and also ex-candidate Dewey, who couldn't show, despite his many speeches, that he had a program, essentially different from Roosevelt's (in part, of course, because Roosevelt some months ago personally pronounced a funeral address for the New Deal).

Here is Roosevelt's present approach in a single sentence: "I believe that private enterprise can give full employment to our people."

## FDR, DEWEY CREDOS

In his Chicago speech of October 28, from which the above sentence is quoted, he promised "close to sixty million productive jobs," high wages, abolition of discrimination in employment, good farm prices, a tripling of foreign trade, and excellent profits. He denied most vehemently Dewey's charge that he lacked faith in America and in the "American system." He offered the following as his economic faith:

"I believe in free enterprise—and always have.

"I believe in the profit system—and always have.

"I believe that private enterprise can give full employment to our people."

The outraged Dewey complained that this was a good Republican hymn and that he was more experienced at singing it, but neither candidate could give any convincing reasons for the belief expressed in the last line of the hymn.

At one point in the campaign the Republican columnist, Walter Lippman, who decided to support Roosevelt in this election, was moved to point out that both candidates were big on promises but short on detailed proposals for avoiding depressions. On several occasions the ultra-conservative New York Times, which also came out for Roosevelt, protested all this dangerous talk about "full employment," because it created hopes that could not be fulfilled in a "free" (that is, capitalist) economy. A better expression, suggested the Times, would be "the maximum possible employment."

Roosevelt, it is true, made a few passes at offering proof for his faith in the course of the Chicago speech. There is a big demand for decent homes, he said, and we have the industrial capacity to build them. We need more than a million new homes a year for at least ten years. And new highways. And new parkways. And new airports. And new planes. And new automobiles. And a new

merchant marine. "Vast opportunities," he said, "opportunities for more millions of jobs." So too decried Dewey on many occasions.

Where does this talk get us? Who has ever denied the vast and unsatisfied needs of the American people for the good things of life? But under capitalism need is not the same thing as demand. To the capitalist there is no demand unless he can sell his goods at a profit. Dewey uttered at least one truth in the campaign, that Roosevelt never came near to solving the problem of full production and full employment, until a war economy of guaranteed and swollen profits, huge national debt and crushing taxes even on the poorest workers replaced the glories of free, private enterprise. But does anyone believe that Hoover or Dewey could have done better—or as well?

At another point in his Chicago speech Roosevelt offered this amazing proof for his faith:

"If anyone feels that my faith in our ability to provide sixty million peacetime jobs is fantastic, let him remember that some people said the same thing about my demand in 1940 for fifty thousand airplanes."

## AMERICAN CAPACITY

Years ago economists who were not even socialists were publishing books on America's amazing but unused capacity to produce. This is no longer news. But we must ask Mr. Roosevelt: If the problem of production and employment can be solved by a demand from your magic lips, why did you not successfully demand an end to unemployment before the war came to your rescue? The government had to "create" a demand for airplanes and other war materials. The government had to furnish over fifteen billions in capital equipment to the private enterprisers. The free and normal workings of the profit system could not be depended on—not even when the profit system was bolstered by New Deal reforms and your prayers, hopes, and "demands" for full production.

In later issues, we shall examine details of the Morgan-Roosevelt-Dewey program for capitalist prosperity—termination of war contracts, sale of government property, price policy, wage policy, tax policy, and the like. These matters the candidates chose to touch but lightly in their campaigning, contenting themselves with large promises and efforts to outdo each other in expressions of faith. We can, however, predict already, on the basis of their general program, that they can furnish neither full employment (which they have provided only in war-time) nor decent living conditions for all (which they have never achieved at any time).

We say: The plants exist. The workers exist. They must be used. We say: If war-time profits can be guaranteed, so can peacetime jobs and a decent annual wage.

We say: If the government can spend a hundred billions for war and destruction, it can spend fifty billions a year for peace and construction, for home, school and recreation.

We say: Let the rich, who can afford it, pay the taxes. Otherwise all promises of a high standard of living are a joke.

We say: If this program interferes with free enterprise, so much the worse for free enterprise. Talk about human rights is cheap. Act to make

human rights superior to property rights.

We say: Capitalist promises, whether the voice is Dewey's or Roosevelt's or even Wallace's, are just promises. Our program calls for a workers' party, a workers' government, a workers' world.

# Kentucky CIO Convention Overlooks Union Problems

By R. HARRIS

The CIO Kentucky State Council convention was held in Ashland, Ky., November 4th and 5th. It is not the intention of the writer to give a detailed account of the convention proceedings but rather to analyze the position of the leadership at the convention on the two most important issues confronting the labor movement today.

## POLITICAL ACTION

The position of the leadership on the question of political action is well known to all militant unionists. It is one of playing boss politics. At this particular convention, the union misleaders were hysterical in their praise of the "Commander in Chief." Every one of them warned the delegates repeatedly that unless this "great humanitarian" was re-elected, the future of the labor movement was in grave danger. When they spoke of Roosevelt, one almost expected them to bow their heads in reverence.

They "pointed with pride" to the "gains" made by labor during the Roosevelt regime. They spoke particularly of the "right" Roosevelt had given labor to organize. They knelt before him despite all the kicks in the teeth they had received from that "great man." Yet they did not complain. They did not mention Roosevelt's disgraceful performance on the Smith-Connelly bill (the one he vetoed because it didn't have enough teeth in it). They didn't men-

tion his lack of "benevolence" in handling the Little Steel case. They forgot to mention that this "lover of the common man" was supported in this campaign, as in all his past campaigns by some of the richest families in America. They forgot all of this in their drooling adoration of the man who represents in the land analysis, all that is decadent, i. e., capitalist society.

These labor leaders either do not realize that Roosevelt is the political representative of the big bosses or they do realize it and deliberately hoodwink the rank and file to whom they owe their very jobs. For some reason or other they can't see that in supporting a political candidate who is the representative of the wealth of the country, they are committing a crime which is analogous to supporting a capitalist for a position in the union movement. They would never think of putting an employer in charge of the union movement but they give their blessing to a representative of the owning class for the highest political post in the land!

The convention endorsed Roosevelt. The election results have shown that the labor movement is stuck with him for another four years. American labor is still the victim of the two-party system. The great political power of the working class has been used to elect a representative of the wealthy and reactionary forces in the land. The political development of the American worker

is still at a low level because of the labor management tactics of the labor leadership.

After delivering the right to strike to the bosses at the beginning of the war, without the consent of the rank and file, the labor leaders have, at this late date, found it necessary to seek the approval of the rank and file on their action. The leadership has introduced a resolution at two conventions in this area in favor of the pledge. Apparently they realize that in giving this disgraceful pledge without the consent of the membership, they put a very powerful argument in the hands of the more progressive elements of the membership. This tactic could be called a sort of delayed democratic procedure. The action of the Rank and File Caucus at the UAW convention scared the pants off them. Now they are attempting to get a majority vote for the pledge by introducing it in resolution form in the more backward working class sections.

Al Whitehouse, president of the Kentucky State Council, when speaking in favor of the pledge, maintained that labor could get too much democracy. It is assumed that by too much democracy he meant that the rank and file could take too great a part in deciding what is best for their unions. This would prove tough for the bureaucrats. They might even be forced to "step down." The labor movement would then have "too much democracy." The rank and file would be in charge!

# Continental Motors Strike - -

(Continued from page 1)

"Lockout" the union leadership replied. In point of fact, it WAS the militant strike action of a part of the rank and file which precipitated the event. The management prematurely locked out the plant—in violation of its no-lockout pledge—in order to aggravate the bonus issue, to create animosities in the plant and divert antagonism from themselves to the militant anti-incentive workers.

## MANAGEMENT DOUBLE-CROSS

The payoff in management arrogance and contempt for the union was revealed at the meeting held on Monday, November 6, attended by over 1,000 members of the local. After having once broken its promise to sign Form 10, the management said it would now (really) sign if the union would agree to certain conditions. To have accepted these terms would have meant destroying the union. They contained such clauses as:

"The company shall be entitled to production in accordance with the machine loads established by the makers of the various machines.

"The company shall have the right to make such transfers of employees as, in its judgment, shall be in the best interests of production and the company shall not be required to negotiate such transfers before they are made; provided, however, that

if it is claimed that any of such transfers are discriminatory or improper, such grievance shall be handled through the regular grievance procedure."

These conditions are transparent enough; they would have meant the end of the union in effect. The bargaining committee did the only thing it could do, namely, reject these demands, and it received the shouting approval of the membership.

It was at this point in the meeting that the faint-hearted, no-strike-bound leadership exposed its weakness. After getting the vote of the members on the ridiculous conditions, the logical and pressing question was what to do about throwing out incentive. What conditions would the workers lay down for a change?

In speech after speech the men at the meeting spoke against going back to work until the incentive pay garbage was swept out of the plant once and for all. A lonely and pitiful attempt at flag-waving to get the men back was booted down. The men were fed up and would not be side-tracked. But motions made to stay out were ruled "out of order" by the president of the local because of the no-strike pledge. The union leadership? It favored returning to work in order to resume negotiations with management over the bonus.

## RANKS WIN FIGHT

The membership was disgusted. It had come to the meeting for a decision on getting the hated bonus out. Instead, it was offered the old dish of delays, negotiations (read: pleadings) and more delays. Many of the men took the occasion of the meeting

to voice their grievances against the union leadership, its inefficiency and undemocratic running of the local.

The meeting concluded with a "surprise" telephone call. The bargaining committee called the company and informed it of the rejection of the "conditions." After some delay, management called back and said it would sign Form 10 and the plant would be opened that same afternoon. Before the members could discuss this turn-about, the meeting was efficiently adjourned.

The reason the management "gave in" should be clear to every man in the shop. It signed Form 10 because it knew, after the latest strike, that if it did not do so the men in the shop would be uncontrollable and sporadic strikes inevitable. It was rank-and-file pressure that closed this issue.

But incentive is not yet out! It is sitting in the famous waiting room of the War Labor Board. The present leadership has shown itself incapable of effectively leading the fight. It is time for militant rank and filers to organize and infuse new life into the local. These militants should organize on the basis of an uncompromising program: No incentive pay! Rescind the no-strike pledge! Take the labor members off the War Labor Board and expose it for the bosses' fraud that it is! For a democratic union!

Such a program will undoubtedly get the support of most of the local and only such a program can effectively continue the fight against incentive pay and for a strong, democratic union.



# "Soviet" in Seattle Out of the Past

By RUTH PHILLIPS

For five days, from February 6 to 11, 1919, the city of Seattle, Wash. was in the hands of labor. A strike committee, representing 110 unions, got out on a general strike, ran the city. Everything was shut down, tight and no traffic could move without the permission of the strike committee. The authority of the capitalist city administration had collapsed in the face of the general strike.

The business men of the city cried "Revolution!" and demanded the armed intervention of the federal government. But this was no revolution. It was merely a sample of what the workers could do if they did start a revolution.

The background of the general strike was two-fold. The first and immediate cause of the general strike was the walkout of 32,000 shipyard workers, who called upon the Central Labor Council to join them in a sympathetic general strike. The Central Labor Council, realizing that the failure of the ship workers' strike would mean a return to the open shop in the city, held a referendum of its constituent unions.

The second and more profound cause of the strike and the reason it met with such a tremendous response, was the militancy and radicalism of the workers of Seattle. This radicalism was the result of agitation by the IWW, and the ideas of the Russian Revolution which had spread to workmen all over the world. In fact, thousands of workers, especially those influenced by the IWW, took part in the strike mainly to prevent the shipment of ammunition and supplies which were being loaded into ships in Seattle bound for the Kolchak (White Russian) forces in Siberia.

The conservative AFL leaders who called the strike had to call it off five days later. They had to call it off because a general strike of that type poses the question: Who shall run industry and the state machinery, the workers or the bosses? The AFL leaders wanted only the closed shop, not workers' power. They returned the city to the bosses.

When, in the great upheavals to come, the workers of America challenge the Sixty Families for control of industry, we will see, from San Francisco to New York, Workers' Councils springing up, of which the "Soviet" in Seattle was the American prototype.

# Future of PAC - -

(Continued from page 1)

We all went into politics; inside our unions and outside the unions. All of us didn't talk the same kind of politics. Some talked for Roosevelt, some for Dewey, and some for breaking with the Republican and Democratic Parties and forming an Independent Labor Party. The Workers' Party and LABOR ACTION talked about a Labor Party. We said that labor must have a party of its own and must have it now; not after the election. We haven't changed our minds about this. Labor could have had its own party. The PAC had demonstrated that this is so. The election campaign and the election itself should have made this clear to every worker in the country.

The PAC organized and conducted the best propaganda and advertising campaign of any organization. It did the best organizing job among the masses who do the voting. Millions of workers really got into politics as never before, and went into politics as a class so far as organization goes. But all of this was done for the Democratic Party. All of this great effort was put forth in order to give Roosevelt four more years in the White House. This doesn't mean that we should have supported Dewey and the Republican Party. Of course not! We could have formed a Labor Party—and that is what we should have done.

## LABOR NEEDS POLITICS

We started off by saying that workers should know now that politics does get into unions. If the millions of workers in the CIO and AFL had understood this a few years ago we would have a mass Labor Party today. If they had known that when cabinet officers, congressmen, mayors and all such people come to our union meetings and conventions to talk, they are talking politics. It was always Republican or Democratic Party politics, that is, capitalist politics. But when a militant worker would get up in the union meeting or convention to talk about labor, having a program of its own and a party of its own, some workers would try to stop him with the cry: "Let's keep politics out of here."

Today hundreds of thousands of workers know that we can't keep politics out of our unions. Furthermore, we don't want to keep politics

out. We want politics, political discussion and political action. But we want it to be working class political discussion and political action. That was what was wrong with the PAC politics; it wasn't independent labor politics; but Democratic Party politics, which is boss politics, that is, capitalist politics.

The CIO News boasts that "Sidney Hillman hasn't taken up residence at the White House." Why should our labor papers boast about this? What's wrong with labor taking up residence at the White House?

"The CIO hasn't taken over control in Washington." That's true, but why hasn't the CIO "taken over control in Washington"? That is, why hasn't labor taken control of the government and control of industry? Is any worker against the working class taking over control of the government and of industry?

## WHY NOT TAKE CONTROL?

Isn't it true that if labor took control in Washington, moved into the White House, into Congress and into the management of industry, there would not be the mass uncertainty and worry there is today over post-war employment? If we had moved into Washington would there be any Smith-Connelly Act or Little Steel formula? If labor occupied the White House would there be any talk about sending troops to dig coal? Would there be any Bloody Thursday under a Hoover or soldiers breaking up a North American Aviation strike, as under a Roosevelt?

That is precisely what was wrong with us in the PAC. We did not organize and plan to "take over control in Washington." That would have required a political party of our own: an independent Labor Party. What we did was organize and plan to keep the capitalist bosses in control in Washington.

Perhaps the millions of us learned some thing from this election campaign. If we did that's all to the good. We'll keep our unions, make them militant and strong, and we'll continue to take in all the workers, irrespective of their political opinions. But we'll also organize our own independent working class political party—a Labor Party.

We'll get ready to "take up residence at the White House," and to "take over control in Washington."

# Goodrich Elections - -

(Continued from page 1)

tion within the local is in an extremely unsettled state as a result of the tactics used by the reactionary elements. LABOR ACTION will attempt to keep its readers posted on future developments. It is possible now, however, to characterize roughly what this new "leadership" of the United Rubber Workers of America's biggest and strongest local union represents.

## POWERS BEHIND NEW LEADERS

First, it is weak. Its ability to stand up and fight against the company on anywhere near the plane that the Bass leadership did is open to serious question. Saylor expressed this best recently when he stated that in his opinion the local had fought the WLB "too hard." Vice-President-Elect Benner had tossed out of office some years ago for his weak-kneed actions. Delaney is purely an entrenched office bureaucrat and contact man for elements outside the local.

Secondly, every reactionary capitalist intriguer in the rubber industry is overjoyed at the upset of the Bass forces, which have stood closest in the past period to representing, even if in confused form, the immediate trade union interests of the rank and file rubber worker. The rubber barons now hope to be able to get away with intensifying their anti-labor pressure within the shops, feeling that a strong rallying center of worker opposition has, if only temporarily, been broken up.

The Akron Beacon Journal in an editorial last April spoke for all the rubber barons against the Goodrich progressives' fight to oust Sherman Dalrymple, the hopeless international president of the URWA, when it said: "How long are the decent, fair-minded members of Goodrich Local

going to tolerate the actions of this gang of lame brains?" The smear campaign of the Saylor-Benner-Delaney-Perrine crowd proved itself to be the answer to the Beacon Journal's special pleading!

Thirdly, the Democratic Party and the Communists are tickled pink over the progressives' defeat. As the party which foisted the no-strike pledge on labor, the Democrats feel that they have now taken their revenge on Local 5 for having dared to oppose the pledge and fight against it at the recent URWA convention. Known Democratic Party ward-healers were very active in the anti-Bass campaign.

The Kremlin crew have been fighting actively within the international union for years against the Goodrich militants, hurling at them their usual filth. These enemies of labor are now licking their chops in hopes that by means of deals with the new conservative regime they can make some headway where it was never before possible.

## LOCAL'S LOSS, "DAL'S" GAIN

Last but not least, the Dalrymple leadership of the international URWA directly benefits by the turn of events against its strongest opponents at Goodrich Local. No one doubts that Dal's henchmen had a considerable part in the elaborate conspiracy which plotted the smear campaign, especially since every known Dalrymple man in the local worked might and main for Saylor's victory.

In future issues LABOR ACTION will analyze further the weaknesses of the progressives in this local. There seems to be no reason, though, why they should not learn quickly from this bitter experience and counteract their losses by winning a majority of the Executive Board in the run-off elections soon.

**New York Attention:**

**New Year's Eve Affair**

GIVEN BY

**Labor Action and the Workers Party**

It may be a little early to make this announcement, but we know you will want to make arrangements to be with us to help bring in the New Year.

TO BE HELD AT

**CARAVAN HALL**

110 East 59th Street New York City

**You Can Buy Labor Action and The New International at**

**SAN FRANCISCO:**

McDonald's Book Store  
867 Mission St.

Golden Gate News Agency  
81 Third St.

Fitzgerald's Newsstand  
4th St. near Market

**CHICAGO:**

Ceshinsky's Bookstore  
2730 W. Division St.

**DETROIT:**

Carl's Bookstore  
Woodward at Clairmount

**NEW YORK CITY:**

Newsstands  
42nd St. bet. 5th & 6th Aves.

Newsstands  
14th St. bet. 3rd & 6th Aves.

**A Few Weeks Left in Sub Campaign - -**

**We're Confident of Beating 4000 Mark!**

Eight branches of the Workers Party have taken a breather this week. Eight of them—look at our scorecard—have cases of goose-egg-itis.

Now, we know the comrades have been working hard. We know their quotas are fairly stiff. But despite this week's lapse, we continue optimistic. Our optimism has a good foundation. That is, the performance of our branches thus far.

If we be accused of expecting the impossible, we reply flatly that we do. The Workers Party always accomplishes the impossible.

We know that the fields for sub-gathering have not been exhausted. The efforts must be intensified by each club and especially by those branches which are behind their pace.

Youngstown-Warren, however, made us happy by coming through with twenty subs. We welcome them into the campaign. Also we record a newcomer in our box score, Southeast Missouri, with ten subs. Feeling that credit should be given where due, the National Office has magnanimously declined to record these subs in its column. The door is open to more newcomers—and we should like to hear from our many sympathizers scattered over the country.

We have a few weeks to go yet—and we know that we are going to pass that 4,000-mark!

City	Quota	Week	Total	Pct.
New York	1,000	34	457	45.7
Akron	150	—	162	108
Buffalo	150	4	145	96.2
Chicago	300	1	201	67
Cleveland	200	—	39	19.5
Detroit	750	—	602	80
Los Angeles	200	—	119	59.5
Louisville	25	—	25	100
Philadelphia	175	8	70	40
Reading	50	—	16	32
St. Louis	50	5	21	42
San Francisco	200	14	116	58
Seattle	150	—	104	69
Streator	50	—	59	112
Youngstown-Warren	50	20	20	40
National Office	500	6	129	26
Southeast Missouri	—	—	10	10
Totals	4,000	102	2295	57.4

**SUB BLANK**

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

# GI's Pay for "Hard Peace" Propaganda

By SOL RAYO

There is a form of Allied propaganda which, judging by its results, can only be called German morale building. Its alleged purpose is to demoralize Germany's army and people and to frighten them into submission. The ancient Roman battle cry against Carthage, "Carthago est delenda" (Carthage must be destroyed), is changed into "Germania est delenda."

Van Sittart's "The only good German is a dead German" motto, Morgenthau's "feeler" plan to demolish Germany industrially and the many times proclaimed, "unconditional surrender" terms constitute the heart of this propaganda. One does not have to be a professional psychologist to foresee the effects on the Germans. Whether the German soldier is feeble, average or a superman, old, middle aged or young, luke-warm Nazi, ardent Nazi or perhaps even a passive anti-Nazi, such a policy is guaranteed to make them all into bitter-end, die-hard fighters.

## NEW YORK TIMES COMMENT

The soldiers on the battle fronts are the unfortunate victims of this whirlwind of propaganda sown at home. A correspondent of the New York Times on October 25 reports the reactions of some American soldiers. "These boys said that every time someone at home advocates extra drastic measures for post-war Germany the German newspapers grab the stories and exploit them to the full. Consequently many German soldiers who were in a mood to surrender change their minds and fight to the bitter end."

The dispatch goes on further to quote German prisoners on the inspiration they derived from Morgenthau's plan, American Army directions to their troops not to engage in any friendly relations with the Germans and the very low exchange value set for the German mark, which is interpreted as the beginning of the financial ruin of Germany by the Allies.

All this is not just colossal stupidity and revenge on the part of Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin. Revenge and stupidity have their place, but much more significant causes motivate these policies. Primarily, it is their inability to hold forth to Germany, Europe and the world an even half-way desirable post-war future. No soothsayer is needed to tell what the world now needs. It is a durable peace, without the burden of armaments, economic comfort and security and the fullest democratic liberties.

Yet, as soon as the peace planners utter the word "peace," they begin to talk weasel words. It is a "peace with honor," a "peace with a proper respect for their obligations and needs," and so forth and so on. Of course, in the midst of all this double-talk, the imperialists know what THEY REALLY MEAN.

The hopes of the peace planners for a better world are expressed in the glorified dole proposed for England after the war. They are expressed in the estimates by respectable American economists and capitalists on the number of millions who will be unemployed.

They are expressed in the negotiations with Darlan, Badoglio and the arch-reactionaries in the Balkan countries and the hidden sabotage of the efforts of the Italian and French peoples to establish their democratic liberties.

## BACK-ROOM VENDETTA

The vendetta against the German people, identifying the mass of workers with their hated rulers, does not prevent the imperialists from trying to utilize her as a pawn against their colleagues. England wants a balance against Russia in Europe, America, against both, and Russia against the U. S. and England. These back-room intrigues are no secret. Every so often somebody slips and we have a diplomatic comedy. All the statesmen put on their solemn faces and play dumb while each intensifies its campaigns. In Charlie Chaplin's movie, "The Great Dictator," the patriotic symbol of the country is the double-cross. Under the sign of the double-cross is the appropriate title for the imperialist conferences and plans.

Reduced to impotence, so far as any political and economic future is concerned, the Allies are forced to shriek "bloody murder" at the German people as a whole.

But there is a plan for Europe, there is a future from which we can derive genuine hope. That plan is the revolutionary socialist program. In a future article we will take up what this plan is and how it could be used to shorten the war.

## The Aftermath of the Elections - -

# What Should Be the Future of PAC?

By J. R. JOHNSON

What is to be the future of the Political Action Committee?

That is the question which is agitating all politically alert persons today. The question, Hillman says, will be decided at the CIO Executive Board this Thursday. But meanwhile, the excitement and the hostility which the PAC has evoked continue. We need not be afraid. Organized labor should note that even when it organizes itself within the Democratic Party, it creates the political sensation of a very important election year. It should soberly reflect on what it could do if it came out boldly in its own name as an independent labor party.

Organized labor, however, has certain enemies masquerading as its friends. One of them is the newspaper PM which is now very quietly and cautiously trying to discredit the activities and achievements of the PAC during the last election. PM's city editor carried out a poll as to what was the specific contribution of the PAC to the victory of the Democratic Party. The general tenor of the replies is as follows:

From Boston: "PAC gets all the credit for registration. In actual votes, it was not particularly effective."

From Buffalo:

"PAC deserves lots of credit for the way it got out the vote. Beyond that, I wouldn't give PAC too great credit as far as results are concerned."

We hope that no worker who supported the Political Action Committee is going to be deceived by these back-handed blows.

The Republican Party on a national as well as on a local scale made the Political Action Committee the main burden of its attack. It accused the Political Action Committee of dominating the Democratic convention. It campaigned on the slogan that every decision of the Democratic National Committee had to be "cleared with Sidney." And Sidney was the leader of the Political Action Committee. The Republican Party claimed that the victory of Roosevelt would throw the government of the country into the hands of foreigners, labor, Communists, etc. The leaders were Earl Browder and no less a person than Sidney. In other words, the Political Action Committee, representing the CIO, was at the very center of the election.

It is stated that many hundreds of thousands of Democrats did not vote the Democratic ticket because they were opposed to the new status of labor within what they rightly consider to be their capitalist Democratic Party. In other words, an important part of the election centered

around whether the country as a whole was satisfied with the emergence of labor as an organized political force even though within the strait jacket of Roosevelt's Democratic Party.

The Political Action Committee and all its supporters were compelled, therefore, to make the case for their PAC. They made it. They not only got out the vote in general. They got out the labor vote and had to carry on a campaign both in terms of labor interests and the general interests in order to rally their own supporters and to neutralize the efforts of their opponents to discredit them.

Now, as cool as Punch, PM (and we can be sure there will be many others) turns up to say that PAC really didn't do very much. All it did was to act like some sort of super-telegram boys or postmen and get people out to vote who would in all probability have stayed at home. That is what labor always receives for doing the work of the capitalists.

PM is not satisfied with that. The newspaper goes further and in the same issue it asks various liberals and progressives what they consider to be the future of liberalism in this country. They begin with Vice-President Wallace and they run through a long list which ends with Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr (he is a professor of applied Christianity at Union Theological Seminary). The list includes Harold Ickes, David Dubinsky and C. B. Baldwin, assistant chairman of the Political Action Committee. It is noteworthy that all these gentlemen, except one, agree that there should be no third party but that all progressives should continue to organize themselves to "make the Democratic Party liberal." This phrase is the special contribution of Vice-President Wallace.

Did we say all? No. We made a mistake. Harold L. Ickes thinks that there should be a third party after the pattern of the American Liberal Party or the American Labor Party in New York. This party, however, should confine itself to voting for President Roosevelt as the Liberal Party did last Tuesday. In other words, Ickes, that bold thinker, does not object to a third party just so long as it votes for his party.

Now all these gentlemen know as well as anybody else that the sole possibility today for any effective third party lies with organized labor. The course of the election and the activities of PAC have proved that. But it is noteworthy that not one of these liberals as much as mentioned the Political Action Committee in all their prognostications as to the future of liberals and progressives. The solitary exception is C. B. Baldwin, assistant chairman of the PAC, who states emphatically that the CIO is on record against the establishment of a third party.

Another voice alone spoke out for a third political party. It was the voice of A. Philip Randolph. We have often had occasion to express the most uncompromising hostility to the perpetually compromising politics of Philip Randolph. He will probably be distinguished in American history as the man who did not march to Washington. But in this case Randolph made a pronouncement which, in our view, epitomizes the lessons of the election.

He says that the recent elections point to "the necessity for the organization and development in the United States of America of a third political party which is not dedicated to any man but to a well-defined set of principles."

The Canadian Commonwealth Federation is an independent Labor Party.

And to make assurance doubly sure, Randolph adds:

"A third party should have as its cardinal principle production for use and not profit."

Then come these final words:

"Labor and liberals should not kid themselves into believing that it is possible to deal effectively with a post-war program of economic security and freedom within the framework of free enterprise, which is espoused by both Republican and Democratic Parties."

There speaks the true voice of labor. That is precisely what the Political Action Committee can set itself to do—cut loose from both Democratic and Republican Party politics. And we can say in advance that this is precisely what PM, the Post, the Stalinists and Ickes and Roosevelt and all those who fattened upon the activities of the Political Action Committee will do their damndest to prevent it from doing. We shall return to this subject.

## Civil Rights Defense Committee Asks Funds in Christmas Drive

THIS CHRISTMAS, HELP LABOR'S PRISONERS!

Dear Friend: Twelve members of Minneapolis Truckdrivers Local 544-CIO and of the Socialist Workers Party have been in prison now for over ten months, solely because of their labor activities and political opinions. Six others were released on October 20.

The imprisonment of these eighteen under the vicious Smith "gag" law makes the Minneapolis Labor Case the most important civil liberties issue in recent years. Already over 350 unions and other progressive organizations representing more than 3,500,000 members have supported the work of the Civil Rights Defense Committee.

The Minneapolis Labor Case directly involves you and your democratic rights. Our campaign to free the prisoners and repeal the Smith "gag" act is a campaign to defend the hard-won rights of the entire American people.

Ever since the eighteen went to prison the CRDC has provided relief for their wives and children. Without this aid the families of these persecuted labor leaders would suffer great hardships and privations. Today the high cost of living makes feeding and clothing their unfortunate ones an ever-increasing problem for the committee.

HELP US TO MAKE THEIR CHRISTMAS CHEERFUL!

Please send your contribution to the Civil Rights Defense Committee, 160 Fifth Avenue, New York.

- Sincerely yours,
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| JOHN GREEN<br>President, Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers, CIO.                | GEORGE BALDANZI<br>Executive Vice-President, Textile Workers Union, CIO.   |
| JULIUS HOCHMAN<br>General Manager, New York Joint Board, Dress & Waistmakers Union, ILGWU, AFL. | ROGER BALDWIN<br>Director, American Civil Liberties Union.                 |
| JAMES T. FARRELL<br>Novelist.   | WILLARD S. TOWNSEND<br>President, United Transport Service Employees, CIO. |
| JOHN DEWEY<br>Philosopher and Educator.   | WARREN K. BILLINGS<br>Famous Labor Prisoner.                               |

# Allies Bolster French Rulers - -

(Continued from page 1)

Britain and the United States, for the purposes of "security."

Agreement on French plans and spheres of influence in Germany have been tentatively reached in the de Gaulle-Churchill talks. Churchill is particularly anxious for complete recognition and participation of France in order to maintain a balance of power among the contending

interests of Russia, Britain and America. The "entente cordiale" is being revived.

A reserved seat on the council of the world police force agreed to at Dumbarton Oaks—paid for by the Allies—is also being turned over to France.

## WHAT THE MASSES WANT

The masses of France want peace and security. The plans of the Big

Four for a crushing defeat of Germany, military occupation and dismemberment only guarantee new wars and prevent security. Already a revival of the French army is being undertaken. Military necessity and bankruptcy prevents a revival of French industry.

The Allies—all four of them—act to prevent a second French Revolution, we said. But since they act to preserve the outmoded rule of wealth

and privilege, they only compel the exploited, suffering, toiling people to rebel against that rule.

The first French Revolution replaced the feudal aristocrats with the lords of money. The second French Revolution will forever wipe out private wealth and special privilege and place in power those who represent the will of humanity to peace, security and abundance for all—the working people.

# British Policy Reason for Moyne Murder

By WILL GORMAN

The assassination of Lord Moyne brought to a climax the series of terrorist acts by Jews in Palestine. In a larger sense it was a climax of twenty-six years of British rule of the much-too-promised land. The assassination has once again put the spotlight on the explosive nature of the "Palestine problem."

## REASONS FOR THE TERROR

It is impossible to shed a tear for Lord Moyne. He was Under Secretary of Colonial Affairs during the violent suppression of the Indian masses and during the drowning and deportation of Jewish refugees. As a member of that cynical and callous tribe of slave-drivers who make up the British Colonial Office, he was involved in acts of terrorism that imperialism always carries out on a large scale.

The terrorist activities of the "Stern Group" are the inevitable result of twenty years of British provocation, sabotage and strangulation of the Jewish community in Palestine. The individual terror is also a by-product of the complete frustration of Zionist politics. The more disappointments they suffer, the more conciliatory the Jewish political leaders become.

While the British hound the Jews of Palestine, the Jewish Agency recruits thirty thousand Jews to shed their blood for the British Empire. The embittered Jewish terrorists are either Yemenites, members of the most depressed and backward sections of the Jewish community, or in some cases, revengeful relatives of those Jews who were victimized by the British authorities.

## SOME RECENT HISTORY

All the Jewish organizations and newspapers have denounced the terror. But for the British Colonial Office this was not enough. They wanted the Jews of Palestine to act as stool-pigeons and spies, to be police-hounds for the British Colonial Police. Since such a role was repugnant to the Jewish community, they had to be bullied and threatened.

The whole Jewish community was held "responsible" in the terror. An entire village was punished for "lack of cooperation." The British police, playing the role of kidnapers, swooped down on 251 Jews and deported them from Palestine.

There was no trial, no proof and no telling in what foul dungeon the 251 Jews were rotting. A week later, the Jewish Agency capitulated and proclaimed that the Jews are to turn over every suspected terrorist to the police. Taking advantage of the Jewish political weakness the British imperialists have succeeded in tightening their murderous grip on Palestine.

## WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

What will come next? Forced evacuations of Jewish villages, more deportations or some abominable imperialist crimes which are as yet difficult to guess? The British Colonial Office is already using the assassination to cloud over the truth of what is going on in Palestine. The Jews are being presented as vicious criminals, the British as innocent bystanders. And behind this thick fog they will be preparing a more staggering blow at Jewish aspirations in Palestine.

Churchill, who in 1938 came out for a Jewish Homeland, kept his mouth tightly shut all during the last four years of anti-Jewish intrigue and violence. Now he comes out bewailing the death of Lord Moyne, "who was a friend of the Jewish people" and was busy finding a solution to the Zionist problem." This "solution" is already known.

Palestine is to be partitioned among the Jews, Arabs and British. Imagine the state of New Jersey being cut up into three parts, each one a national state! The Arab peasant masses, ground into the dust by their feudal exploiters, will be forcibly separated from any contamination by the class-conscious, socially-minded Jewish working class. The safety of Arab feudalism will be guaranteed by the British Colonial Office. And the Jews slaughtered by the millions in Europe, will be given a walled-in ghetto called a Jewish state—with just about enough room to choke in.

At the last elections in Palestine, one-third of the Jewish voters voted against an exclusively Jewish state, thus expressing indirectly their desire for Jewish-Arab and a bi-national state in Palestine. This is an effective move in the right direction. Neither capitulation to imperialism nor assassination of British officials can break the present political impasse. Only a mass revolutionary struggle led by the workers and peasants of both peoples will finally deport British imperialism out of Palestine.

# Stalin's Hand of Empire Reaching Into Iran Oil Fields

By ALBERT GATES

The political situation in Iran is reaching a climax with the reported resignation of the government of Premier Said. Not all the facts are at hand since the first attacks against Iran. These were made in the Russian press when the Said government decided that it would postpone the whole question of oil concessions (to any country) until after the war. But certain developments are unquestionably clear.

1. The Russian demand for concessions in northern Iranian oil fields were made in the same imperialist fashion that Great Britain and the United States had earlier made proposals for concessions in the oil fields on the Afghan, Indian and Baluchistan borders.

2. Premier Said's government had previously rejected the British and American proposals under pressure from nationalist elements. The latter demanded that the oil resources of the country be exploited by native forces and that profits from these developments be retained in the country.

3. When faced with the Russian demands for similar concessions in the northern fields, Premier Said obviously had no other alternative than to reject the requests for concessions until after the war. If he had done otherwise, Great Britain and the United States would have regarded the action as discriminatory and compelled similar concessions in other parts of the country.

## RUSSIA ORGANIZES ACTIONS

3. As soon as the government of Premier Said rejected the Russian proposal with the counter-action of postponement, the Russian press opened up a vicious campaign against it, reminiscent of the propaganda methods of all imperialists.

The Russians proceeded to attack the Premier himself, charging him and his cabinet with being pro-fascist, anti-Russian, anti-Allies. (Said was formerly Iranian Ambassador to Russia and was regarded as friendly to Stalin's government.) GPU-inspired demonstrations broke out in the country, especially in those cities situated in the northern oil fields. The Red Army blockaded the city of Tabriz.

Newspapers, fearful of Russian occupation of the whole country (she now occupies part of the north), attacked Said. If not di-

rectly bribed, some of these papers were undoubtedly succumbing to the pressure of a powerful "neighbor."

4. Izvestia, official Russian newspaper, accused Iran of favoring Great Britain and America over Russia in the oil dispute, citing the fact that America has troops in the country, even though it has no treaty with it.

5. More recently, the Russians inspired a demonstration in Teheran, the capital of Iran, to demand the Premier's resignation.

6. While Stalin's regime has not made official its attitude, and no editorial opinions were expressed, the Russian press did feature a statement by Sergei I. Kavtarzies, Vice-Commissar of Foreign Affairs, the gist of which was that the Russian government could no longer cooperate with Mr. Said's government.

## ALL THE TRAPPINGS OF IMPERIALISM

Isn't the whole imperialist pattern clear? Russia makes a demand on Iran. Iran postpones action until after the war. Stalin's agents foment anti-governmental actions. Other elements in the country, fearful of complete occupation, denounce the government for "worsening" relations with a giant neighbor. Internal "disorder" is created by the mere insinuation of threats by a powerful neighbor. Throughout it all, the demands of the powerful aggressor are labeled as aid to the weaker and defenseless country. No, Russia is not to blame for "worsening" relations with Iran by her demands—Iran is blamed for "worsening" relations with Russia because she rejected the latter's proposals!

Then what happens? The government of Premier Said is forced to resign. A new government will take its place but it will be one friendly to Stalin—that is, it will accede to Russian demands. Suppose the government was not changed? Suppose it had remained adamant in its refusal to grant oil concessions? In that event, it is clear, Russia would have TAKEN the oil deposits. That was already established in the Red Army blockade of Tabriz.

How does this differ from the imperialism of the capitalist powers? In no single important way. That is the way England, Germany, the United States, France, Italy and all the other nations which seized territories and resources of other countries, did it. One does not need a long memory to recall the South American revolutions fomented by American imperialist interests to realize the real significance of the Russian action in Iran.

It is characteristic of imperialism when it does commit an act of aggression to declare that it is doing it in order to aid the country being raped; it is civilizing it, industrializing it, preventing internal strife, raising the standard of living of the backward country. The mere declaration of these intentions serves to emphasize the lies.

Let us see how the Daily Worker, Stalin's voice in this country, describes the "new" imperialism of Stalin. It takes to task those who criticize Russia's conduct toward Iran as imperialist. All the critics are, according to the new foreign expert, Joseph Starobin, anti-Russian. Listen to this apologist for Stalinist imperialism and see if you can detect a single important difference between his literary tripe and those of all other imperialist apologists: Writing in the Daily Worker of November 11, he says:

## DAILY WORKER SPEWS ITS VIEWS

"... The main criticism has run along the lines of charging the USSR with imperialism because it desires to develop the valuable oil deposits of neighboring Iran... The Soviet Union is the last country open to charges of imperialism in Persia. It was the Soviet government that denounced Czarist extraterritoriality privileges in Iran, and turned back to its people all Czarist concessions. No individual and no company in the Soviet Union can possibly profit from the Iran concessions. Bear that in mind.

"In other words, the Soviet desire to develop Iranian oil fields is on a completely different level from the ordinary, garden-variety of oil company operations in foreign lands...

"My own judgment is, without a detailed study of the matter, that the USSR would like very much to see the northern part of Iran developed into a modern industrial area.

"It would mean a progressive trend in that country, a certain security for the Soviet flank on the Caspian, and of course redound to the benefit of the people of Iran, since the concessions would be generously paid for."

Comparison to the workers' government of Lenin and Trotsky cannot hold water. The workers' state of Russia, before Stalin came to power, did, it is true, renounce all concessions which the Czarist government had forced from weaker countries. But what has happened is that Stalin is re-employing the methods of Czarism. He has already incorporated into the Russian state Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and parts of Finland, countries which were granted their independence under Lenin. He is angling for other parts of Europe with the aim of incorporating them inside of Russian frontiers. And now, in Iran, he is attempting to obtain concessions in oil, which the Czar once forced from Persia and which were surrendered after the workers took power!

## WHO WILL PROFIT FROM THE OIL?

Who will profit from these concessions? Starobin says no individuals and no companies. No, that is not true. Russia is no longer a workers' state. It is a bureaucratic collectivist state in which the bureaucrats, numbering many millions, who own the state and through the state the nationalized industries and collectivized agriculture, will do profit from such ventures as Iran.

The bureaucracy is a specially privileged class whose standard of living and share of the wealth of Russia is ten, twenty, a hundred times greater than that of the workers and peasants. No private companies will gain from the Iran adventure but the above class will.

From the point of view of Iran and the Iranian people, it makes no difference who profits from the exploitation of its resources, whether it be American capitalist enterprises or Russian state enterprises and a bureaucratic class. The Iranians will lose—not the Iranian ruling class, who will get benefits—but the people as a whole. And Starobin is a liar when he says that the people itself will profit from whatever payments Russia makes to Iran for these concessions.

Whenever imperialists get ready to steal the resources of a country they make sure to emphasize that the people, whose resources they rob, will get the benefit of it. And now Russia, which has not succeeded in fully industrializing itself and which has a colossal task of rebuilding almost the whole of its European area, is going to industrialize Iran! The joke is a grim one.

And, "it would mean a progressive trend in the country, a certain security for the Soviet flank on the Caspian." Now we get it. Russia, you see, is threatened from the Caspian Sea, an inland body of water thousands of miles removed from any great power which possibly could, if it would, attack her! Or maybe Russia is afraid of an attack from Iran? Or Afghanistan, or Egypt?

Imperialists are always seizing territories, occupying others, obtaining spheres of influence in still others in order to... protect themselves from some small, ineffectual nation that could not muster a regiment fully armed and trained to fight.

The whole game is given away by the Daily Worker. Russia is pursuing an imperialist policy in Iran. Taking advantage of its military power, of its rivals' preoccupation with the war, she is pushing her demands to the full. She will undoubtedly be completely successful, unless American-British intervention forces some compromise. But that event would not change a thing about Russia's role in the Iranian affair.



## Editorials

### WLB Acts Fast - - Against All Strikes, Even "Legal" Ones

Denying maintenance of union membership and check-off of dues to local unions of the Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners, AFL, who had filed notice of intention to strike and had held a majority vote, the War Labor Board ruled that it could not recognize any wartime strike as "legal." This ruling involved seven companies who were joyous over the pro-employer decision of the "public" board (in addition to the "heartily concurring" industry members of the board who joined with the public members, as usual.

The decision came quick as a flash—in contrast to the endless delays of the board when it is hearing a wage case. There is another remarkable contrast between the national board's handling of this case and those involving wage adjustments.

In the fight of organized labor to get the board to make a ruling on the infamous Little Steel formula, the board hemmed and hawed and then said it had no power since it didn't know what the effect of a wage revision would be on the economy of the country!

In the matter of the Smith-Connelly War Labor Disputes Act, however, the board dares to establish an interpretation of and a ruling on the War Labor Disputes Act. Labor, it says, cannot strike, even if it complies with the strict letter of the law. But labor, excepting its leaders, scarcely needs further proof of the boss-minded nature of the WLB.

The reasoning of the industry and public members of the board is of interest. They state in regard to the War Labor Disputes Act that "its purpose is recited to be that of 'preventing strikes, lockouts and stoppages of production.'" But they realize that the purpose of the law in preventing strikes was so to delay, hamper and make difficult the calling of a strike as *virtually* to prevent strikes. Roosevelt recognized this aspect when he opposed the bill because it did not go "far enough" in preventing strikes. The board is willing, nay, eager, to take responsibility for violating the law when it goes against the interests of labor. But where a revision of the Little Steel law is indicated a thousand times over by even conservative estimates on the rise in the cost of living, the board is not willing to make even a *recommendation* for its change.

The board recognizes its *departure from the law* when it adds to its report: "It is greatly to the credit of organized labor that after enactment of the War Labor Disputes Act the major labor organizations and the responsible labor leaders of the country renewed their no-strike pledge." They are saying in effect: "Although strikes may legally occur under the law, labor leaders have said they won't strike. Congress and the employers are likewise opposed to strikes. Therefore, we shall ignore the law."

The lesson in this story that everybody knows except the labor leaders is that the WLB is Roosevelt's weapon to keep labor in line for the employers.

The lesson that rank and file union militants know and that is daily being learned by more and more unionists is that labor should take its weapon—the right to strike—off the shelf.

Why is labor honor-bound to maintain its crippling pledge to the employers, while the employer-minded WLB casually circumvents a law which, while it was correctly branded a "slave act" by organized labor, still "permitted" strikes?

### Why DeGaulle Wants To Disarm the FFI

The recent order issued by de Gaulle's newly recognized provisional government calling for the surrender of their arms by the French Forces of the Interior (FFI) and all other armed detachments of the workers and peasants, indicates the sharp tension that exists in the country. So long as his government was not recognized by the United States, Great Britain and Russia, de Gaulle maintained all the armed groupings in the country. It was one of his "arguments" for the right of recognition. He claimed that he represented not only

the political elements in the country, but also the real fighting front of the French people in their struggle against the German occupation army. Once recognition was granted and France was promised to become part of a "Big Four," de Gaulle at once revealed his real program and his real masters.

The political program of the Allies is now abundantly clear—we had described it long before the Italian, Greek and French invasions. The military advances of the Allied armies reveals that while they are united in defeating militarily the Germans and their allies, they are in constant fear that such victories over the enemy armies will unleash the revolutionary force of the people inhabiting the European Continent.

#### MASS DISCONTENT

That fear is not without foundation. The European people are sick and tired of their miserable existence. They are sick and tired of a social system which has brought one gigantic and destructive war after another upon them. The people have suffered economic hardships, social and political exploitation at the hands of a totalitarian and profit-mad capitalist Europe. They have been cruelly exploited in peace and war by the ruling classes. And now, they want, not merely an end to the war, they want an end to the system which breeds war and which is responsible for their hated life.

But that is just exactly what the Allied powers, not the peoples who inhabit the countries making up the United Nations but the governments representing the interests of the capitalist classes, do not want. Their political program is to retain the present capitalist system, to prevent the people from overthrowing the rule of the old industrial and financial ruling classes.

When Churchill calls upon the French people to maintain "unity and order" he means that they should *not* take the factories, the land, the raw materials, and produce the means of life for themselves. He means that they should continue in their poverty until the old bosses return to claim the factories. He means that they should await the end of the war when business picks up in order to obtain employment at miserable wages and at the old low standard of living.

The FFI and all other armed detachments of the French masses are not yet ready to accede to an order which will take away the arms with which they fought off the Germans and leave them the easy prey of a government acting at the behest of stronger powers, seeking to re-establish the old France of the monopolists and profiteers.

#### MASSES NEED ARMS

After all, it was the people in these armed detachments of the masses who stayed and fought the German, and not only the German, but the French officials, bankers and factory owners who collaborated with the invader against them. They fought bravely when the Allied invasion began. They took over factories and operated them when the collaborating bosses fled with the Germans. They guarded them against destruction by the retreating Germans. Now they want to continue to operate these industries under committees of the workers. They want their full rights, democratic and economic.

With their arms in hand, the French people stand a better chance of getting them. Without these arms, they face an offensive of the new regime with the new power of recognition behind it.

The argument that because Stalin's Communists are influential in the FFI it should be disarmed, misses the point. In truth, the French Stalinists themselves are afraid of the armed masses because of their own fear of a mass rebellion against a capitalism with which they are now cooperating. They are using it as a bargaining point with de Gaulle to get bigger and stronger representation in the government and a larger share in running the country. But the whole FFI is by no means Communist. There are many other armed battalions of the workers who are not communist-influenced at all. Retention of their arms is a means for establishing a truly new France.

A new France means to sweep away, bag and baggage, all the trappings of the old regime. Only the French workers and peasants can do that. That is why their arms should be retained.

## Break the Little Steel Formula!



### Daily Worker on Negroes and the Elections -

## A FALSIFICATION OF HISTORY

By W. F. CARLTON

The Negro people in the United States are so viciously and so obviously oppressed that they are very skeptical of the illusions of capitalist democracy. Thus they, more than any other section of the population, have questioned the capitalist propaganda that this war is a war for democracy. They too have shown the greatest skepticism as to the fundamental changes in the U. S. which would be brought about by a fourth term for Roosevelt or a first term for Dewey.

The Communists of this country know this very well. For this reason a great part of their agitation during the past period has been directed toward making the Negro people feel that the present stage of politics in America is similar to the period of the Civil War during which the Negroes were emancipated from slavery. Some weeks ago we dealt with a particularly brazen piece of falsification by Robert Minor on this subject. In the Daily Worker of November 8, Doxey Wilkerson writes as follows: "Reverend Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., once characterized this election campaign as a 'Civil War.' His phrase is apt. The real issues and the nature of the forces in conflict are now much the same as during that armed political conflict of the 1860's; and again the role of the Negro people may prove decisive."

The impudence of this comparison shows the poverty of the case which the Stalinists are trying to present.

#### NATURE OF THE CIVIL WAR

In the Civil War we had, on the one side, the slave owners of the South, bent on retaining some four million Negroes in slavery. Opposed to them were the independent farmers of the North, organized labor of the North, the petty bourgeois democracy, all under the leadership of Lincoln and the Republican Party. The capitalists of those days for the most part opposed the idea of a civil war. But after they saw that it was inevitable they realized that the slave power had to be destroyed or it would destroy the possibilities of capitalism developing to its full strength. This was a war. It was a war that lasted four years.

The Civil War was the first great modern war. It was also the war of classes in its most extreme form. When the war was over the power of the slave owners had been broken. Chattel slavery was abolished. In order to crush the slave power and prevent it from ever rising to its previous position of dominance in the country, the Northern capitalists collaborated with the Negroes and the poor whites, and subjected the former slave owners to a rule which was democracy enforced by the arms of the Washington government. Later the capitalists betrayed the Negroes and came to terms with the old slave owners. This ended the period of the so-called Reconstruction. By that time, however, Northern capitalism was well on its way and America in a few decades became the leading country in the world.

It is all the more astonishing when we consider that this monstrous article was written by Doxey Wilkerson, one-time professor at Howard University. Wilkerson knows very well that he is talking nonsense and merely deceiving the Negro people. He knows that the fundamental basis of all Marxist politics is the question of class. He knows that in speaking about "civil war" between the forces of Roosevelt and the forces of Dewey he is talking nonsense. To cover up this he first gives the line-up of the two forces. On the one hand he has Hearst, du Pont, Cotton Ed Smith, Father Coughlin, the Klan, etc. On the other, he has what he calls "the forces of the people." Among these "forces of the people" are "great democratic captains of industry, like Henry J. Kaiser," and "enlightened Southerners like Senator Pepper."

Kaiser is one of those "democratic captains of industry" who has coined more money out of the blood of the workers during the war than most of the other capitalists. Kaiser serves his country and the "cause of democracy" by making millions of dollars every year. John Williams or Jack Thompson works in Kaiser's shipyards for a few dollars a day and faces the prospect of being thrown out of work at the end of the war. But, according to Wilkerson, both of these people belong to the same class. Is this an exaggeration? No

such thing. Listen to Wilkerson himself:

There is allegedly sharp conflict between the two ways of life, that is to say, the way of life of Dewey and the way of life of Roosevelt. But "very significantly, it is not class conflict." So that Henry J. Kaiser and John Williams the worker, by the mere fact that they vote for Roosevelt, become people who follow one way of life. If, however, Kaiser had voted for Dewey, he thereby became some one who was following another way of life. Same Kaiser. Same shipyards. Same profits. But support of Roosevelt makes him an entirely new man. However, miraculously enough, this modern conflict which is compared to the "Civil War" must not be considered as an example of class conflict. Are we making jokes? Not at all. The article is actually headed "A Bloodless 'Civil War.'"

There was a time when the Communists pointed out that the class war in this country was the war between the capitalist class and the working class.

#### REASON FOR THE LIE

There was a time when they pointed out that there was no serious or permanent progress to be gained by the Negro people except by a drastic transformation of society similar to the transformation which took place during the Civil War.

They pointed out, and this very Doxey Wilkerson used to do it also, that the masses of the Negro people should fight for their rights and strive to ally themselves with the workers, who would sooner or later be faced with the necessity of making this change.

But all that is gone. Today American capital has become the ally of Stalinist Russia. The Communist Party acts as Stalin's agent in American politics. All this talk hereabout the Civil War of today is merely to blind the masses of the people to the harsh realities of the struggle and lead them behind Roosevelt, Stalin's ally. The Doxey Wilkersons, the James Fords, the Ben Davises and the rest of them who lend themselves as servile tools to these practices are traitors not only to the Negro people but to American workers as a whole.

## AFL Fight to Revise Little Steel Formula - -

(Continued from last column)

In the last few days we have had an extension of this division between the labor representatives. The WLB has suddenly finished its report to the President and proposed that the labor representatives go along with it—even though the board had no recommendations to make as a result of its investigations. The AFL representatives refused again, reasserting their demand for a revision of the formula. The CIO representatives, however, recorded their pleasure that the latest board report was better than previous ones in its admission that the rise in the cost of living was closer to 30 per cent than 23.5 per cent. \$

This should have been the signal for the entire labor movement to intensify its campaign for revision or abolition of the Little Steel formula. Instead, we have a division of the labor forces, one section sticking to its guns for revision, the other welcoming the "change" in the board report.

#### AFL POSITION FOR INCREASES

In the AFL fight there is posed the whole question of post-war unemployment and wages, showing that postponement of wage increases means possibly to allow them when there is widespread unemployment resulting from cutbacks. This is under the best circumstances. Actually the opposite is more likely.

Meany outlined his position, saying: "What this means, in effect, is to continue the wage freeze and when plants are shutting down by thousands all over the country and when mass unemployment is an accomplished fact we should increase wage rates thirty per cent over our present rates."

"This suggestion is so ridiculous that it scarcely needs comment. The tendency of employers would be to reduce rather than to maintain or raise wage rates."

Of course, this is substantially the position of the CIO, but its fight is weakened by half-hearted struggle resulting from its political alliance with Roosevelt.

## WAR LABOR BOARD

### AFL Right in Fight To Revise Little Steel

By SAM ADAMS

The existence of the War Labor Board, from the point of view of the workers, becomes more dangerous with each passing day. There is hardly an organized worker who does not realize that the WLB exists for the primary purpose of preventing long overdue wage increases to be granted to millions of workers all over the country and in all industrial occupations.

At least one-third of all workers have not had a wage increase since the war began. Other millions have received only token increases which did not keep pace with the rise in the cost of living or even with the Little Steel formula.

The outstanding fact about the rise in the cost of living is that it has gone way beyond the increase in wages permitted by the formula. This is not merely asserted by the representatives of labor. It is acknowledged by the WLB itself in its own reports. Nevertheless, the WLB has held fast in its refusal to grant wage increases on the ground that it cannot do so as long as the President's wage stabilization law is in effect.

In other words, the WLB shifts all responsibility to the President and his directors of economic stabilization. But neither the President nor his aides have taken a single step to change the law and alter the Little Steel formula. Oh, yes, many hints were thrown out during the election campaign that Roosevelt was seriously considering a revision in the formula and was prepared to change even before November 5. President Murray of the CIO even staked his life on this in an effort to head off the rebellious rank and file of the United Automobile Workers Union when they sought to rescind the no-strike pledge. But it is clear now that the Administration was again playing hide-and-seek with millions of American workers.

#### THE COST OF LIVING ISSUE

When the issue of the rise in the cost of living first arose, when the labor representatives presented irrefutable proof that the cost of living had risen so high that wage increases were absolutely necessary, the President had the WLB appoint a five-man committee to present its findings in the matter. Shortly after that, the WLB committee and the labor representatives brought in their respective reports. While the WLB report showed a cost of living increase of 23-plus per cent, the labor report showed that actually the rise had been 45-plus per cent.

The dispute in the WLB over the respective figures of the two reports ended in a rout of the special five-man committee appointed by Chairman Davis of the board. Their report could not stand the light of day. They omitted many aspects of the cost of living which are vital to the life of the average worker and his family. The report omitted to state, for example, that those items in which the rise was greatest were precisely the categories for which the worker spent most of his salary: food, clothing, etc. It failed to consider deterioration of goods, which actually raised their costs to the worker and his family. It did not break down the areas of the country which showed that in the biggest industrial centers of the country, where the majority of the workers were concentrated, the cost of living had risen higher than in other non-industrial areas.

The net result of the dispute between the employer-public report and that of labor was that the whole question of wage increases was postponed until after the elections and is now again postponed.

#### MORE WLB OBSTRUCTION

Additional evidence that the main reason for the existence of the WLB is to prevent granting the workers their justified wage increases was the refusal of the WLB to send any recommendations to the President on its findings resulting from the materials contained in the two reports. This cowardly evasion, on the part of the board led to a division between the AFL and CIO representatives.

George Meany, head of the AFL delegation, took the position that it was no longer possible for the labor representatives to consider any individual wage cases before the board until and unless the Little Steel formula was revised. At first it appeared that the labor representatives were united on this question. But as it turned out the CIO refused to go along with the AFL because it had cases coming up before the board. It had hoped to gain something out of the hearings on those cases, especially the one relating to the United Steel Workers, who were scheduled to convene at the end of November. But, again, the WLB refused to act on their demands, leaving the CIO representatives in the lurch once more.

(Continued in column three)

## LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interests of Labor

Published Weekly by the

LABOR ACTION PUBLISHING ASSN.

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

Vol. 8, No. 47

November 20, 1944

ALBERT GATES, Editor  
MARY BELL, Asst. Editor

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

Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940,  
at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the  
Act of March 3, 1917.