

In this issue of LABOR ACTION, David Coolidge, national labor secretary of the Workers Party, presents the position of the party on the national elections. LABOR ACTION also presents, at the bottom of page 1, the issues in the election, the stand of the two capitalist parties on them, and a working class program for a Labor Party.

LABOR ACTION

OCTOBER 30, 1944

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR



ONE CENT

UAW Members Can Defeat the No-Strike Pledge

By MARTIN HARVEY

The union movement in the United States took a gigantic step forward at the recent convention of the United Auto Workers, CIO. When the auto workers voted to submit the question of the no-strike pledge to a referendum vote of the membership, they made it possible for the rank and file for the first time to state their position on the pledge which was given by Philip Murray and William Green and the top CIO and AFL officials.

Murray and Hillman, Thomas and Dalrymple and the rest of the CIO leadership did not see fit to consult their memberships when the pledge was given and have been busy ever since trying to make the pledge stick. But the rank and file revolt has been mounting steadily. At the union conventions of the last few months that revolt reached the highest peak it has attained thus far.

At the Rubber Workers' convention, at the Shipbuilders' convention, at the Steel Workers' convention, strong minorities pressed for scrapping the no-strike pledge. At the UAW convention in Grand Rapids, a huge minority voted to rescind the no-strike pledge and the motion for a referendum was passed by an overwhelming majority. The issue of the no-strike pledge has clearly become the crucial issue in the labor movement—and there is excellent reason for this.

URW President Fines Workers Over Walkout

DETROIT—Sherman H. Dalrymple, who failed to see the handwriting on the wall when a third of his own union revolted against him at the recent Rubber Workers' convention, is blindly and blithely continuing his role of strike-breaker against his own members.

His most recent autocratic job was to levy fines totaling \$6,000 on five hundred striking workers at the U. S. Rubber Co. in Detroit. Each member was fined \$12 for "violating the union constitution and the no-strike pledge." Remember Dal's statement at the convention to the effect that he opposed the Smith-Connally bill because it didn't go far enough and that he would go much further to prevent strikes? Well, he's a man of his word, anyway. No wonder the Beacon Journal, his home town paper and voice of the rubber barons, praises his "labor statesmanship." In the war of the corporations against the standards of the rubber workers, the former are armed to the teeth. Dalrymple disarms the rubber work-

NO-STRIKE PLEDGE IS CENTRAL

Most of the decisive problems that labor faces in these years of war lead directly to the question of the pledge. Are wages kept low while prices and profits rise? What can unions do when they are bound by the no-strike pledge? Has it become impossible to settle run-of-the-mill grievances in the shops? How can you make the bosses listen when you have a no-strike pledge? Does it take the War Labor Board as much as a year or more to pass on a contract? How can you return to collective bargaining when you have given up the right to strike? Questions of politics, of the presidential election campaign, of organizing the unorganized, all lead in one form or another to the question of the no-strike pledge.

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued on page 2)

Elections Show Need For A Labor Party!

Canadian Labor Congress Rejects No-Strike Pledge

By MIKE STEVENS

At the fifth annual convention of the Canadian Congress of Labor, held last week in Quebec, the delegates refused to adopt a no-strike pledge.

The CCL added 50,000 new members during the past year, which increases its total membership to 250,000, thus giving it equal numerical strength with the AFL Canadian Trades and Labor Congress.

The Canadian Congress of Labor is composed of the Canadian locals of the CIO international unions, together with a number of purely Canadian national unions, and the Canadian district of the United Mine Workers of America.

A long debate developed at this convention around a resolution that endorsed the twenty-nine-point program of the CCL's Political Action Committee. The program outlines certain post-war policies on domestic and international matters, but the debate did not center around these policies but on the issue of the relationship of the CCL to the Canadian Commonwealth Federation (Canada's Labor Party). Last year's convention endorsed the CCF as the political arm of the CCL.

The Communists in Canada have organized their own party, the Labor Progressive Party, in opposition to the CCF, and at this year's convention they wanted to remove the CCL endorsement of the CCF. In this fight the Communists were joined by some delegates who have objected to the organizational set-up of the CCF, which permits the unions only a very small role in deciding the policies of that party. Under this pressure the resolution was changed to suit the objections. But the Stalinists still did not vote for

it, showing that they even objected to the few social reforms, that are suggested in the program. Despite the deletions from this resolution, the CCF is still the official political arm of the CCL as in the past.

The Stalinist fight against the CCF was made in the same speeches where they demanded a straight out-and-out no-strike pledge. They were against the CCF because it supports strikes and the wanted the CCL to oppose strikes under any condition.

Avery Formula Still Used by Ward's

BALTIMORE (WDL)—Montgomery Ward's attempt to fight the United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees, CIO, by lawsuits against its affiliated unions has reached out from Chicago to Baltimore. The company has instituted a \$50,000 libel suit against a Baltimore local of the URWDSE for printing stories in the union's paper, Spotlight, which complained of the food served in the company restaurant there.

Nat Klein, president of the local, stated:

"The question involved is whether the union has the right to bring to the attention of the company matters that need correction. It is part of a campaign to hamstring the union in its effort to organize the workers, by attempting to deplete the union's treasury through costly court actions."

Montgomery Ward is apparently still following the infamous Avery formula of attacking unions by a long series of costly actions in the courts.

The convention refused to be stampeded by the flag-waving and adopted a resolution calling upon "the employers and the government to pursue a fair and reasonable industrial policy" so that there would not be any cause for calling strikes. This was too much for the Stalinists. Clarence Jackson of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers (yes, in Canada, too) said he wanted the workers and the workers' organizations to pledge that under no condition would they strike.

He was answered by a host of workers who know what will happen to the labor movement in Canada if they adopt this sell-out proposition. Tom Brannigan of the UAW said that labor had a fundamental right to strike if necessary. "I have three boys overseas—I had three, one is missing," he said. "I'd be ashamed to meet them when they come back, if I took away that right."

C. H. Millard, Canadian director of the United Steel Workers of America, said: "The conditions we meet will determine whether there are strikes or not." Alex Macuslane from Vancouver said that there will be, as in the past, every effort to prevent strikes, "but every union has the right to make the final decision on the course it should follow."

This was the sentiment of the convention. The discussion to retain the right to strike was brought to an appropriate close by refusing the no-strike pledge and by endorsing the recent two-week strike of the Montreal Tramway Workers.

The action of the CCL ought to be a lesson to the CIO and AFL!

By DAVID COOLIDGE

In his speech to the Foreign Policy Association last Saturday evening, President Roosevelt promised that the German people would not be enslaved by the conquering, victorious Anglo American allies. The reason given by Mr. Roosevelt for not establishing slavery in Germany was: "the United Nations do not believe in slavery." Now, since it is clear that in using the word "slavery," the President was not talking about actual chattel slavery but a form of military rule that would deny democratic right and national independence to the German people, it is important that the working class examine this statement of the President.

District 30 Steel Convention Ho Hum!

By R. HARRIS

LOUISVILLE—The District 30 United Steel Workers of America, CIO, convention was held here October 14 and 15. Unlike most conventions reported in LABOR ACTION recently, there were no rank and file caucuses, neither were there any bitter floor fights over what sort of political action to take. The leadership was not threatened in any way by powerful rank and file groups. In plain and simple words, the convention was very dull. Hardly anything happened there which would make the most fidgety boss raise an eyebrow.

The first person of major importance to be heard by the convention (about 150 delegates) was the Democratic mayor of Louisville, Wilson Wyatt. His Honor started off with a bang; he told a gag. After hearing the gag, the delegates laughed obediently. The mayor also said some other things—but there's a paper shortage. After the mayor had finished, the temporary chairman congratulated him on his "inspiring talk."

LONG SPEECHES

The delegates yawned and the permanent chairman was introduced. He proved to be none other than the district director, James Robb. He said that the Little Steel formula must be broken. He also suggested the way the break it. The delegates were to

(Continued on page 2)

He said further that the German people would be given the opportunity, by their conquerors, to climb the steep ascent back into the family of democratic nations. Their rehabilitation would be assisted by taking one burden off their backs: the German people, according to Mr. Roosevelt, will not have to bear arms while they make the ascent. Not only will this assistance be given the Germans immediately following the end of the war, but the attempt will be made to see to it that they never have to bear arms again.

This is something for labor in the United States to think about. If the Germans are kept from having arms someone will have to be armed to enforce this prohibition. Who can this someone be except workers in the United States and England, their sons and their grandsons. He United States is to remain a military camp. Millions of workers are to be retained for years in a permanent standing army. Universal conscription will prevail and every boy as he reaches a certain age will be compelled to take his turn at the job of keeping arms out of the hands of the German and Japanese people.

Mr. Roosevelt did not discuss just

(Continued on page 2)

Low-Down on "Differences" Between GOP and Democrats!

By Mary Bell

For labor, there is no difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties! If you are an ornery Doubting Thomas, let us demonstrate this from the record, platform and campaign issues of the two candidates and parties:

DEMOCRATS: They take credit for rescuing the country from the clutches of what they like to call the "Hoover Depression."

REPUBLICANS: They take credit for the fabulous era of "Hoover Prosperity."

To give Hoover credit or blame for either the period of prosperity or that of unemployment is to be as wrong as to identify him with the vacuum sweeper. All that such logic omits from the analysis is the system of capitalism itself. The capitalists could no longer make a profit, they turned the workers out of the stuffy plants to more healthful outdoors occupations such as apple-peddling or leaf-raking. While Hoover coined the immortal phrase, "Prosperity is just around the corner," this "much-misunderstood" man did not cause either prosperity or depression.

Nor did Roosevelt rescue us. The capitalist ship of state was leaking in the depression and was menaced by the rising tide of breadlines and unemployed. All FDR did was to help bail. If saving capitalism meant talking radical about "throwing the money-changers out of the temple" and throwing the workers a few crumbs—well, no sacrifice was too great to save the system. And being a wealthy man himself, Roosevelt was a good man for the job since he understood the problems of America's Sixty Families.

DEMOCRATS: They are pledged to uphold "free enterprise," promote the success of small business, foster the well-being of the small, independent farmer, encourage "risk capital" after the war.

REPUBLICANS: They stand pledged to uphold "free enterprise," promote the success of small business, foster the well-being of the small, independent farmer, encourage "venture capital."

To set at ease the brokers and financiers who consult LABOR ACTION, the distinction made in the two platforms between "risk capital" and "venture capital" does not constitute a real difference between the two parties.

An item of interest to this class of readers as well as to thrifty soldiers is the war property being offered for sale by the war surplus bureau of the government. There is a large supply of only slightly used war factories in the ten to one hundred million dollar brackets. Also, for the smaller business men there are available a number in the five hundred thousand to one million dollar bracket—practically a song. Even the small, independent farmer might grab off a few of these. There is no conning with the monopolies in getting rid of this property. Everything is to be offered at public sale, so that everyone will have a crack at it. While this is being done under Roosevelt, the Republicans are equally determined to get rid of monopoly by the same drastic means.

DEMOCRATS: They claim credit for the National Labor Relations Act, the Wage and Hour Act, and the Social Security Act.

REPUBLICANS: They go for these acts, too, and promise to continue them. Nay, they promise to do even better.

DEMOCRATS: Their supporters claim Dewey has the American pro-fascist elements on his bandwagon.

REPUBLICANS: Their supporters claim that Roosevelt is supported by the Communists, enemies of labor and servants of the Russian bureaucracy.

They're both right.

DEMOCRATS: Their platform, adopted by them in convention assembled, says nary a word about guaranteeing full employment after the war.

Our Program for A Labor Party

1. Abolish wage-freezing and job-freezing.
2. Rescind the no-strike pledge. Repeal the Smith-Connally anti-strike law.
3. A higher, not a lower, standard of living.
4. No tax on wages. No sales tax on consumer goods. Abolish all taxes on annual incomes of \$5,000 or less.
5. For labor control of rationing and price-fixing.
6. A one hundred per cent tax on all war profits.
7. A \$25,000 ceiling on all individual incomes.
8. A year-around job and a guaranteed annual wage.
9. A two hundred and fifty billion dollar five-year program for housing, public works, etc.
10. For unrestricted democratic rights of servicemen; doubling present dependency allotments, with no deductions from servicemen's pay.
11. Two years' base pay grant to all veterans, with government-financed job training and education.
12. Against all forms of race discrimination, Jim Crow, anti-Semitism, etc., in civilian life and the armed services.
13. Adequate government aid to small farmers. Abolish tenancy and share-cropping by turning the land over to those who till it.
14. For a break with bankrupt capitalist political parties and complete independence of labor from them. For a workers' government to organize the country for freedom, security, peace and plenty for all!
15. For an end to war and fascism by a democratic people's peace, without annexations, indemnities, tribute or the dismemberment and oppression of sovereign nations and peoples.

REPUBLICANS: Their platform, also adopted in convention assembled, and much longer than that of the Democrats, has not a single syllable on guaranteeing jobs after the war.

Now, it may be assumed that since the bright, halcyon days of WPA, the Democrats have learned a thing or two about the evils of pampering the people of this country. And the Republicans, who have ever been the guardians of "individual initiative" could not be expected to rob the worker citizens of this birthright. It does something to a man's morale to be handed a job on a silver platter. (We're not saying what, for the moment.)

DEMOCRATS: They picture Dewey as a babe in swaddling clothes, not old enough to run the country.

REPUBLICANS: They picture Roosevelt as a man with one foot in the grave, and therefore too decrepit to continue in office.

These about cancel each other out.

DEMOCRATS: Their platform says they issued a "new Magna Carta for labor" and they take credit for giving labor the right to organize.

REPUBLICANS: They call themselves "the historical champion of free labor."

The statement of the Democrats is not literally true. The "Mag-

na Carta," as a matter of record, came after the tremendous organizing campaigns of the trade unions, the strike struggles, the picketing, the battling of unionists against strike-breakers' clubs and coppers' tear gas. These contributed a mite to the formation of the giant union movement of today. We hope you do not think us quibbling that we place this molehill beside the mountain of the "New Deal Magna Carta." The Republicans contribute a point about "free labor," and they mean to "free" it of the nasty union restrictions which a man like, say, Westbrook Pegler has pointed out, and which keep it tied down.

DEMOCRATS: They authored the Smith-Connally bill, which was vetoed by Roosevelt only because he thought it didn't "go far enough" toward preventing strikes.

REPUBLICANS: They helped pass the Smith-Connally bill and are against strikes.

The score.

DEMOCRATS: They are for the wage-freeze, and their candidate, Roosevelt, has stood pat on maintaining the Little Steel formula.

REPUBLICANS: They say they are opposed to the "freezing of wages at arbitrary levels."

While it might seem offhand that the Republicans have the edge over the Democrats here, that gain is offset by something else. The Republicans would allow prices to rise also. Roosevelt, however, claims to keep prices frozen. Some radicals, the AFL and the CIO complain that the cost of living has risen by 45.3 per cent. But there are always cranks.

DEMOCRATS: Many of them were influential in defeating the Kilgore bill for unemployment compensation. FDR was totally silent on this bill.

REPUBLICANS: They helped, with an overwhelming majority of their representatives voting for the big business George bill.

For an analysis of their motivation on this issue, refer back to the section on "pampering" labor and encouraging "individual initiative." And remember, too, that Roosevelt signed the "inadequate" reconversion bill.

DEMOCRATS: Their program states they believe that "racial and religious minorities should have equal rights with the rest of the citizens to live, develop, vote, etc."

REPUBLICANS: They are for a Constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax, and for full democratic rights to Negroes.

It would be unfair to call Roosevelt's party the "poll-tax party" just because he has to appease a few lynch-law Democrats from the South, or just because Southern Democrats run a large section of the party and are a big power in all its deliberations. What about the Republicans? There is a certain tradition that this party SPEAKS radically on the Negro problem. But it has been in power many years and did little enough about it. Their utterances are vote-grabbing schemes, while Republicans in Congress vote with the poll-taxers.

DEMOCRATS: They take responsibility for the foresight in arming the country, "quarantining the aggressors," and prosecuting the war for the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms jointly with the Allies. They condemn the Republicans for hindering the war effort.

REPUBLICANS: They support the war for the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms and the United Nations. Some of them point out that Roosevelt promised he would not send our boys overseas. The point about "hindering the war effort" and FDR's promise cancel out. While Churchill fights to defend British enslavement of India, however much FDR objects, he holds his tongue. While presumably the war is being fought to liberate people under a foreign oppressor, you can have too much of a good thing, and Roosevelt undoubtedly realizes this. Roosevelt, with his flexible statesmanship, also recognizes de Gaulle, who presides over France's African colonies. And he preserves a judicious silence over Stalin's rube grabs in Eastern Europe. But Dewey shows himself a good sport and says he is willing to go along. Furthermore, the criticism of his youthfulness does not stand up under the fact that he clings to the tried and true methods of FDR rather than venture something new.

DEMOCRATS: They do not promise to end war.

REPUBLICANS: Neither do they.

Having learned their lesson in the "war to end all wars," neither party is so foolish as to envisage a future without war. They both recognize that more wars are coming, since they are both in favor of a United Nations police force to take action against the future "aggressors." They both believe in capitalism an imperialist and are firm defenders of the profit system and the rights of capitalists to exploit labor.

No, thanks. For us there's no choice between the Republicans and the Democrats. In politics, we don't believe in choosing the "lesser evil" over a greater evil, when such a choice exists. But these two parties are both monstrous evils for the working people. We choose instead something good for working men and women: A LABOR PARTY!



NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Communist Victory in Local No. 9 Blow at Union

SAN PEDRO—At a special meeting of Local 9, Industrial Union of Marine Shipbuilding Workers of America, CIO, the Communist Party members and their sympathizers voted to dissolve the Administrative Board, which was elected only four months ago, and elected their "own" Administrative Board.

This new crude and violent consummation of the communists' bid for power in Local 9 followed rapidly on the heels of the communist victory at the national convention of the union on major questions of policy and in the election of the new General Executive Board.

The date for this meeting had been set by the outgoing GEB, just prior to the recent national convention. In a communication to the local, the GEB, through the international president, John Green, informed it that full autonomy had been restored to the local. The same communication set Sunday, October 15, as the date for a special meeting of the local, at which the membership could choose one of two alternatives; either retain the eight-man board as officers for another year, or set a date for election of new officers.

HOW THEY DID IT

But before this special meeting was held, the national convention had been held and the new GEB, with more communist strength on it than the last, met and decided to make a few changes in the "full autonomy"

decision. The GEB named one of its new members, C. R. Brown, as virtual dictator over the local until new elections are held.

When the special meeting of the local was held, C. R. Brown announced his special powers from the GEB. This news was completely unexpected and only 150 out of 20,000 members of the local had turned out for the meeting. Of these, 100 were communists and sympathizers who were out in full force, for they were the only ones who knew what was to happen.

With a solid bloc of only a hundred votes the Communists voted the eight-man Administrative Board out, a board which was set up in an election in which FIVE THOUSAND members of Local 9 participated a few months ago, with the same one hundred votes set up their own administrative board of seven, the majority of them followers of the Communist line.

THE GREEN PROPOSAL

To trace the origin of the present situation in the local, we must go back to the letter of President John Green, dated October 2, before the election of the new GEB at the national convention.

This letter stated quite specifically that the Administrative Board, democratically elected by the membership, not by one hundred votes at a Communist-packed membership meeting, but by an election in which five thou-

sand members of Local 9 participated, was to remain in office until new elections take place, according to the by-laws of Local 9.

We quote from the Green letter: "If it is decided that new officers shall be elected, then the nomination of such officers shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the by-laws, and until such officers are installed the present Administrative Board and Executive Board constituted in accordance with the by-laws shall establish the policies and conduct the business of Local 9, in accordance with paragraph 4 of this letter."

That is, it was even too raw a deal for John Green and the old GEB to arbitrarily throw out the democratically elected leadership, but with the new GEB on which the Stalinists have a sizable bloc, if not outright control, it is a different story: democracy goes by the board, who the hell cares for that. Pack a general membership meeting and throw out the leadership elected at the gates of the yards in four days of balloting.

Sure, throw them out behind the backs of the membership. Did the eight-man board conduct a militant and fighting policy on the 11.6 repair differential by calling special membership meetings of 1500 and 5000 at four o'clock in the afternoon at which a strike vote was taken?

Sure, throw them out. Did they stand for the rescinding of the vicious no-strike pledge which binds labor

hand and foot and forces acceptance of any bitter pill the employers may choose to administer?

Why, sure, throw them out.

SNEAKING THROUGH

This is the unpardonable sin of the eight-man board: they had enough courage in this period of labor retreat to call huge membership meetings a half hour before the end of a shift ("Why, that's tr-r-r-reason," the Communist chorus howls) as a means of pressuring for what is the just due of the repair workers in Southern California.

For the Communists, who are in favor of extending the no-strike pledge into peacetime, now and forever amen, the membership meetings on the 11.6 and the resultant widespread publicity and pressure, was a "dangerous move."

A leaflet distributed by the Stalinists at this time stated: "It behooves every union worker to avoid helping this conspiracy by refusing to strike, no matter what provocation or temporary injustice seems to 'justify' it."

Sure, say the Communists, let the employers pour it on. We can take it even if they cut the guts and heart out of the labor movement.

The Stalinists, still ludicrously retaining their old name of Communists, have in actuality become COMPANY UNIONISTS. We would recommend to the membership that henceforth it call a spade a spade and know by its color, which is not red but black,

and is busily engaged in digging the grave of militant and fighting trade unionism; yes, Company Unionist Party would be much more appropriate.

The "victory" delegation to the national convention, pledged to return with the autonomy, has succeeded in destroying the autonomy granted by the outgoing GEB and has installed its own dictator in Local 9 to lay the plans for complete Stalinist seizure of the local in the coming election.

THE RANKS CAN WIN

The democratically elected administrative board has been dissolved—WITH ONE HUNDRED VOTES!

This power caucus without pride or principle must be broken!

It is not too late. The rank and file membership must intervene.

We will never get the 11.6 with the Communist company unionists in control.

We must not only attend mass meetings on the 11.6 which directly bears upon our pay envelopes, but also ALL MEMBERSHIP MEETINGS of our local, for what is decided and who is elected at these meetings has a profound effect on the 11.6 and other conditions in the yard, such as attendance by the rank and file is the ONLY guarantee and bulwark against Communist company union domination of our local. Elections are coming. It is not too late to organize and prepare.



"An Injury to One Is an Injury to All" Out of the Past

By RUTH PHILLIPS

The most dramatic pages in American labor history were written by the Industrial Workers of the World. The IWW was formed in June, 1905 by left wing unionists disgusted with the craft set-up of the AFL. The moving spirits in the organization of the IWW were "Big Bill" Haywood of the Western Federation of Miners, Gene Debs of the Socialist Party and Daniel De Leon of the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance. There were also present at the founding convention delegates from unions of railway men, miners and other trades, who had set up rival unions to the craft unions in those fields.

The aim of the IWW was to organize on an industrial basis the millions of unskilled workers neglected by the AFL. It aimed to create "One Big Union" of working men under the slogan "An injury to one is an injury to all." It replaced the conservative motto of the AFL—"A fair day's wage for a fair day's work"—with the revolutionary watchword, "Abolition of the wage system." Its aim was to organize on the economic front a revolutionary industrial unionism as the base for the revolutionary political party of the workers. It declared itself in favor of working class political action, but pledged allegiance to no political party. The IWW was to be formed "in such a way that all its members in any one industry, or in all industries, if necessary, cease work whenever a strike or a lockout is on in any department thereof."

COMPOSITION OF THE IWW

The unskilled and unorganized, the most exploited and sweated workers of America, flocked by the tens of thousands into the IWW. Lumber workers, miners, agricultural workers in the West, textile, shoe and clothing workers in the East, carried the red card of the IWW. The domains of the great industrial overlords were invaded by the "Wobblies." They carried on spectacular and successful strikes which won them nation-wide fame and new members. In company towns, where in the past no one dared speak a word against the powers that be, the IWW staged bold free speech fights. As fast as the "Wobblies" were arrested and thrown into jail by the local sheriff, they were replaced by hundreds more from neighboring towns, until the jails were too full to hold them and the right to free speech and union organization was established.

The IWW was not only the most militant organization on the American scene, it was the most slandered. Tory capitalists united with conservative socialists in vilifying the IWW. They were called the "I Won't Works," the "Bum Brigades," murderers and thieves. The bosses did more than slander them. IWW organizers were framed up, murdered and jailed. Still, the organization flourished, for it was the only answer to the crying need of the most exploited workers for union organization.

SYNDICALIST INFLUENCE

By 1912, the IWW was dominated by the syndicalists current in the organization. Under the influence of the syndicalists it rejected political action and preached the doctrine that the overthrow of capitalism would come through "organizing industrially and forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old."

The influence of the syndicalists was reflected in the trade union practices of the IWW. They won the right to free speech, but left no permanent organization behind them to maintain that right. They refused to enter into legal contractual agreements with the employers, insisting on settling each grievance as it came up by a strike. Their trade unions were loosely organized and often impermanent organizations.

During the anti-red hysteria of the World War and post-war period, IWW halls were raided, their printing presses destroyed, their leaders arrested. Literally hundreds and hundreds of Wobblies were thrown into jail. They showed the same fighting courage in the face of government persecution that they had shown on the picket line. But the organization was unable to survive the blows of the war. In the '20s it began to dwindle in influence and size.

Today the IWW is a dead letter as an organization. Its fighting spirit, which exemplifies the American worker, lives on. It is that same spirit that was behind the great sit-down strikes of recent memory. It is the spirit that the American workers will display in the great battles that lie ahead.

What the Presidential Election Means to Labor --

(Continued from page 1)

how this scheme will work. Suppose the German people should decide that they prefer to make the decision for themselves as to whether or not they want munitions factories and a large army. Suppose one of the "allies" of today, say England or Russia, should decide next year or five years from now that her interests no longer coincide with the decision of today on disarming Germany. What would Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Dewey and the Republican and Democratic Parties have to offer then?

They would do precisely what imperialists always do when their national and imperialist interests are placed in peril. They would do exactly what they did in 1918 and in 1941. They would take the country and the working class into the Third Imperialist World War.

This is what is being prepared today. This is the only meaning that can be given to Roosevelt's speech on relieving the German people of the burden of bearing arms. This would be true whether the President at the time was Roosevelt or Dewey, whether the party in power was the Republican or Democratic Party. And this in fact is what every worker will be voting for on November 7 if he casts a ballot for Roosevelt or Dewey, for the Republican Party or the Democratic Party.

WHAT LABOR FACES

The necessary domestic policy to fit into the post-war plans of the capitalist ruling class will require a blow at the unions. For the capitalists to get the full measure of profit and plunder, wage reductions will be necessary in the United States. If you want to reduce wages it is necessary first to weaken or wreck the unions.

Civil liberties and democratic rights cannot be allowed to flourish in a period when the ruling class is out to ransack the whole world, to maintain a huge military establishment, to increase profits, to place the biggest part of the burden on the working class and make them foot the bill. The unions and the working class will resent these encroachments by the capitalist ruling

class. All the imperialists know this, whether they are led by Roosevelt or Dewey, the Republican Party or the Democratic Party.

The working class cannot escape this fate unless they are politically organized. The road to political organization of the working class does not lead to the ballot boxes of the two capitalist parties, the parties of Roosevelt and Dewey. The path to political and organizational independence of the working class does not exist in any capitalist party but in a class party of labor: a mass party of all the toilers, from the mines, mills and factories, the ships, the fields and the forests.

The Workers Party has long advocated that labor form such a party, a mass labor party based on the trade unions. Of course, such a party cannot be formed before November 7. But this is no reason to vote for Roosevelt or Dewey, the Democratic or the Republican Parties. Why vote for our enemies just because we have been too slow in getting our own party started. Let's fight, organize and plan TODAY for our own Labor Party. Let's agitate on No-

URW President Fines Workers --

(Continued from page 1)

ers of their only weapon against the boss—the right to strike.

While Dalrymple gave the orders, the dirty work of collecting the fines is given over to a fellow strikebreaker, John Marmon, president of Local 101. Marmon supports that band of political parasites, the Communist Party of union-wreckers, whose labor philosophy is that labor should maintain the no-strike pledge not merely for the duration of the war, but for the duration of time, providing it suits the interests of Stalin.

Every such act by Dalrymple against the militant members of the Rubber Workers Union who are trying to protect their rights will set them against him in the ranks of the sizable and forceful opposition that already exists.

November 7 for a party of our own. Not a worker's vote for Roosevelt! Not a worker's vote for Dewey!

TWO "SOCIALIST" CANDIDATES

It is necessary to comment briefly on two other parties that will be on the ballot on November 7. They are the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party. The former is the party of Norman Thomas and he is the party candidate for President. The Socialist Party says that it is for "democratic socialism," "social ownership," and many other grand and noble things that all decent human beings want to see achieved. We have to remark, however, that so far as we know there is only one kind of socialism and that is the socialism of the founders of scientific socialism, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Socialism is democracy for the reason that in a socialist state the government would represent the majority and not, as in the case of a Roosevelt or Dewey government, the small minority of capitalists and their hangers-on. If a party believes in socialism and the struggle for socialism there is no need to talk about "democratic" socialism, because the heart of socialism is the establishment of genuine democracy and not the fake capitalist democracy of the ruling class and its two parties.

On the point of practical politics for labor, it is necessary to say that a vote for the Socialist Party is a vote for a party that has no roots among the masses, no influence in the labor movement, no adequate program for the problems of labor and which has given no clear indication on how it will achieve what meager and shadowy aims it has announced. The Socialist Party is a confused, semi-pacifist, impotent sect that has not yet been able to take a clear and unequivocal stand against the imperialist war. It is for and against the war; it is for and against peace now.

The Socialist Labor Party is also on the ballot. It represents the utmost in futility, senility and sectarian impotence, or years this diminishing sect had one simple slogan and one only: "capitalism must be destroyed." For decades they have

declared ultimatum in every issue of their paper for the "unconditional surrender of capitalism." In the program of this sect it is a waste of time for workers to fight in their unions for "immediate demands," for "capitalism must be destroyed." They turn their backs to the labor movement, refuse to carry on a fight for the day-to-day interests of the workers.

Evidently the SLP decided this year that the way to secure the unconditional surrender of capitalism was to invoke the U. S. Constitution. They say in their platform: "the Constitution of the United States provides for its own amendment. The Constitution thereby recognizes and legalizes revolution. The working class, the majority, holds the government in the hollow of its hand. We propose accordingly, that the revolutionary change be effected by the peaceful and civilized means of the ballot."

Auto Workers Face No-Strike Vote --

(Continued from page 1)

During the debate on the no-strike pledge and the referendum at the UAW convention, the Thomas-Ades-Renther leadership succeeded in getting the pledge reaffirmed only with the greatest difficulty. On the referendum itself, most of the leaders lined up in opposition—belying their argument the rank and file supported the pledge. These great democrats were scared green at the thought of submitting the no-strike pledge to a democratic vote.

In Atlantic City, at the meeting of the UAW Executive Board, following the convention, it was decided to delay any action on the referendum until the November meeting of the

board. This despite the ninety-day limit set by the convention in holding the referendum. Obviously the boys are scared. They stall for time. They will undoubtedly try to put over a few phony deals before the referendum takes place. Whether they succeed in this will depend on the progressive rank and file elements in the union.

The big daily papers, government officials, radio commentators and the rest of the propaganda machine will all intensify their anti-labor activities and attempt to bludgeon and cajole the workers into backing the pledge.

To answer this campaign and to get the truth to the workers, the rank

and file must organize its own counter-campaign. In the UAW, the situation is favorable because a national Rank and File Caucus already exists. It is this caucus which led the fight for the referendum at the convention. But the Rank and File Caucus and the delegates who supported it must not feel that the job is done. The Caucus must plan and conduct a national campaign in the UAW to bring to the workers the truth about the no-strike pledge. For this purpose they must issue printed material that can be distributed in the shops and at plant gates.

A campaign of this kind, however, cannot be carried on by a small committee. It must get support, active

support, in the ranks. In every local union progressive workers must join together to plan and conduct a campaign on a local scale and to help the Rank and File Caucus on a national scale. In each union, progressive groups of workers must issue leaflets explaining the issues to the membership. They must present resolutions to their local union putting the locals on record as being in favor of rescinding the no-strike pledge.

In future issues of LABOR ACTION we will discuss the various arguments presented in connection with the no-strike pledge and the current developments in the union movement in the campaign to scrap the pledge.

District 30 Steel Meet --

(Continued from page 1)

send letters to the "Commander-in-Chief," who wanted to hear from them. He complained that the delegates and the rank and file they represented were not sufficiently militant; they didn't write enough letters. The delegates yawned again. He said that he didn't know what Roosevelt would do. He maintained that the union had a "sound and practical leadership"; meaning, of course, Philip Murray. The biggest job ahead, in his opinion, was to maintain the gains made in the past. After giving out with these few gems, he introduced another speaker.

The next speaker proved to be J. Germano, director of District 31. He claimed that Murray has always been four or five jumps ahead of the rank and file!

There were other speakers, too. Among them was Boyd Wilson, Negro and personal representative of Murray. Wilson praised Russia, made vague allusions to the "new world" after the war and attacked racial prejudice—not too vigorously.

Toward the end there came three resolutions, all three obviously drawn

up by the leadership. The first was a "praise Murray" resolution which the delegates "yeaed" unanimously. The next was a resolution favoring the re-election of Roosevelt and supporting the PAC. This too met with feeble unanimity.

THE NO-STRIKE PLEDGE

The third resolution was one in favor of retaining the no-strike pledge. One delegate spoke against this resolution. He outlined briefly the fight on the no-strike pledge at the UAW convention, pointing out "the outright trickery and less glaring parliamentary maneuvering of the leadership" in their attempts to retain the pledge. He explained that the delegates at the UAW convention who were in favor of rescinding the pledge were probably just as patriotic, had as many children in the armed forces and thought just as much of them as the average American worker but that they saw this terrible contradiction confronting them: On the one hand they were told that they were fighting a war for democracy and all the freedoms. On the other hand, they saw that their

employers were refusing to discuss their grievances; their most militant stewards were fired for union activity, frequently with the consent of the top union officialdom.

In short, they saw their unions going to pot because of this enslaving pledge. He urged those delegates who still had some feeling for the mass of the people to return to their locals and rally them against this tool in the hands of the employers. His talk was not applauded, but some of the delegates who spoke on the issue indicated that they were not too much against the idea. One of the delegates asked Director Robb what the CIO intended to do in the event Roosevelt refused to do anything about the Little Steel formula. Robb answered that he did not know. He would have to attend a board meeting and find out!

The vote was then taken on the pledge. One delegate voted against keeping it. The convention was over. The delegates yawned again and prepared to go home. They had their plan of attack given to them by the leadership. They were to write letters to Roosevelt!

Labor Action Sub Drive Wings Its Way to Goal; 1650 New Subs Total So Far

The steady pace of the subscription drive continues. Every week one city has a banner week. This week it was New York with 133. But we all await a bonanza strike by two or three cities that will put us way ahead for the campaign and bring us in over our quota. And it's those cities that have been creeping along at a snail's pace which we expect to come out with a nugget load of subs.

Here is the story for the benefit of other branches throughout the country, of how Los Angeles got its subs. We quote: "Enclosed are fifty-eight six-month subs and eighteen year subs—all of them bona fide and paid for by the subscribers—that we got at a Negro housing project.

"The method: The project had been covered by one of our people several months ago. To prepare the project for the sub drive a thorough house to house distribution was made for four weeks.

On the following Sunday six of us solicited subs with the above result.

"Since we started early, we met almost everybody at home—mostly the women folk. I think I can safely say that the overwhelming majority of the breadwinners work in the shipyards—others in aircraft.

"There are 300 apartments in the project and the soliciting took short of three hours."

Detroit with sixty-five subs for the past week claims to be plodding along. We hope for more plodders like Detroit.

One discouraging item must be recorded. Sabotage and diversionist activity at the home office. The mailers of LABOR ACTION in New York are crying: "Stop! Stop! No more subs!" But we adjure you in the name of the divinities we hold sacred to show them no mercy. Lash them with your wrath, i.e., more and more subscriptions.

THE SCOREBOARD

| City | quota | Week | Total | Pct. |
|-------------------|-------|------|-------|------|
| New York City | 1,000 | 133 | 372 | 37 |
| Akron | 150 | — | 108 | 73 |
| Buffalo | 150 | 55 | 77 | 51 |
| Chicago | 300 | — | 118 | 39 |
| Cleveland | 200 | 12 | 26 | 13 |
| Detroit | 750 | 65 | 550 | 73 |
| Los Angeles | 200 | 11 | 84 | 42 |
| Philadelphia | 25 | — | 29 | 22 |
| Reading | 50 | — | 16 | — |
| St. Louis | 50 | 11 | 16 | 32 |
| San Francisco | 200 | 21 | 87 | 43 |
| Seattle | 150 | — | 32 | 21 |
| Streator | 50 | — | 44 | 88 |
| Youngstown-Warren | 50 | — | — | 0 |
| National Office | 650 | 12 | 64 | 9.5 |
| Totals | 4,150 | 326 | 1650 | 39 |

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 _____

Portrait of a WLB "Public" Member

By WALTER WEISS

LABOR ACTION has already presented portraits of some outstanding "friends of labor"—Roosevelt, Truman, LaGuardia, Dewey and a few others. However, we cannot let the campaign period go by without commenting on one less famous "friend," Wayne L. Morse.

Whenever CIO's Political Action Committee wants to prove that it is non-partisan, all it has to do is point to its endorsement of Morse for U. S. senator from Oregon. Morse, in turn, has endorsed a self-styled and John L. Lewis-approved "friend of labor" named Thomas E. Dewey, who would, according to the PAC leaders, destroy all of labor's New Deal gains. Yes sir, Morse is a Republican.

What is there about this man Morse that has induced the leaders not only of the CIO but also of the AFL and the Railway Brotherhoods to line up behind a candidate who himself has lined up behind Dewey? What made Richard Frankenstein, a vice-president of the United Automobile Work-

ers, say of him to the Oregon CIO convention last week, "You could not have chosen a better man?"

Until he resigned early this year to prepare his candidacy, Morse was a public member of the War Labor Board. At this late date we don't have to tell American workers what kind of character a man has to have to qualify as a public member of the WLB. Morse, however, was "compliance officer" of the board. That means he had the job of seeing to it that rebellious unions obeyed the edicts of the board. Hardly the position, you would think, to gain popularity among workers and to win the reputation of being a "friend of labor."

WHAT HE DID ON THE WLB

Perhaps Morse shirked his job and was an easy taskmaster? Not at all. But let the man speak for himself. On July 23, 1943, he wrote a famous decision in the case of the Los Angeles street railway workers. Coming

on the heels of a visit by labor leaders to Roosevelt to demand a rollback of prices or a revision of the Little Steel formula (yes, yes, it was way back on July 23, 1943), the decision was extremely significant. Said friend Morse:

"It is specious reasoning for labor to demand wage increases... on the ground that other sectors of our battle line against inflation are not being held, at least to the satisfaction of labor. (Mr. Morse and his colleagues, you can see, were satisfied and, in fact, still are.—Ed.)

"...The War Labor Board wishes to make clear that it does not intend to retreat... even though other divisions of the anti-inflationary army may weaken."

In simple, non-military English, Morse was saying that, however much prices went up, he was determined to hold wages down. Why? Just watch him drag in God and the flag in the passage that follows:

"The life of an American soldier is sacred thing. There is something almost sacrilegious about insisting on

with the Illinois operators. The AFL members of the board thereupon accused the public members of being puppets of Roosevelt's reactionary "Assistant President," James Byrnes. Morse issued a fiery 1200-word reply, which included the following passage:

"All economic pressure groups within the country should recognize that they have no right to expect to be paid for winning this war, but that the country and American posterity have the right to expect them to start paying for winning this war by much greater financial sacrifices than any group has made to date."

As LABOR ACTION reported several weeks ago, coal companies have increased their profits as much as 1000 and even 1500 per cent over pre-war levels, but Morse saw fit to lecture the miners about financial sacrifices.

Finally, the miners (not merely John L. Lewis) convinced even Roosevelt that they wouldn't give up their struggle without a contract and some concessions. He therefore authorized Ickes, on behalf of the government, to reach an agreement with Lewis. On November 4 the War Labor Board reluctantly approved this contract. The vote was eleven to one. The lone dissenter was Wayne L. Morse. He was firmer than the industry members themselves in defending the interests of the coal operators. (New York Times, November 5, 1943.)

On November 9, David Lawrence, one of the really topflight journalists of big business, devoted his entire daily column in the New York Sun and similar conservative papers to a Morse tribute.

"Every now and then," he enthused, "someone emerges in public life with the courage of his convictions and refuses to be stamped into a surrender of principle. Such a man is Wayne L. Morse... who has written what is bound to be an historic dissent from the decision of the board on the matter of yielding to the United Mine Workers under duress."

Here are a few highlights from the Morse decision:

"...The nation should have exercised its sovereign powers (that is, should have arrested union leaders under the anti-strike law, cancelled draft deferments, sent in the Army, etc.—Ed.) to meet the challenge raised by the economic action of the United Mine Workers... rather than capitulate to that challenge by offering them a contract which appears to have been dictated at the point of the strike weapon..."

"...Private property interests throughout the country have the right to be concerned and alarmed over such a procedure (that is, the government's signing a contract with the union)—Ed.)

"...The negotiating and submitting of the contract to the WLB and its approval thereof in the light of all the surrounding facts and circumstances place a great strain on the ordinary conception of government by law."

There speaks the voice of Dewey.

HOAX AT DUMBARTON OAKS-II

W. F. CLAYTON

The whole Dumbarton Oaks conference is exposed! And exposed by no less a person than the President himself.

The embarrassment of Roosevelt on this question shows how far the world has travelled since the days of the League of Nations. A lot of people believed in the League. It looks as if very few believe in Dumbarton Oaks.

First the President said that there was agreement on ninety per cent of the problems but disagreement only on ten per cent. But even the capitalist press noted that people were more concerned with the ten per cent disagreement than the ninety per cent agreement.

The British capitalist press was colder over the proposals. Their attitude was: "We shall see." Dorothy Thompson called the Oaks proposals, a continuation of the existing power structure. In other words, the proposed agreement merely sanctified the existing strengths of the powers. But basing future peace on existing power is the surest way to war. As soon as sufficient powers are dissatisfied they merely leave the association. That has happened in the past and will happen again.

The skepticism of the people has stung the President. So in his speech to the Foreign Policy Association on Saturday night last he came out with this:

"The peace structure which we are building must depend on foundations that go deep into the soil of men's faith and men's hearts—otherwise it is worthless. Only the unforgiving will of men can preserve it."

"No President of the United States can make the American contribution to preserve the peace without the constant, alert and conscious collaboration of the American people."

"Only the determination of the people to use the machinery gives worth to the machinery."

Now this is quite a thing to say.

THE PAST RECORD

Roosevelt and Hull have had charge of the foreign affairs of this country for the last twelve years. During this time they did exactly as they pleased.

They permitted war material to be sold to Japan to make war on China and to prepare for the present war.

Roosevelt in 1937 shouted loud that he would quarantine the "aggressor" but he telegraphed to Hitler and Mussolini at the time when Munich was being arranged and afterward sent them congratulations.

He refused to let the Spanish government have arms. He refused to help Ethiopia.

He maintained the friendliest relations with Franco and did the same with Vichy until the last possible moment.

He passionately defended the monarch King of Italy and gave the fascist Badoglio every possible support.

He did his best to impose Giraud upon the French people. Giraud, a great admirer of Petain, was rejected by the French resistance movement. Roosevelt had to back down. He was compelled, up until only yesterday, to give a grudging support to de Gaulle and although de Gaulle is no revolutionary, Roosevelt distrusted his demagogic talk (when he was in exile) about "a second revolution" and a "Fourth Republic."

He was especially fearful that de Gaulle would not be able to control the French masses.

What have the people to do with all this? They have been helpless. When they became thoroughly suspicious of Roosevelt's policies, Roosevelt, on October 30, 1940, at Boston, assured them "again, and again, and again" that their sons would not be sent into any foreign war. Yet a year afterward the country was at war.

A BRITISH JIBE

Oliver Lyttleton, Production Minister of Great Britain, said openly a few months ago that the United States had provoked Japan into declaring war. That is nonsense, and Lyttleton knew it was nonsense. Lyttleton meant to show that the United States did not sit by like a tame kitten until Japan attacked at

Pearl Harbor. He wanted it understood that all the imperialist powers were jostling one another for position, choosing allies to strike first, or to take such steps as would compel the enemy to take the "moral" responsibility for starting the war which was inevitable.

What did the people have to do with this? Not one thing. The League of Nations carried on its dirty intrigues. The people looked on hoping for the best. When Roosevelt telegraphed to Mussolini and Hitler at the time of Munich he didn't ask the people.

But the people are undoubtedly sick of the intrigues, the treacheries, the deceptions, the greed and rivalry which result in war. They do not want another one. Roosevelt, Churchill and the rest cook up some proposals at Dumbarton. The people show themselves unenthusiastic, not to say suspicious. Whereupon the President coolly informs them that machinery for peace is no good unless "the determination of the people to use the machinery gives worth to the machinery."

When the people's sentiments were against our boys fighting in any foreign war (When was that, Jimmie?) eign war, Roosevelt, who had the machinery of government in his hands, said that the people wouldn't have to fight in any such war. Willson got himself re-elected in 1916 by saying that he had kept the people out of war. As soon as he was safely in power he took the country in. How then are the people responsible?

But is it impossible for the people to take over the machinery of government? Only a coward and a slave in his soul can think so. The people have two great organizations, the CIO and the AFL. They are the biggest organizations in the country. Their representatives could get together and formulate a foreign policy that really represents the interests of the people. The elements of this foreign policy are so simple as to be understandable by everybody. Here are some of the planks:

1. Independence of all subject peoples.
2. Free plebiscites in all disputed areas.
3. Reconstitution of the labor and peasant organizations in all countries.
4. No secret diplomacy.

That is good enough to start with. Such a foreign policy would win tremendous support from millions not only in the United States but all over the world. But could we trust Roosevelt or Dewey to carry it out? Of course not. So that the representatives of the AFL and CIO would have to carry it out themselves. Precisely. That is exactly why we advocate an independent Labor Party. Independent because we know that to preserve peace it must be free of the influence of the Democratic and the Republican Parties, which are both tools of American imperialism.

Catechism for WLB Members

One night as I lay in bed, tossing in fitful dreams, weary and perplexed with the day's toil—for be it known that I plead Labor's cause before the War Labor Board—racking my brain to find loopholes in the Little Steel formula and daily battling the Sphinx-like mystery of why the War Labor Board behaves the way it does—I had a vision like that of the ancient prophets revealing to me the puzzle of the War Labor Board. It was this saying from the Bible:

"To him that hath shall be given, from him that hath not shall be taken away, even that which he seemeth to have."

Then sank I into a sound slumber, for now was the path, that I should tread, clear.

Paris Cardinal Sprinkled "Vichy" Water, Not Holy Water

Immediately after the Germans were driven out of Paris, one of the first demands of the French underground was addressed to the Vatican, asking for the removal of the Archbishop of Paris, Emanuel Celestine Suhard.

Since the fall of France, although many of the lower clergy aided the underground, the Cardinal and his bishops worked openly with the German fascists and their agents, Petain and Laval. The Cardinal aided in organizing the Vichy troops to be used against the underground, and was on the most friendly and confidential terms with the German high command. When thousands of Frenchmen were forcibly taken to Germany to slave for the Hitler war machine, he showed his approval by assisting the Germans even more than in the past. The Cardinal and Petain worked closely on many matters of state, and in many of the Vichy governmental offices in France and abroad the Cardinal had one of his bishops assisting the Vichyites.

The feeling against the Cardinal and his bishops is so strong that on August 26, when de Gaulle was to attend services at the Cathedral of Notre Dame, he notified the Cardinal and the Rev. Beausart, Archbishop of Notre Dame, that under no conditions must they appear at the services. The message was taken to the Cardinal by Father Bruckberger, a Dominican priest who is a member of the underground. Bruckberger, in an interview with Helen Kirkpatrick of the Chicago Daily News, told her that the Cardinal answered "I do not understand how the new government can begin in this anti-religious way."

The Vatican understands that if the French people can force the resignation of the Cardinal and many of his bishops, the whole question of the Vatican's collaboration with fascism will begin to come out into the open. So for that reason Archbishop Spellman of New York was sent to France, and he, as a representative of the United States, tried to use pressure to keep the Cardinal at his post.

Archbishop Spellman's role during the past year has become quite obvious. On his trips to Europe he spends all of his time at the Vatican and visiting Franco in Spain. Although his post is military vicar of the United States armed forces, he does not visit many of the army posts nor do we ever see him touring the camps in the Pacific. He appears at the Vatican and in the cities where the higher-clergy is in trouble with the people for supporting Hitler.

These attempts to whitewash the Vatican and the higher clergy are tied up, of course, with the attempt to keep the workers of Europe from cleaning house of all collaborators in industry and the government as well as in the higher clergy. Because when the house cleaning begins the Vatican knows that a real good job will be done.

Churchill, N. Y. Times, N. Y. Post, Sforza and the Roman "Mob"

Lessons for the Peoples All Over the World

By EDWARD WARNER

PART I

From time to time history produces events which in themselves seem to be relatively small and unimportant. But very often such events bear invaluable lessons for the people. They are worthy of consideration as models for events to come. We are dealing here with this kind of event, because it will be followed by many similar ones in Europe and Asia, as well as, later on, in the United States. If we understand this one we will at least have a key to the understanding of the others.

A little while ago, Winston Churchill said in his "Farewell Speech" to the Italian people:

"When a nation has allowed itself to fall into a tyrannical regime it cannot be absolved from the faults due to the guilt of that regime."

After having spoken great words as a great man, Mr. Churchill, enormously satisfied with his mission given him by the Lord, went home.

Naturally, everybody knows that truth and veracity are not Mr. Churchill's forte, for the Italian nation (i.e., the people) has never "allowed" itself to fall into the tyrannical regime of fascism. No one "allowed" this more than Mr. Churchill himself. Next to Stalin, Churchill is the biggest hypocrite of modern times. Nobody supported Mussolini and his regime more ardently than did Mr. Churchill; nobody was more interested in the victory of Hitler's gang over the German people than was Mr. Churchill (and Stalin).

Mr. Churchill, who serves the interests of British imperialism, has naturally to veil his aims. As in the past, he will accomplish many tyrannical acts, including some toward Italy. But he can't speak openly of these. He therefore points a finger at the "guilt" of the people. All peoples who stand in the way of Anglo-American domination of the world are called "guilty." Consequently, all measures taken against them are considered highly "justified." Should a tyrannical regime happen not to be in conflict with Churchill's plans (what about British tyranny in India?), then such a nation, even if it is ruled by an imitation Mussolini, Stalin or Hitler, is his "best friend."

This brings us to the above-mentioned event. Unfortunately for Mr. Churchill, the Roman people turned out to be possessed with an entirely different opinion of its "guilt."

HERBERT MATTHEWS REPORTS THE EVENT

What happened?

Herbert L. Matthews of the New York Times told the "terrible" story of what happened in Rome on September 18:

"The former vice-director of the Regina Coeli prison, Donato Carretta, was killed by a wild mob of 7,000 Romans today in a most vicious and brutal fashion while 200 Carabinieri and other police looked on without lifting a finger. The action took place inside and in front of the Palace of Justice, where Pietro Caruso was to have been put on trial today..."

"However, it was not the government of Italy but the mob that ruled this morning. It would have lynched Caruso if it could have reached him."

There it is! H. L. Matthews has assisted in the eruption of a volcano! After having suffered for a long, long time under the rule of the fascist gangsters, the Roman people took vengeance. It took

justice into its own hands (where it belongs) and H. L. Matthews is "horrified." He wants such a primitive outburst to be "well educated." And the first thing he does is shout that this outburst took place in "a most vicious and brutal fashion." It was, by God, a "mob"-volcano!

A bit heart-broken but still in the capacity of an "objective" reporter, he tells us more about the "mob."

"To be fair [you see: TO BE FAIR!], one must point out that the spearhead of today's mob was composed of relatives of the victims of Caruso's police. For months these people, who had seen their loved ones die, sometimes under torture, saw Caruso, his secretary, Robert Occhetto, and others live in the safety of the prison. Hatred and passion smoldered week after week and today broke into burning flame."

There you have it again! Hatred and passion smoldered week after week and finally the volcano broke into a burning flame. As every normal human being would expect, a burning flame knows nothing about the sensitivity of a reporter, even if his name happens to be H. L. Matthews. The flame goes its own way and it cannot do otherwise. Let us see now why the flame was especially directed against Carretto. The United Press, as quoted by Mr. Matthews, stated:

Carretta "was attacked when a woman in the courtroom denounced him for having accepted 150,000 lire from her to save her son, one of the hostages, and then had done nothing to help him."

The poor woman lost not only her son—because she "allowed" herself to fall into a tyrannical regime—but she also lost her money. In Italy, business is business, you would think. But there is the much greater business of the Allies, who are primarily responsible for the eruption of this "mob"-volcano. That is why we return to Churchill, Stalin and Roosevelt, who all need so badly to hide behind the "guilt" of the people. H. L. Matthews, horrified as he is, does not dare tell us anything about the business that Mr. Churchill has to veil. On this matter, we refer to the New York Post, which gives an excellent description of what happened:

THE NEW YORK POST JOINS THE FRAY

In its editorial of September 21, the New York Post states:

"Those who murdered Carretta were convinced that the only way to punish this fascist criminal, who was walking the streets of Rome, free and untouched, was to do it themselves."

"Why did they feel this way? Because the people of Rome have lost confidence in our justice."

"They know that the Allies have disarmed as many of the militantly democratic, anti-fascist Partisans as they could, while they allow the ex-fascist magnates to retain their high places in the national economy."

But how could Mr. Churchill "allow the ex-fascist magnates retain their high places"? Does he do it in order to double the "guilt" of the people by "allowing" them again to fall into the hated tyrannical regime? It seems clear that people can never be punished for their guilt unless the ex-fascists are retained in the "high places." Well, done, Mr. Churchill! Your "democratic" logic is absolutely convincing, and in a most "vicious and brutal fashion," as can be seen by what follows in the New York Post:

"They (the Roman people) all know the brave Partisan leader

who was sentenced by an Allied military court to a year and a half in jail for killing a fascist police lieutenant."

In the first place, an anti-fascist is found guilty because Mr. Churchill has always had and still has great love for fascism. Secondly he is guilty because he refuses to "allow" Mr. Churchill to exercise this love for the ex-fascist magnates. For such a crime the punishment of the anti-fascist Partisan leaders was as it must have been: SEVERE.

"Anti-fascists like Churchill, Roosevelt, or Stalin and his international murder ring, have certain principles. Do you know the most vicious of the Stalinist riff-raff? His name is Ilya Ehrenburg. When a correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, curious about the opinion of a real gangster with regard to the future of Germany, asked Ilya Ehrenburg what the Russians intended to do about a revolt of the German people which would overthrow Hitler and welcome the advancing Red Army with appropriate banners," this blackguard replied: "Those would be the first people we would shoot."

It cannot be otherwise. For the Stalinist regime is the bloodiest totalitarian regime in the world—it is loaded with hatred against any revolt of the people. Let us remember, however, that the dirty Ehrenburg was once boxed on the ears by a French artist, André Breton. The cowardly Ehrenburg was once put on the carpet in a Paris cafe for having written calumnies about the surrealist movement, and when he did not dare to whisper a single word in his own defense, Breton boxed his ears twice. The rest, we firmly hope, will some day be done by the Russian people, alas the "mob."

APOLOGUES FOR FASCISM

Returning to the New York Post, we read:

"Every Roman knows that the Allies tried to force on the Italian people those apologists for fascism, the House of Savoy and Marshal Badoglio. They know that when this was unsuccessful, the Allies tied the hands of the democratic Bonomi cabinet that succeeded Badoglio."

We see the same thing once more. The surest way for the Italian people never to be "absolved" from the sins of the tyrannical regime is to force upon them the apologists for fascism. This is the way Churchill has for twenty-two years shown his "opposition" to Mussolini. Confronted with the opposition of the people to his schemes, he does the next best thing: Shackle the hands of the democratic cabinet with strong manacles. Nothing in heaven nor on earth is more "convincing" than Churchill's invariably convincing "democratic" logic. And don't forget that the ex-fascist magnates are punished in a vicious fashion by being retained in their "high places."

The New York Post continues:

"They (the Roman people) know that the government has no strength, that it must bow and scrape before every Allied officer, that Italy is hungry because its government has not been given power to stop inflation or to mobilize agriculture."

All we need to understand is that Italy would not be hungry if the hands of the government were not tied with manacles. To stop inflation or to organize agriculture might some day lead to the "absolution" of the Italian people from the sins of fascism.

And we can well understand how intolerable this would be for the kind-hearted Allies, who must be thinking as Hamlet once did: To have fascists in Italy or not to have—that is the question.

"Why, then, was Carretta lynched?" asks the New York Post, and goes on to answer:

"Carretta was lynched because officials in Washington and London (the Post has some illusions and omits mentioning the super-fascist Kremlin gang) and the Allied officers in Rome thwarted the Italian desire for a responsible, democratic government, one which could bring the fascist criminals to justice. Carretta was lynched because the Allies are forcing the Italian people to take the administration of justice into their own hands."

Turn right, turn left—it is the same story. The "guilty" people wanted democratic justice for all the injustice that it had suffered at the hands of the fascist criminals. History has shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that the people wanted neither fascism nor war. But it was forced into both by the fascist mob, with the help of Mr. Churchill. The "guilt" of the Italian people cannot be proved. The guilt of the ex-fascist magnates in their high places and the guilt of the apologists for fascism, however, are easy to see. Any real democratic trial would reveal to us not only the monstrous guilt of all the fascists, but also the crimes of Anglo-American imperialism and the Kremlin. But the Allies cannot "allow" such genuine trials against the real, well-situated fascists. The masses of the people, however, feel innocent and are forced to take justice into their own hands. Because they are compelled to do this, they are called guilty. Therefore they have to be punished.

People in modern times, it seems, live under two principal laws: To be guilty, and to be punished. The third law is to be hungry, to have inflation and no agriculture—at least in Italy.

The New York Post follows this up:

"Now, reports Herbert L. Matthews to the Times from Rome, the Bonomi government has been warned by the Allies that unless it can keep order and prevent such incidents from recurring, it will be ousted."

In other words, if you cannot prevent democratic justice from being done, you will be punished. The all-convincing logic of Mr. Churchill is doubled by the all-convincing logic of the above-mentioned laws. But it might occur to the people: Hands off, dear Allies, this is no longer any of your business!

"The Allies, having made it impossible for the democratic government to function efficiently in the first place, now threaten to replace it because it isn't doing a good job."

"The Carretta case, and other violent incidents involving fascists, are being used as arguments against giving democratic forces the right to assert themselves."

The New York Post is right a thousand times! What this paper does not understand is the fundamental fact that the fascist and "anti-fascist" rulers of any nation in capitalist society do the same thing. By fascist or "democratic" means they deprive the people of all rights, all freedom, all self-assertion. To be sure, they do their job as well as they CAN. If they encounter opposition by the people, they explain: "You are not doing a good job. You have shown us that you are unable to assert your democratic rights. Count on us. You'll never again get a chance at self-assertion."

(Part II next week)

English Trade Union Congress Swallows Lie; Links German Workers to Fascists

By REVA CRAINE

In adopting the report of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee, the Trade Union Congress of Great Britain revealed that it had fallen for one of the oldest lies maintained by the ruling class in every country. The report, carried by a vote of five to one, linked the German people with their fascist oppressors in the atrocities committed by the latter, and stated that the German people could not be absolved from responsibility for these crimes.

There are several things which are wrong in such an attitude, which is extremely dangerous to the working class, especially in the "democratic" countries.

WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR HITLER?

In the first place, every worker must remember that the German workers and people in general were the first victims of Nazism. Before the Nazis were able to extend their barbaric practices beyond the borders of Germany, they had to break by force and violence the working class organizations in their own country. The first Nazi concentration camps were filled and still are filled with German workers who fought Nazism long before the capitalist statesmen of the democratic countries discovered that they could not "do business with Hitler."

Such workers cannot be held responsible for the crimes of Hitler, who was aided in his climb to power by labor's mortal enemies, both inside and outside Germany.

But why didn't the German workers do something to stop Hitler? Doesn't the fact that they didn't stop him make them at least partly responsible for his crimes?

The German workers were prevented from stopping Hitler and his hordes by the very people who today shout the loudest about a "hard" peace for Germany and not "absolving" the German people. The German working class was organized into two gigantic working class parties, both of them led by men who did next to nothing to organize the fight against fascism. The leaders of

one of these parties, the Social-Democratic, relied upon Hindenburg to stop Hitler. The leaders of the other party, the Communist Party, on orders from Moscow, preferred the fight against the social-democrats to the fight against the fascists. The division inside the ranks of German labor at such a crucial moment, and the lack of a bold, aggressive fighting program against fascism, for which the leaders of both these parties are equally responsible, permitted the fascists to get to power.

Now these leaders, and their prototypes in other countries, shout about the need to punish all the German people for the crimes of fascism. At the very least, says Sir Walter Citrine, general secretary of the Trade Union Council, the German people were quiescent while Hitler's armies ravaged the European continent, and they must therefore be considered accessories to the crime.

LABOR LEADERS HELPING CAPITALISM

Leaving aside for the moment the fact that Sir Walter at the time of Hitler's rise to power was busy selling the virtues of capitalism to the British workers, this kind of argumentation is very dangerous to the British working class.

By this kind of reasoning, all the crimes of British imperialism in Asia and Africa can be placed on the heads of the British working class. What if the Indian people should some day decide that EVERY Englishman is responsible for their enslavement, and that the British labor movement was "at least an accessory" to that crime? How would Sir Walter defend the honor of the British trade unions, of which he is general secretary?

By the same token the American labor movement could be held responsible for every lynching in the South, for every injustice and crime perpetrated by or inspired by the American capitalist class.

When Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt (and they are speaking respectively for the capitalists of England and the United States) say such things, it makes a great deal of sense. (President Roosevelt declared that he does not hold the German people responsible, but they will have to make

their way toward a democratic way of life "without the burden of carrying a gun." What he is actually saying is that the German people will have no weapons with which to wipe out the Nazis.) For neither of them can tell the truth about German fascism, namely, that it is the product of German capitalist society, and that the fascists are the agents who do the dirty work for the capitalists. They can't tell the truth lest the workers in their own countries draw some conclusions about who and what is actually responsible for oppression, fascism and war, and decide to do something effective about ridding the world once and for all of these scourges.

LET THE GERMAN WORKERS ACT!

Given not even half a chance, the Italian people have already shown how little they had in common with Italian fascism. Every Italian worker wishes for nothing better than the opportunity to wipe out the Italian fascists and establish a new and better order. It is not the responsibility for fascism which has been pinned on the Italian people which prevents them from doing a more thorough job on the fascists, but rather the presence of Allied troops and the same kind of labor leaders who in England now pass resolutions condemning the whole German nation.

In Germany too, the workers will yet show how little they cared for Hitler and how great was their suffering at his hands. But they will not be aided in their fight against Hitlerism if the workers in England and the United States and their ruling class insist in placing the responsibility for the crimes of fascism upon them.

Instead, the labor movements in these countries must insist that the German and Italian workers not be hampered in any way in their dealings with their native fascists. Every bit of aid and encouragement must be sent to the German and Italian workers, even over the opposition of the ruling classes and governments of America and England. The workers of Germany and Italy are the only ones really capable of destroying fascism in their own countries.

Poor, Oppressed Greeks Have a Word for British Occupation - It's Imperialism!

By PAUL ULLMAN

Churchill took out a new form of insurance when he sent British soldiers into Greece. It can be called spoils-insurance against the accidents of the post-war division of the loot. Having solemnly promised that "I wasn't made Prime Minister to liquidate the British Empire," he is taking no chances. Like Stalin, in Eastern Europe, he does not intend to ask for his choice sections of the European carcass at the "pieces" conference. He will come to the table with his steak in his hand, having taken his portion in advance.

The military expert of the New York Times on October 6 called the British "occupation" of Greece a "politico-military" move. Not a "liberation," as liberals think who spend their energies deceiving themselves, but an OCCUPATION. The purpose of this occupation is primarily political, its military aims and consequences having little significance in the general European war strategy. Baldwin writes: "The political objective is the traditional one that has governed British policy in the Mediterranean for years—to maintain a Greece and if possible an Albania and the Dalmatian coast area—friendly to Britain and in her 'sphere of influence.'"

With the Russians making a clean sweep in the Balkans and clearly slated to be the dominant power in that area after the war, the British wanted to insure their influence over Greece and thus over a section of the Mediterranean.

BRITISH POLICY AGAINST PEOPLE

The story of British-Greek relations preceding the invasion is a fitting background to this "liberation" that has nothing to do with liberty. The British had imposed and maintained an iron censorship on developments in Greece. The complete story of the mutiny in the Greek navy was never revealed. The tricks and techniques of British maneuvering to keep the reactionary King George of Greece on his throne against the clearly expressed and well organized sentiments of the people were shrouded in mystery.

About six weeks ago, Drew Pearson told some of the details in his regular column. What was well known is the fact that there were two governments of Greece. One government headed by King George

had its seat in Cairo and its head in London. The only crutch which kept it from tottering was the imperialist designs of the British capitalists. The other government was the Greek government-in-Greece, which included all political factions and led a fierce and successful fight against the Nazis.

What was not so well known was the thorough unscrupulousness and bitterness of the British opposition to the Greek Government-in-Greece. According to Pearson, the British some time ago started training the Greek army and navy in Egypt to fight against their brother Greeks in Greece. After King George had moved "his government" to Cairo, it was the Greeks in Greece who organized themselves and continued the military struggle against the Germans. Their fight is one of the reasons the British army is meeting with so little opposition now in its sweep through the country. It was against these Greeks that Churchill organized the Greeks in Egypt. It was then that the Greek navy and part of the army in Egypt revolted. The British suppressed the revolt. According to Pearson, sixty per cent of the Greek navy and twenty-five per cent of the Greek army became prisoners of the British.

BACKING THE KING

The British undermining of the Greek Partisans continued. Pearson writes: "The British have been paying one gold sovereign per month for each soldier fighting under General Napoleon Zervas, a professional soldier of fortune, who is also getting indirect help from the Nazis and is fighting the Greek government-in-Greece."

"One thing the Churchill group in Britain fears—and there is a lot of opposition to Churchill among the British people on this question—is that the railroads, public utilities and water works built in Greece with British capital will be confiscated by the present anti-King George government in Greece."

Churchill used British troops exclusively in the invasion. Presumably the Greeks, who had been trained to fight their fellow Greeks for the sake of a reactionary King, were not qualified to fight the Germans for their own liberty. And while the British troops fight the Germans in Greece, sup-

posedly in the cause of democracy, Greek democrats are being interned in the jails of Cairo.

Greece is only a more glaring example of the contradiction between the desires of the oppressed of Europe for their own governments and the fierce determination of the Allies to kill at birth any possibility of genuine people's regimes. In the case of Greece, the British capitalists, quaking for their capital and craving the Mediterranean sphere of influence, subordinated the fight against the Germans to the necessity of exterminating the partisan influence, which constituted a danger to the attainment of these objectives. The development of real people's government must be nipped in the bud lest it spread and infect surrounding territories and then the tens of thousands of British soldiers who died to preserve the British Empire will have died in vain. And Churchill, cigar in one hand, the other blessing the aristocratic head of the foreign King George of Greece, rasps fiercely: "And they shall not have died in vain."

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. 44 October 30, 1944

ALBERT GATES, Editor
MARY BELL, Asst. Editor

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

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

Low Wages in Meat Packing and Textile Industries Show Up in High Profits

Textile capitalists have informed the War Labor Board that a forty-cent minimum wage is high enough for their workers, too high, in fact. They don't think that a whole family should even try to support itself on one worker's earnings. For their part, they are willing to hire entire families—fathers, mothers and kids. If wages should be raised, they are dead certain that prices would have to go up. Otherwise their profits would go down—and that would be unthinkable under the American system of free enterprise, otherwise known as the capitalist system of private profit.

On October 8, Chester Bowles, head man of the OPA and formerly a big advertising executive, reported that in the cotton textile industry profits before taxes for 1943 were 33.3 per cent higher than in 1941.

That's a nice, big increase, isn't it? But we must say that Mr. Bowles has chosen to make a peculiar and misleading comparison. The accepted method is to compare present profits with those in the pre-war years of 1936-39, since in 1941 extremely high war profits were already being made.

It isn't that Bowles lacks the statistics for making a proper comparison. The OPA last year made some important studies of wartime profits, supposedly to discover whether appeals by industrialists for price boosts were justified. Already last fall the well informed magazine, Business Week, reported that the OPA study on textiles would show 1942 profits up 600 per cent over 1936-39. That's another way of saying seven times as high.

We haven't had the time to investigate whether this particular report was ever made public in any form. As Business Week commented, however, advertising man Bowles somehow never tried to get any publicity for any of the OPA's profit reports. Some were available on request—if you requested fast enough.

A report on the meat packing industry, showing profits up 336 per cent, was available to the extent of just 1500 copies. The paper shortage or some such reason, no doubt. In any event, the meat packers were given a ten per cent subsidy (remember?), so that they wouldn't have to raise prices any higher.

Other OPA reports, which would have shocked the worker and his wife, were simply suppressed. That's what happened, according to Business Week, to a report on the fruit and vegetable canning industry. It wasn't made "available" at all but confined to the OPA's files and marked "strictly confidential."

To return to Mr. Bowles' recent statement, he is moved to admit that "profits have moved up sharply—so sharply, in fact, as to suggest that the cost increases (for materials and labor) should often have been entirely absorbed without unfairness to industry."

The increases should have been absorbed. That means that they weren't. Bowles states that between 1941 and 1943 the textile capitalists were granted a six per cent rise in prices. This helped them to "absorb" a little more profit over and above the 600 per cent increase which they realized, in the normal course of events, by 1942. Naturally, they weren't satisfied with six per cent, so they themselves increased prices many times by lowering quality to the vanishing point and by other black market practices.

Now that you have examined this example (and it's by no means the most glaring) of the President's famous stabilization program in action, you begin to understand why Chairman Davis of the War Labor Board was unwilling even to suggest to Mr. Roosevelt any modification of the Little Steal formula. If in the past, exorbitant profits have proved to be a reason for, not against, price increases, who can even guess what might happen to prices if wages should go up a few cents?

Watch out, fellow worker, that old bogeyman, INFLATION, is just around the corner. Or is he here already, with the blessing of Mr. Bowles, Mr. Davis, Mr. Vinson, Mr. Byrnes, AND PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT?

Yes, you have the inflation, and the capitalist friends of these gentlemen have the profits which caused that inflation. They don't like the thought that the workers might do something unpatriotic, such as striking, to change the situation.

Stalinist Imperialism at Work:

RUSSIA AND IRANIAN OIL

By ALBERT GATES

There is no better testimony of Russia's imperialist role in this war than the recent diplomatic exchanges between Stalin's regime and the Iranian government of Premier and Foreign Minister Mohammed Said Maraghei, for ten years Ambassador of the country to the Kremlin. The dispute, like so many others between imperialist powers and colonial countries, is over oil.

The Russian government proposed that Iran grant it the concession "for the exploitation of Kevir and Khurian oil deposits in the northern part of Iran." Premier Said's government rejected the proposal, declaring that nothing would be done about new concessions until after the war.

It would seem that this exchange between two sovereign nations would end the discussion for the time being. But this is not the way of big powers when dealing with more or less defenseless countries. Stalin's Russia is proceeding in the time-honored imperialist manner to force these concessions from a reluctant regime. How? By preparing a series of attacks upon the Iranian government which will either bring about its downfall or force it to yield to the superior forces of its giant neighbor.

The history of imperialism reveals that this is the general pattern by which the powers obtain their loot from weak and defenseless countries which have an abundance of raw materials to be exploited for profit. The British Empire was a past master of this art. It would undermine a government which did not meet its demands. It would organize a campaign of propaganda beginning in London and seeping down to the press of the very country which it wanted to exploit or turn into a colonial possession. Bribery, coercion and the direct use of force were the several means employed.

THE WAY OF IMPERIALISTS

But the British Empire was not alone in these methods. All the imperialists operated in the same way. Germany, France, Holland, the United States, Italy, have at one time or another employed the same or similar weapons to achieve their aims of obtaining land, raw materials, cheap labor or markets which would profit their respective capitalist classes. That is how all these countries obtained their possessions, their colonies, their spheres of influence, their export of goods, their profits. This is how India, China, the whole Middle East, Africa, Latin and South America, the Pacific islands of great wealth, came under the possession and control of the big powers. The hundreds of millions of peoples which populate these lands have been and continue to be cruelly exploited in the profit interests of the ruling classes of these countries.

The methods of the imperialist powers have long been under the sharpest criticism of revolutionary socialists, of many liberals and anti-imperialists in general. They have pointed out that imperialism means exploitation of backward and colonial countries for the special interest of the capitalist classes of the "advanced" countries. That imperialist policy meant taking the rights of these peoples, the rights to their own land, their own governments, their very lives. Great Britain, Germany, France and the others were rightly condemned for their barbarous and coercive treatment of these peoples. In the United States, too, the sharpest criticisms have been voiced against its imperialist policies and interference in the affairs of the small neighbors to the south.

In the present case of Iran, Russian policy is identical to that pursued by the other powers. Examine briefly what has actually happened. There is some history to it, too. Iran was the object of imperialist exploitation for many, many decades. Czarist Russia, England and Germany fought

over this lucrative prize for tens of years. The elimination of Germany as a competitor left Russia and England alone to dispute over the highly desired booty of Iranian oil.

POLICY OF WORKERS RUSSIA

But, when the Russian Revolution of 1917 occurred, when the workers took power and set up their own government under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky, a new foreign policy was developed by Workers' Russia. The Bolsheviks renounced all concessions which capitalist Russia had obtained from Iran. The Iranian people were told quite frankly that Russia no longer had any profit interests in the country; that the Russian workers did not want to exploit the Iranian peoples, but wished to have the friendliest relations with them, to exchange goods to the mutual benefit of both countries, to establish peaceful relations for all time.

This policy was actually carried out and for many years the relations between the two countries were excellent. The action of the Soviet Union, for then it was truly a Soviet Union, had an additional effect. By renouncing the imperialist policies of Czarism, it militated against the imperialist rape of the country by Great Britain. For the British Empire was always confronted by the reality of a new Russian foreign policy which many in Iran understood, and the country was better able, although not wholly successful, to resist the increasing appetite of British imperialism for oil.



MARSHAL STALIN

How do Stalin's policies square with the policies of Lenin and Trotsky? They are exactly opposite. Whereas Lenin renounced imperialism, and defended the colonial countries, Stalin adopts the old imperialism. Stalin not only does not renounce those sharp practices for which imperialism is noted, but employs them himself.

Here is how Russia proceeds in the present case of Iran. Since the Iranian government rejected its proposal, she opens up a propaganda campaign against the actions of the government; charges it with all kinds of crimes; creates opposition within the country and in general creates a state of chaos and opposition in order to undermine the existing government and either force it to change its policies, or bring about its downfall.

In case either of these measures proves ineffectual, Russia lays the basis for the direct use of force and winning her objectives in that way.

Thus the Russian newspaper, Trud, began a public campaign against the Iranian government. Among the charges made against it are that the government had left unpunished "harmful actions of certain evil-intentioned elements" who interfere with the supply of goods which are sent by lend-lease through Iran. Secondly, the government had not opposed the present "intensification of subversive work by profascist elements in Iran." The Iranian government did not prosecute "criminals" who attack Russian supply trains, but did persecute "Iranian officials who are striving loyally to carry out their obligations under the treaty alliance between Iran, the USSR and Britain."

What else? In its article, "The Words and Deeds of Mr. Said," Trud goes on to say that the Premier's policies have made for "strained and tense" relations with the Allies. Furthermore, "re-

actionaries have set Premier Said to the task of smashing workers' organizations and democratic organizations and for this purpose have introduced a bill for the militarization of industry."

This is indeed interesting. We don't know what is meant by workers' organizations in this predominantly agricultural country with few workers, or democratic organizations in this backward colonial nation dominated for many years by imperialism. The purpose of the writing, however, is very clear.

Russia is preparing to depose Said if he does not grant them the oil concession. If he had, none of these things which are cited against him would ever have been written. Would this mean that they would still have existed and it would have been all right so long as Russia got its oil? Or is it that all these things are untrue and that it is merely part of an imperialist plot against the Iranian government? We incline to believe the latter.

In any case, these are not the important criteria. The fact is that Russia, to prepare its case against the Iranian government, must show first that it violates a "good neighbor" relationship, does not represent its own people, cannot rule its country (remember the point about Russian supply trains), prosecutes the friends of Russia and permits her enemies to go about freely, and as a clincher, harms the interests not only of Russia but of the United Nations, too.

Now, if no change is forthcoming from this government, the basis is laid for its overthrow, or its submission, either by "convincing arguments" backed up by the show of force of the Russian army or by the direct use of its army.

OIL IMPERIALISM

In this little affair is not only mirrored the "new" imperialism of Stalinist Russia but also the sharp struggles and enormous intrigues which exist within the ranks of the United Nations. The war is by no means over when these Allies are already beginning to split the booty. The Russian magazine, War and the Working Class, prints statistics to show the world distribution of oil, statistics which disclose that the United States controls fifty-seven per cent of the world's oil resources, the British twenty-seven per cent, and Russia eleven per cent. Is this important? For Stalin, yes. Because now he has established the basis for his claim for oil concessions in Iran in order to equalize the possessions of his Allies, who have more oil than he.

The struggle for oil is almost as old as capitalism. It was one of the causes of the outbreak of Imperialist World War No. 1. It was behind the outbreak of Imperialist World War No. 2. At the time of the Russian Revolution, that country dropped out of the oil war because Workers' Russia renounced imperialist policy. Under Stalin, Russia rejoins the imperialist race for oil. Thus, the colonial peoples of the world have another power to fear, another army which may sweep over their borders, another corps of national economic experts who will seek to decide the fate of their existence. The other imperialists act in the interests of their capitalist ruling classes. The Russians act in the interest of their bureaucratic ruling class.

The case of Iran is a living proof of how far removed is Stalin's Russia from the Russia of Lenin, from Workers' Russia which renounced all imperialist policy, all territorial and trade concessions which the Czarist imperialist regime had obtained. It shows how far removed is Stalin's army of seizures and occupations from the socialist Red Army of Trotsky. Now would be a good time for the leading writers of the newspaper, The Militant, to explain in what way Stalin's policy in Iran, and the conduct of the army stationed there, carries on in the interest of world freedom, world socialism!

NAM Would Bar Closed Shop

LOS ANGELES (WDL)—California, Arkansas and Florida voters are being harangued by the National Association of Manufacturers and their allies to vote in November for an amendment to their state constitutions which, in the guise of protecting the "right to work," would practically smash the labor movement by outlawing every closed shop contract.

The California proposal would add a new section 1A to the Bill of Rights in the state constitution to read as follows:

"Every person has the right to work, and to seek, obtain and hold employment, without interference or impairment or abridgement of

said right because he does or does not belong to or pay money to a labor organization.

"Anything done or threatened to be done which interferes with, impairs or abridges, or which is intended to interfere with, impair, or abridge said right, is unlawful. Relief against or on account of anything so done or threatened to be done shall be granted in a civil action, legal or equitable, initiated in the superior court of any county in which anything so done or threatened to be done shall occur, upon the complaint of any person or upon complaint of the district attorney of such county.

"The term labor organization means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation, committee or plan, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, rates of pay, hours of employment or conditions of work."

If this measure passes, it may not only outlaw union shops, but will be a threat to labor's right to strike. No person who has ever worked in pre-organized-labor California will ever vote for this bill, which is designed to prevent California workers from enjoying the benefits of the Wagner labor bill.