

UAW STRIKERS STAND FIRM! But Leaders Make Shameful Retreat at Ford

"Company Security" Plan Means Union Insecurity

By DAVID COOLIDGE

An unholy alliance is about to be consummated between the International Executive Board of the UAW-CIO and the Ford Motor Co. Unless the UAW membership and the whole labor movement come down on the heads of the leadership of the UAW, Henry Ford will get from the union itself, and without a struggle, what he was never able to accomplish with his anti-union thugs and company-made blackjacks.

Richard Leonard, Ford director of the UAW, acting for the IEB, has submitted to the Ford Motor Co. the UAW's reply to the corporation's demand for "company security." "In the event of an unauthorized strike... any employee or employees found guilty of instigating, fomenting or giving leadership to an unauthorized stoppage of work shall be subject to discharge." For those workers who participate, "and whose guilt has been determined by the empire," fines are provided. For "first participation... \$3.00 for each day of the stoppage (or major fraction of any subsequent day). Second participation... \$5.00 for each day of the stoppage (or major fraction of any subsequent day). In the event of a financial penalty, the company shall deduct the fine from the earnings of the worker involved. It is agreed that all fines levied under this section shall be donated to the President's Infantile Paralysis Fund."

It is extremely difficult to write with restraint about this "plan" which Leonard has been authorized by Thomas, Reuther and Addes to present to the Ford Motor Co. But this must be the procedure because every worker who reads LABOR ACTION must understand the real and full meaning of this corporation "security" proposal.

CONTENT OF REPLY

The "security plan" is the reply of the UAW leadership to the demands of Ford that before he signs another contract or discusses wages the union must take steps to guarantee security to the corporation.

Ford demanded that in so far as the union and the workers were demanding security and protection from the corporation, the corporation had the right to demand security and protection from the union and the workers.

The notion behind such a demand is not new. In the earlier days of CIO militancy, this organization was contrasted with the more conservative AFL. The AFL was praised as the more "responsible" organization. The CIO had not reached "maturity," it had not attained to the level of "responsible trade unionism." The capitalist employers and their spokesmen in the editorial offices and in Congress meant by this that the CIO was more difficult to control than the AFL. It was less amenable to persuasion from the employer, it was

less likely to compromise, it rejected "sweetheart" agreements; it was more likely to resort to the picket line than was the AFL.

The plans of the employers for the unions took very concrete form. They proposed that their notion be enacted into law. The unions should open their books to the "public." The International Ladies' Garment Workers Union was held up as a model of "responsible trade unionism" adhering to the "American way of life" because this organization published its annual financial statement in the daily papers.

Proposals were advanced and an attempt was made to enact them into law, that union organizers should be licensed and that trade unions should be looked upon in law, in practice and by "the public" as in no way essentially different from a corporation. The general position of the capitalist employers was summed up in their attitude that "responsible trade unionism" must mean the settlement of all grievances around the council table, by the decision of an "impartial arbitrator" or through the intervention of the government. The whole plan was an organized one and directed primarily against the one powerful weapon in the hands of the unions and the working class: THE STRIKE.

This is particularly important for the employers today. Their main concern right now is with WAGES, PRICES, TAXES and PRODUCTION. All of the strikes today and those in

(Continued on page 3)

Tarrytown Strikers Hold Demonstration

By SID ROBERTS
(Labor Action Staff Writer)

TARRYTOWN, N. Y.—Testifying to the fact that the morale of the "industrial soldiers" of UAW Local 864, is encouragingly high as their "war" against the industrial barons who determine the policy of General Motors neared the end of its third week, a group of 1000 people, composed of the strikers and sympathizers, marched through the streets of Tarrytown chanting "Solidarity Forever" and "Wilson is a Horse-Thief," among other militant union songs.

The demonstrators, headed by ex-GIs, carried signs reading, "GIs vs. GM"; "30% or Watch the Fords go by"; "Hitler burned books, GM hides them," and "What have the DuPonts got that we haven't got?" (Quite a few million dollars and controlling interest in GM and a few other shops.—S.R.) The demonstration was held at 3 P.M. Sunday, December 9, with the Westchester CIO Council as the sponsor.

After the parade, the marchers assembled at GM's gates to listen to the main speakers of the day, Manny Gerber, director of UAW Region 9, Harry Sacker, legal representative of the TWU, and Father Darby, rep-

resentative of the Catholic Trade Unionists Alliance. And, precisely at this writing, class-collaboration politics displaced the class-struggle spirit displayed on the picket-lines at Tarrytown and GM plants all over the country. One couldn't help but notice the difference between the working-class in action and the line put forward, by their representatives.

THE POSITION OF GM

Gerber spoke of the proven ability of GM to pay the 30% increase the UAW is demanding, pointing out that, should the strikers win their fight, GM's profit in 1946 will be \$280 million as compared to the average yearly profit of \$176 million in the years preceding the war. He also mentioned the difference in the way Congress dealt with legislation favoring the working-class as compared with bills designed to aid the boss class.

The "Full Employment" bill, he said, is still in a House Committee, as is the bill to increase the unemployment insurance allowance. But the recent tax bill that was considered of the monopolistic corporations and their stockholders went through Congress in three weeks and there isn't much doubt that Truman's "fact-finding" (Continued on page 2)

The UAW Strike: The Road to Victory

By MAX SHACHTMAN

National Secretary of the Workers Party

The position originally taken by the UAW-CIO in its negotiations with General Motors opened the road to victory.

By taking this position, labor said:

We will no longer look at the problem of our economic security from the narrow standpoint of wages alone. Our wage question is inseparably connected with the question of prices, with the question of profits, with the question of production, with the whole question of the way in which American economic life is organized.

The position of the Union in the GM negotiations was one of the most progressive steps ever taken by labor in this country, especially if all its implications are taken into account.

The Union challenged the big DuPont monopoly on fundamental grounds, on grounds of principle.

The GM masters said: Hands off our profits! Hands off our monopolistic prices! Hands off "private property!" Hands off the "rights of management!" The principle of "free enterprise"—that is, of capitalist monopolism—is at stake.

In effect, the union said: All these matters are no less our affair than they are yours. We want economic security for the workers, who have never enjoyed it and never been assured of it. We want a decisive voice in determining the prices of automobiles which you maintain at a monopolistic peak. We want a decisive voice in determining the profits of the corporation prices, profits which exceed anything in history—profits which, by the way, were produced by the toil and brains of the workers.

In effect, the Union said: We no longer trust the "captains of industry" to own and manage industry exclusively on their own. They are not the servants of the people they pretend to be. They are interested only in bigger and bigger profits, at the expense of the workers and the consumers. If they alone determine prices, everyone else will suffer. If they alone determine prices, the prices will be monopolistically high and the consumer will suffer. If they alone determine wages, we will soon be back to the rotten open-shop days.

Therefore, the Union demands the right to intervene actively in all these questions. The monopolists are a gang of bankrupts, so far as the interests of the workers and consumers are concerned. Labor is not less able to determine wages, prices and profits than these profit-lusting bankrupts. Labor speaks not only in its own name, but in the name of all the people outside the ranks of the DuPonts and their ilk.

That was the meaning of the UAW-CIO's position.

The Road to Disaster

The Leonard plan is the road to disaster. It is not only we socialists who say so. Every thinking and militant UAW man says so.

Why wasn't the same plan presented to Ford and to GM? What is the difference between them? Don't both of them exploit the workers in the same way? Aren't both of them hateful enemies of labor and unionism? Don't both of them have monopolistic agreements on monopolistic prices? Haven't both of them piled up vast blood-profits, and aren't both of them determined to pile up more and more, without a ceiling?

Leonard has driven a knife into the ribs of the GM strike, and Reuther and Thomas helped him do it. It's the most natural thing in the world for GM to say now: "We won't even talk about your original demands. Let's talk only on the basis of the Leonard plan presented to Ford. We're no different from Ford. We ought to be handled the same way."

And what is the same way? Hands off our vast profits! Hands off our monopolistic prices! Tie the workers hand and foot. Give us this Plan which makes it possible for us to provoke a thousand "unauthorized" strikes in a thousand different ways, so that we can break the backbone and spirit and pocketbook of every worker, beginning with the militant fighters

That's how the capitalist press understood it, and they were right! Even that press had to admit that in putting forward its position, the UAW-CIO had won tremendous sympathy not only from other workers, but from big sections of the wider consumer public and the middle classes.

That position was the road to victory! Along that road, labor could have taken the next step: Let the government nationalize and take over the industry which its present owners themselves admit cannot be operated on the basis of decent wages to the workers and fair prices to the consumers. Labor could have taken another step: The workers insist that they can operate industry on the basis they themselves demand of the DuPonts, namely, on the basis of capacity production, decent wages and low prices to the consumer. Labor could have taken a final step: If the present government proves to be a DuPont government—as it has proved to be—then we must have a Workers' Government. And that would mean the achievement of REAL VICTORY.

The challenge of Reuther to GM was at the same time a challenge to Reuther himself, and to his fellow union leaders. They put forward excellent demands to GM. Every intelligent worker was behind them. But when GM rejected these excellent and simple demands, what then? Wasn't that a confession that GM cannot and will not run industry in the interests of society? Wasn't that a confession that GM are social bankrupts? And wasn't that at the same time a challenge to the UAW-CIO leaders? If they say that industry can operate on the basis of their demands—as we certainly believe—and if GM says it can't operate on that basis, the next step should have been to say:

If GM won't, we declare that we will! If GM can't, we declare that we can! If the present government doesn't agree, we will organize politically into a party of our own and set up a government that does agree!

But Reuther and his fellow leaders didn't say that or anything of the kind. They didn't meet their own challenge. They ran away from it as fast as they could. They turned back from the road to victory. They want to bring all the UAW-CIO members along with them on this road back. They are scared by their own boldness, and by the enthusiasm and support it generated among the workers. They are scared by the completeness with which they themselves laid bare the reactionary character and bankruptcy not only of the big monopolists but of the government in Washington which their politics helped to put into power.

And that is why, now, with the support Reuther, yes Reuther! and Thomas and the rest of them have given to the Leonard Plan in the Ford negotiations, they want to take the Union and the workers off the road to victory and on to—

and ending with the most docile worker in the plant. We'll break them by fining them from now on with union approval. We'll break them by intimidation, with union approval. Every worker who talks up from now on—gets it right across the nose—and across his pocket!

The Leonard Plan is a crime. It can only demoralize the workers. It can only embitter them against the Union. It can only undermine and weaken the union to the point where the monopolists sweep it away with a wave of the hand.

It is the road to disaster for the largest and finest union in the country!

It must be repudiated! Every union militant must join to win the just demands of the workers against the auto monopolists, in spite of the treacherous position taken by the International leaders. And these leaders themselves, must be called to account immediately by the outraged rank and file. They must be replaced by fighters who don't scare and who don't capitulate.

The road to victory which was first indicated is still the road to victory, not only for the UAW but for the entire labor movement.

Labor issued a challenge. It must not be allowed to become a mere bluff.

What Are PAC-Backed Congressmen Doing?

By ELEANOR MASON

Congress is going great guns these days on anti-labor legislation. This self-same Congress that has steadfastly refused to do a thing about any of the issues so vital to the workers and the people finds plenty of time to rush ahead with vicious measures to throttle the trade union movement and kill its efforts at political action.

This was the Congress whose overwhelming Democratic victory was due in large part to the activities of the Political Action Committee of the CIO. This was the Congress that was going to win the "people's war and the people's peace." Today, Philip Murray cries out in anger that Congress and the President are betraying the people. True, that is, for those who followed Murray's lead of

picking some "good" capitalist politician and hoping he'd look out for the working people.

Trade unionists and all those concerned with seeing that labor starts on the road of genuine independent political action are particularly interested in just what the Congressmen elected with the aid of the PAC are doing to fight for labor's rights.

Almost one hundred PAC-sponsored representatives sit in Congress by the grace of PAC's aid in 1944.

Progressive trade unionists should regularly follow the activities of Congress with special notice of the doings of PAC congressmen. We start here with information and comments on some of the pending legislation.

The Smith-Connelly bill was passed by Congress in an attempt to stop workers from striking. It not only has failed to do that job for the bosses but it has become a boomerang, since the government conducts strike polls for the unions. So now the government wants to drop that aspect of the Smith-Connelly bill and substitute the more stringent anti-labor provisions of the Smith-Arends bill.

The Smith-Arends bill deprives unions of collective bargaining rights if they strike in violation of a no-strike clause in their contracts (carried in practically all agreements) and prohibits unions from engaging in political campaigns even in a purely educational way. The bill would kill the labor movement as well as the PAC, which exists on the basis of the unions.

Rushed through the House Military Affairs Committee without hearings, the bill was approved by the Rules Committee. It has not yet reached the House floor only because the Truman Administration wants action first on the Norton-Ellender bill embodying Truman's straitjacket proposals for fact-finding bodies and a thirty-day cooling-off period. Compare this lightning speed to the slower than snail-like pace of the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill to liberalize the provisions of the social security law. This bill is still in committee after two years!

The CIO, AFL, United Mine Workers and other unions are violently opposed to the Smith bill and Truman's bill. They have issued statements denouncing them. Hearings on Truman's proposal, which start this week, will find a solid array of labor spokesmen against it. But what are the "friends" of labor doing? What are the PAC congressmen doing? Here's what one of them is doing:

Senator Brien McMahon, widely acclaimed liberal and PAC congressman, has introduced a bill setting up a mediation and conciliation board and providing for voluntary arbitration. This is but another variation of the proposals which attempt either to curtail or abolish labor's basic right to strike. The CIO opposes the measure of "their" congressman!

In the House, another PAC congressman, Democratic Leader John McCormack of Massachusetts, is (Continued on page 3)

Mass Picketing at GM; Solidarity of Steelworkers

By JACK WILSON

The CIO pressure against General Motors corporation increased heavily this week with the rejection of President Truman's strike-breaking proposals and with the fresh threat of a nation-wide steel strike.

Any hope General Motors had last week of smashing the strike was dashed to pieces when the UAW ranks and leadership stood firmly against President Truman's strike-breaking move.

The knowledge of this union solidarity forced General Motors to retreat somewhat from its arrogant attitude and to renew negotiations.

Continued negotiations with the Ford Motor Company also offered a possibility that the UAW would make a dent in the industrialists' united front against the UAW demands for a living wage for the auto workers.

In announcing January 14 as a strike date deadline unless wage demands were met satisfactorily, the United Steelworkers of America-CIO placed the power of 700,000 steel workers into the battle against the Wall Street corporations.

A contribution of \$100,000 was given to the UAW strike fund by the USA policy committee, emphasizing the close relationship between the unions and their struggle.

The steel union's rejection of President Truman's proposals, as well as the attack of all organized labor on his congressional program, gave further strength to the position of the UAW strikers this week.

UAW Meet Turns Down Truman Plan

DETROIT, Dec. 9.—A meeting of 200 UAW delegates from GM plants turned thumbs down on President Truman's order to return to work, at an emergency session held here yesterday. This decision will be underlined and re-emphasized thousands of times over next week, when local union members vote on their delegates' recommendations.

SENTIMENTS OF STRIKERS

If Fisher Body in Detroit is a sample, there will not be one vote cast in favor of Truman's demand to go back to work. The workers on the picket lines in front of the Fisher Body plants here are remarkably unimpressed by Truman's proposal for settlement of their strike. Said one, in answer to our question: "Sure I'll vote to go back in—when we get our 30% wage increase." Said another: "We aren't striking for the fun of it. We're out here to win something. Why should we go back to work with nothing—not even a promise—just because someone tells us to, even if that someone is president of the U. S.?" And the picketer walking in front of him chimed in: "If Truman's so anxious to get the facts in the case, let him appoint his fact-finding commission while we're walking these lines on the outside. The facts won't be any easier to find if we go back to work. This is just another attempt to break our strike. They know and we know that the minute we walk through those gates without winning our demands, we've lost the strike!"

One worker said to me, while we were drinking a cup of hot coffee on a windy corner: "Look, sister—I have five children at home. We're cash-

(Continued on page 2)

MEN ARE FIRM

Among the GM strikers confidence remained high as a result of these major developments and a series of mass demonstrations took place over the week-end reminiscent of the good old days. Mass picketing was employed in a one-day demonstration in Detroit. Elsewhere, parades were held by the strikers.

In the midst of these favorable developments, the proposal of the UAW leadership to give the Ford Motor Company "security" represented a serious retreat that can have repercussions in GM.

No sooner did GM hear of this unprecedented concession to Ford than it canceled its contract with the UAW until a similar concession was given it.

The UAW leaders' proposal to Ford—and the whole UAW leadership supported it—provides the company with a weapon against union militants in the shop and weakens the union, even though the check-off and full union recognition accompany it. The power of Ford to fire unionists without union intervention endangers the position of the shop stewards.

Unable to defeat the UAW on the picket lines, and this is a real tribute to the power of the strikers, the auto companies are forced into flank attacks against the UAW. They want to accomplish in negotiations what was impossible on the streets: weaken the union.

However, the UAW ranks time and again have stood as a powerful corrective force to any would-be maneuvers or blunders of the leadership. The voice of the ranks will be decisive again.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Minnesota PAC Flirts With Stassen

HIBBING, Minn., Dec. 3—LABOR ACTION has consistently maintained that there is no essential difference between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party...

To which the congressional chorus echoed: "Amen!"

As if to bear out LABOR ACTION's position that labor must cut itself out of the web of capitalist politics by forming its own independent Labor Party...

Since Benson claims to speak officially for the National Citizens PAC, he presumably speaks also for the CIO-PAC. On the surface, Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party Benson would appear to be booming Stassen for the presidency in 1948...

"Stassen," said Benson in a public announcement, "is to be particularly commended because he proposes to make the Republican Party a liberal, progressive party."

Stassen claims to speak officially for the National Citizens PAC, he presumably speaks also for the CIO-PAC. On the surface, Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party Benson would appear to be booming Stassen for the presidency in 1948...

1. Last July it became evident that the war was lost to Japan. That meant cancellation of billions in war contracts and millions of lost jobs and paychecks. Nevertheless, "our" fair-minded congressmen stopped just long enough to rush through another bill providing guaranteed war-level profits for the money trust...

2. After recently voting big business the staggering sum of \$7 billion in tax refunds, tax "relief" and guaranteed profits in the reconversion period, these Republicans and Democrats faced toward labor...

Everywhere we went—to the lines on Piquette, on Beaubien, Milwaukee, Russell, we got the same answers. The GM workers are firmly determined to win this major battle against the corporations. They are quiet and serious, solidly united in the struggle.

When we asked the strikers their opinions of the proposal to re-open the parts plants, there was again unanimous agreement. Everyone was against it, on the grounds that it would be an opening wedge in the solid front of strikers. One worker insisted that the entire UAW should be on strike, and blasted away at the present strategy of "one at a time."

A few workers expressed their disillusionment with the "friends of labor" they helped put into office last year, who now turn out to be such good friends of the bosses. We pointed to the program of LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party, calling for an independent labor party.

Several agreed that it was a "good idea" and that "we ought to do what labor did in England," but doubted that it is possible as yet in the U. S. "Labor has to be educated," they say.

LABOR is being educated—on the picket lines.

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

offer my congratulations for your excellent article, "GM Theory of Wages" which appeared in the November 5 issue of LABOR ACTION, and, secondly to request information regarding your views—on socialism and related subjects—From Detroit. Just samples of the many requests that help build the Workers Party.

"I think that you are carrying the Press Action box in the right place. I bought a hand printing set and now stamp the words 'Subscribe—Only One a Year' several times on each page. I then lift the corner of the fourth sheet, which exposes the Press Action box, and mark it with red or purple crayon to attract the reader's eye."

And the subs we are getting from Minnesota proves that this effort is worth the trouble.

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

defend big business and sandbag the workers with equal cheerfulness and facility. But when you understand that Benson, and the labor "leadership" generally, are finding it increasingly difficult to sell Truman to the labor vote in view of the President's recent record, this espousal of Stassen may be a quiet warning to Truman to put a little velvet on his knuckles before battering the workers further—else they may not be able to deliver the labor vote for him in '48.

Again, Truman may already be so discredited, and the Democratic régime generally, that the PAC foresees no hope of herding labor to the polls in either '46 or '48 for the current "friends of labor" and are therefore polishing up Stassen, the "liberal" war vet and Republican hope. The New York mayoralty campaign appears to have put Governor Dewey out of the running for good, and what other Republican than Stassen could you possibly dupe the workers with?

LISTEN AND LEARN Whatever the facts in Benson's espousal of Stassen, one thing stands out—no worker can benefit from playing this capitalist political game. This is a game in which the cards are always stacked against labor. Heads, Truman, or tails, Stassen, labor gets it in the neck.

If Benson and the other PAC heads were truly for independent labor political action, they would be organizing political and financial support from the millions of rank and file workers eager to show their solidarity and common interests with the

hard-pressed UAW - CIO strikers against the united auto trust.

If Benson was not a disgruntled politician seeking to mend his fences with labor support, he would be publicly defending the militant CIO steel workers, who, like the striking auto workers, have suffered paycuts and layoffs and company provocations in succession since V-J Day and before.

Calumet, Minn.—260 Yes, 12 No! Buckeye Mine: 48 Yes, 1 No! Minnesota: 10,000-odd Yes, 1,000-minus No!

From mine to village to state, the answer is the same: Strike! But Benson and the PAC are busy elsewhere. The auto workers of the CIO and all the millions of hard-pressed workers throughout the country may be fighting the fat corporations to preserve their unions and maintain their take-home pay; Truman and Burton, Ball and Hatch, Bilbo and Taft, General Motors Wilson and Ford's Ford II may be throwing everything in the book at labor's vanguard in the CIO unions in an attempt to smash the workers; destruction of one union, AFL or CIO, may quickly lead to destruction of all free unions; yet—

from Elmer A. Benson, erstwhile Farmer - Labor Governor, current "friend of labor," chum of Hillman and Murray and assorted Democrats and Republicans; only silence! Except, of course, his PAC bouquets to a "liberal" Republican labor-baiter. The "friends of labor" cast a wide net!

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

Labor Party Trends

By MARY BELL

Two significant events of the past two weeks testify that the wholesale disgust of labor—CIO, AFL and UMW—with the labor-backed Truman Administration can become a groundswell for the formation of a genuine independent labor party.

The first, most forthright and most significant was the approval by the UAW strike committee representing 42,000 workers in Flint, Mich., one of the principal centers of General Motors production, of a resolution calling for the formation of an active political force to represent labor under its own name. The resolution requested the conference of 200 UAW representatives of GM locals which met in Detroit last Saturday to:

1—Mobilize the American people against the anti-labor conspiracy in Congress.

2—Lay the groundwork for the formation of a labor party.

3—Mobilize a mass march on Washington to halt congressional offenses against labor.

The second and less forthright, but nevertheless significant event, was the action taken last Sunday by the New Jersey State Industrial Union Council, CIO, which followed the suggestion of the National CIO Executive Board that all state industrial union councils take over political action committees, and ordered the formerly autonomous New Jersey PAC to become a committee of the state council. A move for the outright formation of a labor party was defeated in the New Jersey meeting.

These events were preceded by the radio address of Philip Murray, analyzed last week in LABOR ACTION, which announced the first break in a ten-year alliance of the CIO with the Democratic Administration.

President Truman, inheritor of the policies of former President Roosevelt, has provoked the anger of both ranks and leaders of the entire organized labor movement by his strike breaking, pro-corporation intervention in the General Motors strike.

Organized labor is fast finding out that in order to gain higher wages, strikes, picketing and economic action are not enough.

The United Auto Workers, massed in the union halls and on the picket lines of the country, have found out that economic action is not sufficient to win their battle. They have demanded in their struggle for higher wages that the auto corporations OPEN THEIR BOOKS, that is, reveal their profits and their wage costs, so that the union may demonstrate that

it is possible to pay the wage increases and yet maintain prices of GM products so that the consumers will not be penalized by increased costs.

The company has said in effect: labor and the consumers be damned! Our ability to pay is none of your business! Determination of prices and profits is the prerogative of private enterprise! And swiftly to the aid of the corporations come their legislative representatives in Congress and their friend in the White House with his strike-breaking proposal and his "fact-finding" committees.

The action of the Flint strikers to buttress their ECONOMIC CLASS ACTION with POLITICAL CLASS ACTION must not only be lauded by union men and women everywhere. It should be EMULATED by them. They know that a labor government in Washington would not stand for the arrogant, public-be-damned attitude of the corporations. They would have control over their own labor representatives in Congress, just as the corporations now control the capitalist politicians who represent them there.

The company's books would be opened quickly if a labor government was in Washington. If the corporations showed that they were unable to manage their enterprises so that labor could receive a decent wage and security, a government of the workers would nationalize industry and so plan production under workers' control that unemployment would be eliminated and a high standard of living secured for all.

The Flint workers are moving in the right direction. It is impossible to say how definitive is the break between Murray and the other CIO leaders with Truman. The break may be only temporary. It may lead merely to the support of another Democratic politician a little friendlier to labor, such as Wallace. It may lead to the support of a "progressive" Republican of the Willkie school, such as Harold Stassen. Or it may lead to the formation of a "third party" that is not a labor party but an aggregate of farmers, labor and middle class elements such as was proposed by the Communists in the New Jersey CIO.

Any of these alternatives to the formation of a real labor party and an all-time break with capitalist politics will keep labor in the same old rut of electing "friendly" capitalist politicians, that is—friendly enemies.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

Labor should take the road of the Flint workers. Break once and for all with the enemy parties of labor, Republican or Democrat, and get on the high road of independent labor politics.

UAW Bars Truman Proposal--

(Continued from page 1)

ing our war bonds now, and it won't be long before they'll be all used up. But I'm willing to spend every cent I've managed to save and then go on relief if necessary, to win this strike. That's how important it is to me and to all the fellows."

Everywhere we went—to the lines on Piquette, on Beaubien, Milwaukee, Russell, we got the same answers. The GM workers are firmly determined to win this major battle against the corporations. They are quiet and serious, solidly united in the struggle.

When we asked the strikers their opinions of the proposal to re-open the parts plants, there was again unanimous agreement. Everyone was against it, on the grounds that it would be an opening wedge in the solid front of strikers. One worker insisted that the entire UAW should be on strike, and blasted away at the present strategy of "one at a time."

A few workers expressed their disillusionment with the "friends of labor" they helped put into office last year, who now turn out to be such good friends of the bosses. We pointed to the program of LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party, calling for an independent labor party.

Several agreed that it was a "good idea" and that "we ought to do what labor did in England," but doubted that it is possible as yet in the U. S. "Labor has to be educated," they say.

LABOR is being educated—on the picket lines.

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

Tarryton Strike --

(Continued from page 1)

ing measure will be dealt with at great speed. Gerber claimed that a combination of Republicans and poll-tax Democrats were responsible for this anti-working class policy (overlooking the fact that the great majority of Northern Democrats voted for the new tax bill). He recommended that the people bring pressure to bear on Congress.

Sacker contrasted the recent action taken by the Japanese Diet to give the Japanese workers the right to organize into trade unions and the right to strike with the threat of the impairment of the American workers' right to strike that Truman's recent actions have foreshadowed. He said that "the American people will not let Truman become an American Hitler." He, too, recommended that the people bring pressure to bear on Congress.

The last speaker, Father Darby, mentioned (quite correctly) that such a demonstration as he was addressing couldn't take place in Moscow today (which Mr. Sacker forgot

to state) because free trade unions didn't exist there. (However, Father Darby, himself, forgot to say that neither could it be held in Fascist Spain nor in Italy during the reign of Mussolini. The Catholic Church found itself able to refrain from criticizing Il Duce yesterday or Franco today—despite Father Darby's concern with the right of workers to have free unions.) He put forward his organization's program of advocating a decent wage for workers and a fair profit for bosses and counseled the workers not to forsake "the American Way" in their attempt to improve their living standards. (He should tell that to the bosses, who have not been above using "the Fascist Way" in breaking strikes and fighting the union movement.)

When the Tarrytown GM workers follow the example of the Flint workers and press for the formation of labor's own party, they will be serving their cause in the political field as well as they do today on the picket line.

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

With the Hyatt GM Strikers

By MARY HOWARD

(Labor Action Staff Writer)

HARRISON, N. J., Dec. 4—If the morale of all UAW strikers against General Motors is as good as that we found displayed by the members of Local 511, striking at the Hyatt Roller Bearing Plant, in New Jersey, we predict that General Motors will have a very hard time breaking this strike until every last demand is met.

Arriving there about 11:00 this morning, your LABOR ACTION reporter found every one of the five gates of the plant shut tight. In front of every gate was a picket squad of approximately twenty people, mostly men, with a few women. They were carrying signs, and walking briskly in a small circle to keep warm. Inside the gates nothing moved. Box cars stood on railroad sidings, smokestacks belched forth no smoke, and windows stared blank and empty.

The picket captain took us up to the union headquarters across the street, which we found crowded and heavy with smoke. On the stairs we had to squeeze along the wall to let about fifty men by who were on their way to relieve the picket squads we had just seen. In the hall itself about two hundred people were milling around. Some were playing cards; some just sitting talking. Along the walls were a good many women, and in one corner a small bar where girls were dispensing coffee, donuts, and sandwiches to the men who had just come off the picket line, cold and hungry.

WHAT THE UNION WANTS Someone brought Bill Casper, union president, up and we introduced ourselves and LABOR ACTION. Bill is a short, dark man, with a ready smile. He was busy, and people kept coming up with questions, but he took us aside and said for us to ask the questions, and he'd be ready with the answers.

He said Local 511 has its own local demands which are "just as important as the UAW's national demands for a 30% increase." When Bill was in Detroit just before the strike began, he said he made this plain to the international officers, and they agreed with him. The local wants to abolish

a lot of evils they've been working under in the Hyatt plant.

First among these is the hated incentive system, which they call the "gyp racket." Next is the "merit spread," which means people don't get raises unless they lick the boss's boots the right way. The union is demanding a program of automatic raises, which will be fair to every individual worker. Also they want to get rid of a seven-day continuous operation schedule in force in the heat treating department of the plant, which means workers in this division get no holiday or Sunday overtime pay, and have only every sixth day off, instead of a regular weekend. Last demand is the abolishment of a shift system which has one short shift. Men working this shift have to work six nights in order to make a full forty hour week, which means they get no weekend as the rest of the plant does.

Asked about President Truman's speech Monday night, Bill Casper said, "We all heard that speech, and we don't like it a bit!" Later we were talking to a striker in the hall who said emphatically, "If we do what Truman wants us to do we'd be losing everything we've been fighting for for the last ten, fifteen years." Another serious little man with glasses said, "Truman's shown he's playing ball with the industrialists. It's up to us to show both GM and Truman we mean what we say, and we mean to get it!"

Casper told us that the whole town is co-operating with the strikers. "The railroad brotherhood won't run a car into the plant yard," he said, "and even wives come down with their kids, ready to help. The kids want to carry the signs right along with the pickets. You can't hold 'em back."

He said the union had spent very little of their strike fund (which would last at least six months) so far. They've had cash donations from merchants in town, and most of the food has been given to them free.

While we were talking to him, a man stuck his head out a door labeled "checks cashed here" and yelled "Hey, there's a cash contribution here; shall we accept it?" Bill laughed and said sure. It turned out to be a delegation from the furriers union,

who wanted to go on the picket line, as well as donate their cash.

Around the hall were about a half dozen signs carrying slogans: "NO APPLE SELLING THIS TIME—30%"; "HITLER BURN BOOKS, GM HIDES BOOKS—LET'S SEE THEM!"; "REUTHER IS OUR LEADER, HE SHALL NOT BE MOVED!"; "30% MEANS FOOD AND CLOTHES FOR OUR KIDS." In the middle of one wall was a tin sign saying "Gas donated by Victor's Tavern."

Up in front of the hall was a long table where tickets were formed into squads of twenty each, given bright colored cards to denote their squad. Every twenty minutes squads changed, and the hall became, momentarily a mad house.

We talked with a good many men who said, with emphasis, "We won't go back until we get ALL we want!" Every one of them seemed ready for a good long strike, if necessary, and they said their wives felt just the same way about it as they did. Asked if they expected government interventions, one man said, "If the government intervenes, we'll have arbitration and the union will lose as a result. We might get a 17% settlement then, but what WE want is the 30%—we need it!"

A woman, who seemed reluctant to talk at first, told us: "We have a right to make a decent living just as much as any GM president or shareholder." We asked another woman if her husband worked in the plant. "No," she said, "he's on the Force. He thinks just the way I do. He swears at those b-----s something awful."

As we left the headquarters a loud speaker put up outside a window was playing union songs. "From eight to ten at night," Casper had said, "there's a regular party out there. They dance and sing. It's the best time to be here."

We went away with a good feeling. Here were men and women who knew what they wanted, and how to get it. We remembered the words of one of them. "Striking's the only way to show GM they can't go on making millions and giving us only \$30 a week to feed a whole family on. The sooner they realize we mean business the better off they'll be. 'Cause we're not giving in!"

LABOR ACTION SUBS REC'D: New York 17, New Jersey 4, San Francisco 2, Los Angeles 3, Cleveland 3, Reading 4, Chicago 8, Oregon 4, Other States 8, Total 59

BUSINESS MANAGER'S PRESS ACTION BY PAUL BERN

"Elizabeth Scott, heroine of 'You Came Along'—was Elizabeth Scott (in 1941). During the war she patriotically dropped the 'E' to conserve newsprint."—From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

We bring the above to the attention of our editor, who is always gripping about the length of this column. We too want that all-out effort. But, after all, you can't blame the editor, who has material for eight pages and each week must squeeze it into four.

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR
Published Weekly by the
Labor Action Publishing Assn.
114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.
CH. 2-9681 (Third Floor)



Vol. 9, No. 51

December 17, 1945

ALBERT GATES, Editor
MARY BELL, Ass't Editor

Subscription Rate: 60c a Year; 35c for 6 Mos. (75c-40c for Canada, Foreign, New York City, Bronx)
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

UAW-Ford Proposals - -

the making revolve first of all around the question of wages. Strikes halt production; this is their chief tactical purpose. This is the point at which the working class is in complete control of its own actions and can act in complete disregard of the desires and plans of the capitalist employers.

WHO IS SECURE?

The proposals made to the Ford company by the UAW are in total disregard of the facts and the history of the past few years. The Ford Motor Co. and all other capitalist corporations are already protected and secure. The capitalist ruling class, which owns these vast manufacturing corporations and the big banks, is protected and secure. Any further protection and security which they need, they can give themselves. They are protected and have security because they own all the property: the mines, mills, factories and the land. They own the banks, the railroads, the communications systems, the public utilities, the big stores. They make huge profits and pile up billions in capital, plant and equipment. They distribute billions in dividends and interest to themselves each year.

Added to this, the capitalist ruling class, which owns all the wealth and property, has its own government in Washington; in every state, county, city, town and hamlet. They own and control this government. They operate it for their protection, for their security and for the protection and security of their property and their profits. Their government in Washington guarantees their profits and protects their property with the police and the army.

FOR LABOR SECURITY

What do the workers have in the way of protection and security? We own no property: no land, mines, mills, factories and banks. WE HAVE NO GOVERNMENT OF OUR OWN. All we have is the millions of us and our capacity for doing the jobs which the capitalist employers give us. Since we own no land, mines, mills, factories, railroads and banks, all we can do is work for the capitalists who do own these things. We make no profits. We receive no dividends and interest. We have no reserves and no capital.

The working class does have its unions, however. They are its security and its protection. Labor can have no other protection and security except the organization of the whole working class into unions and into an INDEPENDENT POLITICAL PARTY OF THE WORKING CLASS.

The plan which the IEB of the UAW has authorized Leonard to present to the Ford Motor Co. strikes directly at the Ford union and the whole trade union movement. It says to a powerful corporation that the union and the workers are ready to place themselves at the mercy of a fascist-minded employer who has demonstrated a viciousness in his relations with labor unsurpassed by any employer in the country, Tom Girdler included.

The fines to be levied will not come from the union treasury but from the earnings of the individual workers. The UAW bureaucrats see to it that the International treasury, from which their salaries come, is not molested. The fines will not come from the local treasury, and thus the local officers will have their security protected.

AN ATTACK ON UNIONISM

The plan is a direct attack on the shop steward and shop committeeman system. What decent and militant union man will be a shop steward or committeeman under such a plan? What can they do? Any action in the interests of their men can result in their being charged with "instigating, fomenting or giving leadership" to a strike. Can any plan have been conceived of greater benefit to the employer? Militant stewards can be and will be fired under this plan. Thereby the workers in the plant have their organization headed. Under this plan no steward can fight to have any important grievance settled. Any insistence on settlement of grievances can and will result in the loss of his job.

All workers in the plant will have the threat of a fine constantly hanging over their heads. It is possible under this sys-

tem for workers to lose from one-half to all of a week's wages. The hypocrisy of the thing resides in that choice piece of shysterism which proposes that the fines go to the "President's Infantile Paralysis Fund!" What consolation this will be to workers and their families!

The UAW bureaucrats do not dare take upon themselves the collection of these fines. They turn this pleasant task over to the Ford Company. Along with the check-off which goes to the International office, the company will withhold the fine money which will go to the Infantile Paralysis Fund, and not to the Ford Motor Company which is presumably so much in need of protection and security.

IT IS A BLOW AT THE UAW

This proposal of the UAW traitors has no relation in any way to collective bargaining or to the violation of contractual relations. Nothing is involved that has anything to do essentially with collective bargaining or observance of agreements. There is no issue here of the right of the union leadership to invoke union discipline where necessary, nor is the right of the union leadership to invoke union discipline over strikes involved.

This action of the UAW leadership is not only an attack on the Ford workers today but it is a blow delivered at the GM workers who are now on strike. By this act they not only deliver the Ford workers to Ford but they also deliver the GM workers over to the du Pont family. The unprecedented but excellent GM demands are countermanded by the action taken in connection with Ford. While the GM workers are on strike and demanding to see the corporation's books the Ford workers are told that if they do not submit sheepishly to the demands and attacks of Ford they will be forced to give a part of their earnings to the "President's Infantile Paralysis Fund."

What is behind this treachery from the UAW leadership? FEAR, COWARDICE, AMBITION and STUPIDITY. Fear of the increasing militancy of the membership of the International. The pent-up resentment of the workers during the war years is being let loose today in demands such as labor has never made before.

They fear the employers because they have no weapon to fight with unless they can get and keep the support and confidence of their membership. They fear the government at Washington because they know that this government will not heed their pleas.

These bureaucrats fear one another. One might outdo the other and one may get more publicity than the other in the capitalist press.

WHAT TO DO

Above all the trade union leadership is afraid of the militant ranks of labor itself. They are haunted by the imminence of mass strike action. Not just the old-fashioned strikes around simple wage demands but strikes demanding the control of profits, prices and perhaps later the control of dividends. This leadership knows in its own stupid way that such demands are not mere trade union demands.

This is the meaning of the Ford "security" plan. This is the meaning of the proposal to arbitrate one day before the GM strike. The UAW plan for Ford is a monstrous proposal. There will be more of these proposals from the trade union leadership. The only way to save the unions for the role which they ought to play is for the militants to assert themselves. The only effective answer to the surrender of the trade union leadership is an offensive against the capitalist employers:

Against GM, Chrysler, Ford, the steel corporations, General Electric, Westinghouse.

Such an offensive can only be carried through effectively if the real militants in the unions band themselves together to push the top leadership forward or to push them out. Such a step must of course be given a correct programmatic base, a correct motivation and must be based on the firm and clear understanding that it is only through the political organization of labor that the Fords, du Ponts and all the tribe of exploiters can be finally defeated.

AN EXCHANGE BETWEEN WP AND SWP MINORITY ON UNITY ISSUE

Readers of LABOR ACTION will recall the material this paper carried on the unity negotiations between the Workers Party and the Socialist Workers Party. The question of unity arose when a minority group led by Albert Goldman and Felix Morrow, two leaders of the SWP, declared itself in favor of the unification of the WP and SWP. When the National Committee of the Workers Party learned of the position on unity taken by the minority group, it addressed itself formally to the National Committee of the SWP, proposing the opening of negotiations between the two parties with the aim of unification.

The agreement of the SWP to hold such negotiations, as it turned out, was simply a maneuver. It had no serious intention to work toward the unification of the WP and SWP, throwing up one obstacle after another. One of the issues involved was the position taken by the representatives of the Workers Party in two negotiating meetings that the Workers Party, sincerely believing in unity but opposed to the firmly entrenched bureaucratic régime in the SWP, which was in violation of revolutionary socialist organizational principles, would retain the right to issue, whenever it deemed necessary, a tendency bulletin inside the SWP under its own supervision and direction.

When asked by the SWP why the WP demanded this right in order to guarantee its democratic existence, the representatives of the WP made it clear that their party had no faith in the kind of régime which prevailed in the Socialist Workers Party. During the negotiations, the representatives of the SWP did not question this right but subsequently made it one of the primary reasons why unity could not be consummated. They stated that the Workers Party intended to issue such a bulletin immediately after unification and to wage such factional warfare as to destroy the unified party. This is, of course, untrue.

The real reason why unity is not consummated is the fear by the Cannon leadership of the SWP of a strong tendency within their party which might challenge their leadership.

Since the issue of the tendency bulletin was made one of the primary reasons why unity was impossible, the minority group addressed the letter published below to the Workers Party asking it to restate its intentions in this matter. The clarifying reply made by the Workers Party only helps to make the case against the bureaucratic régime of the SWP stronger.

Instead of meeting the issue of unity forthrightly as it is posed by the Workers Party and the minority, the leadership of the SWP issued a warning to the minority that disciplinary action would be invoked against it if it proceeded to force the unity issue in its present independent manner. The minority, in turn, denounced the action of the SWP Political Committee as "a typical piece of bureaucratic thinking and acting."

"Anxious above all to achieve unity, the minority presented a formal request to the WP to pledge, in the interests of consummating unity, not to express the right of a minority to publish its own tendency bulletin after unity has been achieved.

"The Workers Party consented to the request of the minority. Were the Political Committee majority honest in its attitude toward unity, it would have applauded this intervention of the minority. For thereby the ostensible obstacle to unity had been removed.

"Instead, the majority takes the attitude that nothing has been changed by this important concession of the WP. Thereby the majority shows that it used the tendency bulletin issue merely as a pretext to justify Cannon's unwillingness to unite. The hypocrisy of the Political Committee majority on this question is thus clearly revealed."

(The text of the correspondence appears below.—Ed.)

November 15, 1945
Max Shachtman, National Secretary
Workers Party
114 W. 14th St.
New York City, N. Y.
Dear Comrade:

The SWP plenum resolution on unity, in referring to the proposal of the WP negotiating committee on a tendency bulletin in the united party, merely states the following: the WP "would insist on the right to publish their own discussion bulletin under their own control." Ostensibly, therefore, the SWP majority does not take a position on this question. However, in the actual life of the party, it has become clear that the majority advances the tendency bulletin proposal as a great stumbling block to unity.

For our part, we do not believe that this is the real stumbling block to unity. Nevertheless we believe that it should be removed. The plenum refused to take note in its resolution of our distinction between the right to a tendency bulletin and the exercise of that right. We believe that the WP should make that distinction and pledge itself not to exercise the right in the united party under the following conditions:

(1) That the SWP cooperate closely with the WP for the purpose of preparing the membership of both parties for unity, and that after unity, there will be real cooperation of the SWP and the WP;

(2) That the SWP recognize the right of a minority to issue its own bulletin for the purpose of convincing the membership of the correctness of its views.

Needless to say, nobody could demand nor could the WP comrades agree, to refrain forever from exercising the right of a minority to issue its own bulletin. No responsible minority would exercise that right without great justification, but no responsible majority would ever prohibit it from exercising it. If the right is used unjustifiably, a majority should easily be able to discredit a minority for doing so. But a united Trotskyist party is so all-important today that for the sake of it we appeal to the comrades of the WP to pledge themselves not to exercise this right, subject to the conditions indicated above.

Fraternally yours,
FELIX MORROW
for the SWP Minority

November 27, 1945

Felix Morrow
SWP Minority Group
214 West 16th St.
New York, N. Y.

Dear Comrade Morrow:

Our Political Committee has agreed to the proposals on the question of the tendency bulletin made by the Minority Group of the Socialist Workers Party in your letter of November 15. Your proposals afford us still another occasion for reiterating and amplifying our position. It has been stated with sufficient clarity in our written communications to the Socialist Workers Party and at the two oral discussions that took place between the delegations of the two Parties prior to the recent Plenum of the SWP.

What was involved from the very beginning of the discussion on the unity of the two organizations was not a determination of the Workers Party comrades to issue a tendency bulletin of their own on the very first day of the existence of the projected unity Party, regardless of circumstances. For example, so far as our Political Committee was concerned, this was made clear in the first report made by its representative to a general membership of the New York Local of our Party, a report substantially repeated to most of the other Locals of our organization several months ago.

As you know, the question involved in reality was the right of the minority in the united Party to issue such a tendency bulletin. The SWP Plenum Resolution is literally correct in stating our position as an insistence "on the right to publish their own discussion, bulletin under their

own control." In the oral discussions between the delegations of the two Parties, it was not we but the principal representative of the SWP who called attention to the fact that, for example, the leadership of the American Trotskyist movement, himself included, had freely permitted the Oehler group to publish an internal bulletin of its own inside the organization in 1934-1935. Therefore, he added, it was not a question of the "right" to such a bulletin "in the abstract," a right which could presumably be granted; but rather a question of our "attitude." We could not then and cannot today construe this otherwise than as a reference to our opinions about the present majority faction of the SWP. These opinions we expressed candidly to the SWP delegation. We pointed to what is generally known, namely, the fact that our comrades do not have sufficient confidence in the present leadership of the SWP, particularly with reference to its record toward inner-party opponents and critics, and are therefore concerned with assuring their democratic rights in the united Party by having the minority's right to its own bulletin jointly acknowledged by both sides. We are perfectly ready to admit that abstractly considered this lack of confidence may prove to be exaggerated, or even groundless. In like manner, we admit that common work and common experiences in the united Party may cause the comrades of the Workers Party to abandon their opinions on this score. They are not ready, however, to abandon them merely on demand. What they are prepared to abandon in the interests of unity, has already been made amply clear and precise. We consider it enough.

We can go further and say that even the question of the right to issue a tendency bulletin is, in a sense, only the formal side of the matter. Ordinarily, it would not occupy the place of importance it has been given in the discussion on unity. As you so rightly put it, "we do not believe that this is the real stumbling block to unity." The "stumbling block" is the conception of the SWP Majority Group of the kind of Party revolutionary Marxists should have and build. Our Party shares with the Minority Group of the SWP the conception of the Bolsheviks which was fought for with such emphasis and clarity, especially since 1923-1924, by Trotsky and his supporters. The SWP Majority, in practice and often in words as well, holds the conception of a "monolithic" Party, which flies in the face of our whole tradition. We are compelled to say now that unity of the two organizations is possible only if this conception is abandoned. It is primarily in this sense that the question of the tendency bulletin is so important. It serves as the concrete test, at the present juncture, of the conceptions held on the kind of Party we must build—a sterile "monolithic" faction, or a united democratically-centralized party of action in which there is freedom of opinion and grouping, and the assurance of democratic rights for all views compatible with the fundamental program of revolutionary Marxism.

This is how the real issue stands. To it, the other considerations can well be subordinated, including the matter of whether a minority would issue a tendency bulletin the morning after the unification, a year afterward, or at all. It is in this sense that we are prepared to accept the proposals of the SWP Minority.

Fraternally yours,
MAX SHACHTMAN
National Secretary
Workers Party

MS/CW
Copy to:
J. P. Cannon, National Secretary
Socialist Workers Party
118 University Pl.
New York, N. Y.

OFF LIMITS

By James M. Fenwick

CHICKEN EVERY DAY

I suppose that there is hardly an infantryman who has not said at one time or another during his army career when the going was rough or the chicken was especially deep, "I sure wish now that I had enlisted in the navy. It's a lot better deal."

Of course, even while saying that, we had a sneaking suspicion that the West Point riff-raff, ex-numbers' racket salesmen, professional bootlickers, former college fraternity boys, pool room habitués, bond salesmen, policemen, and the reactionary and ignorant samples of the flower of southern chivalry who composed our officers, had their counterparts in the navy.

Life magazine recently printed some interviews with navy men that shows our suspicions to have been only too well founded. "They dislike the Navy," says the article, "for its traditional belief that an enlisted man can't think for himself; for its tendency to make him a 'prisoner of the ship' while the officers are allowed to go ashore; and for its habit of paying less attention to its men's all-around intelligence than any other branch of the service. . . ."

"The veterans have seen a wealth of Navy supplies and man-hours of labor lavished on officers' clubs in Hawaii, Bermuda, Noumea, Espiritu Santo, Manus, Ulithi, Guam, Leyte, Samar, and Saipan. They have carried officers' gear and baggage. They have toted provisions, beer and liquor to officers' clubs from freighters and supply ships.

"Some have been on smaller craft where the ship's movies were always held in the officers' wardroom, with standing room only for the men, instead of in the general mess where all officers and men could have been seated. They have been on ships where most of the welfare fund, or very disproportionate parts of the fund were spent on such items as golf clubs, tennis rackets and football tickets, which only benefited the officers.

"A radioman, now on the Seattle, part of the receiving station at Pier 92 in New York, recalls seeing gangs of Seabees and Filipinos work for weeks at Manila to prepare the flower beds and lawns of one of the Pacific's largest villas for the occupancy of a vice admiral."

WHAT ABOUT THE ARMY?

It is not surprising to find that some of the men feel that the contemptible treatment is peculiar to the navy and that things are better in the army. One navy man "suggested that the admirals study the human-relations set-up in the 1st Marine Division, the 1st Cavalry Division, the 1st Infantry Division, the Rangers or any of General Patton's armored divisions. 'In those outfits the men always come first. They're fed first. They get to wash first, if there's a chance. They're bivouacked first and they're dug in first. And if it's a matter of recreation, the officers start for their own only after they've fixed it up for the troops to get theirs.'"

The writer of this column cannot speak for most of the outfits mentioned, but I can speak of conditions within the First Division, of which I was a member for fifteen months. And I am sorry to report to our navy friend that life in "The Fighting First" was not only not as he imagines, but directly the opposite. In short, it was much like life in the navy.

As a matter of fact, the life of the enlisted man in all the armies and navies of the world is much the same, except that the life of the enlisted men in foreign armies is infinitely worse. Anyone who had the slightest contact with foreign soldiers knows the miserable conditions under which they exist.

THE BRITISH AND THE FRENCH

The redeployment situation in the English army, for instance, is worse than ours, especially when it is considered that many English soldiers have been fighting for six years and are still forced to fight against colonial liberation movements all over the Far East. From one rubber plant in England, 4,000 men were inducted into the army. To date, only twelve have been returned through redeployment, and six of them have been re-inducted into the army.

The French enlisted man is no better off. The French economy is so decrepit that it can hardly sustain an army. A private's pay is 180 francs a month—or less than what an American soldier can get on the French black market for two packages of cigarettes. Since the army cannot furnish the French soldier a complete uniform, he is forced to buy it on the black market (at 800 francs for a pair of o.d. pants and a shirt) or make a deal with an American soldier. Discipline is even more petty and intense than in the American army. In generals like de Lattre, who personally inspects his men's teeth and underwear, and has palatial headquarters built for him by the enlisted men, France has a general who can give even a human zero like Patton a few lessons.

The discipline in the German and Japanese armies was notorious in its brutality. It is useless to try to attempt to explain this condition by imagining that it is caused by simple ignorance on the part of certain officers, that it flows from bad precedents established by the Royal Navy, or that it is simply "the Army."

As long as capitalism with its class society exists there will also exist a capitalist army with an aristocratic minority riding upon the backs of the majority, who possess almost no rights.

Since very few people in their right senses will join a capitalist army voluntarily under "normal" circumstances, and since capitalist propaganda has great difficulty in hiding the fact that the war is solely for the benefit of capitalist profits, the army has to be created and held together by force.

This force is wielded by the officer caste, that privileged minority which is bribed by capitalism through better pay, the best cuts of meat, a jeep and driver, a softer bed roll, access to nurses for social purposes, liquor rations, dog-robbers, terminal leave, salutes, separate entrances to buildings, private latrines, and better burials. It's as simple as that.

Tresca Murder Anniversary

NEW YORK CITY—In the Great Hall in Cooper Union Institute, where Abraham Lincoln once spoke against slavery, prominent labor union officials and others who were Carlo Tresca's friends will pay tribute to his memory at a mass meeting on Thursday, January 10. That will be one day ahead of the third anniversary of the unpunished murder of the editor of the Italian anti-totalitarian journal, Il Martello (The Hammer). Sponsored by the Tresca Memorial Committee, of which Norman Thomas is chairman, the meeting is to start at 5:15 p.m. This hour was chosen to meet the convenience of many workers who wish to attend. Cooper Union

is at Fourth Avenue and Eighth Street. Admission will be free.

Among those invited to speak are: Edward Corsi, State Industrial Commissioner, whose father and Tresca both came from Sulmona, an Italian mountain town, and who both were political exiles from Italy; David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union; Luigi Antonini, president, Italian-American Labor Council and general secretary of Local 89, ILGWU; August Bellanca, director, Italian department, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; George Balzanzi, vice-president, Textile Workers Union of America, and Arturo Giovannitti, poet, labor organizer and historian. "Carlo's friends were of many shades of conviction and opinion,"

Mr. Thomas said in announcing the meeting. "In the short speeches, however, there will be no controversial guesses as to the identity of his slayers, but only a united insistence that the authorities hunt down the guilty and that this country be freed from the curse of murder as a political weapon."

Conduct of the District Attorney's office in the Tresca investigation was sharply criticized by the Memorial Committee in a recent pamphlet report on the case, which has aroused wide comment, but which has met with no answer from District Attorney Frank S. Hogan.

Tresca was shot down in the dim-out at Fifth Avenue and Fifteenth Street on the night of January 11, 1943.

ATOMIC ENERGY: for Barbarism or Socialism?

A SERIES BY THE EDITORS OF LABOR ACTION

PART IV

The Administration has outraged the entire scientific world. Dr. Harold C. Urey said that passage of the bill, which so far has the support of the Truman Administration, "will lead to an atomic armament race."

Referring to the section of the bill forbidding the teaching of nuclear energy theories, Oppenheimer said: "It could stop science in its tracks."

Lowell Mellett, writing in the New York Post of October 23 said that "Many of the scientists who worked on the development of the atom bomb feel that science, as far as America is concerned, will be placed in a straitjacket if the present Administration bill for control of atomic energy becomes law. They think, further, that passage of the bill will start other nations off in a mad, secret race with us that can end only in some nation putting the bomb to use."

Dr. T. R. Hogness, of the Atomic Scientists of Chicago, called for defeat of the May-Johnson bill, stating that there was a "clear-cut and strongly-backed effort in Washington" to prevent them from "fully presenting to the public their ideas on the implications and future control of the terrible weapon they have placed in the hands of mankind." This statement was signed also by Dr. Harlow Shapley, Harvard astronomer, and Dr. Karl T. Compton, MIT president.

The Chicago group stated further: "A danger of a policy of secrecy is that while we would be spurring on other nations to develop atomic bombs, we might sterilize our further development of nuclear physics and chemistry in our own country by withholding information from the majority of our own scientists. . . . 'The maintenance of secrecy in the field of atomic developments will mean that vital political decisions also will have to be made in secret without consultation with the people.'"

The scientists, whatever their illusions about an international agreement by the nations of the world today, have no illusions about the May-Johnson bill, produced in the Senate of the country whose "sacred trust" the atomic bomb is!

THE MILITARY MINDS AT WORK

And what of our military leaders—what effect does the atomic weapon create on their thinking? They don't, naturally, advocate the outlawing of war. That would be asking them to commit hara-kiri. They don't call for the outlawing of the bomb, either. The stepped-up destruction of the atomic bomb leaves little impress on these specialists in destruction. Some say, like Major de Severson: "I don't believe the bomb is any more destructive than twenty thousand tons of ordinary incendiary bombs" (!) Otherwise, besides recog-

nizing a very slight difference in magnitude of destruction, the military goes about with a war-as-usual attitude. The former U. S. Chief of Staff, General George C. Marshall, stated this viewpoint in his report to the nation:

"So far as they can see world conditions a decade from now, War Department planners, who have taken every conceivable factor into consideration, believe that our position will be sound if we set-up machinery which will permit the mobilization of an army of 4,000,000 men within a period of one year following any international crisis resulting in a national emergency for the United States." What an atomic-powered rival nation could do to the United States, given a year following an international emergency, the general does not indicate. He must conceive that we, too, would have our atomic weapons ready at a moment's notice.

Nor does the cataclysmic explosion that wipes out over 100,000 people at one stroke seem to have produced much of a dent in the thinking of the New York Times' military specialist, Hanson W. Baldwin. He readily admits the possibility of an "atomic Pearl Harbor," but advocates as preventative the development of air power, pilotless planes, rockets and an enlarged and highly skilled intelligence service! Our spies would keep us informed of atomic developments abroad; other agents would keep other countries informed on us.

As a novel response to meet a novel situation the Navy advocates more ships. The Army, with true brass hat courage, argues you still need an army, the infantry, to seize, occupy and hold territory in order to clinch the atomic victory. They do not say that with atomic warfare the action of an infantry, which may be the last patrol of the last nation left on the globe, may be a macabre job of seizing, occupying and holding a no man's land—all that will be left of civilization.

WHAT WILL CAPITALISM DO WITH IT?

Given the continued existence of capitalism, the prospects for the use of atomic energy in peacetime productive channels are no happier than its military use. This is true whether capitalism develops atomic energy on a wide scale to revolutionize the power sources of industry or whether capitalism doesn't develop atomic power for peace at all.

In his testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, reported in PM, October 15, Dr. Oppenheimer asserted that "... a million kilowatts of electric energy is not far off, possibly five years or less. But to fit this into our economy may take a long time." Why? Because whether atomic energy has industrial application and when "is a matter of economic

policy." Atomic energy could be manipulated so that "industrial development would never occur."

What Dr. Oppenheimer fears is that the fate of atomic energy will be identical with that of technological improvements under capitalism. Because production for profit is the mainspring of our capitalist society, and as a tendency to increasing monopolization continues, the determining factor in the use of any new discovery is: *is it profitable?* While the industrial use of atomic energy might be of enormous benefit to society as a whole, its use by present-day society might be unprofitable to the industrialists and financial overlords, the two per cent who own seventy-five per cent of the wealth of the United States. Many inventors today, whose discoveries, if put to use, would aid mankind, play the rôle of blackmailers of the trusts, because to put their inventions to use would entail the scrapping of already existing machinery, increased costs to the owners of industry and reduced profits.

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN

Suppose capitalism did find it profitable to use atomic energy industrially? Willem de Voorter, writing in The New Internationalist, September, 1945, expresses what would likely happen if atomic energy were developed under private ownership:

"Let us assume, however, that U-235 can be made cheaply enough so as to become a serious threat to present power sources. While as yet the stuff cannot have any useful part in our technical processes and is no immediate threat to coal and oil interests, it then might be. Then we would see an immediate change in imperialist policies, directed toward uranium deposits as well as to oil lands. The entire imperialist game will have to be reshuffled and again the people will have to pay for the game with blood and life.

"If we assume that U-235 or another new element or isotope is tamed and becomes the power source we are being promised, the consequences will be, as far as the workers are concerned, disastrous under a capitalist system. A single airplane could serve for fuel transportation over the entire world, delivering an ounce here, an ounce there. One has only to visualize the unemployment resulting from its use in power plants. Truly, the burden of labor would be lifted from the shoulders of mankind, to make place for the burdens of unemployment and hunger on an ever-increasing scale. Technological unemployment would reach staggering figures; and the capitalist would invent the slogan: a fair day's work for a fair day's wage, when dictating conditions to those he will employ. This might be interesting for the membership of the AFL: Capitalism will feel perfectly healthy again:

Iran Revolt, Russia And Oil Imperialism

By J. K.

Russian imperialism has engineered a revolt in northern Iran for the purpose of using it as political blackmail in its rivalry with Great Britain and the United States over oil concessions. The crime is not that the peasants and workers of the province of Azerbaijan have revolted against the Iranian régime, seized the land and raised democratic slogans. These are natural aspirations and we stand with the Iranian people for them. The crime lies in the fact that these aspirations are subverted by Stalinist Russia's imperial concern in wresting bigger oil concessions from the British-dominated Iranian government.

Already an Iranian delegation is on its way to Moscow to "settle" the conflict. Another Russian sell-out is in progress.

LENIN GAVE UP CONCESSIONS

To understand the sharpness of imperialist rivalries in Iran, it is important to know that Iran is the fourth largest oil producing nation in the world, sending out 78,000,000 barrels annually. It has been a coveted prize of both the Russians and the British since 1906. An agreement signed between the Shah of Persia (now Iran) and the Czar of Russia in 1907 conceded the northern section of the country as a Russian sphere of influence. The British were already in firm control of the south, where the best oil deposits are located. About 1920, the United States, through rich oil concessions, given to the Standard Oil Company and later Socony, also became a competitor in Iran.

With the rise to power of the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky, all such Russian treaties were renounced, the Soviet government relinquishing its concessions in Iran. This meant that when the Stalinist bureaucracy decided to resume Czarist imperialist ambitions, it had to start from scratch in Iran. The war gave the Russian state an excuse for marching troops into Iran. They are still there, despite the agreement signed by the three powers in Teheran to the effect that "the governments of the USA, the USSR and the United Kingdom are at one with the government of Iran in their desire for the maintenance of the independent sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran."

At this same Teheran meeting the country was divided into three spheres of influence. Russia was given the north, Britain the south and the central area was "neutral." The Iranian régime continued to be pro-British. After the cabinet shake-up last year, when Russia demanded oil

concessions which were refused, the pro-British faction was strengthened.

Despite the rich oil flow, despite the millions of dollars spent in the country on installations for shipping lend-lease supplies through to Russia and despite the presence of American, British and Russian forces, the internal economy of the country went from bad to worse.

The price of commodities rose to fantastic levels while wages continued to be very low, and the peasants continued in their old condition of virtual serfdom to feudal owners of large estates. Trade union and political leaders were jailed and political parties were persecuted. A parliament in which the various political parties have representation exists, but policy and administration are still controlled by the pro-British feudal faction.

Against this background, the Iranian democratic movement is developing very rapidly. The Stalin-controlled Communist Party has taken advantage of this sentiment by propagandizing for a program that corresponds to the wants of the people, though its ultimate aim is not to serve the people but the ambitions of Stalinist Russia. Thus the Tudeh, or Communist Party, which was formerly confined to the southern or more industrial sections of the country, has extended itself under the aegis of the Russian army, has become the Democratic or Peoples Party and has organized trade unions and peasant societies in the north. Its program calls for division of the land, local autonomy in the northern provinces and collaboration with Stalinist Russia.

The Russian army distributed arms, sent in gangs from the provinces in Russia which border northern Iran, broadcast propaganda from Moscow, issued publications denouncing the Teheran cabinet and virtually assumed control of Azerbaijan and Kurdistan, confining the Iranian army to its barracks and turning back police and soldiers sent from the central government.

This is being done not to assure democracy in these northern provinces but to loosen the hold of the Iranian régime on those sections. It is reported in the press that the Russian government has already gone ahead with oil installations, despite the fact that the concessions have been denied. It is therefore a foregone conclusion that in lending its mass strength to further the aims of Russian imperialism, the People's Party will not be advancing the interests of the peasants and workers of Iran.

Wallace and Jobs For All

By Susan Green

Mr. Wallace's plan for "Sixty Million Jobs" as presented in his book of that title, has been embodied in the Full Employment Bill, now almost choked to death in the labyrinth of Congressional red tape. In view of the flagrant unconcern with which the problem of unemployment has been approached by the guardians of private enterprise, Mr. Wallace's optimism that capitalism can provide full employment appears well-nigh ridiculous.

It isn't that Mr. Wallace doesn't understand that there are those who "wrap themselves in the flag of patriotism and do the dirty work of scoundrels." He says: "... the goal of sixty million jobs is attainable provided that the pressure groups cooperate for the common good. This may be a big 'if.' True enough, it is. But it is also a realistic and not a wishful 'if.'" So Mr. Wallace keeps smiling and believes that the FACTS will cause the capitalists to change their ingrained greed and lust for self-aggrandizement.

Some of the facts are, indeed, colossal. For instance, Mr. Wallace tells us that from 1930 to 1941 there was a loss of 88,000,000 man-years of production—due to unemployment. That amount of labor power could have been transformed into \$350,000,000,000 of wealth. To equate this sum to the things of life could mean 70,000,000 homes at a cost of \$5,000 each, which is about three times what is necessary to clear all the slums of the country. Or that waste can be equated to twice the value of all the capital stock of all the private corporations in the United States. Or it can be expressed in terms of three hundred and fifty river valley developments like the magnificent TVA.

CHITING THE GREAT NEEDS

Apparently such facts are not the ones that determine the conduct of the capitalists and their politicians. The facts that influence this gentry are contained in fat corporation ledgers and in the figures of dividend checks. Similarly, Mr. Wallace's array of unfulfilled needs that can form "the backlog to give us the driving power for peace" is very impressive, and without any doubt the needs are there—waiting to be fulfilled. His list of "unfilled orders" includes houses, hospitals, schools, rural electrification, soil conservation, river-valley developments, improved and increased transportation facilities, industrialization of the South and other backward regions where people are under-employed and don't produce enough for consumption. And Wallace also lists the undeveloped human and national resources in other lands, that have to be built up.

But again all these bursting human needs Mr. Wallace confines within the fences of private enterprise and, according to him, they must wait for the private capitalists to be won over "to the demands of peace and general welfare."

Now Mr. Wallace tells us in his book that even with FULL employment at WARTIME wages eight million city families—not counting their country cousins—would still be getting less than \$1,000 a year and would be unable to "buy enough meat, eggs, dairy products to raise healthy children" or keep themselves in good health. Yet private capital, in which Mr. Wallace places so much hope, is now fighting like a wild tigris for its cubs, against the demands of labor to keep wages at these inadequate wartime totals. Where, pray, is the basis for Mr. Wallace's hope that private enterprise will submit to planning for full employment?

In fact, Mr. Wallace reveals himself as a bundle of contradictions. On the one hand, he stands for an economy of abundance, as, of course, is implicit in any program for full employment. On the other hand, however,

he is the advocate of small business and small farms. While it is true that small enterprises contribute to total production, the basic truth is that both industry and agriculture have gone beyond the horse-and-buggy days, that big business dominates both, and that plenty for all the people can be produced only on the basis of large-scale industry.

The question, of course, is what to do with the giant industrial establishments which are here to stay and which are absolutely indispensable to an economy of abundance. Mr. Wallace says he is opposed to monopolies by great corporations and cartels. It is always fashionable to be against monopolies. But the proof of the pudding is the means proposed to abolish them. Mr. Wallace approaches the question with the outlook of the small business man that he is. He wants the big business government to help the small business man against the great corporations and cartels. Might as well try to make Niagara fall the other way.

Like all pro-capitalist liberals, Mr. Wallace makes sense till it comes to the point of HOW. He is a great champion of the "common good," but only in so far as it can be fitted into the system of private profit. He sees the social evil in the powerful economic and financial monopolies, but does not take the logical step, namely, that these industrial giants needed for an economy of abundance, must become the common property of all the people. Instead, he yearns for the good old horse-and-buggy days of the small company and the small farm—and small production!

NO PLANNING?

Similarly he hedges around the need for social planning. Indeed, his program, embodied in the unfortunate Full Employment Bill, involves some kind of planning. It would provide for a budget of annual employment to see how many jobs private business is expected to provide, how many municipal, state and federal government can be expected to furnish, and how many more would be needed for sixty million jobs. Then the government would stimulate business into certain further production by offering subsidies and other inducements; and then the President would suggest to Congress additional government expenditures to make up the difference still needed to give jobs to sixty million workers.

This Wallace calls "democratic planning," but please, please don't call it "Economic Planning" with capital letters, because that means the end of private enterprise.

Unfortunately, Wallace is still a favorite with organized labor. In 1944 many CIO union conventions acclaimed him as their 1948 choice for president. By throwing in their lot with a pro-capitalist liberal, with a self-contradictory approach to the vital problems of the day, labor retards the solution of these problems.

A WAY OUT

There are jobs for all—but not within the profit-grabbing restrictions of private enterprise. There can be plenty for all—but only by socializing the means of production and placing production under control of workers' committees. There is a new and full life to be built—but not by bills gathering dust in the desks of capitalist politicians nor by fattening up the capitalists with more government subsidies.

The way to a new and fuller life is via a Workers' Government that will end private profit and lead the nation to Socialist endeavor. To break with the Wallaces and to take the road to independent political action on working class lines, that is the task at hand for labor.

Wallace's book simply proves how true this is.

Jersey Housing Crisis: Effects the Poor

By S. BERG

NEWARK—In the midst of the nation-wide housing crisis, an open campaign to oust Negro and low income white families from their homes has begun in New Jersey. In East Orange, a predominantly well-to-do suburb of Newark, the Planning Board of the City Council has proposed the condemnation of so-called "blighted" areas in order that modern high-priced garden apartments can be built in the area.

The "blighted area" is the only working class neighborhood in the city of East Orange and is occupied by both Negroes and whites. Directly affected are not only 150 small property owners in the neighborhood but also hundreds of tenants who will have no place to go if the scheme is pushed through.

The needs of the tenants are of no interest to the Planning Board which, like the City Council and the majority of the city, is made up of wealthy commuters. Only a determined fight

will be able to keep the Council from condemning the area. Thus far the small property owners have appeared at council hearings to protest the plan, and the NAACP has held a meeting on the subject. Nothing, however, has been done to mobilize the Negro and white workers who make up the tenants of the neighborhood.

THE REAL JOB

It is up to the tenants. They must insist that the "blighted area" should be condemned to make way for a housing project for low income families and not to raise the assessed valuation of East Orange property. Such a demand should go hand in hand with insistence that the city provide adequate temporary housing for any families evicted to make way for the housing project.

Action has already been begun to initiate a united front of trade unions, Negro organizations and working class political parties to campaign along these lines.

Self-Rule for Colonies; Bring the GI's Home

In its efforts to hide the real character of the world we live in, the capitalist press will resort to anything. Many times it even stoops to telling the truth.

And the current truth is that while millions of soldiers and sailors in all the God-forsaken corners of the globe are sweating out redeployment, allegedly because of the lack of shipping space, scores of American-made ships are transporting the troops and matériel being used in the horrible massacre of the native populations of China, Indonesia and Indo-China.

The case is simple: The colonial peoples want the right to govern themselves. They want this right so that they can free themselves from the exploitation which condemns them to a life little better than that of the beasts of the fields.

U. S. REPLACES NAZIS

But imperialist France, Holland, Britain and the United States want control of these areas for economy, political and military reasons of their own. France and Holland, which themselves know what it means to suffer under the yoke of a foreign oppressor, came out of the war so economically weak, however, that they can no longer even be simple and effective tyrants and murderers. The job had to be taken over by powerful United States imperialism.

That the United States foreign policy thereby becomes almost indistinguishable from the policy of Nazi Germany should come as a surprise only to those who believe that the war was fought for paper ideals like "democracy" rather than because of the capitalist greed for profits.

For the American soldier and sailor the present situation is a clear proof of the old socialist truth that the interests of workers all over the world are identical.

Withdraw the troops, ships and arms being used against the colonial peoples in their struggle for independence!

Bring the American soldiers and sailors home!

—J. M. F.