

17,000 Cramp Shipyard Workers Strike!

Fight Company Anti-Union Drive; Demand Contract

By PHILADELPHIA REPORTER

On June 23, 1943, a one-year contract between Local 42, IUMSWA, and the Cramp Shipbuilding Corp. came to an end. Negotiations for a new contract reached a standstill and the dispute was turned over to an arbitrator and subsequently to the WLB, where it has rested quietly in that graveyard of anti-labor decisions.

The Cramp management, banking on the no-strike pledge, began, late in June, to subject the men to provocations, contract violations and delays. Then they fired a group of piecework counters for refusal to take the ever-increasing counting load the company was trying to put over. The firings brought prompt action from the men—daily stoppages culminated in two mass meetings of thousands of union men.

The night shift meeting unanimously voted invocation of the Smith-Connally Act, demanding a signed contract as well as adjustment of other grievances. The day shift meeting brought thousands of men into the halls and streets, where loudspeakers brought them the report. John Green, president of the International Union, also put in an appearance and told Local 42 that whatever decision they might make, he would use his constitutional rights to ignore it if it meant violating the no-strike pledge.

Despite a tumult of opposition to this arrogant disregard of the wishes and needs of the men, Green kept his word and ignored the thirty-day notice that was filed. The thousands at the meeting roared approval of criticism of the no-strike pledge and Little Steel Formula. The officials of the local, acknowledging Green's fighting record of days gone by, and bewildered by his attitude, retreated from their original position, and the men went back to work disheartened and dissatisfied. Many wondered what had happened to the fighting leader, Johnny Green, who had done so much to build this union.

In September, the IUMSWA held in convention in New York. Hundreds of delegates traveled thousands of miles to listen to admirals and politicians. The problems of the workers—the rising cost of living, frozen wages, heavier taxes and a dozen other major items weren't even talked about. But—the no-strike pledge was reaffirmed.

Now, less than one month later, Kearny and Cramp have already returned the harsh light of reality on what is really happening in the shipyards of the country.

On Friday, October 15, Cramp fired Jiggs Lynch, a burner shop steward. The management, relying confidently on the no-strike pledge, has inflicted provocation upon provocation upon a "disarmed" union. To get away with the discharge of Jiggs Lynch meant a big step forward in the union busting they had mapped out. So they refused even to discuss the case with the grievance committee. But the union leadership had taken a lot and decided it was time to call a halt. Before the day was over, nine departments, comprising over 2,000 men, had walked out. On Saturday they were joined by the rest of the yard and at 2:30 Philadelphia papers reported 17,000 men out and the yard shut down.

Phillip Van Gelder, executive secretary of the International, came to town Saturday morning and received a tongue lashing from William B. Schaffer, president of Local 42, who said: "We are tired of being pushed around" and "We don't want promises any more, we want results." The entire executive board concurred and agreed to recommend to the general membership that "we take whatever action is necessary for immediate settlement of all our demands."

Two thousand men jammed the Kensington Labor Lyceum on Sunday, October 17, and hundreds more listened in the street.

Herbert Moyer, executive secretary of Local 42, opened the meeting with a complete report of events to day. Then Van Gelder promised that if the men went back he would see that they get action. The reaction of the men to this was emphatic: "We want to see the action, then we'll go back." That was what the local's official board had told a now more amenable management when they presented a similar plea.

Barney McCormick, naval relations representative, Justin McMahon, U. S. commissioner of conciliation, and John Casey of the WLB also spoke. The tenor of their remarks was acknowledgment that the men weren't getting a square deal, but "get back to work and we will get you action." The interjections from the men were many and to the point.

(Continued on page 4)

OCTOBER 25, 1943

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR

ONE CENT

COAL MINERS WALK OUT; FIGHT WLB RUN-AROUND

'We're in Bad Shape'--

A Sharecropper Writes

Dear Editor:

We are in bad shape in this part of the country. We workers better look out for a year ahead, for after the war it is going to be hell. We want high price for our work, but it has been told us: "We white folks don't want you all on our farms."

We got to stick close together because we work all spring and none of us can show \$50 in money or money worth. We pick cotton at slave wages. For my part the cotton and corn can stay in the field and rot if we can't get more wages. The Labor Board said that they was going to get some war prisoners to pick cotton and corn and pay them \$1.75 a hundred pounds for cotton picking which is too cheap. Work is great but price is cheap, \$3 a day for 10 hours.

The bosses will try to make it hard for us next year. Then let them do the work themselves. When we get frozen on the farms it is slavery. If we don't raise hell and raise hell now it will be very hard on us in the cotton field.

Some workers say "I don't know what we are going to do." I say, "eat one meal and let them have the farm. If you can't make a living on the farm get off."

The bosses got together this time. Our pick sacks are \$1.85 a sack and they pay \$1.75 for picking cotton. That is not enough when we pay 23 cents pound for salt meat and no lean in it. Some of us are in big debt. It is awful to think about. A man work all spring and summer and have nothing, another works all fall and gets nothing.

We pay \$2.00 a sack for flour and 20 cents a pound for lard. Everything is high but work. We need someone to help us plan for the bosses. I think this is a free country and no man has a right to drive another and say both are Americans. The bosses say that if we don't work they won't have us on the farm after the war.

We have to look out if things don't change. We must do the changing to the bosses. We got to look out for ourselves now. We better look for more money next year for picking cotton. A man

asked me to stay with him next year and asked me how much I want. I told him I want 25 acres of cotton, some corn sorghum patch, a bean patch, well everything they grow to eat. He said: "How about 40 acres of cotton?" I said that we got to fight against cheap cotton. We got to raise more food to eat.

All of us want something better. How can we get it? Down here they want to lead us with cotton and pay nothing for it. We want more corn sorghum, beans and all that a man eats. We have to show that we can't eat cotton.

Another man asked me if I was going to stay here next year. He wanted to know how many children I had. I told him sometime 9, sometime 7. Then he wanted me to take 40 or 50 acres of cotton. He made me mad as hell and I told him that they wasn't paying anything for cotton and I had to have more planting for something to eat. I'll write more next time.

John Jones.

Southeast Missouri.

By GERTRUDE SHAW

In appealing to the striking miners in Alabama and Illinois to return to work, their union president, John L. Lewis, said: "I know how discouraged and embittered you are because of the shabby treatment you are receiving. You are denied a wage that will provide adequate food for your families while the coal operators are making the greatest profits in history."

Apparently for this very reason, the 22,000 miners out in Alabama continued their strike which is at this writing in its seventh day. Lewis acted at the request of the War Labor Board, which said: "This strike is contrary to labor's no-strike pledge and the national policy."

However, the miners who get coal out of the earth never gave a no-strike pledge. Moreover, they have a policy which is not to work without a contract. For six months now the miners have

been waiting for a contract, and while the so-called truce period expires on October 21, a contract is not yet forthcoming.

John J. Hanratty, international representative of the UMW, urged the men "not to argue the whys and wherefores" of the case, but to "get on your muckers and get into the mines today if that is necessary to produce a record tonnage of coal tomorrow." And he added: "If any man tells you that your union is giving you this advice 'with fingers crossed' he is either a fool or a liar."

However, he also told the strikers that they are "conspicuous among groups denied even a fair return for their labors" and the miners don't see why they should not ask the reason why portal-to-portal pay is being denied them.

A United Press dispatch about the strike contains this passage: "An example of the response of the miners was in these words of one employed at the ... shaft of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co.: 'To hell with the union and to hell with the WLB. No contract, no work; and this time that stands.'"

It is very doubtful that this irate striker meant to hell with the union in the same sense as he meant to hell with the WLB. Miners know too well the importance of their organization. They are, however, angry about the advice to return to work before their grievances are settled and at the union leaders who give it.

A Silent Understanding

A special report to the New York Times of October 19 gave this significant description of how the miners are conducting their strike: "According to reports from the striking areas, the miners were refusing to attend meetings lest they incur the penalties of the Connally-Smith Act and they had somehow set up some form of a 'silent understanding' with each other whereby they did not even need to speak, but would act as individuals as long as their wage grievances were not redressed."

The miners seem to have the know-how.

The result of the strike so far as the WLB is concerned is the announcement of a public hearing on October 21 to listen to arguments on

(Continued on page 2)



JOHN L. LEWIS

Pressing Union Problems On Floor At 63rd Annual Meeting of AFL

By SUSAN GREEN

The convention of the American Federation of Labor meeting in Boston the week of October 4 took up a number of vital labor questions on which we shall report in this article. Further analysis of its action will be taken up at another time.

The AFL, for example, had an opportunity to strike a severe blow at Jim Crow in the resolution introduced by A. Philip Randolph of the International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, calling for abolition of all Jim Crow locals and bars to equal union status for Negro workers.

To the shame of the AFL leadership, none of the white delegates either spoke or voted for Randolph's resolution—not even the delegates of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, who were presumably representing one of the first unions in the country to fight Jim Crow. Randolph himself and Milton P. Webster, also of the Sleeping Car Porters and the only other Negro del-

egate, were the only supporters of the resolution.

Instead of support in his efforts to bring real unity between white and black workers, Randolph faced a barrage of unjustified attack from President Green and the AFL top. He was called an "AGITATOR" and a "PROFESSIONAL NEGRO" by his fellow delegates. John P. Frey, president of the AFL Metal Trades Council, characterized Randolph's courageous speech as a "MORAL CRIME."

In rebuttal Randolph asked: "Is anybody here taking the position that racial auxiliary unions are justified? No one will content that Jewish or Catholic unions should be organized. A racial auxiliary union is either right or wrong. If it is right, it ought to be justified. If not, it ought to be condemned and exterminated. If you were in the Negro's place and were put into auxiliary unions without rights and had to pay dues and you were not permitted to exercise your skill and you were

not permitted to rise, what would you do? We contend that the AFL itself is not secure so long as the Negro is denied the same rights as white workers. Nothing has been said here to cause me to retreat from the position I've taken.

In spite of Randolph's fight, the convention side-stepped its responsibility and adopted a routine resolution for education against race prejudice, for the appointment of a subcommittee on minority questions, and for endorsement of the limping and ineffectual Fair Employment Practices Committee.

The UMW on the Floor

The question the outcome of which was awaited with the greatest interest by the whole labor movement was the readmission of the United Mine Workers into the AFL, from which it once withdrew to form the CIO.

Reaffiliation of the miners is surrounded by side issues having nothing to do with the main point—

which is to solidify labor's strength by unity. The difference between Lewis's political ideas and those of many of the AFL leaders also was an undercurrent affecting the re-entry of the UMW.

The New Dealers in the AFL, among them Daniel J. Tobin, head of the Teamsters' Union, and Harvey W. Brown, head of the Machinists' Union, are not anxious to add he Republican tendencies of Lewis to those of W. L. Hutcheson, head of the Carpenters. Today, when independent political action is a must for labor, a great labor federation had its problems befogged by its leaders struggling to strengthen one capitalist political party or another!

On the legitimate matters requiring adjustment, such as the status of District 50 of the UMW and the relation between the Progressive Miners of America and the UMW, Lewis sent a letter to the executive council giving assurances of his willingness to make settlements fair to all con-

(Continued on page 2)

Analyzing the Tasks of the Auto Workers

The Progressives at the UAW Convention

By MAX SHACHTMAN, National Secretary of the Workers Party

The United Auto Workers Union, CIO, is probably the largest single labor organization in the world. It is easily the most important one in the United States. And as its Buffalo convention a couple of week ago continued to show, it is also the most democratic of all the country's unions, and the most promising for the future of our labor movement.

But the great promise of the UAW will be fulfilled only if the rank and file militants, the true progressives, organize and conduct themselves more ably, intelligently and courageously than they did at the Buffalo convention. For the future of the UAW, and with it the future of the better half of the American labor movement, the CIO, depends first and foremost upon these progressives.

That is what the Buffalo convention showed. That is what this article aims to show too.

Dominating the convention was to struggle for power between the two main groups. One was led by Addes and Frankenstein. The other was led by Reuther and Leonard.

The Addes-Frankensteen faction was made up, in large part of the Stalinists (the Communist Party-liners), was supported by them and in the main organized by them. If convincing proof was need that the line of any

union group dominated by the Stalinists is the greater danger to the best interests of the labor movement today, it was amply supplied by the Addes-Frankensteen-Stalinist combination in Buffalo.

On every question in dispute, it took the more conservative and more reactionary position. Every attempt to promote the independence, self-reliance and militancy of the union, every attempt to organize the defense of the union's interests on a clear-cut labor basis—that is, on the only possible basis—met with more vigorous, more determined and more conscious opposition from the Stalinists and their allies than from anyone else.

For example: Pretty nearly everybody in the convention favored support of Roosevelt for a fourth term. That is not to say that there was no discontentment with the growing anti-labor record of the Administration. There was—more of it than ever before in the UAW. But many if not most of the delegates feared that a break with the Roosevelt regime might bring into office a more outspoken and determined opponent of labor.

What is important, however, is the fact that it was the Stalinists who fought for a blank check to be given

Roosevelt, an endorsement without qualification. They didn't even want to sell labor dearly. They wanted to give it away for nothing.

They displayed the same attitude on the other disputed questions. The most deliberate and unyielding adversaries of the organization of a Labor Party, a party representing the interests of the workers and controlled by them, were the Stalinists.

They were the ones who stood like a rock against any attempt, however moderate, to regain that weapon without which labor is totally disarmed, the right to strike.

The fight to destroy the effectiveness of the union by the universal introduction of the speed-up system, positively known as "incentive pay," was initiated inside the UAW, organized and carried almost to the point of victory, by the Stalinists.

Some nitwitted capitalist reporters sent out stories in which the Addes-Stalinist group was designated as the "left wing" of the union and the convention. By any meaningful standards, the Stalinists represented the RIGHT WING of the union. The fact that the Communist Party once represented the real left wing in the American labor movement, about twenty years ago, has no

more meaning today than the fact that the Republican Party once represented the left wing of the capitalist class, about ninety years ago.

The Reuther group was led by a motley combination of unprincipled office-holders, confusionists, double-talkers and ex-progressives who have grown tired of fighting and want to become respectable. Where they did not take an outrightly wrong position they took an ambiguous position. Privately, some of these leaders assure you that they are "for a Labor Party—but now is not the time to fight for it." They speak—and act—likewise on all the other important questions before the UAW.

The fact remains, however, that the people around Reuther, and to a certain extent R. J. Thomas, too, do not have the same interests as the Stalinists. The latter are concerned with one thing and one thing only: to protect the interests of the ruling bureaucracy in Russia. If that requires the most reactionary, union-paralyzing and even union-destroying policies, those are the policies they follow and seek to impose on the unions. And such are the only policies that CAN protect and preserve the Russian bureaucracy.

(Continued on page 4)

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Union Problems at 63rd Annual Meeting of AFL--

(Continued from page 1)
cerned. However, the criss-crossing of interests was not straightened out sufficiently to result in positive and immediate action by the convention.
The matter was referred back to the executive council for further negotiation, with the right to unions having jurisdictional disputes with the UMW to file their grievances within thirty days. The counter-resolution to wait until the 1944 convention before settling the question of the miners was defeated, and the general feeling of the convention was that the miners would be admitted within a few months.

and the deep blue sea on this question of strikes. For instance, they rightly and roundly condemned the Smith-Connelly anti-strike law as "a new high point in anti-unionism in this country." Yet because of the harmful no-strike pledge, Tobin made a spectacle of himself by actually complaining that the Smith-Connelly law permits strikes.
Price and Post-War Plans
The delegates undoubtedly voiced the opinion of the whole working class when they expressed in a resolution on prices and rationing that prices are now stabilized at too high a level—though the word "stabilized" is far from a realistic description of the price situation.
A resolution urging the women's auxiliaries to mobilize with union representatives on price control and rationing in each community was definitely a step in the right direction, but it is all too plain that sentiment is still for collaboration with existing boards rather than for action on labor's own steam.
While the convention recognized the problem involved in 30,000,000 potential post-war unemployed, the measures it voted are very inadequate. For example, it overstressed the role of post-war housing in solving the unemployment problem. This, at its best, can provide only some 1,250,000 new jobs for a short time. The convention opposed the AFL

entering into an international committee including the Russian unions on the ground that "The fundamental differences between the federation and the government-controlled Russian unions are so glaring that no liaison between the two is now remotely possible."
In this connection, it must be recalled that the AFL leaders were venomously opposed to the Soviet unions when Lenin and Trotsky were in power and when they were genuinely free institutions—the freest in the world. Refusal to have anything to do with the free Soviet unions was an expression of the bigoted and reactionary stand of the AFL leadership. Its refusal today to have anything to do with the "government-controlled" Russian unions is not a recognition of what Stalin has done to the once free Soviet unions, but the continuation of the same bigotry.
Indicative of the extent to which the AFL tops are still prejudiced and reactionary was the action on the Chinese Exclusion Act—which even the reactionary capitalist Congress no longer likes. The argument that the "Chinese are our fighting allies" did not rally enough convention support to defeat the recommendation of the executive council not to permit Chinese immigration. The convention merely voted to have the language "toned down" and referred the matter back to the council for "study."

FDR in the Dog House
Although the body rose and cheered when Democratic Senator James Mead eulogized the President as "the man given to us by divine power—the most popular leader in the world today—President Franklin D. Roosevelt," there was no pro-Roosevelt frenzy at the convention. There were plenty of references to how the Roosevelt Administration is giving labor a "kicking around." Perhaps the delegates didn't care too much for the part of the President's message to the convention which said: "The working people will be asked to continue to support the war effort by lending their money and making sacrifices and modifying their personal habits."
A resolution entitled "Co-operation with President Roosevelt" and praising "his progressive and far-sighted view on domestic and foreign matters" was prevented by the committee from coming before the house—and nobody got mad about that. Some convention observers took this lack of enthusiasm for FDR to indicate that the AFL leadership is putting itself into a trading position with FDR—others thought it a definite trend toward the Republican Party. Horse-trading with capitalist political parties is indeed a far cry from using labor's political might independently to serve labor's class interests.

The Italian Situation
The delegates considered the question of trade unionism in Italy and pledged the AFL to assist the workers of Italy in restoring their "free trade union movement which had been crushed by Mussolini." There seems to be a bad contradiction, however. For at the same time the convention expressed its wish for the leaders of the "underground Italian labor movement" to be put "in charge of the former fascist unions."
Atherton Puts Green on Defensive
There were, of course, the usual avalanche of pep speeches by all and sundry. The speech that attracted most public attention was that delivered by Atherton, reactionary head of the big-business-controlled American Legion, who had the brass to come before a convention of labor to say that "it should be treason" for a worker to strike.
In rebuttal, President Green did not do himself so proud. He allowed this reactionary—who had no business to have been invited to a labor convention in the first place—to put him on the defensive. Instead of attacking this enemy of labor, who uses the war as an excuse for his labor-baiting, Green assured him that labor is making "a fine record in a most imperfect world"—Green's idea of perfection presumably being the same as Atherton's, namely, no strikes by labor.

Two Speeches By Auto Workers

No Bosses' Party! Against Incentive Pay!

Speech of Emil Mazey, Local 212 On the Fourth Term
Mr. Chairman, this resolution, in my opinion, should not be acted upon at this convention, but should be acted upon in our convention next year, after we have an opportunity of seeing what the Administration is going to do with basic problems facing the workers of this nation.
We have had in the past few months a number of things take place in the Administration that do not indicate that the Administration is pro-labor. I have specific reference to the passage of the Smith-Connelly Bill. Mr. Chairman, I contend that the Roosevelt Administration and the Democratic Party made no effort to organize a fight to uphold President Roosevelt's veto on the Smith-Connelly Bill. I have heard it charged that the veto message of the President on the Smith-Connelly Bill was ten times more vicious than the bill itself.
A question was asked by Brother Corbin of Local 262 a short time ago as to who was responsible for removing Vice-President Wallace from the Board of Economic Stabilization. It was the President who removed Wallace from that board.
I want to state we have criticized at this convention and other conventions the War Labor Board and the Little Steel Formula. Who appointed the War Labor Board?
We have also criticized the rationing program. Who appointed the people to the rationing program?
We raise hell about the manpower problem. Who appointed McMutt, the "Hoosier Hitler" as director of the Manpower Commission?
Each and every one of those appointments was made by the President of these United States, if you please, and I say to the delegates of this convention, instead of raising hell with some of the chairmen of the agencies of the War Labor Board, the Manpower Commission and the other agencies, we ought to raise hell with the person who is making the appointments and who has worked out these policies. He dictated the policy of the War Labor Board.
One further point, Mr. Chairman. The delegates to this convention should hold off acting on this point until the next convention.
My final remark is this: I believe, in addition to postponing action on this matter until the next convention to see what action we get on our wage problems and the other basic problems we face in our union, that this convention ought to take a strong position to do away with company-unionism policies on political action, and we should start building now for a real Labor Party, and we won't be a part of the bosses' party.

Speech of Board Member Richard Gosser
Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates: I come from the region of the United Automobile Workers that is more highly infested with piecework than the entire International Union put together. I, too, come from the same plant as Brother Ades came from, and there sits a bunch of fellows with twenty-two years' seniority in the plant, and I have been fired four times trying to eliminate piecework in that plant. Let them try to deny that. I am the only one that has been fired on that basis—nobody else.
Here stands an International Executive Board divided on an issue—think of what I am saying—divided on the issue of whether we will have incentive pay. When the International Executive Board is split wide open, will you tell me how in the hell we can go down in Washington and say we want an increase, when actually half of us are sitting here today and saying we cannot get any money, we have to go into the incentive pay and make the workers work harder to increase their wages?
Piecework and Unemployment
I want to go back to 1937. In 1937, many of our workers were walking the streets in the automobile industry, because in the automobile industry in some of the plants the pieceworkers were trying to kill themselves to make a few extra bucks, and in some cases if you had struck the plants and put them on day rate, you would have almost doubled the employment in that plant. You know it and I know it. You have got it out at General Motors now. You have got it out at Ford.
No person from my region can get up and take the floor and say we haven't been as loyal as anybody in this union. Were we in the Flint plant during the trouble there? Yes. Were we on every picket line, including Ford? You're damned right. We come from Toledo. We fought for nine years to eliminate piecework and you haven't been able to do it yet. You put it up now, and by God, our children's children won't eliminate it!
Let me close by saying this: Are we the mighty militant UAW that we speak of? If we are, let us solidify ourselves, let us pick something else for a political issue, let us unite ourselves on this basis, that we throw the Little Steel Formula to the hell out, that we either correct the War Labor Board or throw it to the hell out, that we stabilize the wages in this industry and that we don't say to our membership: "Work like hell so you can make a couple of more pennies."
Thanks a lot.

Progressive Resolutions Submitted to the Convention of the UAW

Incentive Pay and the WLB

Of the burning union issues facing the convention, the delegates—to their credit—took swift and unequivocal action on incentive pay, rejecting all wage systems based on incentive pay as merely "speed-up" camouflage. Whether it was planned that way or not, Joseph D. Keenan of the War Production Board, who came to the convention to peddle propaganda for incentive pay, delivered his piece after the convention had acted on the incentive pay resolution.

Much time was given to the issue of the War Labor Board, without taking the simple action—required by labor's interests—of calling labor's representatives off this government agency which operates so effectively against the workers of this country. The resolution to continue the AFL's futile efforts to defend trade union rights before the board, also voiced resentment that the CIO and not the AFL is the WLB's pet.

Strong objection was taken to the present situation where wage decisions of the WLB are subject to Economic Stabilization Director Vinson and War Mobilization Director Byrnes, and a resolution called for the removal of the "load of super-agencies" from the WLB's back and the restoration of the board to "its former position." This action avoided the conclusion that the WLB was always the graveyard of labor's demands.

The convention-approved telegram sent by Tobin to the chairman of the WLB indicated that the delegates realize that the WLB is just such a graveyard. The telegram said in part:
"I now notify you and the WLB that both myself and my associates find it impossible to convince our membership immediately in many places of the necessity of observing our no-strike pledge because of what they and I consider an unnecessary delay in endeavoring to make decisions."

No-Strike Pledge and Connally Act
Furthermore, while admitting in this telegram that the workers have no redress but to strike for their demands, the convention at the same time reaffirmed the no-strike pledge. The leadership is between the devil

For a Labor Party

RESOLUTION NO. 230 Submitted by Local Union No. 15

Whereas: The recent history of the labor movement constitutes adequate proof of the statement that it is impossible for labor to depend upon either the Democratic or Republican parties for the expansion of its aims or the carrying out of its program, and

Whereas: Union members are becoming more and more reluctant to participate in election campaigns for the support of old-line politicians, or the candidates of the two major political parties, and

Whereas: The greatest showing of labor political strength of rank and file participation in elections and of the possibility of direct labor representation in government was in the "Vote Labor" campaign in Detroit in 1937 and in the New York State election of 1942 in which the American Labor Party ran independent candidates, and

Whereas: Labor is now and will from now on be engaged in a life and death struggle with employers and other sinister influences whose aim is to establish the dictatorship of the few over the masses of the workers, and

Whereas: Labor is sick and tired of depending on so-called "friends" of labor in public office who are in fact in almost all instances better friends of employers and reactionaries than they are of labor, and

Whereas: The unionists of other countries, especially in Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, have made great strides forward on

the political front through their labor parties, and

Whereas: The Republican and Democratic parties have demonstrated their growing inability and unwillingness to solve the basic social problems of the workers of the nation, and

Whereas: Labor must have its own political party to successfully cope with the problems of unemployment and the social disorder that will exist in America in the post-war period,

Therefore be it resolved: That Local 15, UAW-CIO, go on record as favoring the immediate formation of an independent Labor Party through the united efforts of the CIO, the AFL, the Railroad Brotherhoods, the United Mine Workers and all unaffiliated independent trade unions in the United States, and

Be it further resolved: That the 1943 convention of the UAW-CIO go on record as supporting the movement for such an independent Labor Party, and

Be it further resolved: That this UAW convention instruct the incoming executive board of the UAW-CIO to take active steps to participate in and further the movement for a Labor Party, and

Be it finally resolved: That the UAW convention condemn the defeatist program of the Hillman Political Action Committee of the CIO, and instruct UAW members who are officers of the national CIO to carry on a struggle within the national CIO for genuine independent political action of and for the working men and women of this country.

On the No-Strike Pledge

RESOLUTION NO. 118 Submitted by Local Union No. 337

Whereas: Our International Union has in patriotic fervor given its pledge not to strike to the President of the United States, and

Whereas: The President in return gave his pledge to the labor movement that prices on living necessities will be restricted and that business will not be allowed to take advantage of our no-strike pledge, and

Whereas: All promises to labor have been broken, and

Whereas: The cost of living contin-

ues to spiral upward with no restrictions, and

Whereas: Labor's struggle to recoup its losses by the rise in prices has been frustrated by our no-strike pledge,

Therefore, be it resolved: That we call upon the International Convention to retract its no-strike pledge and go back to the policy of direct negotiations, and

Be it further resolved: That the International Union withdraw the representatives from the War Labor Board.

The Little Steel Formula

RESOLUTION NO. 160 Submitted by Local Union No. 365

Whereas: The Little Steel Formula was devised to maintain an equitable balance between wages and prices, and

Whereas: The cost of living has gone up steadily while wages have been virtually frozen, and

Whereas: The present system of price control is not designed to strike a balance between wages and prices, and

Whereas: The roll-back of prices appears to be almost unattainable,

Therefore, be it resolved: That labor make a final and determined effort to obtain an effective and equitable roll-back of prices, and

Be it further resolved: That, failing in this attempt, labor go on record asking that the Little Steel Formula be brought up to date and that the original powers of the War Labor Board be returned, and

Be it further resolved: That, failing this, the labor members of the War Labor Board be asked to resign in protest.

RESOLUTION NO. 161 Submitted by Local Union No. 15

Whereas: The Little Steel Formula laid down by the War Labor Board has been clearly revealed as purely and simply an excuse for not granting much needed increases in pay to the working people of the country, and

Whereas: In view of the continued skyrocketing of prices, the Little Steel Formula has become the most hated aspect of American life of the working people of this country,

Therefore be it resolved: That Local 15, UAW-CIO, go on record for the abolition of the Little Steel Formula, and in favor of a sliding scale of wages, which means that as prices and the cost of living increase, wages will be increased proportionately to compensate for this higher cost of living, and

Be it further resolved: That the International Convention of the UAW-CIO plan and undertake a serious struggle during the coming year to throw out the unjust Little Steel Formula and replace it with the sliding scale of wages.

Resign from the War Labor Board

RESOLUTION NO. 200 Submitted by Local Union No. 15

Whereas: The WLB from its very inception has resorted to various devices and subterfuges to deny labor its just demands for increases in wages to meet the rising cost of living, as well as other demands to which labor is rightfully entitled, and has obviously delayed its decisions for months, thereby aiding the employers in increasing still further their exorbitant profits while giving labor the run-around, and

Whereas: The WLB has adopted certain general policies such as the Little Steel Formula which are inimical to the interests of labor; and the actual findings of the WLB in individual disputes are merely interpretations of such anti-labor policies adopted by the WLB, and therefore almost always favor management against labor, and

Whereas: The participation of labor in the WLB makes labor share the responsibility for the anti-labor policies of the WLB, and

Whereas: Any labor and public support that the WLB might have is due entirely to the fact that representatives of labor still remain on the WLB, bolstering its prestige, and giving it the appearance of impartiality which it does not in fact have, and establishing before the masses of

workers and the general public the false impression that labor is getting a fair deal at the hands of the WLB, when in fact that contrary is the case, thereby preventing the WLB from being thoroughly discredited in the eyes of the workers and of the general public, and

Whereas: At best, labor's representation on the WLB is a one-third minority of the entire composition of the WLB, and is confronted on the one hand by an equal representation on the part of management, which although comprising a small group of people has an equal voice with the ten of millions of workers who with their families constitute the majority of the population of this country, and on the other hand by an equal representation of public members who are most often chosen from the supporters of management, and from those who in one way or another are close to and indebted to management for their various occupations and positions, and therefore almost always side with management, thus making the WLB a body which is at all times stacked against labor, and

Whereas: The representatives of management and of the so-called public continually face labor representatives on the WLB with a series of alternatives each one worse than the other, as in the recent Chrysler

decision, and these labor representatives have actually in this case, as on numerous other occasions, voted WITH management and the public AGAINST the interests of labor, thereby giving a false picture of unanimity within the WLB, and

Whereas: Labor cannot make a convincing fight against the unjust and false policies of the WLB, and its partial and hostile decisions which flow directly from these policies, as long as labor's representatives remain on the WLB and thereby condone these policies and decisions, and at the same time give the false impression that labor backs these general policies and decisions which are in fact inimical to the cause of labor,

Therefore be it resolved: That Local 15, UAW-CIO, call on the National Convention of the UAW-CIO to immediately direct all UAW members who are representatives of labor on the WLB to resign at once, and

Be it further resolved: That this convention call the CIO to order all its members to resign from the WLB, and refuse to permit its members to further serve thereon, and

Be it finally resolved: That copies of this resolution be sent to Philip Murray, president of the CIO, and to the press.

Indiana NMU Ship Workers Seek Transfer to IUMSW

By ROY GOULD LOUISVILLE—During the first week in November an election will be held among the six thousand shipyard workers at the Jeffersonville, Ind., Board & Machine Co. to ratify their transfer from the National Maritime Union to the Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers, both CIO.

This appears to be a neat Stalinist trick in their current campaign to "take over" the CIO Shipbuilders Union. It is not the first time that the Stalinist have shifted union locals under their control from one international to another, like so many chessmen, in their political game. The Communist leaders in the NMU evidently count on leading the Jeff Boat workers around as blindly in the Shipbuilders Union as they have in the NMU. They have been able to carry on in this way, not by any strength of the Communist Party

in the Louisville area—where it is very weak—but rather because of the lack of union experience of the workers. The great majority of the workers in this booming territory are fresh to industry and never before belonged to a union. The NMU has sent a steady stream of Stalinist bureaucrats through here, and now they have the big Jeff Boat local "under control."

Despite the motive behind the change, it is better for the ship workers to be in the Shipbuilders Union. This will give them a better opportunity to develop themselves, provided the Stalinists do not capture THAT international as they did the NMU. The workers in the older yards should keep their union free of Stalinist parasites, both for the general good of the shipyard workers and for the good of the new workers who need an opportunity to develop their own locals.

Miners' Strike - -

(Continued from page 1) the proposed contract agreed upon a long time ago by the UMW and the Illinois coal operators but opposed by the Appalachian operators. The WLB also proudly asserts its policy not to consider a case "at the point of a gun" and threatens not to hold the hearings after all unless the striking men return to their jobs. Without the muzzle of the strike in their backs, the WLB members did not see fit even to call a public hearing.

The Appalachian operators have made haste to state that they reject the terms of the proposed agreement, that it is a "subterfuge" covering a "hidden wage increase"—and of course, these capitalists bursting with war profits are worried about the

"hold-the-line" order, you bet! So the same old run-around begins again.

The Questions Posed
The miners have again pioneered for the labor movement. The Alabama and Illinois mine strikes pose to the whole labor movement once more the need to fight to end the Little Steel wage formula, to repudiate the no-strike pledge, to call labor's representatives off the WLB—and to put labor in a position to bargain collectively for its legitimate demands.

For the miners themselves, the Alabama and Illinois strikes again pose the question of nationalizing the mines and placing them under workers' control.

LABOR ACTION Turns the Spotlight on WAGE FREEZING INCENTIVE PAY WAR PROFITS JIM CROW RISING LIVING COSTS "PHONY FRIENDS" OF LABOR NATIVE FASCISTS WORKERS' POLITICS Get Your Copy of "America's Leading Labor Newspaper" EVERY WEEK BY SUBSCRIBING NOW! Special Introductory Offer—Only 25 Cents for Six Months Clip and Mail with 25 Cents for Your Special Sub TODAY LABOR ACTION 114 West 14th Street New York 11, N. Y. Please enter my six-month subscription at the SPECIAL INTRODUCTORY RATE. I enclose 25 cents to cover full cost. Name Address City State If you are a subscriber, why not help a friend or fellow worker get LABOR ACTION regularly by sending in his subscription on this blank?

GET YOUR COPY NOW! A COST-PLUS WAGE By MAX SHACHTMAN, Nat. Sec., Workers Party PRICE: 5 CENTS IN BUNDLES: 3 CENTS WORKERS PARTY 114 West 14th Street New York 11, N. Y.

Wages Are a Poor Reward For Labor

By ALBERT GATES

Ever since the rise of capitalism there has been a sharp struggle between the bosses and the workers over wages. From the early days of this system, when machine production was still in its infancy, production and profits have depended on the direct exploitation of labor.

Profits of the capitalist class were based on the long working day, the seven-day week and the intense physical exploitation of men, women and children. To keep wages as low as possible—just enough to permit the working man and his family to live and reproduce in kind—meant high profits. Wage increases would lower profits.

Since the capitalist is in business only for profit—he does not care whether his product is useful or not—he has ever sought to keep wages as low as possible.

The capitalist and the worker, throughout the existence of capitalism, have fought over wages and the conditions of labor. If the former kept wages low, hours long, without investing money to improve the conditions of work, he did well and had a profitable business. It mattered not to him if the workers suffered severely under this brutal system.

The development of technology, which permitted a tremendous rise in production and a corresponding rise in the productivity of the individual worker, saw a gradual rise in wages, a gradual reduction of the work-day and work-week, and a gradual improvement of working conditions.

It is a fact of economic history that while the capitalist profited from every improvement in production, while his wealth mounted, his living standards rose higher and higher, his leisure increased manifoldly, and his general security was strengthened, the conditions of the working man remained, on the whole, far below what was warranted by industrial progress.

It is also a fact of economic history that, for every improvement in the lot of the worker, he had to engage in heroic and violent struggles against his profiteering boss. The capitalist never gave anything to the worker voluntarily. Everything the worker has gained—higher wages, shorter hours of work and improved conditions of labor—was the result of intense struggle by the working class.

The bosses have always resisted wage increases because the granting of higher wages would come out of their profits. Usually they overcome this by increased production or increased prices and new markets. In the end, the capitalist saw to it that he lost nothing even in granting wage increases; he was always compensated for any concession which the workers wrung from him by sharp struggles.

But most important of all, wages have always lagged behind profits. They never rise simultaneously or in the same proportion as profits. It is only after the workers observe the increase in profits and life becomes increasingly unbearable that they are, willy-nilly, driven to fight for a greater share of the wealth produced by themselves.

For example, between 1924 and 1929, in the very midst of the prosperity period in which big business "earned" enormous profits, wages, that is money wages and real wages (what they will actually buy of the necessities of life) remained stationary. As a matter of fact, wages in this period were below the rates of 1920!

Lewis Corey, in his "Decline of American Capitalism," vividly describes this situation when he says:

"Thus, in 1929, relative wages fell to the lowest point in American history in the midst of an extraordinary rise in the productivity of labor, surplus value, and profits."

What are called high wages are in reality low when compared to the productivity of labor, and they are low in terms of the possibility of still higher wages.

High wages, so-called, are also low wages in terms of what they can provide in minimum requirements for living in a society where millions live in poverty on sub-standard wages.

Wages have always lagged behind dividends, interest and the salaries of officials of companies. As an example, between the years 1921 and 1932, wages declined by twenty-five per cent while dividends and interest rose by fifty-five per cent.

In this discussion of wages and their relation to incentive pay, it must be borne in mind that even when wages rise, they fall in relation to profits; that profits are increased by forcing wages down and that profits represent "surplus value, unpaid labor."

It is possible to say that, as a rule, during periods of prosperity, wages rise, but profits rise much faster, and the so-called "high wages" are low compared to the productivity of labor. During crises, profits may fall and do fall, but wages fall much lower, and for millions of workers they cease altogether.

In such periods, the bosses may not get so much, but all workers get still less, and many get nothing. It is the worker who becomes unemployed, who is found on the breadline, and who needs relief in order to live. The boss merely retires to his estates to live on his accumulated wealth, produced by labor but appropriated by the capitalists. — From "Incentive Pay, the Speed-Up, New Style," Chapter V.

FEPC Has Failed--

Committee Appointed by Labor Needed

By W. F. CARLTON

Father Haas, chairman of the Fair Employment Practices Committee, has resigned. He is going to become a bishop. The Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia Independent, a Negro paper, writes as follows: "The announcement of Father Haas left members of his committee and the public here stunned."

Too bad. People with illusions, who put their hope for Negro rights in the FEPC and similar Roosevelt committees, have an inexhaustible capacity for being stunned. Prepare yourselves, gentlemen. You are going to be more and more stunned as time goes by.

A History of FEPC

We propose here briefly to review the history of this committee and then to give an example or two of Father Haas's special contributions to it.

1. The Negroes say that they will march on Washington to bring their grievances forcibly before the public and the government. This threat of action starts the whole business. Remember that.

2. Roosevelt suddenly recognizes that there is discrimination in industry. He writes a letter to one of his agencies saying that discrimination is a shame, harms the "war for democracy," etc., and must stop.

3. Negroes pay no attention. They continue to prepare for the march. They sell tickets and they sing:

"We are coming, Father Franklin, One hundred thousand strong!"

4. Roosevelt gets thoroughly scared. He sends Eleanor and Florence as ambassadors to Walter White and Phillip Randolph. It is reliably reported that they have an interview lasting six hours. White and Randolph, those bold leaders, say that they cannot stop the march.

Halting the March

5. Roosevelt must now do something to stop the march. He invites our pair of gladiators, White and Randolph, down to Washington. These two are met by Roosevelt in the chair, Stimson of the Army, Knox of the Navy, Knudsen, at that time head of production, Hillman, his co-head, and LaGuardia.

After speaking for half an hour Roosevelt leaves the others to it. The text is "Call Off the March." White and Randolph capitulate. They get as a reward the President's executive order, thundering against discrimination, forming the FEPC and carefully giving it no powers to enforce anything. When Randolph reports to the New York organization on what he has done, they are mad at him but don't know what to do, and so do nothing.

6. Roosevelt appoints Mark Etheridge as chairman of the committee. Mark Etheridge is a distinguished

Southern liberal and notorious "friend" of the Negro people. He soon distinguishes himself by resigning from the committee and shows his "friendship" for Negroes by declaring in Louisville that the South will never tolerate Negro equality.

A Few Incidents

7. The committee makes investigations all over the place and with great energy discovers that there is discrimination in industry. Reports of its meetings fill the columns of the Negro press. Luckily there is a Negro and a labor press. Otherwise the public would not have heard of the committee at all.

8. Meanwhile, the Negroes are getting fed up more and more. The committee can do nothing and never was given the power to do anything. Finally it decides that it will investigate discrimination on the railroads. By this time the committee is a nuisance. Roosevelt dumps it into the hands of McNutt. McNutt dumps it into his wastebasket. The railroad hearings are called off.

But at this the Negroes shout loud and long that the "war for democracy" is a fraud. Roosevelt on his way home from Casablanca visits President Barclay at Liberia. He invites Barclay to Washington. Barclay stays at the White House and in accordance with protocol, i.e., social gymnastics between rulers and high officials of one country and those of another, Barclay is accompanied to the door of his rooms by the President's wife.

The Negro press says "Wonderful!" and goes into ecstasies on page one. But on page two it says "What about the FEPC?" In a week or two it has forgotten about Barclay. Some of them even call him a tyrannical scoundrel (which he most certainly is.) But none of them forget about the FEPC. The general Negro ferment in the country is tremendous and, from being a nuisance, the FEPC is now a scandal.

9. Dickerson of Chicago takes what is for him a "revolutionary" step (he is an alderman). He announced that the work of the committee will go on. Roosevelt appoints Haas as chairman and fires Dickerson from the committee.

The Committee Under Haas

10. Haas takes over and the committee holds the hearings on the railroads which have been reported and commented upon in LABOR ACTION. Let us note some of the contributions of Haas.

(a) He announced at the start that although government contracts stipulated that there should be no discrimination, he was not going to take any steps against those companies which discriminated because that would hamper war production.

(b) Haas, however, gave a new

twist to the committee. He discovered that labor was heavily responsible for discrimination. The railroad hearings reeked with this malicious slander. Both the companies and the FEPC directly and indirectly tried to make it out that the main responsibility was labor's.

Pointing the Finger at Labor

Last August, in an article printed in the American Federationist, organ of the AFL, Haas wrote:

"In most cases labor leaders 'pass the racial buck' to their membership, which, they insist, 'will not stand for Negroes.'"

He also pointed out, according to the Pittsburgh Courier of August 7, that not all unions which bar Negroes and other minority groups are in the AFL. In other directions he tried to cover himself, but he has taken care always to draw the fire from capital by pointing a persistent finger at labor.

Sparks in the News

By JOHN BERNE

Down in that foreign land known as the state of Texas there is a new law requiring all union organizers to register with the secretary of state and get a license. Furthermore, they must have lived in Texas a year to qualify for a license.

R. J. Thomas, president of the United Auto Workers, put the law to a test on September 23 by appealing to workers of the Humble Oil & Refining Co. to organize. Thomas was put in jail, released on a writ of habeas corpus, and the case has been set for October 20.

J. Frank Doble, of the University of Texas, says in opposition to this reactionary law, known as the Mann Act: "A man can stand up anywhere in Texas, or sit down either, and without interference invite people, either publicly or privately, to join the Republican Party, the Holy Rollers, the Liars Club, the Association for Anointing Herbert Hoover as a Prophet, the Texas Folklore Society—almost any organization on earth but one—but it is against the law in Texas for a man unless he pays a license and signs papers to invite any person to join a labor union."

Very well put—especially for a professor!

—LA—
The special board appointed by the White House to settle the case of railroad workers' wage demands brought in an award of thirty-two cents a day increase for 300,000 men. The workers had demanded a \$3.00 a day raise.

Louis Star, labor reporter for the New York Times, wrote: "Although

Now today the FEPC is leaderless again. Haas quit because, as he admitted, he could accomplish nothing.

Organized labor has a job to do here, a big job. To oppose discrimination in your own union is good. To form labor committees for interracial good will is fine. But labor must rise higher than that. Here, as everywhere, labor must assume full responsibility.

The FEPC is good for nothing? All right. But why not a committee appointed by representatives of organized labor? Such a committee would have power far beyond the powers of law which Roosevelt will not give the FEPC. It would have the moral power of the labor movement; by fearless action and exposure it could achieve astonishing results.

By so doing it would not only win the confidence of the Negro people but inspire labor to fight in its own cause.

the three members of the board agreed that the employees had made out a strong case for a wage increase to correct gross inequalities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, they split on the application of this conclusion to the case."

For workers to have "a strong case" for a wage increase is apparently not enough. What sort of a case can the railroad magnates put up to justify increases in war profits amounting for Erie, for instance, to eighty-three per cent above last year and for PRR to seventy-five percent?

—LA—
I. F. Stone, Washington reporter for The Nation, wrote in a recent issue:

"Off the record" information I am not privileged to reveal at this time leads me to conclude that the whole North African and French policies are the President's, as much as the State Department's, if not more so. While there is a strong faction in the State Department which favors recognition of the French National Committee, as does the British government, the President is said to be strongly opposed. Incredible though it sounds, informed people whom I trust say that one reason for this is that the President still thinks another deal with Laval may yet be possible and is prepared even to make a deal with Laval, if anything can be obtained from him."

Though events move so fast that Mr. Roosevelt may by now have other plans, still labor leaders who are assiduously pinning angel's wings on their "friend" in the White House should study the above quotation.

Big Business Wants Profit Incentive!

By DAN BERGER

With commendable foresight, the American capitalist has already begun to prepare for the third war for "democracy."

Vexed now with tax measures which compel him to finance in part, at least, the war which is being fought for him mainly with workers' labor and workers' blood, he has assigned his law-makers to write for him a guarantee of virtual immunity from taxes.

In fourteen states the legislators have demonstrated in rapid compliance their eagerness to serve their masters. Congress has received from these states resolutions demanding the addition of a twenty-second amendment to the Constitution which would prohibit an income tax of more than twenty-five per cent. The amendment, if ratified, is to take effect immediately upon the conclusion of THIS war.

BIG BUSINESS MOVES BY STEALTH

The campaign for the adoption of this new contrivance for tax evasion has proceeded with the silent efficiency which reflects the determination of capital to shift more and more of the burden of government expenses to the shoulders of the working class. One phase of the scheme is the present proposal for a ten per cent sales tax which would leave untouched all but a microscopic portion of the big executives' salaries and profits, while taxing almost all of the workers' earnings.

Of inestimable aid to the proponents of the sales tax has been Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau's widely-publicized discovery that four-fifths of the national income is "enjoyed" by those earning less than \$5,000 a year. His conclusion, based on this figure, was that further levies on this class of wage earners were impractical. The business men's representatives, in Congress as elsewhere, concluded, however, that here was indicated clearly the source of any new revenue, those earning \$5,000 to \$500 a year, or less.

Further taxing the bosses is regarded as "confiscatory" and "destructive of the profit incentive."

THE NEW YORK TIMES, ONCE MORE

The New York Times, ever the voice of reaction, has already devoted much space to the thesis that the ruling class of this country is being systematically impoverished by heavy taxes. Godfrey N. Nelson, tax expert, writes that "the so-called rich are being liquidated; the middle class is being so drained as to bring them, in point of living standard, into the category of the four-fifths."

Editorially the Times voices again and again the fear that taxes will consume more than 100 per cent of large incomes. On Friday, October 8, it attempted to prove that an individual "earning" \$300,000 would be obliged to pay \$302,304 in taxes. And more of the same will misrepresentations.

In contradiction to all this, the Treasury Department's survey released on October 11 shows that even in non-war production industries, the average company has had "four straight years of prosperity earnings after taxes." More than forty per cent of these companies doubled their 1939 earnings in 1942, even after paying the greatly increased taxes. Ninety-three of 515 companies have tripled their net profits, while the average company producing metal goods has even quadrupled its profits. (It is to be kept in mind that these are not war industries.)

BIG BUSINESS POVERTY IS A FRAUD

In addition, the tax refunds available after the war are many times greater than the enormous non-taxable reserve funds already built by these companies. In fact, some companies could afford to GIVE AWAY all of their 1943 products and still be three-quarters compensated by the refunds from the taxes of the two preceding years.

The Times, however, insists, despite all contrary evidence, that "the Treasury has been squeezing close to the last drop of revenue out of the highest incomes."

This, quite briefly, is the impoverishment to which the rich are being subjected. This is the cruel fate they are so desperately combatting. They are impelled finally to envy the lot of workers earning much less than \$5,000 a year! And now, anticipating their possible survival until the next war, they demand a tamper-proof protection from the taxes which irk them in war as in peace—the twenty-second amendment.

Some Notes on the Jewish Question

By JESSE KAREN

The main bulk of American Jewish organizations are Zionist. They denounce violently any measures of self-defense or militancy indulged in by small Jewish groups and are suspicious of the labor groups.

By human standards alone, they should have been goaded into some sort of violent action. Taken as a whole, the Jewish people have suffered a more severe casualty rate than any single nation involved in this war. Rough estimates put the number of dead at about three million and practically all the surviving European Jews are now in concentration camps, homeless and in exile.

There is enough awareness that the necessity for securing some avenues of salvation for the hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees is an acute one. They know that they must prevent the casualty list from mounting still higher and so reduce their numbers as to be at the mercy of anti-Semitic forces.

Since American Jews constitute the largest remaining section, leadership of world Zionist affairs is in American hands.

The main aim of this leadership, so conservative in its approach to a solution, is to secure Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth. This they hope to win at the coming peace conference. They do not ask the United States to open its doors to Jewish immigration, they do not ask the Allies to take all immediate steps to save the remaining

European refugees, all they ask is large-scale immigration into Palestine.

At present, they represent a Palestinian population which is one-third the size of the Arab population, and when the ratio is changed the other way around, they figure everything will be settled.

There was one request from a Jewish population for rescue. Just before the wholesale destruction of the Warsaw ghetto, underground Polish leaders sent out a plea that the Allies request Germany to exchange Polish Jews for German war prisoners. This last-minute desperate cry did not receive much publicity, and it was ignored.

Jews are asking the British for the privilege of forming Palestinian fighting units so that they can go out and die for the British Lion more effectively and under their own leaders. To date this request has been refused. A recent report to the Chicago Sun from London says that "Britain is considering creation of a Jewish Army of possibly one or more divisions assigned to help drive the Japanese from Burma."

Burma, remember, is the place where the British Army was put on the run by the Japs, aided by the Burmese themselves. Last year a suicide expedition was sent back through the jungle without reconquering a foot of territory for England. A few men managed to come back alive.

So now, "the idea, which has found favor in certain responsible military quarters, is that the Jewish soldiers would be recruited mainly from the British Army in the Middle East, especially Palestine. Included among those who might volunteer would be Jews from Algeria, whom General Giraud refused to admit into French combat units. Jewish formations drawn from the Middle East would be brigaded into a special army under their own Palestinian flag. Enlistment might be thrown open throughout the British Empire and possibly to United States Jewish troops."

Pierre Van Paasen, writing on the contribution of the Palestinian Jews to Britain's war effort, says that North Africa, Syria and the Near East are strewn with the graves of Jewish soldiers. They volunteered for the most hazardous reconnaissance patrols into Ethiopia, into Syria, and formed part of other commando units. Two of five Palestinian units fighting in Italy were among the first Allied troops to land there. These represent fresh troops.

At the fall of Crete, 1,500 Palestinian soldiers were captured and there were only four units left at that time. Also, a large contingent of Jewish troops were lost en route to Malta some months ago. There are still 20,000 Jews from the comparatively small Jewish population in Palestine left in the British Army.

This sacrifice was made by people in whom the desire for national status is very strong, in the hope that by spilling their blood they would bring an end to the enslavement, degradation and slaughter of millions of Jews in Europe, and furthermore they hoped to curry favor with the British.

They fight with such bitter determination because they are filled with horror at the fate of their kinfolk in Europe. A recent traveller returning from Turkey estimates from information gathered there that only 200,000 have survived from among the three million Polish Jews who lived in that country before the war; in Rumania, only

300,000 Jews remain alive from a population of 800,000, and 70,000 of these survivors have been deported from their homes to a distant province; in Yugoslavia only a remnant of the 75,000 Jewish people remains and that remnant is fighting with the guerrilla forces; from Sofia and Salonika come reports that all Jews have been deported by the Germans. They were sent off in truck loads, of which it is estimated only twenty per cent remained alive.

In all the "free" ports of Europe and in the Soviet Union are hundreds of thousands of refugees who managed to escape from their native lands. They are kept huddled in barracks without sufficient food and clothing, yet none of the "human" nations under the control of the Allies will permit them to settle anywhere. The British government permits a limited number into Palestine and it permits children without parents to enter, in spite of the fact that all Jews who enter the country have their initial support provided for by large-scale American welfare agencies.

However, even this small amount of immigration will be banned when the White Paper goes into effect next March. Right now, England is more concerned with putting on a show of pro-Arab friendship in view of the large oil deal recently put over in the Middle East than she is with being "humane." Incidentally, the newspapers report that a large share in these latest oil concessions went to Standard Oil.

NOW ON SALE: INCENTIVE PAY

The Speed-Up, New Style
By ALBERT GATES
Editor, Labor Action

The FACTS about the boss's scheme to squeeze more work and more profits out of YOU.

5¢ per Copy, postpaid 32 pages
3¢ per Copy in bundles of five or more

ORDER A BUNDLE FOR YOUR FELLOW WORKERS!

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

Enclosed please find five cents for a copy of "Incentive Pay."
Enclosed please find _____ for a bundle of "Incentive Pay."

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____

PLENTY FOR ALL

The Meaning of Socialism
By ERNEST LUND

How the Owners of the Machine Have Mismanaged
Why the Capitalist System Won't Work
The Death Agony of Capitalism
The Way Out
Why Russia Turned Sour
How It Can Be Done
Where to Begin

Price: 10¢ per Copy, Postpaid 60 Pages
7¢ in Bundles of Five or More

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

Enclosed please find ten cents for a copy of "Plenty for All."
Enclosed please find _____ for a bundle of "Plenty for All."

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____

See Next Week:
THE UAW CONVENTION
By David Coolidge
THE THREE-POWER CONFERENCE
BISHOP SPELLMAN'S LETTERS
CONGRESS PLANS A SALES TAX

Progressives and UAW -- India Starves While Allies Talk "Freedom From Want"

(Continued from page 1)

The unions are not the natural basis of the Stalinists. Their basis is the Russian rulers who nourish and sustain them.

For the other officials and bureaucrats, the unions are a natural base. Destroy it and they are themselves destroyed. To one extent or another, they understand this fundamentally important truth. That is why, with all their allegiance to the capitalist system and to the Roosevelt Administration, they dare not and do not go as far in union-wrecking as their Stalinist rivals.

If this is not clearly understood it is impossible to understand the fight between the Stalinists and a group like Reuther's. It constitutes the basic reason why the Stalinists in the political-military interests of the Russian bureaucracy, were driving for the unconditional surrender of the UAW (and other unions) to the capitalists and their administration in Washington; whereas people like Reuther and Thomas, while continuing their own policy of surrender, were not inclined to make it so unconditional that the very basis of their existence as an officialdom—namely, the union itself—would be wiped out.

Hence, Reuther favored a mild condition or two attached to the endorsement of Roosevelt for a fourth term. That is why he made his fight, wretched as it was, against "incentive pay." That is why he worked out his super-clever formula which is supposed to leave the union a loophole for exercising again the right to strike under certain circumstances.

Whether they understood fully the difference between Reuther and the Stalinists or not, it is this difference that brought the overwhelming majority of real militants and progressives into the Reuther camp, for all the criticisms they made of its leadership.

It is perfectly clear to anyone who knows the UAW situation and who watched closely the Buffalo convention sessions that in addition to compromisers and tight-rope walkers like Reuther, there are many, many real progressives.

By "real progressives" we do not mean revolutionary socialists or "Trotskyists," as the Daily Worker labels everyone who fights in the best interests of the union. We mean unionists who take at least this much of an advanced position: (a) take back the right to strike; (b) smash the incentive pay drive and fight for real wage increases; (c) break with Roosevelt and the capitalist parties and form an independent Labor Party. Such unionists exist by the thousand in the UAW and even had some spokesmen in the convention.

If they had, why didn't these spokesmen organize a fight of their own and make their presence felt? It is a certainty that they are not isolated in the union, for they express the feelings of wide sections of the membership. This has been demonstrated already. For example, by the progressive decisions adopted at the recent Michigan CIO conference, and earlier by the Bush-Kill conference called by the people of Brewster Local 365.

It is true that the views of the progressives did find some expression on the convention floor. There were a few good, clear, aggressive speeches against the Roosevelt myth, for an independent Labor Party, against the incentive pay fraud, and so forth. But all of them taken together in no way corresponded to the real strength of

the progressive program in the membership, or to the urgent requirements of the union.

Despite all these speeches (and there weren't too many of them, either), there was no action or serious attempt at action.

I think that the real progressives were dominated far too much by a fear of the harmful consequences of an independent intervention by themselves and by a lack of self-confidence which they have neither the right nor the need to feel.

They seemed to fear that an independent fight would divide the anti-Addes, or anti-Stalinist front and facilitate a victory for Addes and the Communist Party-liners. They feared that a bold and uncompromising stand would be exploited demagogically by the Stalinists against the "general" Reuther camp. In other words, that the Stalinists would begin shouting: "You see! That's the kind of people Reuther has on his side, or who vote for him! They're against our great Commander-in-Chief! They're against our great war effort!" And so on and so forth. And who (if the progressives seemed to be asking themselves) would support them in fighting back? Reuther? Now, their judgment of what the Stalinist fakers would do was undoubtedly correct. So was their judgment of how quickly Reuther would leave them in the lurch, if not directly attack them in order to show how respectable he is.

But this does not change the fact that the progressives made a mistake and a big one. If they keep on standing still on the same road they are lost and so in the long run, is the magnificent UAW that took so much time and militant effort to build up!

Once you think in terms I have tried to describe, you are done for. The Stalinists understand this perfectly, and that is why they open up their dirty blackmailing and blackjacking campaign of intimidation the minute a progressive appears on the scene.

If the progressives continue to be intimidated, the road is clear to the steamroller of Stalinist destruction. The time will never be "ripe" for an independent fight of the progressives unless they rid themselves of the fatal tactical notions and fears inculcated in them by others—and partly by themselves.

The same holds true with reference to Reuther. If he can force the real progressives to give up their fight and knuckle down to his disastrous line of compromise and double-talk by warning: "If you don't string along with me, the Stalinists will win!" he will play that game forever.

The progressives will end up by being completely discredited, and they will deserve to be. The rank and filers who look to them for leadership will get good and fed up with them, and proceed to look elsewhere for avenues of expression.

This means: ORGANIZATION! Not just at conventions, when it is usually too late, but before conventions, long before. Organization OF a union is needed to fight the capitalists. Organization IN a union is needed to keep it best equipped to fight the capitalists.

This means: organization now! The progressives in the UAW, as elsewhere in the union movement, must organize their forces! It is a job that can be postponed only at the greatest risk to the union's future. If the Buffalo convention didn't make this clear to the thinking militants in the UAW, there isn't much time left for them to get clear about it!

By ALFRED FREEMAN

The latest report from India states that 130,000 people in Calcutta are "near death from starvation." One official reported that 9,000 persons in Bengal Province starved to death last week.

The rate of deaths in Calcutta alone is now over 1,000 persons a week. A United Press report quoted a Bengal legislator returning from a tour of one section southwest of Calcutta as having found a "city of the dead."

They are dropping off like flies, the people of India. It is the biggest famine to have struck that unhappy land in many years—a famine which was predicted by the leaders of the Indian people; which, they warned, was coming as a result of the hard-headedness, stupidity and do-nothing policy of the British imperialist administration. They sat on their imperialist thrones, not bothering to exert their musty minds with the problem of how to provide food to meet the famine which everyone could see was coming...and then went out to relax in their exclusive hotels and night clubs.

In the meantime—and this is merely what the reporters in India have been ALLOWED to say for public consumption—the people of Bombay and Calcutta were dropping into the gutters, their bodies shrunken with hunger.

Yes, indeed, it was an illuminating spectacle of the morality of the capitalist world and its supporters. In London, Herbert Morrison, Church-

ill's labor leader, thought this the appropriate occasion to launch a speech praising the efficiency and humanitarianism of the British Empire. Those critics who condemned the Empire, he said, were speaking of something that no longer existed; today all is peace and friendship within a happy partnership of nations. (And, no doubt, it is this new era of British imperial good-fellowship and tolerance which still keeps Gandhi and Nehru in prison.)

Praise to the Empire

You would think, perhaps, that someone presuming to speak as a leader of labor, as Morrison does, would have just a word or two—say, a passing phrase—to say about the heart-rending plight of the Indian masses and perhaps even a side reference to the responsibility of the imperial rule for the mess that is India's food administration; and perhaps even a word about the black market in India which has been condoned by the imperial administration and which sucks the last bit of blood money out of the Indians—but no. This, thought that great "municipal socialist," Herbert Morrison, was the occasion to praise the fairness of the British Empire!

Well, to each his appointed task in life....

And, of course, no one could take the New York Herald Tribune to task for editorially praising Morrison for his pro-Empire talk. It is frankly imperialist, and if a British labor leader prostitutes himself in its cause, it is right for the Tribune to rub its editorial hands gleefully.

But in the meantime, the people of India keep dying and starving. Not all the pap about the Four Freedoms or about the good-fellowship of British imperialism could feed their hungry bellies.

What About the Food Program?

Simultaneously, the American liberals were engaged in a wordy debate about post-war food problems in Europe. Should Herbert Lehman be the head of the European feeding agency or should someone else take charge? Should it be done via lend-lease or some other way?

And then too you must have read the accounts of starvation, of horror which came from our correspondents in Italy, describing the legacy which the Nazis left to Naples. How righteous, how pious were the words of the Allied spokesmen who condemned the Nazi regime of terror and hunger!

In the meantime, in the British backyard, in India, they keep dying and starving. And the United Press correspondents write about how the rich Britishers and imperial administrators dine in their special hotels on seventeen-course meals.

But hasn't Herbert Morrison assured us that the Empire is getting better and better, and aren't the American liberals too busy planning the post-war world in Europe (about which they'll have no real say, anyway) to pay any attention to the fact that thousands die in India?

After all, wouldn't it be sheer spitefulness to tarnish what Churchill has called the jewel of the British Empire?

The Chinese Exclusion Act

FDR "Acknowledges" Mistake

By HARRY YOUNG

The President has proposed to Congress that it adopt a bill repealing its various acts which have excluded Chinese immigration into this country for fifty years. He proposed that Chinese be permitted to enter the country under current quota laws—that is, one hundred and five immigrants each year. Such action by Congress, says the President, will silence "the distorted Japanese propaganda," and he regards this legislation as "important in the cause of winning the war." Magnanimous indeed is Mr. Roosevelt when he remarks that "We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and to correct them."

The implication contained in that last statement is really something. We are going to "correct" fifty years of Chinese exclusion, fifty years in which we have announced by legislative action that Asiatics (don't forget that the Exclusion Acts apply to ALL Asiatics; not only the Chinese) are inferior peoples unworthy of admission to our land; not to mention the years of anti-Chinese terror on the West Coast—we are going to correct all this by allowing one hundred and five carefully selected immigrants into the country!

The President, of course, conceives of all this merely as a symbol, a noble gesture of a "new" attitude toward China. But even as a symbol the action is meaningless. Faced with gigantic problems of internal construction after the war is over, the Chinese people have no intention of migrating in large numbers to any foreign land, especially to a country which has treated them so badly in the past as has America. And furthermore, where is there the Chinese worker and peasant who will take seriously this avowal of friendship—at the rate of one hundred and five a year? The gesture becomes even emptier when we consider that no move is under way to repeal the California discriminatory acts that prevent West Coast Chinese

from holding land or property. And the whole thing becomes more of a farce since Roosevelt wants the Exclusion Acts to continue in force for the rest of Asia's peoples—the Indians, Javanese, Malaysians, etc.

Reasons Behind the Move

Why this move on FDR's part at this particular time? The main reason is completely bound up with the war in the Pacific and has opportunistic motives. The whole matter is vital for the future of the Pacific war. The Allies are preparing to launch new offensives in the Pacific. The British seek to recapture Burma, Malaya and other lost positions; the Americans seek the reconquest of the Philippines and control of the Pacific.

Aware of these approaching offensives, the Japanese militarists in occupation of these territories have begun a demagogic scheme to win some support from these colonial peoples whose lands they now occupy. They have granted "freedom" to their Burmese puppet government and are about to do the same in the Philippines. In Malaya and the East Indies they have granted concessions to native middle class and business elements.

Let no one underestimate the skill and intelligence of the Japanese imperialists. They have not carried out THEIR imperialism with rigid color lines. They long knew they would have to face a counter-attack and that they must have some local support in the native population to aid them in the struggle against these attacks.

The Japanese "Concessions"

The Japanese are going to the people of Burma, Malaya and Java and offering some concessions as well as grandiose promises for the future. Among the workers and peasants (who are no doubt just as badly off as ever under Japanese rule), they are conducting their propaganda campaign around the theme of "the

old, white imperialists want to come back; together we must stop them." Demagogic, hypocritical and lying—beyond a doubt—but effective because of the whole history of white rule in Asia for the past two hundred years.

Roosevelt and the Allied leaders seek to counteract this propaganda with a propaganda of their own. FDR urges the immediate "freeing" of the Philippines (when he had these islands—no freedom; now that we DON'T HAVE THEM—"freedom" at once). He urges repeal of the Exclusion Acts as applied to China. Queen Wilhelmina talks of a "new deal" for the East Indies. It is even rumored (Lord bless us!) that Churchill is consulting with the former Governor-General of Burma regarding "reforms" for that colony upon its reconquest.

But even here the timidity and emptiness of the counter-propaganda is transparent. All mention of a Pacific Charter guaranteeing complete independence to the Asiatic continent has disappeared from the press for a year now. No serious programs for reconstruction, no guarantees of self-determination are offered. Every statement about Asia indicates the clear intention of the British, Dutch and American imperialists merely to reoccupy the lost territories, drive out the present Japanese masters and carry on as before Pearl Harbor.

The message of FDR to Congress on China is but another feeble gesture in this attempted response to Japan. Just as before American entry into the war, the American working people were the real friends of China (protesting against the policy of supplying Japan with the means for its imperialist wars), so now we see that it is still these same workers who are China's real supporters. They do not approach China with bogus offers, nor refuse to talk about the real issues involved, the future independence from imperialism of China and the rest of the Asiatic world.

BRITAIN--USA:

Rivals Fight Over Share of Post-War Profits

By CARL DAVIS

One of the interesting and explosive products of the upturn in the military fortunes of the Allies is not merely the sharpening relations between the Anglo-American coalition of the United Nations and their partner, Russia. That deep differences exist between these powers on military and political questions, particularly those which concern domination of the European Continent, is now a matter of public knowledge.

But that is only half the story. It has now become clearer than ever that almost as sharp a conflict exists between Great Britain and the United States. While the competition between these two powers has always existed, their antagonisms in this war have usually been subordinated to their main aim of achieving a military victory over the Axis.

Now, however, the deep differences between Great Britain and the United States have come out into the open, and the opinions expressed by spokesmen for both countries have been extremely sharp.

What are these differences about? Economic interests, that is to say, the hunt for profits!

AMERICAN BUSINESS WINNING

The war enabled American big business to deliver some heavy blows against their British capitalist competitors. British participation in the war for two years before this country became a belligerent and the heavy demands made on British industry by the war effort, enabled American business to drive her business out of the South American market. And it took over a large share of British business in other parts of the world.

The heavy British losses in shipping have been compensated for by the tremendous construction program laid out by Washington. But while the early losses have been replaced and many new ships added to the total Allied merchant marine, these new ships have merely given the United States the greatest merchant fleet in the world. Thus, Great Britain has been replaced as the leading maritime nation in the world.

This has meant that most shipping now carried on is by American boats.

America has likewise "leased" a number of British bases throughout this hemisphere. The British are deeply concerned whether they will be returned and how soon, after the war; whether the United States really means to keep these bases after the war.

"WE INTEND TO STAY"

British business interests are gravely worried over whether American capitalists will permit them to participate in the economic life of Latin America, from which they have been forced to retire since the war.

Rear Admiral Vickery (speaking for the Administration) told the British, on the question of the merchant marine:

"Yes, and I told them we intend to become a maritime nation and intend to stay one. I said we would do it by cooperation, but if they didn't want to cooperate we'd stay one anyhow."

That's only another way of saying: British rule of the sea—military and commercial—is over. From now on, this role belongs to the United States. The United States will take over the lion's share of the rich international trade. Such a shipping tonnage which America now has will not only enable her to handle the biggest share of trade, but it will make it much easier to penetrate new areas not previously within her "sphere of influence."

What the business interests are doing—and shipping is a key need in this affair—is preparing for post-war world domination of Europe, Asia, Africa and South America.

Such post-war world domination would not merely mean that Britain will play second fiddle—for that is the instrument she now plays—but it would be devastating to the future existence of the British Empire.

A PLEA FOR COOPERATION

The British have recognized this all along. From the very beginning of lend-lease, they objected to the restrictions placed on her trade, which she sought to continue because a vast supply of lend-lease material reached her shores. They asked that assurances be given that once the war is over British business can continue where it left off. Needless to say, no such assurances were given to her.

Her shipping monopoly is obviously gone. South America is now a "colony" of the United States. The United States has begun its penetration of Asia (Indian independence is very popular in this country precisely because it will enable American business to bust the British monopoly there) and aims to play the first role there. That is why the British yell so much for post-war cooperation. They will fare better that way!

Each new stage in the war reveals that behind the nice phrases is the reality: a struggle for trade, territory, resources, all of which can be summed up in one word—PROFIT!

Cramp Shipyard Strike --

(Continued from page 1)

Then William B. Schaffer, Local 42 president, took the floor. In a speech replete with biting scorn and justifiable anger he announced that he agreed with none of the previous speakers. "I've been subjected to all kinds of pressure, by phone and by personal contact to change my attitude; I've been warned that I might wind up in the Army right quick—well, I've worn the uniform before and I'm not afraid to wear it again."

"I've leaned backward so far in appeasing everyone," he said, "that I was almost on my back. I was being called a company man and my union a company union by a sad and disappointed membership. Well, I am not a company man and this is not a company union," he shouted, amidst a tumult of applause. "We are sick of the abuse and fake flag waving. Every one of us has brothers, cousins and relatives in the fighting forces and if we don't fight here to protect their interests, we will have failed in our duty to them. We want jobs and union protection for them when they come home. It is little enough we are asking and I am telling every one we are fighting mad."

"Johnny Green and our national office haven't done a damned thing for us except to rush in and tell us to get back to work with empty hands. Green came in here only once before all this to talk to the shop stewards and that was to give them hell. Why don't the national office read the preamble to our constitution once in a while? I'm sick of the lack of help from them."

"We won't take any more promises. We want every one of our demands taken care of and taken care of right now."

Schaffer's speech, broken into by repeated cheers and whistles, ended in the wildest, most enthusiastic demonstration this reporter has ever seen in years of union membership. The ovation ended only when Schaffer called for order.

Speaker after speaker then got up and condemned the company for its inefficiency, its great

profits and its anti-labor attitude; they criticized the national office and urged it to give the leadership union men have a right to expect; they attacked the government agencies for doing nothing but hand out anti-labor decisions and they shouted that they would stand together with President Schaffer and Local 42's officers in their rejection of the national office's insistence that they go back without anything.

Further discussion on the proper course of action brought Schaffer to the floor again. "I hope no one will say I'm leaning backward again when I suggest that we go back to work tomorrow. I'm making this suggestion on one condition—that we get every one of our demands together and that we give them six days to settle every last one of them satisfactorily. If we do not get satisfaction on every grievance, I am asking now that we file into this hall next Sunday and vote to walk out and stay out until we do get what we want. And I mean every word I say."

The meeting broke up and the enthusiasm and high spirits of the men kept discussions going until late in the evening. Monday brought thousands of the cockiest, proudest union men you ever saw walking into Cramp's. Where active union men were having a tough time trying to keep the dispirited union men from trying to have their names taken off the union rolls, now non-union men were rushing to join up. Bill Schaffer's name was on everyone's tongue and the men feel that at last, maybe, they are on the road to getting a contract and proper treatment.

As we go to press we learn that the impressive spirit and demonstration of unity and leadership have reached even the supervisors, who are acting very nicely to men they were kind of rough on before.

We also learn that already, reclassification raises, held up for months by the company, started coming through on Monday.—Philadelphia Reporter.

A "Dreyfus Case" in Palestine

By WILLIAM GORMAN

The Jewish taxi driver and the leader of the Seamen's Union in Tel Aviv were not the only ones convicted at the end of the "Arms Trial" in Palestine.

The whole affair was publicly staged as a crude attack on the political existence and hopes of the six hundred thousand Jews of Palestine. It was a well planned blow at the only expression of Jewish self-government in the country—the Jewish Agency. In short, it was one more step in Britain's imperialist machinations in the Middle East, aimed at consolidating a bloc of Arab countries under reactionary feudal princes, who would only be the richly paid puppets of the British.

Gun-running has been going on in Palestine for many years, but the British colonial rulers never cared to publicize it. However, in this trial a hundred and twenty newspaper men were literally rounded up from all parts of the Middle East, and the usually tight censorship, which never allows political news to leak out, relaxed so that anti-Jewish dispatches could go out daily all over the world.

The British Colonial Office did not miss the Jews in its all-out effort to label the Jews of Palestine as "armed trouble-makers." Once the "crime"

is established today, brutal imperialist punishment could be justified tomorrow.

A Policy of Provocation

There is still a more important reason for the gun-running trial. It was aimed as a provocation for the Arab people, who are now supposed to become so alarmed at the "arming of the Jews" that they would appeal to the British for "protection" and "action." This would fit in excellently with the British plans.

After the last war, the Jews were used as an imperialist pawn against the nationalist aspirations of the Arabs. Today the process is reversed. The Arabs are being used to frustrate the nationalist aspirations of the Jewish people. Thus, one people is being played against the other, Jewish and Arab blood flows, which enables the British to maintain with ease their hold on the rich and strategic Middle East.

Arab-Jewish Unity

The British imperialists have many reasons to fear what is now happening in Palestine. Jewish and Arab working class unity, which the imperialist bureaucrats have fought against for decades, is advancing slowly and steadily, thanks to the industrialization of the country.

LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interests of Labor

Published Weekly by the

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

Vol. 7, No. 43 October 25, 1943

ALBERT GATES, Editor

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

Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1944,
at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1879.