

STEEL UNION DEMANDS RAISE

R. J. Thomas Blasts Vinson Hearings

UAW President Defends Brewster Local 365

Twice refused a hearing by the sub-committee of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, which has been investigating production and labor at plants of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, on Monday, November 29, sent the committee a letter in which he charged the real objective of the investigation has been the "hanging" of Brewster Local 365 of the UAW-CIO, and the "smearing" of the entire labor movement.

Thomas accused the committee of excluding vital statistical evidence on the Brewster situation, one of them the result of an official survey by the U. S. Manpower Commission. He alleged that this was done because the committee sought only testimony which would injure the union in the plant.

The committee was accused by Thomas of badgering and bullying witnesses who did not support the "apparently preconceived conclusions of the committee."

Thomas's letter, sent out as a press release, was given practically no publicity by the press, which carried on such vile attacks on the Brewster union. The text of the letter follows:

I have your telegram of November 1, in which you, for the second time, decline to permit me, as president of the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO, to appear before the sub-committee which has been investigating production problems in the plants of the Brewster Aircraft Corporation.

Your statement that I "have had no direct or indirect connection with Brewster" is inaccurate, as I could have shown to your satisfaction had your committee not arbitrarily refused me the right to a hearing. It so happens that I helped negotiate and was one of the signatories of the 1939 contract between the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation and Brewster Local 365, UAW-CIO. Since that time I have had several occasions to acquaint myself with specific problems involving the Brewster contract. In the final analysis, I am the chief spokesman for the Brewster workers as well as all other members of the UAW-CIO. I therefore feel it was completely unfair and not in the

best interests of an important investigation for your committee to refuse to hear me.

"Open Shop" Investigation

Furthermore, I cannot subscribe to your statement that your investigation has limited itself purely to production problems in the Brewster plants. Members of your committee, as well as some witnesses before it, were permitted to stray far from the subject purportedly under investigation. You permitted arguments in favor of the "open shop"; you permitted criticism of the Wagner Act and the War Labor Board; you permitted attacks on features of Brewster contracts which are common to most labor-management contracts in our country; you entered into personal matters which you failed to show had any connection whatever with production at Brewster. Your refusal to hear me, even on the mistaken supposition that I had no direct information on the Brewster situation, has, therefore, no legitimate justification.

Your refusal to hear me, together with the reading of the testimony before your committee, leads me to feel that the investigation which you have conducted cannot accurately be called a sincere effort to improve production in the Brewster plants.

I will grant that you have produced a large amount of information dealing with reasons for lack of greater production at Brewster, but you have also permitted your inquiry to degenerate into a labor-baiting affair which could not help but have the effect of vitiating, perhaps completely nullifying, the constructive features of the hearings.

Any fair-minded person reading the testimony would be struck immediately with the persistency with which you tried to badger witnesses who did not agree with you, tried to misinterpret their remarks, and tried time and again to put in the mouths of witnesses attacks on the Brewster Local Union which they did not desire to make.

Anti-Unionism at Hearing

Your examination of three union spokesmen whom you chose to hear, Messrs. Thomas V. DeLorenzo, Paul J. Krebs and Gabriel J. DeAngelis, was accompanied throughout by bul-

lying, by threats, by personal abuse and by impugning of motives. I have no desire to justify Mr. DeLorenzo's answers on certain questionnaires, but I maintain that you did not probe in any way that any of his acts reflected in any way on Mr. DeLorenzo's record as the leader of the Brewster Local, or his efforts to maintain production in the Brewster plants.

By contrast with the abusive manner in which you interrogated witnesses who did not agree with you, you were most kind and solicitous of those witnesses who supported the apparently preconceived conclusions of the committee. In view of these facts, I am constrained to observe that your committee was only secondarily interested in Brewster production, and primarily considered itself a "hanging committee" for the Brewster Local Union in particular and the labor movement of the country in general.

Reading the testimony, I was

shocked to learn that you refused to display any interest in or make any effort to obtain probably the most authoritative survey of employment and production problems of the Long Island City Brewster plant. I refer to the investigation by the Division of Manpower Utilization of the Manpower Commission, Region 2A. Since your committee failed to visit the plant, or send its own investigators into the plant, it seems to me that you might at least give consideration to a thorough investigation which was made by another government agency.

The determination of your committee to bar out any facts which would not serve to blacken Brewster workers, their union and their leaders, is evidenced also by your refusal to receive in evidence and make part of the testimony a careful, detailed, objective report made by labor members of the Brewster labor-management production committee.

I urge that in all fairness these two reports be made part of the records of the proceedings of the committee and given their merited consideration in your final report.

An Ex-President Speaks

On the basis of these two reports and on the basis of testimony by officers of the U. S. Navy and officers of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, it is obvious that the production deficiencies which prevailed in the Brewster plants can in no way be charged to Local 365, UAW-CIO. On the contrary, it appears that production failures were the responsibility of the managements and of the Navy Department itself, which sponsored some of the managements.

In this connection, I would direct your attention particularly to the testimony of Ralph Singer, a former president of Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, who stated that the company set about making planes with-

(Continued on page 2)

Other Unions Join in Fight Against Little Steel Formula

By GERTRUDE SHAW

The International Executive Board of the United Steel Workers of America, CIO, has just come out for an increase in wages of seventeen cents an hour for the 750,000 members of that union. The present basic hiring wage is seventy-eight cents an hour.

This is good news for the whole working class of America.

The CIO convention recently held in Philadelphia went on record against the Little Steel freeze.

In his closing speech at that convention, President Philip Murray—who is also president of the United Steel Workers—said he was going to "present this problem" to a special meeting of our International Executive Board.

The definite demand for a wage increase for the 750,000 organized steel workers proclaims to the entire labor movement that the CIO means business. The Little Steel formula is actually junked—in accordance with the resolution of the CIO convention:

"The working men and women of America must be permitted, through the sound and stable processes of collective bargaining, to

secure wage adjustments to levels necessary to maintain their morale, health and efficiency and to meet the special needs imposed on them in this war period."

In line with this resolution, the International Board of the United Auto Workers has also recommended wage increases in the entire industry. It is expected that the first to carry out the recommendation and make specific demands will be the Chrysler department of the union, representing 70,000 workers.

Among the other CIO unions that have thus far taken action to implement the convention resolution kicking the Little Steel formula out of labor's back door are the Aluminum, Electrical and Textile Workers.

The Executive Board of the New York State CIO also voted unanimously to urge "all affiliates to immediately seek wage increases to meet the rapid increases in the cost of living."

Outside the CIO, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, an AFL affiliate representing 500,000 workers, has likewise come out in favor of wage increases in excess of the limits set by the formula.

Undoubtedly these and other unions will now follow the example of the Steel Workers Union and make definite demands with the utmost speed. Labor leaders can no longer resist the pressure from the ranks. The labor movement is on its way to end the injustice of a wage freeze with ever-mounting living costs on the one side, and on the other big business war profits for 1943 at over \$8,000,000,000 clear gravy.

Other Progressive Demands
Besides asking for a wage increase, the Steel Workers Union will make other progressive demands. One is for "severance pay" for workers "when a plant or any portion thereof is permanently closed down."

Four weeks' pay will be requested for workers having one to three years' continuous service, and eight weeks' pay for those having three years or more of continuous service to their credit.

Under threat he would lose his \$54,000 job, Boehm declares, he and other officers and employees of North American were compelled to pay fees to lawyers, which were "kicked back" and turned into the slush fund.

The slush fund, Boehm charges, was spent as directed, by Harrison Williams, chairman of the board of North American and for many years a spectacular Wall Street operator, whose wife has been described as "the best-dressed woman in America."

Others involved by Boehm in the scandal are Dillon, Read & Co., New York investment bankers, who for years, according to Boehm, enjoyed "the highly lucrative business of marketing securities for North American without competitive bidding."

Last week the Supreme Court held the challenged provision valid, which means Egan must go to jail and the company pay the fine.

Forced to Testify Falsely
Immediately following the decision Boehm filed his suit. He says he testified falsely at the trial and also

declared the company had made him a scapegoat in a conspiracy to manipulate its funds so as to conceal its political activities. Boehm is suing North American for \$25,000,000 damages for "defamation, slander and libel."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which

declared the company had made him a scapegoat in a conspiracy to manipulate its funds so as to conceal its political activities. Boehm is suing North American for \$25,000,000 damages for "defamation, slander and libel."

(Continued on page 4)

Powers Clash at UNRRA Conference; Ignore Plight of Jews and India

By V. JENSEN

The cold winds that blow through Atlantic City during November tell of a hard winter to come, but they did not seriously inconvenience the cozily housed and well fed delegates of the forty-four nations to the council meeting of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. It is to be hoped that these cold winds will have at least blown the cobwebs from the minds of those liberals who looked to the meeting for any real solution of the enormously important and pressing problems of relief and rehabilitation in a devastated Europe.

Faced with the all-important problem of a devastated, starved, disease-ridden Europe, faced with the prospect of unprecedented human misery and death, the UNRRA meeting presented a shameful spectacle of the powers that be, greater and lesser,

horse-trading, jockeying and juggling for more favored economic and political positions, bargaining and stinting. Generous in words, the meeting was generous in nothing else. What may be expected of it as far as the reduction of misery goes is best seen by its refusal to touch the two most immediate relief problems presented to it, relief for the Jews and famine relief for India.

The inescapable need for relief established, the meeting was primarily concerned with the efforts of the small nations to get as much relief as possible from the supplying nations, principally the United States and the United Kingdom, and to give as little as possible in the way of political and economic domination to the great powers. On the other hand, efforts of the great supplying powers to give as little as possible and get as much as they could, and to prevent any among themselves from getting undue advantages over the other provided a thoroughly illuminating but disgusting spectacle.

In this respect, the United States, though it has not had its own way unopposed, inevitably holds the whip hand. The whole setup is a tribute to the position that America holds as the dominant capitalist power.

The Relief Setup

The UNRRA has as its stated goal to provide relief for thirty-five countries, containing half a billion people by providing 48,855,000 metric tons of supplies, 9,500,000 from North America for the first six-month period. The supplies are in two categories: (1) immediate relief necessities, such as food, fuel, clothing, shelter and medical supplies; (2)

a separate international agency instead of the UNRRA. The French delegate followed the British with a proposal that activities should stop at the water's edge and that the French themselves should administer distribution of relief.

The British and French struggle to weaken American domination of the setup came over the issue of whether veto power over the allocation of food and other relief supplies should be given to the UNRRA, or whether the wartime control now held jointly by Britain and the United States through combined boards, be continued.

The British and French wished to give these boards, on which the British exert great influence, the power to allow France, which is a "rich" nation with gold reserves, to buy stocks which would permit it to set up its own independent stockpiles. This would also go for the Netherlands, Belgium and Norway.

Lehman came out bitterly against these limitations on the powers of the committee. He wants no private stockpiles but a pool from which all nations would draw, with the United States, of course, having most of the say.

Fallings-Out of the "Charitables"

Despite the usual paeans of praise for co-operative attitudes and the wonderful unity on the part of the press, editorially, day-to-day dispatches indicated serious differences among the powers. The most serious fight took place on the struggle for power between Lehman on one hand and the British and French delegates on the other.

Early in the sessions a British expert testified to a subcommittee that the British believed questions involving relief goods that must be moved by inland transportation should be under the jurisdiction of

British Workers March; Protest Mosley's Release

By JOHN BERNE

As soon as it was made public that Sir Oswald Mosley, founder of the British Union of Fascists, would be released from prison, British labor protested this double-cross which it rightly considered as a blow at itself.

From all over England protests poured into London. Conferences of shop stewards sent angry resolutions to Prime Minister Churchill and to Herbert Morrison, Home Minister. Delegations tried to get a hearing at 10 Downing Street or at Whitehall. Failing to do so, one delegation left a message for Churchill: "Feeling in factory is such that we cannot be responsible for anything that happens."

The Transport & General Workers Union passed a strong resolution, as did other unions. Arthur Deakin of the Transport Union pointed out: "Gandhi was at death's door but he was not released."

Will Lawther of the Miners Federation wanted to know: "How can the government square such an action as the sending to prison of boys for refusing to work in the mines with the release of a man like Mosley with a pass?"

Despite this widespread mass opposition, on November 20 Britain's No. 1 fascist and his wife slipped out of prison before daylight "under government protection." The founder of the British Union of Fascists has gained "restricted" freedom. So has his wife, sister of the notorious Unity Freeman-Mitford, whose name was linked with Adolph Hitler. So also have a number of Mosley's lieutenants.

The awaited explanation made by Herbert Morrison before Parliament on November 32 has yielded nothing not already known. The Home Min-

ister again referred to Mosley's phlebitis and to the opinion of several physicians that further imprisonment might ruin his health.

However, the National Council of Labor, representing the Trade Union Congress, the Labor Party and the cooperative movement, "is not convinced that facilities for medical and other treatment could not be provided for Mosley without his being released."

A laborite MP also wanted to know: "Why, as medical and nursing services provided in Holloway prison are adequate for prisoners confined there, is it necessary for medical reasons to remove Sir Oswald and Lady Mosley from detention in that institution?"

But how about Mosley's wife? She is hearty and hale. So are the Mosley followers who have been released. The "phlebitis" looks like a pretext—and nothing but.

Nor should it be supposed that the Mosleys were confined in Holloway Prison under hardships. British capitalism treats its fascists well. The Mosleys were removed from Brixton Prison more than two years ago to live in the comparative luxury of

Holloway. Their new quarters consisted of four adjoining cells made up as two bedrooms, a living room and a kitchen.

These honored guests of the British government had their own furnishings, including carpets. Hot and cold water, a special food supply, entertainment, visitors, a private radio, all contributed to make prison life not too difficult.

"Mosley In—Morrison Out"

On the morning when Morrison made his so-called explanation to Parliament, thousands of individual workers and others duly delegated to represent hundreds of thousands more, demonstrated before the House of Parliament. There were banners reading "Mosley In—Morrison Out." People surged into the lobby of the House, button-holed MPs and shouted their protests. Parliament Square was packed with demonstrators, marching and chanting: "Put the No. 1 fascist back in jail" and "We want Mosley." Many night workers came directly from plants and yards to join the demonstration.

Frederick Graham reported to the

(Continued on page 4)

Landlords Up Income 31-42%

The OPA has just completed a survey on landlords' income which reveals that this band of vultures has taken advantage of war conditions to get their unholy share of the income of the people.

The survey discloses that landlords are receiving from thirty-one to forty-two per cent more income under rent control than before. This means that for each \$1.00 of rent formerly collected, they now get \$1.31 to \$1.42.

These facts, the OPA declared, came from the books of the landlords.

"Political Action" by a Corporation

Utility Scandal a Lesson for Labor

By CHARLES M. KELLEY

(Reprinted from "Labor," organ of the Railway Unions)

Anybody who has had even speaking acquaintance with politics knows that public utilities have spent oceans of money in efforts to put their men into office and to defeat candidates suspected of being devoted to the people's interests.

Only occasionally has it been possible to trace the slush funds to their source, but the public got some idea of the extent of public utility corruption in a suit filed in a St. Louis court this week. An "insider" lifted the curtain and made one of the most amazing confessions in the industry's history.

The giant North American Company—just one of many big holding concerns—was accused of having spent more than \$5,000,000 since 1930 in attempts to influence elections and the appointment of federal and state officials in Missouri, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, California and

the District of Columbia. Throughout that area North American operates through a string of subsidiaries.

The accuser is Frank J. Boehm, who at one time drew \$54,000 a year as executive vice-president of the Union Electric Company, a Missouri corporation and subsidiary of North America. He recently completed a ten-month sentence in federal prison for perjury committed at a court trial that followed an inquiry by the Securities and Exchange Commission into political skulduggery by Union Electric.

Boehm was sentenced to a five-year term, but President Roosevelt was persuaded by someone to commute the sentence to two years. He was released on parole last March.

Declaring the company had made him a scapegoat in a conspiracy to manipulate its funds so as to conceal its political activities, Boehm is suing North American for \$25,000,000 damages for "defamation, slander and libel."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which

is at the center of incidents exposed by Boehm, considered his charges of sufficient importance to devote columns to them.

Several years ago the Securities and Exchange Commission discovered that Union Electric officers had spent more than \$600,000 in efforts to influence elections. Louis H. Egan, who for twenty years was president of the company, was convicted with others and given a two-year term, while the company was heavily fined.

Egan and the company appealed to the United States Supreme Court, contending a provision of the Holding Company Act under which they had been convicted was unconstitutional.

Last week the Supreme Court held the challenged provision valid, which means Egan must go to jail and the company pay the fine.

Immediately following the decision Boehm filed his suit. He says he testified falsely at the trial and also

declared the company had made him a scapegoat in a conspiracy to manipulate its funds so as to conceal its political activities. Boehm is suing North American for \$25,000,000 damages for "defamation, slander and libel."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which

declared the company had made him a scapegoat in a conspiracy to manipulate its funds so as to conceal its political activities. Boehm is suing North American for \$25,000,000 damages for "defamation, slander and libel."

declared the company had made him a scapegoat in a conspiracy to manipulate its funds so as to conceal its political activities. Boehm is suing North American for \$25,000,000 damages for "defamation, slander and libel."

declared the company had made him a scapegoat in a conspiracy to manipulate its funds so as to conceal its political activities. Boehm is suing North American for \$25,000,000 damages for "defamation, slander and libel."

(Continued on page 4)

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

MASS ACTION

By David Coolidge

R. J. Thomas Defends Brewster Union--

(Continued from page 1)

out blueprints and without engineering.

Mr. Singer said: "There have been no airplanes of that design; there has been no engineering data of any kind other than, as I say, a rough sketch and this mark-up; so that you can readily see we were going into production on something that did not exist."

The confusion which resulted from this preposterous situation should be understandable to all reasonable men. Frederick Riebel, another former president of Brewster, told your committee that engineering changes numbered 500 to 1,200 per week. Mr. Riebel also indicated that there was considerable labor hoarding at the plant. It was also testified that the flow of materials was irregular and inadequate, and that the physical layout of the Long Island City plant was far from conducive to top production.

In view of these circumstances, I do not see how any labor union could be held responsible for production failures. Under the circumstances recited to your committee, there can be no legitimate charge made of loafing on the part of workers. I have, at times, worked in mass production plants and I know that bad engineering and lack of parts give workers no alternative but occasional idleness. This was obviously true in the Brewster Long Island City plant.

The Republican and Democratic Parties do not serve, represent or protect the working class. They serve, represent and protect the boss class, the ruling class of capitalists.

This is just as true of the "New Deal" Democratic Party as of the "New Freedom" Democratic Party of Woodrow Wilson or the Republican Party of Herbert Hoover. The same would be true of some "third party," such as might call itself a "Progressive Party" or "People's Party."

There was some talk of forming such a party around former Senator Norris and other people who go by the name of "liberals." Such a party would be a capitalist party and could not be any improvement over the ill-fated New Deal.

A Labor Party would not be a "third party." It would be a FIRST party, so far as we workers are concerned. It would be a party that the mass of workers would give allegiance to. The CIO should abstain from any move in the direction of a "third party." It should, however, encourage any move in the direction of the formation of a Labor Party in the United States.

If the labor leadership doesn't move in this direction, and soon, the most intelligent and militant of the secondary leaders have the responsibility for taking the initiative. There is plenty of time to get a Labor Party movement under way for the 1944 elections.

Philip Murray and the other CIO leaders will hang on to Roosevelt's coat-tails until they are battered and bruised beyond recognition. These leaders have already demonstrated that they have unlimited capacity for taking punishment. And what is their response? More tears and more supplication. It's about time, it seems to us, that labor began thinking of getting the capitalist bosses and their stooges in Washington into the position of beggars and supplicants.

LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party believe that the first political step for labor is the formation of a militant labor party, free from the capitalist Democratic and Republican Parties.

Such a party would not have given a no-strike pledge, it would not have accepted the Little Steel formula. Such a party would have backed the miners' strikes without any ifs and ands. Such a party would not be frightened by Roosevelt's work-or-fight decree or by Smith-Connally acts.

This free, independent and militant Labor Party would educate its members and the working class in the principles of aggressive trade unionism and working class political action.

Roosevelt, Willkie and the bosses would not like this but—so what? The masses of the workers would like it because they would know that such a Labor Party would protect, serve and defend their interests.

Davis, the Times and White Collar Workers

The little patent lawyer, Davis, who is head of the anti-labor WLB, is very downcast over the low wages of the white collar workers. The New York Times is also very excited about the condition of the office slaves. Aside from the hypocrites of Davis and the Times, which don't deserve much attention, all that can be said is what every worker knows: let the white collar workers organize and fight!

One other suggestion is in order. Let Merrill and the other Stalinists who head the CIO white collar workers' unions, pay more attention to the misfortunes of the members of their unions and less attention to the Stalinist bureaucracy in Moscow. The Stalinist leaders of the white collar unions might try a season of organizing the white collar workers and leave the opening of a "second front" to the capitalist politicians and generals.

B. H., Detroit.

What happened there cannot properly be called loafing; more correctly, it should be labeled "enforced idleness," for which the management was solely responsible....

Some Other Points

Your committee devoted a great amount of time at its hearings to an attack on features of the contract which covered the Brewster workers. These contracts were signed by the managements, as well as the Brewster local. In your attack on some features of these contracts, as I said before, you do not merely attack the Brewster Local, but you attack and seek to undermine similar contracts which cover the majority of our country's thirteen million organized workers....

Your committee made much of the fact that the Brewster Local sought a voice on recommendations for Selective Service deferments for essential workers in the plants. I have no apology to make for this. The local was merely following some excellent suggestions on policy, which have been clearly enunciated by General Lewis B. Hershey, director of Selective Service.

Were your committee not intent upon smearing the Brewster Local and, incidentally, the rest of the labor movement, you could find more than sufficient testimony given at the hearings to justify the conclusion

that labor was not the factor responsible for the failure of production. You have been informed that the production record in the Newark plant of the Brewster Corporation was highly satisfactory, yet this plant operated under the same contract and under the same set of officers that prevailed at Long Island City and Harboro plants.

In this connection, I would refer you also to the testimony of Rear Admiral Sydney Kraus, of Lieut. J. J. Reynolds, Jr., and of other witnesses. These witnesses refused to be pressured by members of your committee into stating that the contract of Local 365 was a major cause for the lack of production....

Admiral Kraus put his finger on one of the sore spots of the situation when he stated: "Brewster wage scales were low and remained low, and contributed to bad morale for a long time." In this connection, Admiral Kraus declared also: "They (the management) got away for a considerable time with a wage scale that was below par. That condition cannot exist indefinitely and retain either an adequate or a contented force of employees." These fair statements so annoyed your committee that one of its members permitted himself to tell the Admiral: "I think you know a great deal you are not telling."

In apportioning blame for the kind

of management with which Brewster was saddled, I believe the Navy Department cannot be absolved. I think it perfectly obvious that C. A. Van Dusen and Mr. Riebel, two of the most recent presidents of Brewster, were certainly not equipped for the tasks with which they were entrusted. Yet these men were the choice of the Navy Department. I have received sufficient first-hand reports to indicate what members of your committee must also know—that Mr. Riebel, in addition to being incompetent on production, had no conception whatever of how to deal with men and labor.

Both Mr. Van Dusen and Mr. Riebel, as your committee was informed, had in their employ capable labor relations men who were paid good salaries. These experts were apparently ignored by Mr. Riebel and Mr. Van Dusen, men who had no conception of the problems involved. Mr. Riebel's recital to your committee regarding the so-called "declaration of war" by the Brewster Local, was silly, childish stuff which I am sure must have embarrassed your committee, eager as it was to give an air of credence to the witnesses' wild attacks on the Brewster workers and their union....

Very truly yours,
R. J. THOMAS, President,
United Automobile, Aircraft
and Agricultural Implement
Workers of America, CIO.

Steel Workers Union Demands Raise--

(Continued from page 1)

This excellent demand is also in accordance with a resolution passed at the CIO convention seeking to prevent workers from being thrown out of their jobs without any means of subsistence when war orders cease and reconversion commences. Presumably all CIO unions will make similar demands. While not in any way solving the post-war unemployment problem, such a demand should be pushed to the utmost for the temporary relief it can give.

The union will also be asking for the restoration of time and a half for the sixth and seventh days of every regular week worked—a right given up by labor leaders about a year ago.

Another protective demand to be made by the Steel Workers Union is for a guaranteed minimum weekly wage for each worker for each week

during the life of the new contract to be negotiated. This demand is to counteract partial lay-offs that would make deep gashes in the workers' pay envelopes.

The five hundred locals of the United Steel Workers Union have still to vote on the recommendations of their board. They will undoubtedly push their demands with the utmost energy and determination. They are now out in front, with the whole labor movement watching them.

The auto, electrical and aluminum workers, every CIO union, every AFL union, all of organized labor likewise have to make specific demands for wage increases and for protective measures—and get behind their demands with all they have.

What Is Involved
It is not only necessary to smash the Little Steel formula once and for all time to enable labor to keep pace

with the cost of living necessities—which in itself is as important as life itself. In a larger sense, however, it is also necessary for the labor movement to restore its militancy if it hopes to survive.

There will be grave post-war problems to solve which only labor will be able to solve.

In turn this means that the unorganized will have to be brought into the ranks of organized labor—where they can be induced to go only if the militant action of the unions is actually getting results for its members. The capitalists must not be given a chance to pit the unorganized worker against the union worker.

At the CIO convention, R. J. Thomas, president of the UAW, now on the eve of making important wage demands, delivered these stirring words:

"I think in this convention the No.

1 slogan of our convention should be the same as it was when the Committee of Industrial Organizations was organized, and that is to go out across this country and organize and organize, and when you are through organizing, keep on organizing."

To which sentiment must be added the reminder that when the CIO was organized, it did so on a fighting program, involving some of the greatest strike action in labor history. The rank and file ought to keep this shining precedent before them today. They also have the recent example of the miners who went out on strike four times, pioneering in the fight to break the Little Steel formula.

It is clear that the no-strike pledge must also go with the wind. In fact, it is the logical next step to the demands made by the Steel Workers Union and to be made by the other CIO unions.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Detroit Reader On Miners' Strike

To the Editor:

It seems to me that LABOR ACTION and your writer, Walter Weiss, have not been able to make up your minds whether the miners actually won anything or not in the Ickes-Lewis agreement. I refer to the issues of November 8 and 15. In two articles Weiss proves, or tries to prove, that the miners got practically nothing. At the same time the headline in the November 15 LABOR ACTION reads "Miners' Victory Shows the Way" and in the course of his article Weiss writes: "But they won part of their fight and they smashed the Little Steel formula."

What are the actual facts:
Under the Ickes-Lewis agreement the miners get \$57.37 1/2 for a 52 1/2-hour week. But of this only 48 is actual working time and 4 1/2 is travel time.

Compare what the miners would have gotten for the SAME work week under the OLD agreement, which provided pay only for actual working time and not for travel time. For a 48-hour week at the rate of \$1.00 per hour (time and one-half after 35 hours) the miners would have received \$54.50.

Under the new agreement, \$57.37 1/2. Under the old, \$54.50. Simple arithmetic shows that for the same WORK the miners receive \$2.87 1/2 more.

Under the old agreement, by working 48 hours the miners would have received pay for 54 1/2 hours. Divide the \$2.87 by the 54 1/2 and you discover that the miners won a REAL increase of four cents an hour, calculated on the basis of the old contract.

It is this real increase in wages that proves that the miners broke the Little Steel formula, despite the fact that they fell far short of their original demands for a \$2.00-a-day increase.

And the miners will still win more out of the same agreement. A reporter asked Davis: "Do you think you'll get eight hours at the face?" "I'm not operating the mines," Davis answered, "and I'll ask you one; do you think Mr. Ickes will get eight hours?" The reporter answered: "No."

The miners broke the steel formula by striking. Let's not give any assistance to the WLB or the Administration by glossing over this fact.

The letter from B. H. of Detroit raises some interesting points in connection with the miners' decision and whether or not the miners won their fight.

In think, too, that the banner headline of the paper and the article in question did not quite run together. The article was too analytical of the wage demands without concentrating its attention on the implications and significance of the fight the coal diggers of this country made.

Although the article of Walter Weiss did make clear that the miners' fight was the first big shot against the Little Steel formula and had in effect shattered it (unions everywhere are now demanding wage rates above the formula) as well as strengthened the whole labor movement, and also that the miners did gain some increase, I think the difficulty lay in the fact that all the facts were not at hand when it was written.

As a matter of fact, an examination of the press since then, including the United Mine Workers Journal, does not lend to a great deal of clarity, because there is much contradictory material contained therein which does not permit of a clear examination of the actions of the WLB, or Ickes.

But, insofar as a victory is concerned, we have no doubt on that score: the miners won a great fight!
—The Editor.

Comparing the Sperry Contract

By ROCCO

Many Sperry workers had so resigned themselves to not getting a raise from the WLB that they hailed as a victory the three-cent increase. Working under the theory that something is better than nothing, and influenced by the lump-sum retroactive pay, some Sperryites have overlooked or forgotten some very important facts.

1. The local at Ford Instrument Co., a subsidiary of Sperry Gyroscope Corp., was able to get a much better contract. As a matter of fact, before its recognition by the NLRB, the Sperry union had as part of its platform a minimum wage of seventy-five cents an hour.

2. The twenty per cent withholding tax reduced the income of every worker considerably. (Big business

Sperry Unionist Writes on Miners

To the Editor of Labor Action:

This letter is a protest and in part an answer to an article on the miners' strike which appeared in the last issue of "Shop News," official paper of Sperry Local 450 of the UERMWA, CIO, by Seymour Alberts, member of the local's policy committee.

True, that the base pay of the miners was not raised except for a few cents allowed for travel time. Nevertheless the struggle, the fight and sacrifice the miners have gone through has been the greatest blow toward the crushing of the "phony Little Steel formula" (to use your own words).

Except for the miners' strike, I doubt whether Alberts and the rest of the present leadership of our local would dare utter such a phrase.

After their whole-hearted and strenuous support of the "phony Little Steel formula," the WLB and the entire anti-labor program established by the present government administration (camouflaged by its war patriotism), they suddenly make a turn about-face. Why, may I ask, this sudden change? Is it not a result of the miners' victory in bringing to light to the rank and file of the nation the atrocities being committed by the demagogic WLB (which, by the way, have been so schemingly and wisely kept a secret by the supposed representatives and leaders of our unions)?

always counts its profits after all tax deductions. There is no reason why labor should not.)

3. Since the last increase in wages, the cost of living, especially of food and clothing, has risen about forty per cent. So that the same wage can buy about forty per cent less than previously.

So, you see, the Sperry workers ("defense workers" who are supposed to be soaking in wealth) have been getting quite a rooking.

The rank and file must demand from its union that it fight militantly together with other militant locals against such "wage cuts," against the WLB and its Little Steel formula. Specifically, wages should go up every time prices go up. In that way workers can begin to solve their problems of meeting the high cost of living.

Brewster Worker.

WORLD EVENTS

By Europacus

The Comedy of Atlantic City

A gigantic hoax is now being perpetrated in a fashionable hotel in Atlantic City. A United Nations Conference on Rehabilitation and Relief has been giving performances there for the last two weeks.

Hundreds of thousands of people are dying in the streets of India from the severest famine which has struck the country in many, many years. It is a man-made famine, caused primarily by the impact of the war on India's economy and by the complete disregard of the British overlords for the elementary needs of the Indian masses. So you might think that such a conference would have a very important job on hand right now. But you are mistaken there.

This conference is not at all interested. India is not a NAZI-occupied country... it is occupied by the British. No, India does not fall within the scope of this committee. What is being created in Atlantic City is a gigantic organization to dole out some meager relief to the peoples of Post-war Europe, provided... they behave nicely and avoid "disorder and anarchy."

Against the Masses

It is an attempt to take up again on a gigantic scale the job of the Hoover Committee for Relief of the last war. Students of the history of the Hoover committee are able to point to hundreds of instances where it was used as a means of political pressure against the danger of "Bolshevism" in Europe.

It was used to combat the Hungarian Soviet Republic. "If you abandon the soviets, many trains of food which are now awaiting on your border will immediately arrive in Buda-

pest." It was used to keep the Vienna social-democrats from succumbing to the pressure of the radical workers. We will send you enough food to avoid the outbreak of hunger manifestations."

This time the policy will be represented at a much larger scale. Humanitarian liberals shed crocodile tears over the splendid intentions of the Roosevelt Administration in helping destitute people. But, in fact, this conference has nothing whatsoever to do with humanitarianism. It is an extremely important weapon in the defense of imperialism against threatening revolutions in Europe.

Three Powers Dominate

All forty-four United Nations are represented at this conference, and to the casual observer it might look as if these proceedings were the first stage of a genuine concert of nations, all great and small, having voice and power of decision. However, this is strictly a three-power show. England, America and Russia decide and the small states have to assent.

In ancient Rome every patrician had a number of "clients," i.e., plebeians who were dependent upon his patronage. In modern international politics, the role of the smaller nations has become very similar to that of the Roman plebeians. They can hope to achieve anything only by buying the patronage of at least one of the great powers. Thus the Atlantic City parliament of the forty-four nations strongly resembles the backstage deals between the heads of temporary alliances. In this sense, indeed, it might be said that Atlantic City gives a preview on future "international collaboration."

Nazis Admit Germans Have Enough of War

On the subject of Germany, it might be interesting to quote the following extracts from three Nazi papers, as an illustration straight from the horse's mouth, of how wrong they are who assert the identity of the Nazi gang with the German people.

The Westfaelische Landeszeitung on August 14 wrote: "Some people say defeat wouldn't be as bad as it is painted."
The Heimbote on August 21 de-

clared: "The opinion is occasionally heard on remote farms that the war is not the farmer's business."

The Augsburger Nationalzeitung on August 21 said: "Some stupid people say, 'What do I care about the war? I didn't want it. Let those fight who asked for it. What do I care—I have nothing to lose and nothing to gain.' We must admit realistically that the longer the war lasts the more people waver and weaken."
So be it.

Carnegie-Illinois Steel Union Demands \$2.00-a-Day Pay Increase

CHICAGO—A minimum \$2.00 pay increase proposal as a basis for general contract demands was adopted by Local 65, United Steel Workers Union, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Company's South Work plant, at its meeting held November 23.

This proposal, along with other resolutions adopted at this meeting, was to be presented to a special meeting on November 30. These propositions also represent the attitude on wages and other demands adopted by a meeting of Division 7 on November 19.

Other resolutions, provisionally

adopted at these meetings, call for: 10 and 15 cents per hour night bonus increases; vacation provisions effective after one year's service, instead of the present three-year service requirements; and one week of sick leave after one year's service.

It is to be hoped that steel locals throughout the industry nationally are also adopting recommendations to help guide the deliberations of the national wage policy conference of the union, being held in Pittsburgh, in regard to wage adjustments and other improvements in the existing contracts.

LABOR ACTION Turns the Spotlight on

- WAGE FREEZING
- INCENTIVE PAY
- WAR PROFITS
- JIM CROW
- RIISING 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

A Negro Writer Portrays the Life of His People

By V. Jensen

Roi Ottley's "New World A-Coming," one of Houghton-Mifflin's Life-in-America prize books, is an excellently detailed picture of Negro life. The author subtitled the book "Inside Black America" and has given as his aim the relating of the Negro's search for democracy.

Mr. Ottley's method is to give a detailed account of the various movements, political, cultural, religious and nationalistic, and the various leaders who have played an important role in the Negro life of recent years. He used Harlem, the most complex and influential of Negro communities, as a sort of test tube in which movements important in Negro life are examined as a reflection of what is going on in all of black America.

After a brief historical sketch of the development of Harlem into a Negro community, he begins his real study of Harlem with the developments of the first decade after the First World War. This period was highlighted by sensational developments in jazz which made Harlem a unique entertainment center in the eyes of the white world, and more important and significant, the growth and influence of Marcus Garvey and his nationalist "Back to Africa" movement, which set in motion the wheels of race and color consciousness and still remains a compelling force in Negro life.

DETAILING RECENT NEGRO HISTORY

Then, with a wealth of detail, he examines the various movements rooted in the depression of the thirties, movements which began as badly expressed racial protests and which gradually grew into more or less socially and economically conscious movements.

Ottley discusses the influence of Father Divine, the growth of many religious sects, the impact of the depression and slum life on the health, morals and politics of the Negroes. He discusses inner-racial differences, social and political. Everything in Harlem life, from the influence of Joe Louis and the details of high life in Harlem's cafe society to the "Jobs for Negroes" campaign and anti-Semitism in the Negro community, is outlined.

Ottley sees his vision of a "new world a-coming" for the Negroes (presumably a democratic world) made possible through the growth of more mature and responsible movements for political, social and economic equality for Negroes which have flourished since the advent of the New Deal.

He recognizes the significance not only of the influx of the Negro into the unions, but their new aggressiveness, their desire for equality so militantly expressed in union fights, in the original sweep of the March on Washington movement, in the protests and riots among Jim-Crowed soldiers. But somewhere in his mass of details, well organized and cleverly written as they are, he has lost his discrimination.

CONCLUSIONS DO NOT FOLLOW MATERIAL

Although Ottley recognizes the importance of the mass movement for equality, and really started off his study on that basis; although he recognizes the fact that the FEPC was formed as a concession to the threat of a March on Washington, and has failed in its promise to end discrimination in industry; although he recognizes that the Administration has no intention of ending Jim Crow in the Army—still he looks to Roosevelt to "serve the democratic way" and be a new great liberator. More inexplicably still, following on his mass of evidence of the wide gulf between the exploited Negro masses and their white capitalist masters—the conclusion that he draws is that this is a war for the Negro and that he must fight in this capitalist war!

"New World A-Coming" is a good book for white people who want to get a detailed view of Negro life and movements. It is an introduction to Negro problems. But no Negro need read it; he has nothing to learn here, for he has lived through these movements for equality, he is living through the exploitation of capitalist bosses, he is living through the horrors of a war in which he has no stake, in which he has to fight without a semblance even of the democracy he yearns for.

What the Negro has gained in the past decades he has gained not through President Roosevelt nor the intervention of a few kow-towing Negro leaders in a so-called "Black Cabinet," not through fireside chats or presidential orders—but through his own fighting beside his white brother on the picket lines and in his own day-to-day struggles in his community.

Next Week--

LABOR ACTION will carry the full story of the Three Power conferences.

Of Special Interest to Women

By Susan Green

The prospect of more meat for civilians is something to look forward to.

The War Food Administration announced its suspension of quota limitations on the slaughter of livestock because there is now a record surplus of 17,000,000 head of cattle.

In fact, the OPA expects such a huge supply of meat in the near future that it contemplates reducing ration points on meats to induce the consumer to buy plenty. That will be fine, but—

Why wasn't the meat released right along instead of allowing such a surplus to accumulate? It looks now as if the meat famine was an unnecessary hardship!

The pendulum of food supplies for the people is allowed to swing from the extreme of dire shortages to the other extreme of oversupply. "All or nothing at all" is all right for the theme of a song, but hardly a sound policy for the distribution of the people's food. And behind all the bungling and unnecessary hardship can be found the motive of private profit for the big food interests.

LABOR ACTION has been pushing the idea that the food situation must be handled by committees of organized labor, housewives and working farmers. One thing becomes more and more certain: **No one could do worse from the angle of working class needs than the big farm interests and the politicians are doing.**

And what about the quality of the meat to be released?

Recent meat supplies have been decidedly inferior—so poor in fact that many retail butchers have refused to handle some of it.

One dealer in the Washington Market in New York City said he could not sell it to his customers and keep their trade. "The only thing that kind of beef is good for is for chewing gum," he told a reporter.

Inferior meat comes from poorly fed cattle. Now here is a riddle to be answered. The government has just paid a subsidy of \$450,000,000 to cattle growers because the cost of feed for cattle has gone up. So what have the cattle growers been

doing with that \$450,000,000 that should have gone for good feed to make good cattle to yield good meat?

Did the big cattle growers pocket the subsidy as gravy—and proceed to buy cheap feed for their cattle on the assumption that in this market anything can be sold?

Could be, could be! Such ethics on the part of big business cattle growers would be right in line with the war practices of big business in general. It not only wraps its fists around all the so-called "legitimate" war profits it can but around every illegitimate billion that comes its way—witness the sale of defective war material which means shipping unexpected death to the boys at the front.

That's capitalist morality.

While the dispute over miners' wages was in progress, the Bituminous Coal Institute, the organization of mine bosses, staged at the Hotel Plaza in New York a fashion show unique in fashion history.

There were put on display by these exploiters of the bituminous miners the styles in clothes "that the daughters and wives of miners desire to wear and do wear." Besides tailored clothes, the show included party and evening dresses, fur coats and jackets—naturally not of mink or ermine.

The hot-air merchants speaking for the coal barons at the show failed to give statistics on how many daughters and wives of miners actually do wear the garments on display—which certainly are nothing extraordinary in this day and age—and how many get no closer to these simple things than permitted by the thick plate-glass windows of the stores owned by the mine companies.

Neither did any of the speechmakers bother to state that a large portion of the retail business in the mining areas—as well as everything else—is owned and conducted by the mine companies. With such a monopoly of trade, they charge whatever they want to—thus very effectively keeping down the number of miners' daughters and wives who can afford to buy their desirable merchandise.

Why do you suppose this deceptive show was put on by the mine companies? Simple, my dear Watson—to "prove" that the miners, whose daughters and wives roll in fur coats and jackets, do not need a wage increase. Presumably the miners were striking for the hell of it.

A different kind of fashion show was put on unofficially the other night. The "golden horseshoe" at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York blazed forth in all its splendor for the opening of the opera season.

"Fabulous jewels" were worn by many of the notable ladies. One matron dazzled the crowd "with her array of diamond bracelets from wrist to elbow." (What, not all the way up to her shoulder?) This Jane also sported emerald earrings and a diamond and emerald necklace.

"It was somewhat of a toss-up whether mink or ermine appeared the most often." The gowns were of satin, lamé, chiffon, net, lace—and did not come from the company stores in the mine districts.

This finery came from the swanky Mainbocher where anybody can get an evening flimsy for from \$300 to \$600, or from Valentina's, where prices run on the same level. The "less expensive" among them might have been made up exclusively by Sophie at Saks-Fifth Avenue.

While these dames did not wear their street clothes on this occasion, it must be stated here—to complete the picture—that they are the social set that thinks nothing of spending \$400 for a suit and \$150 for a little sweater to go with the suit.

Yes, you heard me. And if any of my readers do not believe this, let them try to pick up a little "bargain" at Mainbocher, Valentina or Cartier's.

The "golden horseshoe" at the Metropolitan symbolizes the class that fights tooth and nail against every demand of the workers for a decent wage. Yet labor produces all the wealth the rich wallow in as unashamedly in wartime as in peacetime. There will come a time when labor will refuse to support a class of useless parasites in the manner to which it is accustomed—or indeed in any manner at all.

Randolph Prepares a New 'Demarche'

By W. F. CARLTON

"I advise you that you may expect instructions and the call to march on Washington perhaps next spring."

Who is this speaking? No less a person than A. Philip Randolph. This was his final message to the Negro people of Denver, where he spoke on Sunday and Monday, November 21 and 22. Randolph is, once more "preparing" a march on Washington which he has already called off several times.

Randolph Is Misleading

Randolph in his talks declared that fascism and discrimination are on the increase in the United States. Let us leave out fascism for the moment and deal with discrimination. Randolph is propagating a dangerous falsehood when he gives the impression that discrimination against Negroes is increasing in the United States. It is a dangerous falsehood because it is one-sided. While it is true that the reactionaries, North and South, have become more militant in their anti-Negro activity, the organized labor movement, the CIO in particular, is carrying on propaganda and agitation and taking steps to build better relations between whites and Negroes on a scale never before known in this country.

This is the fundamental fact about racial relations today. During the recent upheavals in Detroit, the white and Negro workers in the factories displayed a solidarity which has been commented on by all observers.

Furthermore, many middle class and liberal minded people feel that, in a country which is supposed to be fighting for democracy, the situation of the Negroes is intolerable and something should be done about it. These people are, as usual, middle-headed and do not see that only the labor movement can seriously tackle discrimination. But they mean well toward the Negroes.

However, when such a movement starts, the reactionaries are immediately on the alert to fight it. That is why the hoodlums and the Ku Klux Klanners in Detroit and backward labor elements in the South begin to be more vicious than ever in their attacks upon the Negroes.

They see that the Negroes are militantly on the offensive for their democratic rights. They see that large sections of the labor movement are taking the Negro's struggles seriously. They see that in Detroit, the entry of thousands of Negroes and the chaos and confusion of capitalist society have brought about a sharp racial situation. But they see too that organized labor, in this case the UAW, fights for more than Negro rights in the ordinary social life of the city. Still more, the UAW and the Negroes actually formed a political united front in the recent elections.

Fear of Negro Militancy

It is all this which moves the professional Negro-baiters and the enemies of organized labor and the Ne-

groes—they are often the same people—to raise their voices and plan and organize against Negroes. In so complicated a matter you cannot give figures but, in our opinion, the truth is not what Randolph says it is. It is because the movement toward recognition of the Negro's rights is gaining strength that the enemies of equality are so active.

Randolph, Walter White, Adam Powell and the rest of them never make this clear. Whenever they face Negro militancy, they give the impression that the Negroes are in a minority and that everybody is against them.

However, in this crisis, the fact is that Negroes are those who, by their militant struggles, have forced the country to take notice of them and their demands. And one of the enemies of Negro militancy is this same Philip Randolph. It is very important for us to get this right and not be fooled by Randolph again as we have been fooled in the past. Particularly when he begins to talk big about marching on Washington, "perhaps in the spring," we have to watch him and warn everybody against him.

Randolph, Past and Present

Randolph has a good past. Many years ago he was a socialist and ran a fine socialist paper for Negroes, called The Messenger. Then he became an organizer and leader of the Pullman porters. That, too, was a good job. Every time the AFL convention meets, Randolph makes a militant speech against discrimina-

tion in the AFL and gets a great deal of publicity.

But, as we have repeatedly shown in LABOR ACTION, it was Randolph and Walter White of the NAACP who called off the march on Washington in 1941.

The Negroes wanted to march. Randolph and White had the opportunity to develop and lead one of the biggest Negro demonstrations that this country has known for years. It would have stimulated the organized labor movement and all progressive elements; it would have assisted the struggle for democratic rights all around, not only for Negroes, and it would have echoed around the world. But Philip Randolph said "No" and accepted instead the FEPC.

Today the Negro question is once more coming to the fore. The Attorney General's office, the War Manpower Commission and others are all busy trying to pacify the wrath of the Negro people. The FEPC is exposed as a do-nothing body. It is at this moment that Randolph comes out again. He promises to lead a march, "perhaps in the spring."

We say confidently: If, even by some miracle, he does find himself entangled in the leadership of such a march, he will betray it. We must beware of Randolph. He is pro-war, pro-Roosevelt, and he talks big, but is afraid of the militant mass movement. When he begins to promise a march in the spring it is time for us to do some organizing of our own and to remember Randolph's betrayal two years ago.

Canol, New Standard Oil Scandal

By V. J.

Government oil deals have been notoriously corrupt, but the latest "Canol" deal may establish a long-distance record for smelliness. As a matter of fact, this spill leaked out of Washington through the Truman Committee and is now clogging sensitive noses from here to Canada and back.

In May, 1942, the Army launched this Canol oil project to provide aviation gasoline for Alaskan military purposes without even consulting the War Production Board, which is supposed to control priorities for strategic materials, or the Petroleum Administration, which is supposed to be responsible for the oil program. When these departments got wind of this matter, the Army refused to let them in on the little deal, charging that it was a military secret. It was still a military secret here long after the Canadian government had published details.

This project seems to have been dreamed up in the office of General Somervell, who, it appears, was extremely charitable with the Canadians and Standard Oil. It called for prospecting of oil by Imperial Oil (a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey), the construction of a 550-mile pipeline from Fort Norman to White Horse, Canada, and the construction of a refinery at White Horse, all at the expense of the U. S. government.

Prospecting was to be done at government expense, but the oil rights were to belong to the oil company and the Canadian government, and under the terms of the contract the U. S. government would never be repaid. The Canadian government is

also to get the option to the refinery at the end of the war at its commercial value, which Ickes testified would probably be nothing.

Ickes blasted the project before the Truman Committee and recommended that it be junked. Representative

Leon Gavin of Pennsylvania charged that the government couldn't be repaid for the expense of prospecting for 168 years. Ickes also said that General Somervell had used the "military secret" excuse as an alibi for failing to consult the Petroleum

Administration and he furnished the committee with a series of protests he had filed with the War Department. These included a recommendation of an alternative procedure of using an inland waterway system for transporting oil to Alaska from the United States. The War Department used this but did not junk Canol.

Budget Director Harold Smith testified that he got the plan from the Army first as a \$25,000,000 project but by spring, 1943, it had grown to a \$119,000,000 project. After investigators from the Budget Department were sent out, he suggested that the project be stopped but the Army insisted on going ahead for "military" reasons.

Meanwhile the generals, old cavalry men, have climbed on their high horses and are keeping an injured and dignified silence, leaving it to Under Secretary of War Patterson to explain that this was a "war project," not a "commercial" one. This lucid explanation is ably backed by the protestations of the press, which tearfully explains that no cost is too great to get oil to our boys. (Naturally this does not apply to paying higher wages to coal miners so that our boys can get coal!)

There is just the faintest, faintest breath of a suspicion that some one from Standard Oil of New Jersey has a friend in the War Department.

Anyway, Henry, open the Senate doors a little wider—there's a terrible odor in there!

NOW IS THE TIME

To Get These Three Pamphlets:

PLENTY FOR ALL

The Meaning of Socialism
By ERNEST LUND

10c per copy, postpaid 7c in bundles of 5 or more

INCENTIVE PAY

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

5c per copy, postpaid 3c per copy in bundles of 5 or more

FOR A COST-PLUS WAGE!

By MAX SHACHTMAN
National Secretary, Workers Party

5c per copy, postpaid 3c per copy in bundles of 5 or more

ORDER FROM

THE WORKERS PARTY

114 WEST 14TH STREET

NEW YORK 11, N. Y.

We Are For--

An Independent Labor Party

Free French Make New Promises to Lebanese People

By Stanley Grey

The violent and first phase in the current Lebanese fight for independence has thus far ended in a defeat for the French. Under the combined pressure of British diplomacy, for the reasons we have pointed out previously, and the fighting spirit of the Lebanese, as expressed in a twelve-day general strike, mass demonstrations and the formation of guerrilla troops, the French have been forced to grant the Lebanese their immediate demands. They have agreed to restore to office Premier Riad Solh and two other ministers whom they had dismissed immediately after the proclamation of independence by the Lebanon Parliament.

The struggle has now entered a new period of negotiation and diplomacy. The French will undoubtedly propose alterations in the constitutional structure of Lebanon designed to give the Lebanese greater control over their own affairs. But these will be no more than paper changes. The French will keep the real power in their own hands... if the Lebanese let them get away with it!

FRENCH PROMISES AND REALITY

The people of Lebanon must have laughed grimly when they heard General Catroux broadcast from Beirut on November 24: "Once again my lot has been to help you recover your Constitution, to which I, with the Committee of National Liberation, am as much attached as yourselves. France remains faithful to her promises, commitments and duties."

The Lebanese have learned to know the French by what they do, not by what they say. The history of French rule has been one of promises and parliamentary concessions, the first no sooner made than broken, the second serving as a cloak for the strengthening of their repressive control.

In 1926 the state of Greater Lebanon was made a republic with all the constitutional forms of a democratic regime. However, the French maintained the power of veto over important legislation and kept their hold over foreign affairs.

In 1936 the French signed treaties with Syria and Lebanon, giving them their independence after a probationary period of three years. But on September 21, 1939, it was reported in "Athra," a publication of the time put out in Beirut, that the Constitution was abrogated, Parliament was dissolved and a State Secretary was given the real power. This State Secretary was appointed by the French High Commissioner and had the power to make appointments to all the important offices of the state. That was how the French kept their promises to the Lebanese.

A REVIEW OF RECENT EVENTS

But imperialists who find it impossible to grant real independence to their colonies have no difficulty handing out promises. In 1941, General Catroux carried the following golden words to the Lebanese: "Free France... will come to put an end to the mandatory regime, and proclaim you free and independent."

This time the Lebanese took matters in their own hands, and on November 9, 1943, declared themselves an independent republic. The French immediately dropped their mask and with swift military strokes arrested the leaders of Parliament, banned the press of the country and declared a state of martial law. But they met the united resistance of the people of Lebanon, which broke the back of French force.

And now the French are back to their old tricks. The 1941 "liberator," Catroux, is making speeches again. "Once again" he says he is going to liberate them. Does this gramophone of the French rulers believe that the Lebanese have forgotten 1941? Or is he consciously adding insult to injury? The Lebanese know that "once again" means nothing but the revival of the same old buncombe.

LEBANESE CAN TAKE THEIR INDEPENDENCE

The French have no more intention of giving up Lebanon than the British have of "giving up" India. On November 27 the New York Times said: "There is no sign that the French would consider giving up the mandate until such time as the League of Nations can meet to discuss the matter." The French are hiding behind the "legal" skirts of a corpse, and expect the Lebanese to wait for the resurrection "to discuss the matter."

To win their independence the Lebanese cannot compromise with any constitutional framework or legal fakery. They have had enough of words. If they are not granted unqualified independence, there is a way out: kick out the French and take independence.

Editorials

Minneapolis Case

Last week we published the news of the refusal of the Supreme Court to review the verdict in the "Minneapolis Case." By this refusal the court has declared that the eighteen members of the Socialist Workers Party must go to jail.

The facts in the case are well known to readers of this paper. These members of the SWP were brought to trial because the Teamsters Union in Minneapolis, organized and militantly led by them, had incurred the wrath of the employers and the reactionary officialdom of their international union, led by its president, Daniel J. Tobin. The case was, in reality, an accommodation to the bureaucracy by getting rid of this leadership.

They came to trial under the notorious Smith "gag" law and were convicted on such evidence as being advocates of the ideas of the "Communist Manifesto," written by Karl Marx almost a hundred years ago.

Thus while notorious and outspoken fascists walk the streets and propagate their ideas, while supporters of Hitlerism speak their filthy propaganda in the Houses of Congress, revolutionary socialists, the best defenders of the common interests of the workers, are being sent to jail—for exercising their democratic rights!

The persecution and prosecution of the SWP, in the "Minneapolis Case," in the hounding of The Militant, as well as the persecution of the Workers Party in the harrasing of LABOR ACTION, are of a piece with the growing reaction against labor. Into the same pattern fall the imprisonment of the SWP comrades, the freezing of wages, the exorbitant taxes upon workers, no-strike legislation threatened against labor, job freezing and... fabulous profits of the bosses. Class rule goes hand in hand with class justice.

In its refusal to review the case, the Supreme Court, by evasion, is actually upholding the Smith "gag" law. This makes it all the more necessary to fight for its repeal, since it is a threat against the whole labor movement.

We ask all our friends to give their support to the Civil Rights Defense Committee, 160 Fifth Avenue, New York City, which is in charge of the "Minneapolis Case."

Another Trial And Its Lessons

On page one of this issue of LABOR ACTION we reprint a story of the trial involving the North American Company, a giant holding firm sued by a former officer who took the rap for the company in a previous case.

The trial is important in that it reveals the efforts of a monopolistic firm in the utility field engaging in "political action." This political action consisted in buying off the professional politicians of the Republican and Democratic Parties, who appear to be easily bought.

Protest Mosley's Release - -

(Continued from page 1)
New York Times that "there were abundant indications of individual spontaneity." The demonstration before the House of Parliament was not of London workers alone. Early morning trains carried large numbers of workers from the Midlands. There were representatives of 140,000 outraged Yorkshire miners, representatives of the Durham miners and of 10,000 miners in South Wales. Delegates came from Birmingham factories and Sheffield steel mills.

Inside the House, Morrison, trying further to explain his action, stated that Mosley was a special kind of prisoner—a prisoner without trial—and therefore presumably could be released. This is indeed unique procedure. Why, then, WASNT this fascist tried for his crimes—including his responsibility for the pogrom against the Jews of London? Since when is release from prison a substitute for a trial?

As to the release of certain of Mosley's lieutenants—not sick of phlegm or anything else but the fascist bug—Morrison explained that this action was due to the "improvement in our national fortunes," referring to the military victories. However, if the British government were really fighting fascism as a hostile political regime, as it pretends to, it could not release its domestic fascists.

The government benches in the House were, of course, packed on this occasion and, in spite of the loud uproar from the laborites, Morrison's

action was approved. He took full responsibility for Mosley's release, which, he said, he ordered under the war powers granted to him. A proposal for a general debate on the question was shouted down.

Where Class Collaboration Leads
However, Morrison's political goose may be cooked. The slogan of the demonstrators in Parliament Square, "Morrison Out," had real significance. The Mosley matter is not yet closed. The Trade Union Congress, representing six million workers, has, since Morrison's so-called explanation, assailed his action as "a most untimely blunder," and has demanded that the entire question be "immediately reconsidered by the government."

The National Executive Committee of the Labor Party, of which Morrison is a member, has disapproved his action. Apparently the Labor Party bureaucrats agree with the masses that helping the fascists is stretching the policy of class collaboration a bit too far.

Every industrial center has demonstrated its anger at the release of fascist No. 1. In Bristol a crowd shouted down Sir Stafford Cripps, Minister of Aircraft Production, when he advised the people to leave the matter in the hands of the proper authorities.

British labor rightly feels this is its own vital business. Labor must also realize that the fight against fascism can be carried on honestly only by

The Minneapolis Case - -

A Statement by J. T. Farrell

Following the denial of the U. S. Supreme Court on November 22 to hear the case of the eighteen members of the Socialist Workers Party and Minneapolis Motor Transport Workers Local 544, CIO, James T. Farrell, noted novelist and chairman and the Civil Rights Defense Committee, issued the following statement:

"We do not judge men merely by their avowals of faith and good will. Neither do we judge institutions by the descriptions of their authority and functions contained in written constitutions. We judge men and we test institutions by their actions."

"The Supreme Court of the United States has given us the material whereby we can test it. When it refused to hear the appeal of the eighteen defendants in the Minneapolis case, it administered a blow to the cause of free speech; it showed itself more than inattentive to the provisions of the very Constitution which it has sworn to uphold."

"It is the opinion of serious persons in the labor and liberal movements that the Smith 'Gag' Act is in flagrant violation of the Bill of Rights. This case is the most impor-

tant one which comes under the provisions of that act. The Supreme Court has even refused to hear an appeal which will test the constitutionality of that law. The authority of the court is largely based on the decision of Judge Marshall in the case of Madison vs. Marbury, when he contended that we must have a government of laws rather than of men. Apparently we now have that, and one of these laws is the Smith 'Gag' law. According to its provisions, it is possible for a man to be jailed if he publicly quotes the Declaration of Independence or Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address."

"This is Thanksgiving Week. In the motion pictures and newspapers and on the radio we are being told over and over again that we should be thankful for being free. But there is less freedom in this country today than there was last week or in Thanksgiving Week, 1942: We know that this week the Supreme Court of the United States is less of a guarantee of our liberties than many people have believed it to be."

"Although the two most illustrious and liberal figures of this Court during the present century, Holmes and

Brandeis, promulgated the doctrine of "clear and present danger," their successors have totally disregarded it. What is the real illustration of this doctrine? It is the Japanese idea of 'dangerous thoughts.' Once this idea becomes the law of the land, all thinking becomes a dangerous and potentially criminal activity."

"One of the simplest lessons of history is that no government and no court can, in the long run, stop people from thinking. This action of our highest court will not do that, which cannot be done; it will only encourage all who want to be free to defend their freedom."

"Liberal and labor opinion should now mobilize to prove that it is one hundred per cent more attentive to freedom than is the Supreme Court. We must continue to defend the eighteen victims in this case. We must press our attack against the Smith 'Gag' Act."

"One of the first free speech cases in history was that of Socrates. When he was on trial for his life, he told his judges that 'the unexamined life is not worth living.' Let us now reaffirm that noble statement."

The New Leader And Sir Oswald

We seldom pay much attention to a contemporary weekly, the New Leader. But an editorial in its last issue makes it impossible for us to ignore it.

The New Leader has come to the defense of Herbert Morrison, the British Home Secretary and pretender to the post of leader of the Labor Party, for his action in releasing the fascist, Sir Oswald Mosley!

The reasons given by the New Leader are spurious indeed. They cite the fact that Mosley was never really brought to trial, that his incarceration was a war measure, that he was in ill health and, finally, that since the war was going good for the British rulers, there was no longer any need to hold him in jail.

We didn't notice that the New Leader was quite so solicitous when youths of 16 and 17 were jailed because they refused to go into the mines for the pittance pay which the cruel mine operators in England offer. Morrison didn't get worked up about their fate, either.

While we don't believe that a capitalist government, a bosses' state, can or will really fight fascism, neither do we find the release of Mosley as evidence of the "democratic tradition."

The action on Mosley, and his wife, who is not ill but was also released, is only another expression of the fact that the Churchill government is a reactionary government which can show its teeth when it is a question of teen-aged youths who refuse to mine coal for miserable wages, but who become extremely worried about the health of a fascist scoundrel.

But to each according to his taste. The New Leader can have its Morrisons and its Mosleys—and the Churchill government thrown in, to boot!

A Tempest at Notre Dame

By JULIAN STERN

Notre Dame University is afraid to have its name associated with the following: collaboration with the USSR in the post-war world, calling Franco and Coughlin fascists, and opposition to anti-Semitism.

Dr. Francis E. McMahon, a mild PM-type of liberal, was recently thrown out for expounding these views.

Dr. Hugh O'Donnell, president of Notre Dame, admitted in his press release on the affair that Dr. McMahon's removal was the result of "a rising volume of protest."

The source of these anonymous protestations is not too hard to find. They came from the Christian Fronters and their not-so-outspoken friends in the Catholic hierarchy. The president of Notre Dame makes quite an admission when he wants to dissociate the name of the university from such views.

Of course the "resignation" was accompanied by the shadow-boxing usual in these academic affairs. Dr. O'Donnell accepts Dr. McMahon's resignation; the latter says he never offered to resign. Dr. O'Donnell tries to make it appear as if no question of academic freedom were involved,

that he just wanted McMahon to submit his speeches for approval ("so that precautions could be suggested," i.e., censorship) in order "to separate the name and influence of Notre Dame from Dr. McMahon's position. Differences of opinion as to his interpretation of Franco are really incidental to the primary issue which revolved itself into Notre Dame's unwillingness to continue to sponsor, by implication at least, such individual views of a member of the faculty."

Dr. McMahon said in reply: "I have realized that throughout these trying times powerful pressure has been exerted upon the university authorities to muzzle me. It is to their credit that for a long time they resisted these pressures. It is all the more regretful that they apparently now succumbed.... I thought it was a tragedy that Catholics submitted for so many years to the policies of Mussolini. That type of Catholic is now trying to crawl away from the limb he found himself on.... The Catholics today who believe that Franco is the savior of Spain and religion are going to realize shortly enough that Franco's cause is the cause fundamental of Hitlerism and fascism. Many clerical and lay professors of Notre Dame also share my views, although for obvious reasons they can-

not express themselves publicly."

The liberal Catholics are also out on a limb: either they break away from the church (repudiate Catholicism) or remain within it and try to "push it leftward"—something which is impossible. For it is obvious that the church represents more than a body of dogmas: it is an institution that has definite material roots in the status quo, in whatever social system it finds itself: a capitalistic or a semi-feudal one.

They remained passive in Germany until their property rights were threatened, and countenanced the activities of the Christian Front hoodlums in the United States. They supported the fascists in Italy and Spain. They constitute one of the props of the Petain-Laval "government" in France.

Finally, notice the equivocation and hopelessness of the liberal Catholic weekly, Commonweal: "... the fact is that Catholic institutions are at present sadly sensitive to this pressure... which we find disturbing in the extreme, for it operates to make the church in general seem sympathetic to the fascist tendency of this loud-mouthed minority. We can only hope that as time goes on a genuine immunity to pressure will be built up."

The UNRRA Conference - -

(Continued from page 1)
mit his speeches for approval ("so enemy countries must pay expenses of any UNRRA activities in their territories."

Then the opposition countries added an amendment that their rights to restitution of property that the Nazis looted should in no way be limited by the powers of the UNRRA to seize surplus Nazi stocks for relief and rehabilitation in liberated territories. These countries hope, by a strict policy of reparations from Germany, to build again their independent stockpiles and their independence, as far as possible, from the dominant imperialist powers.

The delegates engaged in these

shenanigans are not interested in the relief of the misery of Europe's millions but only in maneuverings and bargainings to put their failing capitalist interests into as good a position

New York Readers! You Can Buy L. A.

At the newsstands on 42nd Street between Fifth and Sixth Avenues.

as possible. Nowhere is their callousness and hypocrisy more evident than in their refusal to consider the problem of immediate relief to European Jewry, the worst sufferers from Nazi tyranny, or in Britain's bland and shameless insistence that the Indian famine is an "Empire" problem not in the sphere of the UNRRA.

The suffering and starving masses of Europe and Asia cannot look to these bunglers for relief and rehabilitation. They will get relief when they throw out their common oppressors and take the land and resources that rightfully belong to them and administer them for the good of the masses.

India in Revolt

By Henry Judd

25 Cents Postpaid

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

A Socialist Classic, Now Available For the First Time in English

THE NEW COURSE

By Leon Trotsky

Written in 1923, this book opened the struggle against Stalinism. The New Course remains today a brilliant and penetrating study of the problems of socialist construction, working class democracy and bureaucratic dictatorship. This is a new translation, with explanatory notes.

IN THE SAME VOLUME:
Max Shachtman, National Secretary of the Workers Party, has written a 130-page historical essay,

The Struggle for the New Course

which provides the necessary background for a complete understanding of Trotsky's work. The class nature of the Russian state is given special consideration, and Trotsky's theory of the "degenerated workers' state" is submitted to a critical re-evaluation.

250 Pages Price: Paper cover, \$1.50 postpaid
Cloth cover, \$2.50 postpaid

Order from:
The New International Publishing Co.
114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Utility Scandal - -

(Continued from page 1)
Sullivan & Cromwell, New York law firm, is declared to have been up to its ears in political chicanery and in "shaking down stockholders." Officials Feathered Nests

Equally sensational was Boehm's charge that, while corrupting elections, the defendants feathered their nests by "milking" the company of fabulous sums. Harrison Williams, he said, had pulled out profits of more than \$100,000,000; Dillon Read & Co. were accused of having collected "excessive" commissions of more than \$25,000,000, and Sullivan & Cromwell were charged with having taken fees of \$1,500,000 to which the firm had no legal claim.

One of the startling disclosures was that North American, with assets of \$1,500,000,000, is controlled by officers and directors who own less than one-tenth of one per cent of the common stock, with a market value of \$120,000. In addition to the huge rakeoffs, Boehm asserts, the officers are drawing annual salaries of more than \$500,000.

Boehm went into considerable detail in describing the purposes for which the slush fund had been used. Among his allegations were:

1. North American money played a part in the defeat of Daniel Hoan, who for twenty-four years was mayor of Milwaukee and established such a reputation that Milwaukee was said to be "the best governed city in America."
2. North American aided in the defeat of Governor Philip F. La Follette of Wisconsin and made an unsuccessful effort to defeat Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr.
3. The utility spent part of its slush fund to beat proposals submitted to the voters of San Francisco for municipal ownership of some of the properties of the notorious Pacific Gas & Electric and to influence the election of governors and legislators.
4. In the nation's capital, North American used money to influence the appointment of members of the Public Utility Commission who would look with favor on a merger of North American subsidiaries—a move specifically banned by law. The deal was put over, and North American stands to clean up fabulous profits.
5. In Missouri, the slush fund was tapped to obtain favorable municipal and state legislation and to elect candidates to state offices, while in Illinois the object was to control appointments to the State Tax Commission—so as to secure large reductions in taxes. Public ownership movements in several municipalities were also opposed.
6. Funds were spent to elect governors in Ohio, to obtain passage of state legislation and to prevent the city of Cleveland from expanding its municipal power plant. Details concerning expenditures in Michigan were not given.
7. In national elections, Boehm recited, funds were spent in behalf of presidential candidates; also to influence the selection of members of various federal commissions which had to do with utility matters.

PALESTINE

The Fruits of Britain's Middle East Policy

The latest British strategy in Palestine seems to be one of pretending not to notice the arming of the Arabs while at the same time it pursues a vigorous and highly publicized campaign of searches for secret weapons aimed against the Jewish population.

The British aims in this situation seem quite obvious. One, to convince the Arabs of British friendship and so entice them into the Pan-Arab Federation which it is anxiously organizing just now and, two, to prove to world Jewish opinion—particularly American opinion—that it is not feasible to permit further Jewish immigration into Palestine.

The latest governmental provocation, an arms search conducted in the village of Ramath Hakovesh, resulted in the death of one settler who was shot by the police. The wave of fury which swept over the Jewish population as an aftermath of this police raid resulted in a one-hour general strike which took place in Palestine on November 22, in demonstrations in Tel-Aviv, where stones and flaming kerosene-soaked rags were thrown into government buildings, and the tearing down of a British flag to be replaced by a Zionist banner.

Large protest meetings were held all over the country in villages and in the cities of Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem and Haifa. Four thousand people attended the meeting in the latter city called by the Jewish Council (Histadruth).

All the Hebrew newspapers voluntarily ceased publication as a protest against the banning of two Hebrew dailies which were suspended by the authorities because they allegedly published uncensored reports concerning the raid on Ramath Hakovesh, which the authorities considered "highly tendentious and calculated to mislead and inflame public opinion." Bonfires in the streets of Tel-Aviv were made of the government-issued Hebrew language newspaper. In the meantime, all seven Hebrew papers announce that they will not appear so long as the other two dailies are under government ban.

The arms search which started this latest wave of anti-government demonstrations took place on November 16 by a combined force of British police, Indian troops and Polish military police who broke into the colony in what was described by the government communique as a "search for deserters from the Polish army, illegal arms caches and a training camp for an illegal armed organization."

The communique further states that the colonists "refused to co-operate with the police," resulting in the death of one man (a Polish settler who came to Palestine in 1936) who was shot by the police officer commanding the raiding party, "to protect the police rear guard withdrawing after a day-long search." Thirty-five members of the settlement were arrested, numerous settlers were injured as well as a few policemen. A vaguely worded report from the government states, "certain military equipment was found."

The funeral of the man who died, Shmuel Wolinietz, was a signal for large demonstration meetings all over Palestine and in the villages. Despite the attempts by conservative Jewish leaders to quiet their people by negotiating with the government for an end to arms searches, the workers and colonists continue in a state of unrest and open hostility toward the British government.

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. 49 December 6, 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, 1940,
at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1879.