

Browder "Dissolves" Party; Backs Capitalism!

The Communist Party has been officially dissolved. That is the decision already made by the real bosses of the party, and the convention called for May of this year will simply rubber-stamp the decision.

This decision, announced by the party secretary, Earl Browder, was foreshadowed by a series of events. It was indicated by the decision of the Kremlin to dissolve the Communist International last May. Since then, the Communist Party of Costa Rica was the first to change its name to that of the "Popular Democratic Party." Recently the

Communist Party of Cuba renamed itself the "Social Democratic Party." The Canadian Communist Party, too, has appeared with a new name. The Young Communist League of the United States has just been dissolved into a "cover" organization, the American Youth for Democracy. Now it is the turn of the Communist Party itself.

It is perfectly clear now that this is an international policy dictated by the Kremlin gang and will be followed by its vassal parties throughout the world.

The explanation for the dissolution of the party, as made

by Browder in his statement, and in his lengthy speech at Madison Square Garden in New York on January 10, constitutes the most reactionary and perfidious declaration ever made in the history of the world labor movement.

The idea of the class struggle is categorically repudiated. More accurately, the Stalinists have placed themselves on record as the defenders of the capitalist system and its regime of exploitation and oppression.

According to the new doctrine, the role of the working class and the labor movement is to be confined to helping

maintain the capitalist system. The working class viewpoint on wages, for example, is abandoned completely in favor of what is a fundamentally capitalist viewpoint. In Browder's own words, "Any sensible wage policy must be designed to promote production."

The socialist standpoint has always been exactly the opposite, namely, that "any sensible production policy must be designed to promote wages," that is, to advance the economic and social position of the working class.

(Continued on page 4)

We Say--
A 100% Tax on
All War Profits!

LABOR ACTION

We Are--
For a
Cost-Plus Wage!

JANUARY 17, 1944

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR

ONE CENT

FDR FOR SLAVE LAW!

The New Convert!



Soldiers Want Their Vote

By NANCY NATHAN

Word comes from Allied headquarters in the Mediterranean that the American soldiers are making themselves heard on the question of voting in the 1944 elections.

The Stars and Stripes, circulated among the armed forces abroad, states that a representative poll shows that the men overseas are overwhelmingly in favor of a simple uniform balloting law to be passed by the federal government.

Sailors questioned about their views wanted to know: "Can you imagine what percentage will actually vote if each has to proceed through various state methods, most of them not even knowing the requirements of their respective states? The process takes months, and we have little time to spare."

The Stars and Stripes comments editorially that the men "do not feel they are asking Congress for any

special privilege. They feel they are asking for a simple right."

There also appeared in the Stars and Stripes a letter signed by forty-two men in arms from as many different states, in which they all expressed their desire for a federal law "to give us a chance to vote the easy way and not leave us to the individual states with their inadequate laws and delaying difficulties."

So much for the soldiers' point of view.

Here at home in the halls of Congress the Southern poll-taxers are consolidating their forces to resist any bill containing even a suspicion of federal supervision of the vote.

Senator James O. Eastland, Democrat, of Mississippi, who led the unholy fight against the Green-Lucas bill, moderate and mild as it was, expresses confidence that his "solid front" is not only as solid as before but has even gained strength.

Even if this front of poll-taxers should crack, there are those reactionary die-hards who say they will institute a filibuster if a federal balloting law is again brought up.

In the meantime Senator Lucas, Democrat, of Illinois, author of the bill that was defeated in the Senate, is submitting a compromise bill. However, Senator Eastland is not interested in a compromise. He and his gang just don't want any of their control as political bosses in poll-tax territory—even if the soldiers fighting for "democracy" are robbed of the elementary right to vote in the coming election.

The unsavory position taken by the poll-taxers makes it appear, by contrast, that those who supported the Green-Lucas bill were progressive. As a matter of fact, the Green-Lucas bill would have done nothing more than allow only a PART of the men and women at the fronts to exercise rights of citizenship. It would still exclude from voting those fighting men and women not yet twenty-one who should also have the right to vote.

It would be a good idea for every union local to express solidarity with the fighting men and women by passing and giving the widest publicity to resolutions to that effect.

Again LABOR ACTION wants to point out both to workers and soldiers that the shameful spectacle over the soldier vote created by the Congress of capitalist politicians is another argument for an independent Labor Party for the workers, for their brothers in arms and for the mass of common people.

An Editorial

Steel Profiteering

The big business press shrieked itself hoarse when the steel workers walked out after the steel barons and the government agencies refused to give them their much-needed and just wage demands. As happened in the case of the coal miners, the reactionaries and the labor-baiters screamed about inflation and the "unfair" demands of labor. They were joined by General Marshall, whose "off the record" remarks merely served to strengthen the anti-labor front.

At the same time, however, the United Steel Workers, CIO, published the figures on steel profits, which should be made known to every worker in order to demonstrate how big business is veritably choking with profits gained from the sweat and toil of the American workers.

In another column we present the figures of a number of these steel companies and the profits they have made up to now. At the top of the paper we present the figures for total profits since the year 1940.

Here is additional evidence that the workers are being rooked in the steel industry, as they have been cheated and robbed in auto, mining, railroading, aircraft, meat packing, etc.

On the basis of peacetime profits, the following figures show the amount of "excess" profits, i.e., war profits taken by the steel barons:

1940: Steel corporations reported total profits of \$367,000,000. War profits amounted to \$153,800,000.
1941: Steel corporations reported total profits of \$367,400,000. War profits amounted to \$228,400,000.
1942: Steel corporations reported total profits of \$280,000,000. War profits amounted to \$141,300,000.
1943: Steel corporations reported total profits of \$265,800,000. War profits amounted to \$126,800,000.
Thus, out of a total profit of \$1,206,000,000, steel war profits reach the sum of \$650,000,000.

Is it in defense of these "unconscionable profits" that General Marshall made his smear attack upon labor?

Is it in defense of these "unconscionable profits" that President Roosevelt is now proposing the establishment of a national slavery act, called a national service act?

Of course, it is! And we believe that this fact about the steel industry is the answer to anyone who wants to know why the workers are fighting mad. It is an answer as to where Roosevelt and his Administration really stand in relation to labor.

How the Steel Monopolies Split the Profit Booty

Company	Total Profits For 4 Peace Years 1936-1939	Total Profits For 4 War Years 1940-1943
United States Steel	\$186,600,000	\$431,584,000
Bethlehem Steel	75,480,000	159,409,000
Republic Steel	31,180,000	83,104,000
Jones & Laughlin	12,104,000	49,331,000
Youngstown Sheet & Tube	23,760,000	50,413,000
National Steel	49,580,000	59,322,000
Inland Steel	41,300,000	55,645,000
American Rolling Mill	18,680,000	37,355,000
Wheeling Steel	14,400,000	23,409,000
Crucible Steel	9,840,000	32,091,000
Colorado Fuel & Iron	3,044,000	7,964,000
Pittsburgh Steel	1,660,000	9,026,000
Sharon Steel	2,904,000	6,564,000
Lukens Steel	360,000	6,018,000
Alan Wood Steel	2,116,000	3,574,000
Allegheny-Ludlum Steel	7,200,000	17,958,000
The Midvale Co.	5,548,000	16,663,000
Rustless Iron & Steel	2,232,000	9,338,000
American Steel Foundries	7,928,000	12,317,000
General Steel Castings	496,000	10,659,000

By DAVID COOLIDGE

"A national service law, which, for the duration of the war will prevent strikes and, with certain appropriate exceptions, will make available for war production or for any other essential services every able-bodied adult in the nation."

This is the heart, the core and the very essence of Roosevelt's message to the new session of Congress. Roosevelt calls on Congress to take the final step for forcing labor into a legal straight-

Baruch Has a Word for It

"Enforced and involuntary service for a private master is and has been clearly and repeatedly defined by our Supreme Court as slavery prohibited by the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States."—From *American Industry in the War*, by Bernard Baruch.

jacket which will leave the workers at the mercy of the capitalist bosses and their henchmen in the federal government.

Roosevelt asks Congress to enact a law "which for the duration of the war will prevent strikes." How are strikes to be prevented? By making "available for war production or for any other essential services every able-bodied adult in the nation."

In other words, Congress is to establish a LABOR FRONT, United States style. In this labor front not only will the workers be harnessed to the job selected for them by the government bureaucrats but their wages and hours of toil will be supervised by these same government bureaucrats.

Cramp Strike Answers Company Anti-Union Acts

PHILADELPHIA—A three-day strike of the workers at Cramp Shipyards again showed that they would not stand for being pushed around by the anti-union officials of the corporation. The strike was an inspiring example of labor action and solidarity in the face of the company, the WLB, the Navy, the capitalist press, and, worst of all, their own national officials, led by John Green, president of the CIO Shipbuilders Union.

The strike was brought about by the discharge of fifty-two painters who refused to do the very dirty and unhealthy spray work without receiving specialists' pay and rotating the work among all men in the department. The firing of these painters, however, was only the most recent in a long series of provocative acts against the union on the part of the company.

Men Fight Odds

The men refused to work without the discharged painters and when the company refused to reinstate them, the executive board of Local 62 termed it a "lock-out" on the company's part.

On Friday morning, 11,000 day shift workers congregated in the streets in front of the yards and refused to enter. The executive board then issued a statement, refusing to go back until all outstanding grievances between the union and the company were settled. These included three disputed clauses in the contract now before the WLB since last June.

Despite the absence of a picket

Under such a law, the assault on collective bargaining will have been completed, and, should they submit, the unions may as well fold their tents, surrender and be prepared to submit to the snarls of every foreman and the unified attacks of the whole class of capitalist employers.

The proof that no worker is to be allowed to escape the regimentation intended by Roosevelt is in the phrase: "...will make available for war production OR FOR ANY OTHER ESSENTIAL SERVICES every able-bodied adult in the nation." Not only are the war workers to be included in the labor front but even those who are not engaged in war work. This is a demand on Congress to pass a law that will "unify" the working class, that will forcibly regiment labor as a whole in support of the Second Imperialist World War.

Roosevelt is clear and forthright in his demand for a national service law that will "prevent strikes" and make every last man and woman (except the halt and the blind) available for labor in the factories, mines and fields. But he isn't so clear and forthright in connection with profits, salaries, dividends and interest.

The "greatest President since Abraham Lincoln" asks for "a realistic tax law which will tax UNREASONABLE PROFITS..." He demands "continuation of the law for the renegotiation of war contracts which will prevent EXORBITANT PROFITS and assure FAIR PRICES to the government. For two long years I have pleaded with the Congress to take UNDUE PROFITS out of war."

This is all that Roosevelt has to say about the billions in profits the capitalists have already taken and

'We Ain't Making a Cent'

A Report on Rail Profits

The golden year of 1942 may pale considerably when the carriers finish counting their profits for 1943.

That was indicated this week by reports from the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Association of American Railroads, showing a net of \$838,000,000 for eleven months of 1943, after allowing for taxes and all charges. This is about \$18,000,000 higher than the corresponding period of the preceding year, which was the most bountiful in the history of the railroads.—"Labor."

Total Steel Profits 1940-1943

\$1,206,000,000

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued on page 2)

MASS ACTION

By David Coolidge

The Railroad Strike Vote

Before the railroad strike had been called off, the Cleveland Plain Dealer had an editorial entitled "Strong Arm Tactics." This was the way this Ohio capitalist daily paper described the projected strike of the railroad workers.

After going through the usual capitalist class bunkum about how well the railroad workers had been the "good boys" in the American labor movement, the Plain Dealer asked: "What are they up to now?" According to that paper, the railroad workers were about to indulge in practices that the country associates with John L. Lewis.

What the Plain Dealer is afraid of, of course, is not so much that the handful of rail union leaders would act like Lewis, but that the rail unions would begin to act like the miners' union.

The editorial goes on to say: "The fact is that the railroad brotherhoods are attempting to put over a colossal bluff. They are in the same position as the player in a game of stud poker who has only a deuce in the hole but is relying on a loaded gun at his side to win the pot. We do not believe the brotherhoods actually intend to fire the gun."

This is something for the railroad and other workers to think about. It is not good for labor to have the reputation of being only a bunch of big mouths who don't intend to fight. "You're only bluffing," says the Plain Dealer, "and if the government and the bosses call your bluff, you'll tuck your tail between your legs and sink off like a whipped cur."

Of course, labor isn't doing this, but we must be careful that we don't give the bosses and the government any grounds for believing they can bluff us. Labor is not in the position of a poker player who has only a deuce in the hole—and an ace up. This is usually enough to win, and you don't have to bluff. As a rule, when faced with such a hand, your opponents turn back and don't risk their stack.

A good player, determined to win, won't take chances with hard-headed opponents. He makes the betting so stiff that the enemy is usually glad to run for cover. This is the position of organized labor today. We don't have to bluff. We have the forces and the power. All we need is the guts to use them.

The Plain Dealer says that the workers depend on the gun at their side to put over the bluff and steal the pot. What's wrong with this when we are dealing with an enemy who also has a whole arsenal at his side and who bluffs and blusters, steals and strong-arms all over the place? But we say again, labor does not have to do this. We have the numbers and the power. Above all, we have genuine grievances. The most elementary satisfaction of these grievances demands first of all far higher wages than the workers get today.

Labor and Renegotiations

The trade unions should pay more attention to the renegotiation controversy that is going on between the capitalist bosses and their government. Under Secretary of War Patterson, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, reported that the Timken Detroit Axle Company had profits of 33 1/2 per cent on net sales for last year, before negotiation and taxes. In the period 1936 to 1939 net profits on net sales for this company amounted to 10 1/2 per cent.

In the years 1936 to 1939, Timken Axle paid common dividends averaging \$1,477,000 a year. In 1942, alone, however, Timken Axle common dividends amounted to \$4,216,000. How about holding the line on dividends? If a worker asks for a dollar an hour, that's inflationary. If a capitalist boss rakes in a \$100,000 salary and another \$100,000 in dividends, that's rendering a patriotic service to one's country in wartime.

Chairman Truman of the Senate War Investigating Committee has announced that eight billion dollars in war contracts have been cancelled to date. This will continue and many workers will be faced with unemployment. That is, unless there is a return to the production of consumer goods. This is another matter for the unions to give attention to. It is really far more important than wasting time trying to decide whether to support Roosevelt or Willkie for President.

Every last man and woman can be kept at work if the factories that are taken off war production are immediately converted to the production of goods for the benefit of the masses of the people. Workers should be more enthusiastic over producing clothing, food and houses than they are about bullets, tanks and planes for war purposes.

India in Revolt
By Henry Judd
25 Cents Postpaid
WORKERS PARTY
114 West 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Dalrymple Expels 74 Rubber Strikers

By BILL FORD

AKRON—Expulsion of seventy-four striking members of the United Rubber Workers of America, CIO, from their union by direct order of S. H. Dalrymple, international president, has brought to a climax three months of growing unrest among Akron rubber workers. Dalrymple is moving, in addition, to invoke the union's maintenance of membership clause against these strikers and has been assured, in advance, of loyal cooperation from the companies!

The incidents took place at General Tire and Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., where, respectively, seventy-two and two workers were involved recently in strikes over rate adjustments in the band building and milling departments. Numerous stoppages had been engaged in previously by these workers and they had been penalized by a week's layoff.

Drive Against Militants

Dalrymple's action is the carrying through of his threat, made at the Toronto international convention last September, where he warned that he intended to be a "damned sight tougher" in the coming year against "unauthorized" shut-downs. At that time the convention had debated vigorously a previous expulsion of U. S. Rubber Co. strikers, and a large minority had opposed the reactionary intervention of Bureaucrat

Dalrymple in their internal local affairs.

The present case is bound again to come before the next convention because Dalrymple has never tried to amend the URWA convention on local autonomy, contenting himself with taking executive action and counting on overruling all opposition through his well entrenched bureaucratic machine.

This expulsion action climaxes Dalrymple's propaganda drive against stoppages, carried on in recent weeks by means of large joint meetings of company and union officials and committeemen. At these meetings the top bureaucracy of the URWA has indicated most clearly that it really LOVES its job of licking the boots of the city's rubber barons, all at the expense of the interests of the workers.

The Dalrymple leadership is literally panic-stricken at the increase of sit-down strikes among the rubber workers. It has been estimated that thirty stoppages occurred during the month of December in the Goodyear plant alone, and similar numbers at the other large plants. The companies have maintained their offensive against labor standards all along the line, trusting in Dalrymple to keep the men at work. He, however, knows full well by now that the struggle in the shops will not be halted by his stupid and cowardly appeals. And he and his clique at

the top of the URWA are deathly afraid of losing their jobs at the next convention as a result of increasing militancy from the rank and file. Prediction of such a future occurrence even appeared in a Fortune magazine article last November, and such an eventuality has the rubber barons fearful!

The local press has carried on a running campaign of sniping and even attempted, for many months now, a frame-up of militant union men in addition to its regular coverage of national anti-labor smear plots. A particular target had been George Bass, president of Goodrich Local No. 5, recognized as the most aggressive of local rubber union leaders. Columns of rationed newsprint have been devoted to a farcical and fraudulent list of charges against him for alleged violation of OPA gas and fire regulations. Attempts were even made to paint him as the "brains behind the scenes" of a stupid and unsuccessful action by some here-brained anti-Stalinist unionists who stole the ballot box of the United Auto Workers local union at Goodyear Aircraft during a union election.

For Labor Political Action

Even the AFL is being shaken by local events too. On December 22 it withdrew its representatives from the War Manpower Commission, blasting the WMC director for his sponsorship and dictatorial methods

in presenting a "controlled referral" plan for hiring, in which ALL employment locally would be handled through the government employment agency.

In spite of all this growth of labor militancy in various fields directly related to its immediate economic welfare, the political progress of Akron labor has not kept pace. In the city elections last November the unions endorsed and organized to support Mayor George Harter for reelection on the Democratic Party ticket. Harter seemed like a genuine "friend of labor" in comparison with many "Democrats" throughout the country, because of his frequent pro-labor statements and even actions, such as keeping police from molesting pickets. But his "appeal" to the average worker certainly did not amount to much, for labor was not and could not be stimulated by it in sufficient numbers to get out and vote.

Only an independent labor party, standing on an avowed working class program and running genuine working men's candidates, has the possibility of attracting the attention of masses of workers in these days of national and international crises. The Akron elections proved to the hilt, and negatively, that capitalist politicians are UNABLE to arouse in labor any consciousness of its duty to protect its class interests politically.

Strike of Cramp Ship Workers --

(Continued from page 1)

line, not a single production worker volunteered to go in to work. At a mass meeting held on Friday afternoon the prevailing sentiment of the men was "all or nothing" and "now or never."

A spokesman for the Stalinist party line advocated immediate return to work and support of "our commander-in-chief" and "leader of our union, John Green." He was met with such a hostile demonstration by the men that he had to request an escort from the chairman to protect him as he left the hall.

On Friday night, President John Green, who is more and more following a Stalinist party line, issued a blistering statement from his headquarters in Camden, denouncing the strike as inexcusable and demanding that the men go back at once. He prepared a statement ordering the men to go back, which he demanded the officers of Local 42 to sign. When news of this reached the executive board of the local on Saturday night, they voted to forbid the officers the right to sign any statement sending the men back without a vote from the membership.

On Saturday night, Green once more summoned the officers of the local to Camden and furiously demanded that they sign the statement before he would even consider any propositions they had to make. Heading their own executive committee vote, the officers unanimously refused to sign.

Anti-Labor Lineup

Three thousand members of the local met on Sunday afternoon in a mass membership meeting to hear the report of their officers. By this time the capitalist dailies, the Inquirer, the Record, and the Bulletin, had been drumming up public pres-

sure for three days against the men. Backing up this campaign were statements from the local Democratic congressman, Bradley, who has always been elected with the votes of Cramp workers, a statement from the War Labor Board to the effect that the Cramp case was being put at the bottom of the list of shipyard cases as punishment for the walk-out, a statement from Secretary of the Navy Knox, and several statements by Lieut. -Commander Joslin, in charge of labor relations for the Navy at Cramp's.

But the unkindest and most damaging blow of all was the vicious statement of President Green of their own union. The men had come to expect anti-labor statements from the capitalist press, the politicians and the government boards. But the stab in the back statement from the man they helped elect to the presidency of their union and whose salary is

paid out of their dues topped the line-up of forces against the men.

The president of Local 42, William Schaffer, pointing out what the men were up against, advised that they comply with the order of President Green and return to work. This statement was booed by the men. In the course of his speech, Schaffer launched into an attack on Green, saying:

"John Green and his statement to the press was worse than General Marshall's. I think it's about time we started a fight to change the national office's policy."

This sentiment was seconded by the secretary of the local, Herbert Moyer, until recently a loyal supporter of the Green administration. Moyer called for the repeal of the no-strike pledge to untie labor's hands. However, he too was booed lustily when he finished by advising the men to go back. Boos likewise

greeted the rest of the official board of eight members.

Green Avoids Ranks

Green failed to make an appearance. His usual substitute, Philip Van Gelder, secretary of the national organization, likewise failed to attend. Their representatives, two members of the General Executive Board, found it practically impossible to be heard above the booing.

However, speeches by active union men from the ranks, above all by Jerry Kotz of the electricians, finally persuaded the men that it was hopeless to hold out in an isolated strike against the efforts of their own national officers to break the strike. His speech finally convinced the men that the odds were against them this time but that their demonstration had shown that the men would refuse to lie down and let the company walk over them. His motion to go back to work was carried, with some hundred scattered votes against.

Immediately after the vote, Local President Schaffer offered his resignation on the ground that his position forced him to act against his own convictions. The men, however, in a vote of confidence, refused to accept the resignation.

Large groups of union men assembled in front of the yards on Monday morning and marched back to work in a body, demonstrating that they were not beaten stragglers, but disciplined unionists. It was quickly proved that the men were in no mood to be toyed with when quick and determined action by the union put two stewards back on the job who had been fired in the morning by department foremen, who mistakenly thought that the return to work meant that the union had been licked. All indications are that the fifty-two painters will soon be put back on the job also.

Ceylon Trotskyist Leaders Imprisoned

Information has been received that the leaders of the Lanka Sama Samaj, the revolutionary socialist party of Ceylon, followers of Leon Trotsky, who with Lenin led the Russian Revolution and who was assassinated by Stalinist agents in 1940, have been arrested in India by British authorities and are now being held on the charge of high treason.

The arrested revolutionary socialists, D. P. R. Gunawardene, Dr. N. M. Perera, both members of the Ceylon State Council, Dr. Colin R. de Silva and E. Samarakody, were previously imprisoned in Ceylon, from where they made their escape to India.

Their "crime" is that they have been fighting for the independence of India and Ceylon and for a socialist republic. For this, the British authorities made the arrested and now threaten these outstanding fighters for Ceylonese and Indian freedom with long prison terms.

The sharpest protests must be made against the British authorities for their actions and the demand raised for the immediate release of the leaders of the Lanka Sama Samaj, as well as all the other leaders and rank and file of the National Congress Party and every other fighter for Indian independence!

FDR Calls for Slave Labor Law --

(Continued from page 1)

are taking in from the sweating of the workers in the field, factories and mines, and the blood being poured out by their brothers on the battlefields of the world.

What About the Profiteers?

Why didn't Roosevelt demand that Congress include in his national service law that ALL the profits be taken out of the war? What does he mean by "unreasonable profits" and "undue profits"?

Why doesn't Roosevelt demand that every dollar of profit from war orders go into the federal treasury?

Why doesn't Roosevelt demand that, for the duration of the war, not a dollar of war profits go to pay dividends or interest?

Why doesn't Roosevelt demand that, for the period of the war, every government official (including the President) and every corporation official have his salary and income "stabilized" in the same manner that the wages of the workers have been "stabilized"?

That is, why doesn't Roosevelt demand that government officials (including the resident and members of Congress) and all corporation executives have their salaries and incomes reduced to a bare maintenance level? Why didn't the President demand that corporation officials and their subordinates be tied to their jobs just as the workers are?

Roosevelt demands none of these things. He leaves the capitalist bosses just as they are today; in full control of their corporations, their

salaries, dividends, and with all their tremendous power over the masses of the people untouched.

Roosevelt knows this and he knows also that Congress understands fully that it is not his intention to disturb the power and incomes of the capitalist bosses in the slightest degree.

What Is Labor Serving?

Congress understands fully that the national service act is to be directed at labor, and at labor alone. It will be a law aimed at smashing the unions.

This act will be aimed straight at the UMWA, the railroad brotherhoods, the steel workers and at all unions that show any degree of militancy. This recommendation of Roosevelt to Congress is a warning to the steel workers, who are demanding an increase in wages, to tuck their tails between their legs and bow down before the coke ovens and the blast furnaces.

The national service act is to be a warning to Murray, Green and Lewis not to get out of line, not to give heed to the pressure of their rank and file. Lewis has authorized strikes of the miners, the leaders of the railway unions have been taking strike votes and 75,000 of the steel workers in Murray's union took a "holiday" away from the mills. Roosevelt now tells Murray, Green and Lewis that they are to close ranks with him, Congress and the capitalist bosses against labor.

The national service act (Labor Front) which Roosevelt tearfully submits to a waiting Congress, will

increase the power of the capitalist employers over labor and guarantee that the profits of the bosses in 1944 will be bigger than in 1943. There will be no avoiding this if the trade unions permit this act to become law. This will be the inescapable result, for the reason that this labor front act will so weaken the unions that they will not be in position to maintain collective bargaining rights either with industry or the federal government.

The message of Roosevelt takes nearly a full page in the capitalist press. It is so welcome to the bosses and their press that ten pages would be used if the message required it. There are many other questions raised in the message but they all relate to the main point: to "prevent strikes" and round up the workers. All the rest of the message is mere decoration calculated to make the organization of a labor front more palatable to labor.

The Murrays, Greens and all the other labor lieutenants of the Roosevelt government, and all the labor recruiting sergeants for the imperialist war have their answer and their reward. They are being paid in full for their stupidity and treachery to the millions of workers they are supposed to represent.

Where Labor Stands

At the CIO convention Murray said that he was displeased with what was going on in Washington. He wasn't ready to endorse Roosevelt for a fourth term. At the AFL convention, the numbskull Green was also displeased with

the attempts to regiment labor.

At the UAW convention, Thomas said that before the war he had authorized more strikes than any other international president. After the war Thomas says that he will do the same thing if the bosses try to give the workers the run-around. But Thomas will be relieved of this now and after the war if the national service act becomes law. His friend Roosevelt will take care of the situation for him.

Perhaps now, considerably late, the working class will begin to understand what LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party have been talking about for months, in issue after issue, when this paper has advocated independent political action of labor; that the working class shall break with the Republican and Democratic Parties; shall break with the capitalist bosses and their government and form an independent mass labor party. This is one sure way to defeat the national service act and all similar anti-labor proposals.

Editor's Note: There are other questions raised by Roosevelt in his message to Congress that will be treated in subsequent issues of LABOR ACTION.

Next Week:

LABOR ACTION will carry a full story on the struggle in the American Labor Party.

WORLD EVENTS

By Europacus

Banker Gets High Post on Control Commission

Some weeks ago it was announced that a number of representatives of American big business had received important posts in the AMG commission which at present overlords Italy. I. F. Stone, in a dispatch to the New York newspaper, PM, January 9, reveals that another representative of influential British-American banking interests has been appointed to a high post in the Allied Control Commission. He is John L. Simpson, an official of the Henry Schroder Banking Corp. of New York. The Schroder firm is linked with a British house of the same name and has had extremely close ties with the German bank, Schroder Brothers of Hamburg, and J. H. Stein of Cologne.

The German Baron von Schroder was one of the most influential people in German banking who backed Hitler before 1933; it was he who established the connection between von Papen and Hitler in 1932 and helped to introduce Hitler to the heads of German heavy industry. The American and British Schroder banks did a flourishing business with Nazi Germany in pre-war years. Some of the British partners were members of the pro-Nazi Anglo-American Fellowship.

The American Schroder bank participated in a number of important deals involving German-American

cartel agreements. It dealt in the notorious German Ruckwanderer marks—a matter which has recently been under investigation by the Department of Justice. The bank was also interested in the international rayon cartel which was closely tied with the Italian artificial silk industry—among the staunchest supporters of Mussolini.

These are some of the facts revealed by I. F. Stone on the most recent addition to the list of American Gauleiters in Italy. This is an additional proof of the fact that American big business and international banking interests have moved into the innermost councils of the Allied Administration of occupied territories. While high sounding declarations still speak about making the "liberated" countries safe for democracy, these facts show clearly that they are rather made safe for capitalist exploitation.

The Schroders and their many associates in Wall Street were not worried about fascism. In fact, they had a thriving business with Hitler before the war, but now that they can no longer deal with the Nazis they make sure to get their "rightful" share in the spoils of Europe after Allied occupation. In minor facts like these the whole face of imperialist control is revealed—much clearer perhaps than in long essays.

Item on German Workers

The Zurich newspaper, Weltwoche, reporting the growing sympathy of German workers for the much-abused foreign workers in Germany, said recently:

"The attempt of the Nazi government to imbue German workers with the ideology of the 'master race' in order to make them look down upon foreign forced laborers, has not been completely successful. German war workers are giving

countless daily proofs of their friendly attitude toward their foreign colleagues whose position is worse than theirs. They begin by giving them cigarettes, then secret gifts of food. They even give financial and other vital assistance to those who have deserted from forced labor camps. To escaped war prisoners German workers give ration cards and civilian clothes and provide them with shelter in secret hiding places."

Levy Case and Army Jim Crow Put Up to President Roosevelt

A request that President Roosevelt "correct a flagrant miscarriage of the system of military justice" and demonstrate his "determination to abolish race segregation and discrimination in the Army" by restoring Private Alton Levy to his former rank of sergeant, signed by 235 national leaders in the fields of education, religion and labor, was made public this week.

The letter to the President was issued through the Workers Defense League by Samuel Wolchock, president of the United Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Employees, CIO, A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL, and David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers, AFL. They are chairman, secretary and treasurer, respectively, of the Trade Union Conference on the Levy Case held at Freedom House, New York City, October 20, and personally signed the letter.

Court-martialed for criticizing Army discrimination against Negroes, Private Levy was released November 12, five weeks before the expiration of his four-month sentence at hard labor, after his case had been a cause celebre in the liberal, labor and Ne-

gro press for two months. Thousands of letters urging his release reached the White House. Shipped from Phoenix, Ariz., to Amarillo, Tex., one hour after his release, Private Levy was suddenly re-shipped to the Gila Bend Guntery Base, Gila, Ariz., on November 25, where he is now.

The letter told the President of the widespread conviction that Levy was punished for his opposition to illegal discrimination against Negroes and for his labor background, and detailed five points in Levy's behalf: The original court-martial declaration of Levy's innocence; the appointment of the court-martial by the very officer who claimed he was slandered by Levy; the fact that rumors attributed to Levy had been known to the Army for months before Levy came to the base; inclusion of the charge that Levy had falsely stated that "the colored soldiers at the base are being mistreated" indicates the crux of the issue; and the suspicious circumstances that the WAC who turned in Levy "also turned in four other men similarly, three of whom were also Jews." The only non-Jew she involved, Sergeant Bolton, testified Levy had not slandered the general.

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?

General Marshall Overlooked Something

Merchants of Death and the Soldiers

By GERTRUDE SHAW

Yes, how about THEM? General Marshall, President Roosevelt and the whole kit and kaboodle of capitalist spokesmen who have come out with so much vehemence in attacking labor, have never uttered a syllable of condemnation against the merchants of death.

Who are these merchants of death? They are the giants of American industry. They are the pay-triots who are raking in "legitimate" war profits that must make even the gods of war hang their heads.

But they have earned the name of merchants of death for two special reasons:

To satisfy their unquenchable thirst for profits they have actually aided and abetted Hitler.

To fill their pockets with gold they have actually sold defective war materials to be used by soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen.

For these two special reasons people hiss at American big business the well-deserved epithet: MERCHANTS OF DEATH.

Let us look into the record a bit. Loyalty to Profits First

Back in 1942, when the housewives of the country were stripping their kitchens of aluminum pots and pans to build airplanes, the Department of Justice revealed that the Aluminum Corporation of America was deliberately, willfully and with a plan entailing greater profits for itself, holding up production of aluminum and

magnesium—without which planes cannot be built.

Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold in his testimony against the aluminum trust revealed just how this situation came about.

The Aluminum Corporation of America had a cartel agreement with the Nazi firm of I. G. Farben. By the terms of this agreement, Nazi Germany was permitted to double and triple its aluminum production. The American trust agreed to keep its production in status quo. The "inducement" was that the German trust would not export any of its aluminum or magnesium into the American market—as if the Germans wanted to, since they had plans of their own for the use of aluminum and magnesium!

Out of this arrangement the American aluminum trust reaped bumper profits. But the shortage of these metals in this country meant delay in building the air umbrella for the American armed forces, while the Nazis were enabled to maintain superiority for a long time.

No Pals of the Soldiers

Would any soldier, sailor, marine or airman call the Aluminum Corporation of America his pal? Hardly! But Alcoa is one of the powerful American trusts now behind the attempt to steam up the soldier against the worker. And why not? Better steam up the soldier against the worker than let him find out on his

own who was regally stabbing him in the back.

In giving testimony against Alcoa, Thurman Arnold said: "Throughout my testimony I have tried to emphasize the fact that this case is not unique. I do not think it is an extreme statement to say that in most basic war materials we find similar cartel agreements."

Long after Pearl Harbor the American armed forces were being hampered by cartel agreements which allowed the American captains of industry to get enormous profits but at the same time gave Hitler the advantage in building and accumulating war materials.

To cite only two other cases that come readily to mind, there is the Standard Oil trust, whose cartel agreement with I. G. Farbenindustrie prevented for a long time the production of synthetic rubber in this country, and the great General Electric combine, whose agreement with Krupp of Germany regarding tungsten was of the same general nature.

These are the "good friends" of the soldier, who are behind the anti-labor propaganda.

Yes, the pillars of American capitalist society don't care how they make profits, so long as they are big enough. That is why they are also shipping, on government war orders, defective materials. How many soldiers, sailors, marine and airmen met with sudden death inflicted by "his own side" will, according to the Sen-

ate Truman Committee, never be known.

Profits Versus Death

There was the case of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a subsidiary of the great Anaconda outfit, which cheated on inspections and shipped defective wire on government orders. The Department of Justice declared this to be one of the most reprehensible cases of defrauding the government and endangering the lives of American soldiers and sailors ever to come to its attention.

The United States Steel trust engaged in similar criminal fraud. The Truman Committee disclosed that the tanker Schenectady, which broke up during its trial on the West Coast, contained defective steel plate made by the Homestead works of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co., a subsidiary of U. S. Steel. It was discovered that this top capitalist concern made it a business to sell defective sheet plates. Some 23,000 to 35,000 tons were faked to meet the specifications of war orders going to the United States Navy and Maritime shipyards, and to lend-lease consignments—before the fraud was discovered.

How many seamen lie at the bottom of the world-circling oceans because of the greed of this merchant of death?

Do you know that the United States Cartridge Co., one of the largest manufacturers of small munitions in the world, was delivering thousands of defective cartridges for shipment to the armed forces?

Do you know that another company was putting government inspection tags on defective shells after taking them from shells that had been okayed—then they would have the okayed shells inspected again to get more tags to put on more defective shells?

How many soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen would be alive now if not for these criminal frauds? But these are by no means all. In January, 1943, there were hundreds of cases of such criminal fraud in various stages of prosecution.

Look at a partial list of the merchants of death: Aluminum Company of America, Standard Oil, General Electric, Anaconda Wire & Cable, United States Steel, United States Cartridge, and others.

This is representative American capitalism. Cruelly and relentlessly it functions to make profits. And its spokesmen want to get the soldiers, whose lives weighed as nothing against its profits, to be sore because American workers are getting tired of holding the bag of war burdens at home. The American workers are not only protecting present standards of living but will also be protecting the returned soldiers and sailors in their fight against unemployment after the war.

In many cases these merchants of death would have continued longer with their criminal fraud if it had not been that the workers in the plants would not tolerate stabbing in the back their brothers in the armed forces. This was true in the case of Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co. selling defective steel plates and in the case of the U. S. Cartridge Co. selling duds as good ammunition. In exposing their bosses, the workers, of course, risked losing their jobs.

The merchants of death do not offend the sensitivities of General Marshall and his crowd. But workers striving to make these capitalists relinquish some of their profits so that working people can live decently—ah, that's a different story!

Somervell's Evasions Protect Standard Oil Canol Grab

By V. JENSEN

The Army is putting up a stiff fight to save and expand its Canol oil project in spite of the accumulated evidence against the project and the united recommendation of other war agencies that it be scrapped.

Lieut. - Gen. Brehon Somervell, chief of supply, vigorously defended the project and urged its expansion in his testimony before the Truman Committee. And President Roosevelt made a surprise statement which will undoubtedly be used by the Army bigwigs in which he said that he had approved the Canol project in Canada at a time when it appeared there might be a great military action in the Alaska and Aleutian area. He added that at the time he would have approved anything to get a new source of oil in that part of the world as a war measure.

Roosevelt's statement and the Army's preparing to request funds to expand Canol came as unexpected moves following the accord reached earlier in the week by the Navy Department, the War Production Board and the Office of the Coordinator of War to recommend scrapping the project. These agencies, and the Truman Committee, which is drafting a report condemning Canol and urging its abandonment, had agreed that it would be better to drop it now at an estimated loss of \$77,000,000 than to spend \$30,000,000 more to complete it.

The committee hearings have pretty thoroughly exposed this deal as one of gravity for Standard and Canadian oil interests and as of very little use from any point of view, including the military (see LABOR ACTION, December 6).

Somervell's Testimony

Somervell's testimony, like Roosevelt's statement, leaned heavily upon a plea of a desperate military situation at the time it was approved. But this plea of urgency loses some of its appeal when faced with the following hard facts:

Somervell admitted that the date originally fixed for completion of the project, October 1943, was impossible to achieve. It is not possible to complete it before the spring of 1944.

In order to get drilling equipment to the field, the Army had to build a waterway and portage route which it had previously rejected in favor of the Alaska Highway. In order to build the pipeline, the Army had to construct an accessory highway over tougher terrain than the Alaska Highway. In order to get refinery equipment to White Horse, the Army had to straighten a narrow-gauge railway.

Oil is supposed to be desperately needed. But evidence at the committee hearings has brought out that oil won't even flow through the above-ground pipelines at the extremely low prevailing winter temperatures and that there has been no provision made for feeding and servicing crews at pumping stations. Also, it has been shown that the Army failed to provide a source of water for steam needed to operate the refinery.

This is an interesting lesson on how to get nowhere quickly in a "desperate military hurry."

General Somervell has made much of the fact that the project has developed oil "beyond our wildest expectation." He boasts that the Army

discovered the biggest oil field found on the continent in the past fifteen years. "If that's a crime," he modestly beats his breast, "we're guilty of it." All very fine—but the general neglects to add that the refinery was built to handle four hundred and sixty-nine barrels of oil a day, NOT the twenty thousand now coming in.

Fact and Fiction

Many interesting ways on how the Army does business have come to light during the struggle of the Truman Committee to obtain information on the basis for the approval of the project by the joint chiefs of staff. The Truman Committee has asked for the data on which they acted. The Army has replied that this was confidential. (No doubt!) The committee is not well satisfied with this excuse. In July of this year, Somervell made a report to General Marshall, chief of staff, which said that the Canol project had been approved after "an intensive study" of the Norman field in Canada.

When asked for any written record of that "intensive study," Somervell said there was none except the one-page memorandum on the basis of which he had approved the project. A committee member pointed out that this memo contained no data but was merely a series of recommendations. Somervell replied that the Army had "no occasion" to build a written record on the project.

Somervell admitted there had been no engineering surveys of the project prior to his approval of it, but

argued there wasn't time for such things! It is earnestly to be hoped that the War Department doesn't enter on its military campaigns with such "pay-triots" vagueness.

Standard Oil in Again

The general was also delightfully vague about the question of who had first suggested the Canol project to him. He did not recall. He said he "may have" discussed it with Walter Teagle, former official of Standard Oil of New Jersey, whose Canadian subsidiary—Imperial Oil—is one of the biggest beneficiaries.

Somervell's testimony, and its enthusiastic reception on the part of the press, is an interesting commentary on the inability of the investigating committee to get any information from the War Department. Somervell is insolently confident that he is backed up by his high-ups in the War Department and, indirectly at least, by Roosevelt's statement, and answers no questions that are too embarrassing. Who are the friends of Standard Oil who are being so effectively covered?

If Somervell were a union leader, instead of an Army general, we venture to guess that an investigating committee would have had out of him by now every mite of information about his private and public life and that of his friends, and his testimony would not be greeted with the polite respect accorded to Somervell's evasions.

For generals there's caviar—and lots of oil to make it go down easy.

Polish Government in Exile Loaded with Anti-Semites

By J. KAAREN

Charges that the Polish army-in-exile is poisoned with anti-Semitic propaganda from the topmost ranks downward and that this remains unchecked by the Polish government, which gives lip service to democracy, were made by two Jewish deputies at its cabinet meeting in London recently.

Leaders of the Polish Peasant Party and of the Socialist Party joined the two Jewish deputies in the Polish National Council who are demanding that the Polish government take energetic measures to combat the anti-Jewish persecution now being practiced among Polish refugees and soldiers.

As a protest against the cabinet for its attitude of indifference on the question, Emanuel Szerer, the Jewish socialist member, refused to vote on the budget. He stated that "the anti-Semitic atmosphere is still maintained and even fostered by certain groups in the army."

Another Jewish deputy, Dr. Ignacy Schwarzbart, supported this view, saying that "the spirit of General Anders, expressed in his order on anti-Semitism issued on November 30, 1941, is still haunting some detachments." (General Anders, chief of the Polish army in the Middle East, issued an order to the army stating that while he understood the anti-Jewish feelings of the Polish soldiers, they must realize that anti-Semitism is unpalatable to the Anglo-Saxon world.)

Mr. Szerer also demanded that food be sent the surviving Jews in the ghettos of Poland through the International Red Cross. In fact,

concrete steps of any kind to bring relief to the Polish Jews both inside and outside the country are not forthcoming in spite of governmental protestations of horror at the extermination of the Jews by the Nazis. Conservative estimates claim that about two million Polish Jews have been killed by the Nazis either outright, in concentration camps, or in their attempts to escape. This is the largest casualty percentage suffered by any nationality in this war.

In spite of the fact that the outwardly democratic coloration of the cabinet is greater than it was in pre-war days, actually the element among the deputies seated in the cabinet in London is not very different from the reactionary Jew-hating type of Polish official personified by ranking members of the Polish government up to 1939.

When it became necessary to depend for its power and prestige on the support of underground groups in Poland, among whom were numerous Jews, and to be more subject to the pressure of democratic world opinion than when it was a legally constituted government in Poland, then the government in exile became more "democratic" in tone.

The few steps that could have been taken to ameliorate the terrible sufferings of the Jewish refugees outside of Poland and to send a measure of support to the Jewish groups within Poland have not been taken. The Polish army stationed in Palestine has even supplied troops to take part in searches conducted by the British against Jewish settlements there for allegedly harboring "Polish deserters."

Sparks in the News...

By JOHN BERNE

"The champagne buying days are definitely back. Rex de St. Cyr gave a party for Gloria Baker at El Morroco, with thirty guests, for which the check was over \$1,000."—From the New York Post.

And workers are being maligned for trying to keep up with the cost of milk.

—LA—

Publisher McCormick, of isolationist and other fame, has seen fit to "insist on retaining such of the islands as we have saved from, retaken or taken from the Japanese."

Charles Hurd of the New York Times reports from Washington: "The Army and Navy Journal reported today that 'all leaders' who participated in the Cairo-Teheran conferences had agreed that the United States should acquire the Japanese-mandated islands after the anticipated victory in the war."

The "internationalists" and the "isolationists" have no differences when it comes to the realities of imperialist expansion.

—LA—

The Board of Estimate of the City of New York has set aside \$60,688,000, exclusive of land acquisitions and the expense of providing hangars and other buildings, for construction of the Idlewild airport, needed for military and commercial purposes.

The New York Times explains: "The surprising increase in the allocation for the Idlewild project was puffed in part by drastic cuts in land acquisition and planning costs for other projects, including new post-war hospitals and the reconstruction and alteration of old ones."

Thus the "era of the common man" starts in New York City with high

expenditures for a military and commercial project—AT THE EXPENSE OF WHAT THE PEOPLE NEED!

—LA—

Word comes from Washington that almost \$100,000,000,000 unused and unattached balances are in the hands of the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration.

That's an awful lot of money to be lying around idle for any Tom, Dick or Harry to play with. Yes, and why do the workers have to pay as they go, when there is all this unused money on tap?

—LA—

The New York Sun justified the increase of thirty-five cents on a barrel of crude oil on the basis that "an increase in the price of crude oil would make the rewards of success more commensurate with the risks of the exploration for new oil."

Judging by the Canol and other recent oil scandals, the "risks" are being carried by a very obliging Uncle Sam—with all the rewards flowing into the coffers of the oil magnates.

—LA—

"Washington Memo" in the New York Post is chagrined. "President Roosevelt possibly would be surprised to know how much consternation has been caused among some liberals by his remark a couple of days ago that, in the field of racial relations, he quite frankly didn't think we could bring about the millennium at this time."

"Consternation" is not exactly political sagacity, a quality for which liberals are not really noted. Anybody with only half an eye open could have seen that FDR's allegiance to capitalist aims and to his fellow Democrats of the anti-Negro, Bourbon South with prevent any-

thing but a slight dressing up of the status quo on the racial question.

—LA—

The Times of London is worried about post-war British business because American business seems to be on the verge of monopolizing world export trade. The Times discerns two trends in American business: "A determination to find new and expanding markets for American exports" and "a growing interest in acquiring large and controlling interests in industrial or commercial concerns abroad."

This once more brings to mind the very wise saying of President Wilson to the effect that industrial and commercial rivalry is the seed of war in the modern world—meaning World War III this time.

Dr. Howard E. Kershner, who directed relief for the American Society of Friends in Europe from 1939 to 1942, charged recently that the British government "had interfered with the shipment of food from the United States to starving French children. 'Can it be,' asked Dr. Kershner, 'that Britain did not want America to continue to be the sole recipient of gratitude for feeding the children of France?'"

Why not? All's fair in the struggle to create spheres of influence.

—LA—

To put another dab of color on this ugly picture of international competition, the National Association of Credit Men of America in their turn complain that "the Indian government is being controlled by Britain to the point that they may not buy here any more than they have to so that when the war ends and the market is open, importers will continue to trade in England."

Minority Resolution On Question of Forming Labor Party

The following is a resolution on the question of the attitude of revolutionary socialists toward the formation of a Labor Party in the United States. Written by Paul Temple, it is now being discussed by the members of the Workers Party. Although it differs from the point of view of the National Committee of the Workers Party, as set forth in its own resolution on the subject, which we printed in two recent issues, and differs also from the point of view advocated by LABOR ACTION, we publish it here as discussion material because of the interest that LABOR ACTION readers have in the subject and because of the vital importance of the question to the labor movement as a whole.

By PAUL TEMPLE

THE THREAT OF "LABOR" THIRD PARTISM

This analysis determines the political perspective of the Labor Party movement in America which—though it is today still on a much lower organizational level than it has been at least twice before in America since 1918—may yet burgeon into a more serious organizational development.

Such an eventuality could occur under the pressure of three interrelated forces:

1. Generally speaking, a greatly intensified discontent by the rank and file of labor with the bourgeois politics of the labor movement—a healthy impulse from the grass roots which would have to be "ridden" and channeled by the leadership if it could not merely be knocked down.

2. The ending of the Roosevelt era and the triumph of the more openly reactionary wing of capitalist politics, with a consequent extrusion of the bourgeois left, homeless, into the political cold, and their rapprochement with the labor bureaucracy.

3. The sweep of revolution in Europe, in its effect on class relations in America, together with the direct backwash of the war on the revolutionization of American labor.

Under the impact of such forces the formation of an independent third party in America, representing the coalition of the labor bureaucracy and the bourgeois left, is a potent threat.

Whether such a party is entitled the American Labor Party or not, whether it is heralded forth at a trade union convention or in a Washington hotel or at the former following the latter, its politi-

cal character will be unchanged. With its mass basis in the trade union workers—the liberals will not escape this inevitable present-day accompaniment of any third party movement which wants to be of greater consequence than the Lemke party of 1936—it bodies forth the characteristic combination of the People's Front; the generals-without-an-army of bourgeois reformism bestriding and reigning in the body of labor.

It does no good to say: We want a "genuine" independent Labor Party, not a "third party." We ask, and there is no answer: What basic difference of today are these two labels supposed to refer to? In program? Support of capitalism? Methods? Mass basis? The labels are nostalgic historical references to a dichotomy that has ceased to exist.

TWO LABOR PARTIES: THE REALITY AND THE DREAM

The Marxist analysis of the Labor Party problem has been confirmed at all points by the only existing "independent Labor Party" in the country—the American Labor Party of New York State.

This "independent Labor Party" took its inception in the fear of the labor bureaucracy that progressive labor in New York was turning away from Roosevelt and the New Deal in disillusionment. It was formed in order to ride this progressive impulse of discontent with bourgeois politics, and rein it toward support of Roosevelt.

Like any other today, this Labor Party was the continuation of class-collaborationist politics—by other means.

This "independent Labor Party" has since acted completely as the "loyal" wing in New York of the Roosevelt Democracy. Its structure and organization is, if anything, more bureaucratized than are the trade union bodies on which it is formally based. Its farthest step in the direction of "independence" was the running of an "independent labor" candidate for the high post of Governor of the State of New York—Dean Alfange—as a bold move for independent action—by the Roosevelt wing of the Democratic Party.

If a third party of bourgeois reformism had been formed in New York "instead of" the ALP—how possibly could it have differed from the actually existent ALP? If a third party is formed nationally, how possibly will it differ from a national extension of the ALP?

To call for the creation of a national American Labor Party

means to take responsibility for it before the working class—at least, before that section of the working class which heeds OUR call; namely, the most advanced, militant, class-conscious workers. Criticism of ("refusal to take responsibility for") this, that or every other specific action by the Labor Party does not absolve us of our responsibility for the effect of its existence on the class struggle for socialism.

The desire to find a by-pass to the creation of a mass revolutionary party is a common concession to the mood of the times. It even leads to the notion that a national American Labor Party can be that mass revolutionary party itself! This theory of how a revolutionary party can be forged is by far less plausible than the average theory on this basic question which Bolshevism has had to reject and combat. We teach that a revolutionary socialist party must be founded on a revolutionary program and built around that program. A wealth of historical experience, including that of the Norwegian Labor Party, has confirmed this in every instance. We have seen no reason advanced to make an exception for America in this regard.

To teach the most advanced workers to look toward a Labor Party as the political rallying center of American labor (let alone as the future revolutionary party instrument of American labor) is to teach a falsehood and a delusion. It will be precisely the best, most advanced workers who will be disillusioned with a Labor Party first. Our job is to hasten this process, if it turns out that they must go through it. It is not our job now to point to the Labor Party as the way out of the post-war breakdown which we predict or as the shield against fascism, but to insist with all our strength that only revolutionary socialist politics and a revolutionary party can solve these problems. We must tell the truth about the Labor Party, that it will not be able to solve "even the most immediately pressing problems" of labor.

THE POLICY OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS

We therefore do not advocate the formation of a Labor Party. Still less do we advance the defeatist concept that if a Labor Party is not formed, the alternative for the workers is defeat and doom. Our attitude toward existing or future labor parties or labor party movements is a question of tactics. We have always said and say again that we will stand at the side of the working class without separating ourselves from them, in every phase of their political development.

We stand ready to enter and work within any Labor Party that is set up, in a struggle for real independent action and program. We will advance and fight for the immediate and transitional demands which we propose for the working class. We will seek to utilize whatever arena the Labor Party provides for these purposes and for socialist education. To any Labor Party movement we say: "Your leaders have ostensibly organized for independent political action and in order to solve your pressing problems. It is our opinion that they and the Labor Party will do neither. You don't agree with us? Then see for yourselves; fight for class-struggle candidates and a class-struggle program. We intend to fight along with you for these objectives. We will show you in action that socialist politics is the only way out." This is the general sense of a revolutionist's agitation and propaganda with respect to a Labor Party movement.

But our job is to attempt to shorten by our own efforts any hypothetical Labor Party phase of working class political development; to convince at least the vanguard now that they must come directly to the revolutionary party, and to utilize their experiences, especially their experiences with the Labor Party, now for this purpose. Our job is to foster disillusionment with the reformist, pro-war, collaborationist machine, instead of strengthening illusions by our own advocacy. We do not wish the character of the Labor Party to be exposed solely by experience. We wish the advanced workers to turn to the others and say: "This party told us the truth about the Labor Party; it showed us the way soonest; it is a good party."

It is primarily by our work in the trade union movement that the best elements of our class will be drawn to us and the revolutionary party built. The prospect ahead is one of world-wide revolution and crises. In modern days these have always developed through a rising tempo of strike action, political strike movements included; the break-up of reformist formations; the merging of economic action into political action through the variety of organizational forms which the working class inexhaustibly invents, of which the soviets were the type—shop committees, councils of action, etc.

This is how the revolutionary politicalization of the working class expresses itself. This is real independent political action by a working class mass movement. This is the end to which we shape our policy.

The Drive on the Labor Movement

FDR Administration Leads the Attack

By WALTER WEISS

"A well organized smear campaign against labor" is in progress, and General Marshall allowed himself to be used as a tool of the forces behind the campaign. So charged David Dubinsky last week. The organizers of the campaign? Big business, said Dubinsky.

The charge is true, but only part of the truth. As usual, Dubinsky shields Roosevelt and his Administration. In fact, Mrs. Roosevelt was sharing the ILGWU platform when the Dubinsky speech was made.

The fifteen non-operating railroad unions, in their official paper, Labor, have gone further and charged that the White House incited Marshall to his attack and that Roosevelt, had he wished, could easily have settled the threatened strike without taking over the roads.

We don't have to guess that Roosevelt and his aides are organizing the campaign in its present stage. There is plenty of evidence. Here is some of it:

1. About a week before the Marshall statement another "high government official" made the headlines with the sensational revelation that war casualties would reach a half million in the next three months. This "high official" too, chose not to reveal his name. He too invited a handful of pet reporters to a "private" conference. He too ignored the Office of War Information. The official was Roosevelt's civilian right-hand man, James F. Byrnes (PM, January 2), just as Marshall is the military first assistant.

Newsweek, a conservative weekly, very well informed, asserts that the press, in general, missed the point of Byrnes' sensational story: "It was the casualty prediction that made the headlines. Less emphasis was the lesson in this top-ranking executive wanted to convey—that, as the war grows bloodier, home-front bickering will seem petty in comparison" (our emphasis).

The January 3 issue of Newsweek, although it went to press before the Marshall statement, was fully informed already, you see, as to the nature of the Administration campaign. "Home-front bickering," that is, strikes and wage demands, will not be tolerated. Byrnes, says this magazine, had for months been too busy to grant newsmen an interview. By making an exception at this time he emphasized the importance of his message.

2. Newsweek properly connects the Byrnes statement with Roosevelt's own attitude in his

first conference with the rail union leaders. The President was very "tough"; he started by comparing the conditions of the soldiers with those of labor—an old theme of all the reactionaries. Time magazine (January 3) can hardly restrain its joy at what it calls Roosevelt's "iron hand" toward the rail union leaders.

3. After the Marshall statement, Roosevelt, far from reproving the general, allowed White House Secretary Early to say that the President had been "thinking along the same lines." In proof he quoted from the notes of the conference with the brotherhood leaders. Of course, it was pure coincidence that the President and his two chief aides, civil and military, should "think" along the same lines.

4. A few lesser lights of the Administration have also had the same kind of "thoughts" in recent weeks. Said Joseph B. Eastman, director of the Office of Defense Transportation, on December 16: "...the workers, through stoppage of transportation facilities, could inflict a worse blow on the war effort than any that lies within the power of our enemies."

On December 28, after Roosevelt had ordered government "seizure" of the railroads, "Secretary Stimson and General Somervell made it clear that the entire War Department felt that the war program would be wrecked by a general rail strike."

"At one point, the Secretary of War's voice shook with emotion as he referred to the 'terrible danger' to both the Army and Navy... and he bit off his words with deliberate emphasis as he described what would have happened if these gentlemen who were threatening a general strike to the railroads of the country had been successful in their efforts" (New York Times, December 29).

5. There has been a great deal of talk and print lately about a crucial ninety days. The story is that the stabilization program can be saved, the threat of inflation warded off, if another three months pass without a break in the line. The talk is really about wages, of course, since price control has been a farce.

War Labor Board Chairman Davis has often been quoted on this subject (for example, "Liberal" Nation of December 25; big business Barron's Weekly, December 20). Davis said: "...if we can hold the line against inflation for ninety days, we're over the hump... the labor market is loosening and the manpower shortage becoming less acute. There will be a very different picture in

ninety days if the program is not sabotaged by Congress in the meantime."

In other words, Davis was hoping to stall the workers until "cutbacks" came along to make them think of unemployment rather than of higher wages. In general, the big brains of business put little faith in this prospect. In its January 1 issue —after Byrnes' statement and Roosevelt's "toughness" but before the Marshall blast—the very knowing Business Week was seeing the ninety days in another light. To quote:

"President Roosevelt is counting on the coming invasion... in the home-front poker game. His strategy is to stall home-front issues in the hope that the exaltation, anxiety, and grief of decisive battle will make 'win the war' a completely effective answer to the clamor for relaxation of controls....

"Now the President and his advisers think they see daylight ahead...."

They look for, continues Business Week, "a blaze of popular anger that, skillfully guided, will overcome the dissidents—as soon as the troops land in Western Europe and really big casualty lists start coming in...."

"This new hope is largely responsible for the recurring talk about passing the home-front crisis within the next ninety days."

With its usual cold realism, Business Week adds that the spirit of sacrifice will be used, as it was shortly after Pearl Harbor, "to resolve issues that have only a remote connection with the war" (all emphasis ours).

In conclusion, we must point out that the Marshall statement, represents an "adjustment" in the strategy described above, to meet a labor crisis that refused to wait ninety days.

Roosevelt's dramatic—and unexpected, as all observers remarked—gesture of taking over the railroads fitted perfectly into the changed pattern of the strategy; it emphasized the terrible crisis to which the railroad workers supposedly brought the nation.

Plans for a harsher anti-strike law or for a labor draft (a "strike-breaking device," as Business Week of January 8 frankly states) are already proposed. The death of the New Deal, recently proclaimed by its creator, is to be sealed with the blood of American boys fighting to usher in a "better world"—better in the eyes of Roosevelt and big business. That is the Roosevelt plan.

Browder "Dissolves" Party; Backs Capitalist System --

It is not surprising, therefore, that Browder comes out again, and more definitely, against any attempt by the workers to gain an improvement in their economic position by exercising their organized strength. "The absence of such a common-sense wage policy is no justification for strikes." In other words, labor has no right to fight in defense of its economic standards with the best weapon now at its disposal, even if the capitalists do not adopt what Browder calls a "common-sense wage policy."

Browder announced himself also in favor of the system of "free enterprise," that is, of capitalism. The system of "free" enterprise is a fraud in its very name, for all it means, all it ever meant and all it could mean is the freedom of a handful of capitalists to monopolize the means of production, the means of life in modern society, and thereby to subject the masses of the people to the most intensive exploitation known in history.

Browder for Imperialism

Browder announced himself in favor not only of "free enterprise" but of capitalist imperialism. He demanded markets, and "huge foreign markets," for capitalism. What "huge foreign markets" have always meant under capitalism is no secret. They have meant cut-throat rivalry among the imperialist nations, leading to just the kind of war we had in 1914 and again today. Worst of all, they have meant subjugating the small and weak nations of the world, their reduction to colonies and "spheres of influence," deprivation of national sovereignty and most, if not all, human rights.

There is hardly a reactionary idea that did not find its champion in Browder.

What he called "such elementary measures as nationalization of banks, railroads, coal and steel, although they would obviously make American capitalist economy much stronger," must under no conditions be advocated. Why not? Because they "would be resisted desperately by powerful circles in America." Who are these circles? The ultra-reactionary big monopolists and finance capitalists. Their "resistance" now sets the limits of the political action of the Stalinists in the United States!

The Two-Party System

For a hundred years, labor has tried off and on to break through the vicious circle of the two-party political system in this country. Vir-

tually everywhere else in the world, labor has had its own party for generations. In the United States, such a party is the most urgent step in the declaration of independence of the working class. All this is now condemned by the Stalinists, who come out flatfootedly for the maintenance of two-party capitalist politics, and of labor's subordination to the two parties.

It would be a first-class mistake, however, to believe that the latest act of the Stalinists means that they have dissolved themselves as an organized force, or that they have become confirmed converts to the "ideals" of capitalism.

The dissolution of the Communist Party is only the means whereby the Stalinists, who have every intention of remaining a closely-organized and heavily-disciplined force, expect to infiltrate and corrupt the labor movement. If any strike-breaking dirty work is to be done in the trade unions, it will continue to be done by these servile tools of the Kremlin bureaucracy. The danger of Stalinist corruption has not been lessened by the spurious "dissolution," but greatly increased. Labor will now encounter Stalinism on every side and at every step of the road it takes in defense of its rights and aspirations, as a cunningly-disguised enemy with a dagger in its hand.

Labor—Beware!

The organized betrayal of labor's interests, however, will not be perpetrated primarily for the purpose of bolstering up American capitalism. It will do that, too, to be sure. But ONLY as a by-product of the real, basic and unaltered aim and purpose of Stalinism in the United States and all other capitalist countries. The aim and purpose of organized Stalinism in these countries is the defense and protection of the interests of the Russian ruling bureaucracy!

The Stalin gang in Russia, cynical and rotten to the core, wants pawns in every land, preferably the big pawns of the labor movement. The Stalinist parties, or groups, or "educational associations," exist in every country solely for the purpose of turning the working class and its movement into political vassals and chessmen of the Kremlin, serving its imperialist ambitions throughout the world. Burrowing into the labor movement under a new name, the Stalinists hope to achieve their sinister purpose with greater ease in the future.

At the same time, Stalin's imperialist plans require the winning over, or at least the neutralization, of the

hog-tying of even the capitalist parties outside of Russia. Everywhere, Stalin wants the governmental parties to be "pro-Russian," that is, to go along with Stalin's war and post-war plans. The treatment accorded the Polish government in exile is one example. The kick in the teeth recently delivered against Willkie for making the mildest kind of benevolent criticism of Stalin, is another example, aimed at being a warning to all the capitalist politicians to "lay off" Stalin's plans.

No Real Dissolution

Hence Browder quietly announced that the Stalinists will have no objection to their members joining either of the two capitalist parties. They aim to influence the Republicans and Democrats from within, and even to capture their political machines, as they once did with the Democratic Party in parts of California.

The fact that the Stalinists have now openly forewarned socialism is to be welcomed. It will contribute to political clarity in the labor movement. It will widen the room in which a genuinely revolutionary socialist working class party can rise and develop. It will help engrave more deeply upon the brow of Stalinism the brand of "reaction" which properly belongs there.

At the same time, the "turn" of the Stalinists represents a danger which may become potent and even disastrous for the future of the labor movement unless it is clearly understood and unless the proper measures are taken by the thinking workers to put a spike in the Kremlin's treacherous schemes.

The entire New York press reported that in the middle of Browder's infamous speech, members of the audience began walking out by the score. The rest were apathetic or bewildered. A good sign. Many of the rank and file Stalinists, or party sympathizers, are undoubtedly beginning to awaken to a realization of where they have been led by their leaders, of what Stalinism really means.

Speed the process of disillusionment, Mr. Browder! It will help the growth of the Workers Party, enemy of capitalism to the bitter end and proud and open champion of the principles and ideals of international socialism.

Editor's Note: In a forthcoming issue of LABOR ACTION, Max Shachtman will have a detailed analysis of the significance of the latest Stalinist action.

An Editorial from "India Today"

The Politics Behind the Indian Famine

There is no possible doubt that the victims of famine in India are also the victims of politics. Politics at home which help to make possible the present terrible suffering, and politics abroad which cut them off from relief under the UNRRA.

Some American journalists are helping to build up the fiction that hoarding is in great part responsible for the famine, and that inefficient "native" provincial governments are responsible for poor distribution of food. Both of these charges are demonstrably untrue. . . . The vast majority of the people of India are in no position to hoard food, even if they wanted to. You cannot hoard food when you do not have nearly enough to satisfy your daily, habitual hunger. And as the English New Statesman and Nation pointed out in an editorial . . . "emergency legislation has placed unlimited powers in the hands of the Viceroy and the Provincial Governors, who are themselves subject to his orders." These powers were simply not used to handle the food situation. Also, the New Statesman and Nation points out, "at the elbow of each Indian Minister there are British civil servants." Provincial autonomy in India is not such that any Indian Minister can act freely; his hands are tied, and the Provincial Governor holds the strings. These are all matters beyond the power of the United Nations to help, at present. But they should be recognized in reporting conditions in India.

But when it comes to the politics which were allowed to interfere with relief to the

starving people of India, that is a matter for which no member of the UNRRA can deny his responsibility. It is said by I. F. Stone in his article in The Nation of December 11 that the Chinese, Mexican, Chilean, New Zealand, South African and Australian representatives to UNRRA were prepared to support India if the question of the famine were raised. It is charged by Mr. Stone in articles in PM that there is plenty of shipping available to take food to India if anyone takes the trouble of looking for it; that ships go from the United States to Australia with war cargoes and then turn around and come home again. As Mr. Stone says, they could quite easily pick up some of Australia's surplus wheat—which she has already indicated she would be glad to send to India—deliver it in India, pick up a cargo there of the minerals needed in the war effort, and go home.

But the whole question of famine in India was closed by Mr. Llewellyn, the British representative at UNRRA, on the ground that India's walking skeletons are not war victims. Which is manifestly absurd, for without the loss of Burmese rice—a war loss—without the exportation of rice to the Middle East—a war need—without the influx of refugees and troops from Burma, India could have managed, even though crops in Bengal were destroyed by cyclone.

Much has also been said to the effect that feeding India is a domestic matter in which outside assistance is not needed. But we cannot help remembering that vitamins

and oranges and powdered and tinned milk were requested for the children of England when their need was direst. Now, let it be clearly understood, we do not grudge one ounce of food sent to England's children. But we fail to see why food can be solicited for one part of the Empire and not for those of another. There has always been shipping space for Bundles for Britain—surely there is no less for Rice for India.

India will survive this famine, as she has survived famines in the past. But the memory of the hundreds of thousands of Indians who died because no help came to them from their allies will be a ghost not quickly laid. India is patient, but there comes a time when human patience can endure no more.

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. 8, No. 3 January 17, 1944

ALBERT GATES, Editor
Subscription Rate: 60 Cents a Year
7 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, 1919.

British-American Rivalry in Asia

There are two wars going on now. The first is reported in headlines on the front pages and counts its casualties in millions of dead and wounded. The second issues its communiqués in the neglected financial pages and tallies its dead in millions of dollars lost.

While workers are killing each other in the name of post-war peace and international cooperation, the capitalists of the countries in the United Nations are engaged in a crucial economic tug-of-war. At either end of the rope, pulling in opposite directions, are the capitalists of England and the United States, and so far the latter have been pulling the English all over the economic lot.

LABOR ACTION has analyzed in recent issues the fundamental clash between English and American capitalists on the issues of domination of the air trade routes, control of the sea lanes by the Merchant Marine, and oil and trade competition in the Middle and Near East. This silent conflict between the two groups of

capitalists extends to other issues and other lands, especially to that sub-continent with four hundred million customers, the core of the British Empire, India.

Britain is the undisputed master of India. Its policy of preventing the industrialization of India—the only development which can begin to raise the standard of living of the Indian people—has kept India dependent on England for its manufactured goods, at tremendous profit for the English capitalists.

The British tariff policy of "imperial preference," which gives the British capitalist advantages over the capitalists of other countries in the Indian market, has helped secure Britain's position as the dominant power. India is Britain's economic back yard, and other capitalists can expect a stiff fight if they dare climb over the fence.

The American capitalists have climbed into India in recent years and present the British capitalism with its most powerful rival in its history. The small but ambitious Indian bourgeoisie, throttled by the repressive policies of England, tends to lean on the American bourgeoisie in its fight for more power and freedom. Trade between India and America has increased and the American capitalists look on India as an important market for their goods in the post-war world.

But the British have no intention of handing over this juicy morsel of profits to their ally in the United Nations. A recent meeting of the National Association of Credit Men, an organization representing exporting interests in the United States, protested against British discrimination against American exporters to the British market. American imports from India have exceeded exports to that country for the last twenty years.

As late as 1940 the excess of imports over exports was \$34,000,000. This trade, favorable to India, should have built up large dollar balances in America, which would have enabled it to buy American goods after the war. But England stepped in and

converted this dollar balance in America to a sterling balance in England, thus reserving India for its own exporters.

The American capitalists complain that "the Indian government is being controlled by Britain to the point that they may not buy here any more than they have to so that, when the war ends and the market is open, importers will continue to trade in England."

The American capitalists would no doubt like to see more freedom from India from British domination and, of course, at the same time, more freedom for itself to exploit the Indian market.

That is the way the lines are drawn now. While the British Tommy and the American doughboy spill their lives cooperatively on the road to Berlin, in the name of post-war peace and freedom, the capitalist rulers of their countries carry on an economic war for the power to exploit millions of Asiatic peoples, of course, here too, in the name of freedom and liberty.

Labor Must Organize the Fight Against Anti-Semitism

By SUSAN GREEN

The swelling tide of anti-Semitic acts makes necessary a review of the various actions being taken to combat this menace.

Most naturally, the Jewish people, through their own organizations, have begun to take measures. Thus the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith compiled a detailed report of the recent attacks on Jewish children in New York, involving slashings with knives, as well as of the defacing of synagogues with swastikas and of the damaging of Jewish properties.

The report of the B'nai B'rith has stirred up widespread indignation in New York City and forced the attention of Mayor LaGuardia to this burning question. Public opinion has compelled Police Commissioner Valentine, who at first was very complacent about the whole matter, to assign additional police patrols to the districts of New York most affected. How efficacious they will be remains to be seen.

Anti-Semitic Cops

More important, however, is the fact that the composition of the whole police force is now under fire, the height of public clamor having been reached over the case of James L. Drew, the policeman exonerated by Commissioner Valentine in spite of the fact that his connection with such fascists as Christian Mobilizer Joseph McWilliams has been proved and in spite of the further fact that the Department of Investigation of the city knew he had large bundles of anti-Jewish literature in his home. Mayor LaGuardia informed the city over the radio the other day that the case of Drew is under review.

Along these lines, Victor Riesel calls attention in his column in the New York Post that the metropolitan police force is honeycombed with Christian Fronters and sympathizers. He recalls that several years ago FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover handed LaGuardia the names of 1,500 cops who had applied for membership in the Christian Front. In 1940 LaGuardia himself conducted a poll of 19,000 policemen and discovered that 80 admittedly had been in the Christian Front. Twenty confessed to paying dues to the fascist outfit at the time of the poll.

Nothing at all has been done with

this damning information, and hundreds of anti-Semitic cops are supposed to be protecting the Jewish people from anti-Semitic attacks. This situation is alarming, not only in New York, but in every other large city. Coordinated action to end this dangerous infiltration is indeed urgent.

Some Steps Already Taken

However, the Jewish people must realize that what we have come to know as filthy politics is so ingrained in capitalist society that the best preparation is self-reliance. The CIO Community Council in the Jewish populated Brownsville - East New York sections of Brooklyn is possibly a step in this direction.

This community council has been active in the Drew case, calling mass meetings, etc. Neighborhood defense should also be a problem of such committees. They, of course, will have to avoid the danger of getting into the control of Stalinists and others who would manipulate affairs in their own interests rather than those of the community. The most trustworthy as neighborhood leaders would be the most militant and progressive union rank and files.

Action along an altogether different line has been taken by the Textbook Commission to Eliminate Anti-Semitic Statements from American Textbooks. Nearly three thousand ministers have thus far pledged themselves to tackle anti-Semitism in the field of education and in the home. They will attempt to puncture the ages-old myth that the Jewish people killed Christ and expose other more insidious forms of anti-Jewish propaganda in the churches, schools and Sunday schools.

Other organizational efforts, more or less militant, could be listed. However, the most important thus far announced is the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism. The CIO News reports it as an organization "dedicated to the proposition that anti-Semitism in any of its forms is fascism." Considering the times we live in, there can be no two ways about that!

The National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism sets itself the immediate task "to effect the introduction and help in the passage of national legislation outlawing anti-Semitism." Sponsoring this committee are not only writers, actors, churchmen and

politicos, but among the initial sponsors are included labor leaders, i.e., Presidents Philip Murray of the CIO, R. J. Thomas, of the UAW, Albert J. Fitzgerald of the UE, S. H. Dalrymple of the URW, and Clinton S. Goldman of the USW.

It is to be expected that organized labor be in the forefront of the fight against anti-Semitism, which is part of the fight against fascism. But what labor must understand, and quickly, is that it cannot afford to be the tail to any liberal kite. Labor must be the heart, head and body of the anti-fascist movement, around which all anti-fascist elements can rally.

This is not said with a desire to impugn the honesty of the many liberal and public spirited men and women on the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism nor to question the propriety of labor leaders working with them on such a committee. But from the standpoint of realistic politics, it is undeniable that both present-day anti-Semitism and its sire, fascism, aim primarily at the annihilation of the labor movement. Labor must be the hard core of anti-fascist resistance.

A law outlawing anti-Semitism is desirable, by all means. But to rely solely on a law on the statute books is folly. For labor to take the lead in the fight against anti-Semitism and fascism does not mean for its leaders merely to participate on committees such as this one. It means rather that, aside from all such activities, every union local must be ready to guard its national and local union bodies—and also to guard with the Jewish people or the Negro people their neighborhoods from fascist attacks.

If the triumph of Nazism in Germany has taught anything, it has taught this: Anti-Semitism and fascism can be nipped in the bud by counterpoising labor's organized strength—IN TIME!

Next Week:

LABOR ACTION will publish an analysis of the "Polish Question," as well as other features of timely interest to the labor movement.