

## Despite Labor Support, Washington Reports Disclose:--

# FDR STANDS PAT ON WAGE FREEZE!

## "The Voice"--and We Don't Mean Frankie Sinatra

By MARY BELL

This is the season when the hired hands of the capitalist press are assigned to dig up the facts on the "human interest" side of candidates running for public office in order to sell to the public whichever man they are backing. Their lot is not a happy one, particularly when they delve into the personal life of the ex-racket-buster who "busted into" the bigger racket of capitalist politics—Thomas E. Dewey. What they choose to write down for us from his past in order to prove he is the man to vote for to head a country of 140,000,000 is a commentary on at least two things: contempt of the capitalist press for the workers who make up the majority of the population—and a revelation of Dewey.



Dewey in his childhood, we are informed, was such a model boy that his little schoolmates looked upon him with suspicion. He was never willfully absent from school. He picked up his toys without being scolded and kept his room as neat as a pin. As the twig is bent, so the tree is inclined. Today, *Life* magazine informs us, he is immaculate. He rarely sweats. He employs an occasional "damn" only for emphasis. He is driven to an "Aw, nuts!" only when sorely tried by impatience. He tries to conceal his boredom with people who don't know what they're talking about "when they are politically important."

We are forced to add a human touch to such rectitude. The gang-buster who was Jack the Giant Killer in public life extends his pursuit of things evil to the lowly housefly in his home or office. "His aim is good," says our *Life* reporter, "but he swats lightly because he does not want to smear the walls, which are finished in a light tan homespun-type paper which he selected himself. He prefers to stun the fly so that it falls on the rug where he can finish it off neatly."

Dewey also has a passion for the "deep freeze," that is, frozen food lockers. Of the deep freeze, he says: "I think it will revolutionize the family." For fear you think he's going off the deep end, we quickly add another statement that shows he's not becoming too radical.

We are further informed that the basso (not profundo) from Owosso has said: "I have the best mother in the world." This indicates that the urban lawyer has not become too urbane. He is really "homey" and "folksy" and stands foursquare for the Preservation of the Family, that burning question in American politics.

### DEWEY, THE UNSULLIED

Dewey's favor of frozen things included not only frozen food, but also frozen wages. Here he treads on the toes of many millions of workers. It may be remarked, however, that these workers are biased, since if the wage freeze were lifted, they would stand to gain. Dewey, however, having been born the only son of the richest man in town, and currently served by two butlers who wear morning trousers at breakfast, and change to tuxedos for dinner, has not been scathed by the "moll and toll of a workingman's existence. He is therefore unsullied by the prejudices of labor against the wage freeze.

### DEWEY, THE MAN OF CULTURE

A note about Dewey's cultural background would not be amiss since we are interested to know what manner of man it is who wants to head the country. We are told he studied operatic singing in college and, according to Roger Butterfield, Dewey's voice instructor remarked "he had never seen nor heard a more dramatic portrayal" of "The Love Song of an Idiot" than that rendered by Dewey.

Another note reveals his love of literature as much as his sense of humor. When asked what book he likes best he is likely to quip, with those "flashing eyes," "The one I read last."

This is obviously a man for the ages!

### DEWEY, THE ADMINISTRATOR

Due to his experience in administration, Dewey is described as "a genius for putting other people to work." If there is one thing every man, woman and child in the country would agree on it's that in the post-war period we will need someone or something that will put people to work. It seems the Republicans banked their faith in Dewey's ability to "put people to work" to the extent of voting down (together with a goodly number of Democrats) the Kilgore unemployment benefits bill.

### DEWEY, THE PHILOSOPHER

While Dewey is a shade more shifty than the Democrats on questions like post-war employment, and it has been remarked, not without point, that he trails behind in the Gallup polls on matters of public sentiment, it would be unfair to say he has not a conviction or two. In his personal philosophy, rigidly embedded as a fish in ice, is the belief that the world is divided into two classes of people, the Good and the Bad.

All things are simple to simple people, Dewey may be mocked. But wait! There is more to come. Dewey also believes that the Good People had better be aggressive and run things or the world will go to pot. Now, obviously, since he is running for the Presidency, all this puts Dewey into the category of the Good People, and naturally he would associate only with Good People. That makes his sponsors in the Republican Party—men like Boss Pew, Kemper, etc.—Good capitalists. That makes his supporter, Elizabeth Dilling, a Good red-baiter an Good pro-Nazi; his supporters, George Deatherage and Gerald L. K. Smith, Good rabble-rousers—a little fascist-minded, perhaps, but in the same way as you can speak of Good and Bad fascists.

Dewey, according to his *Life* magazine biographer, is not only willing to admit "ignorance when he is ignorant" (a virtue in any man's language, we confess), but is also willing to take advice from someone he trusts. In fact, his most trusted adviser is a former adviser of trusts, one John F. Dulles. According to Drew Pearson, the international lawyer Dulles has argued personally for Franco of Spain against the U. S. Treasury; had legal relations with Count Rene de Chambrun, son-in-law of the French Quisling, Laval; and in 1940 defended the character of Dr. Gerhard Westrick, a German agent

(Continued on page 2)

By V. F. JENSEN

The announcement has come from Washington through an "authoritative" source that President Roosevelt will not alter the national wage stabilization policy before Election Day by modifying the Little Steel formula and granting the steel workers a general wage increase. This comes as a slap in the face to the President's "loyal" labor supporters and as a fitting climax to the policy of cringing subservience to Roosevelt and his War Labor Board by U. S. labor leaders, particularly Philip Murray, president of the CIO.

## What Happened at the UAW Convention --

# New Shift in the CP Line

By MAX SHACHTMAN

"What Happened at the UAW Convention?"

Under this title, the *Daily Worker* of October 8 prints an article by Nat Ganley, leader of the Communist Party termites in the UAW-CIO and their spokesman at the union's Grand Rapids convention.

Ganley is very much disturbed, and he has a right to be. For the first time in the history of the UAW, the progressive militants joined their forces in a Rank and File Caucus. This caucus, with a program of its own, for which it fought cleanly and aggressively, was independent of the two old power cliques in the union—Ades-Frankensteen, which the Communists support, and Reuther, Ganley understands perfectly that if the Rank and File Group continues to grow, if its program is adopted by the majority of the UAW membership, it will mean the end of the paralyzing policies which he and his party and its allies have foisted on the union.

Ganley is especially worried about the vote rolled up by the progressives at the Grand Rapids convention

against the hamstringing no-strike pledge. The vote was especially impressive in view of the fact that the entire leadership was arrayed against the progressives on this point.

The sentiment of the rank and file of the convention may be judged by the fact that in the first balloting the Communist resolution in favor of the pledge, supported by every prominent UAW official except the Reuther brothers, was defeated; and the fact that the pledge could be reaffirmed on the convention floor only by the use of skulduggery and fraud and by the Reuther faction lining up behind it along with the Communists, Thomas, Ades, Frankensteen and Leonard.

### WHAT THE RANKS WANTED

The membership's sentiment may be judged from the fact that the delegates voted overwhelmingly in favor of a referendum on the pledge, in spite of the opposition of Ganley and the entire UAW officialdom, again except for Reuther, who felt it wiser to "go along" with the rank and file on this point. Ganley & Co. were afraid to consult the membership on

the pledge, afraid of the decision it would make in a referendum.

The sentiment of the delegates may be judged, finally, from the fact that in adopting the decision for a referendum it also adopted provisions aimed at preventing the officialdom from using its bureaucratic powers to influence the voting. The adopted resolution specifically prohibits all international officers from using their office, from using the union press, or from using union funds for the purpose of influencing the outcome of the referendum. Furthermore, the resolution took the conduct of the referendum out of the hands of the International Executive Board and placed it in the hands of a special nine-man committee composed of three representatives from each of the three viewpoints.

Whatever else may be thought of these provisions, one thing they show clearly: the delegates had no confidence in their official leaders, no trust in their impartiality. It was a vote of no-confidence, and not the only such vote at the Grand Rapids convention.

(Continued on page 2)

# The Shipbuilding Workers Convention--An Analysis

(Last week's edition of LABOR ACTION carried Ernest Lund's news report on the CIO Shipbuilding Workers convention at Atlantic City. The following is his analysis of the meaning of what took place.—Editor.)

By ERNEST LUND

### PART I

The recent convention of the Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, CIO, marked a definite turning point in the history of the union. It marks a turning point for the following two reasons:

1. The control of the union passed, in large measure, into the hands of the Communist bloc, leaving President John Green with only nominal authority.

2. The widespread discontent in the ranks was, for the first time, expressed in a convention of the IUMSWA by the appearance of a firm and fighting opposition based upon progressive policies.

These two factors foreshadow the nature of the struggle within the union for the coming year. It will be a race between the rising strength of the progressive opposition forces and the attempts of the Communist-manipulated General Executive Board to clamp down on locals and individuals who threaten their control.

### WHAT COMMIE VICTORY MEANS

Both the victory of the Communist bloc and the appearance of a fighting progressive group set off this convention in sharp contrast to the 1943 convention. At the convention of last year the Communists were thought to have suffered a disastrous defeat. Last year's convention was entirely empty as far as any serious discussion of policy was concerned, above all, any discussion which gave voice to the progressive demands raised in many locals.

The 1943 convention had as its central issue the case of Irving Velson, who had been suspended from the GEB on charges of membership in the Communist Party in violation of the reactionary clause in the union constitution which forbids Communists to hold office. The Communist bloc suffered a defeat on this issue when the convention upheld the ousting of Velson. However, the fight ended in a compromise when Phillip Vangelder, secretary-treasurer of the union, who had played the role of "front" man for the Communist bloc, was re-elected to office in a deal with John Green. This deal placed a key post in the hands of the Communist

bloc. How well they used it in the past year was seen in the results of the recent convention. From the persecuted, defeated minority of a year ago, the Communist forces reappeared at the convention this year with decisive control of the majority of the convention and in a position to exercise their power in electing a new GEB that suited them.

In analyzing how it was possible for the defeated group to stage such a comeback, serious trade unionists in the IUMSWA will learn many a valuable lesson about politics in general and trade union politics in particular.

The first lesson that this demonstrates is that it is reactionary and, in the end, futile to fight the Commu-

nists simply on the ground that they are Communists. This is the method of the red-baiter. It is simply an attempt to capitalize upon the prejudices and fears created in the minds of workers by Hearst and the capitalist press generally. It teaches the workers nothing. Instead of an attempt to examine intelligently what a man is proposing, the red-baiter shrieks: "That man is a Communist." This is no better than to say: "That man is a Catholic," or "That man is a Jew" or "That man was born in Lithuania."

Not only is such a fight against Communists reactionary, but it is, in the end, futile. This is proved by the case of Velson. After much spy-

(Continued on page 3)

Eight months ago the labor unions presented the WLB with the incontrovertible evidence that the cost of living had risen far above the levels shown by the lagging indices of the Bureau of Labor Statistics which sought to justify the maintenance of the inequitable "little steel" formula. Though only a blind man who never went shopping would not have known that the cost of living had soared 'way above the fifteen per cent "yardstick" of the WLB, it took the "fact-

### WLB Rejects AFL Plea for Little Steel Change

BULLETIN—At the time of our going to press, it was reported out of Washington that the WLB had rejected the demand of the AFL for a revision of the Little Steel formula. After rejecting this demand, which would have melted the wage freeze, the WLB sent its report to Roosevelt without any recommendations. This august body declared it could not act on the demand because it had no idea what effects a modification of the formula would have! The vote? You guessed it: Industry and Public, 8; Labor, 4.

finding" panels the better part of a year to discover that the BLS index was "inaccurate" and needed "upward revision."

The same panel also reluctantly admitted that the steel workers' demand for a seventeen-cents-an-hour pay raise would not, if successful, break current controls on prices or have an inflationary effect, the public members holding that the risk in that direction "appears to be more than offset by the possibility of decreased earnings in the approaching period of reconversion and the increase in supply of civilian goods."

This niggardly and reluctant report admitting the justice of labor's demands could hardly have been counted as a labor victory; it was hostile to the union's demand for a guaranteed annual wage, increased sick leaves and vacation benefits. Nevertheless, the appearance of this report concurrent with an OPA report saying that even if the steel companies were to grant the seven-cents-an-hour raise demanded by the union, it would not justify a rise in cost of steel—gave rise to the general belief that there would be

(Continued on page 3)



STAND-PATER

# WP Branches, Friends Obtain Over 1000 LA Subs in Four Weeks of Drive!

The drive for 4,000 new subscriptions to LABOR ACTION is gaining momentum. Over 1,000 subs have been obtained during the first month of the drive (the exact number is 1,035). This really is not a bad start. But it means that in the two months left to the drive, almost 3,000 additional subs must be sent in.

The first month of the drive was really a preparatory, warm-up period and now with the drive in full swing we expect our agents, readers and branches of the Workers Party to swamp us with new subscriptions.

Detroit continues its excellent work. It really knows no lull. During the past week we received 150 new subs which brings up their total considerably (see box below). Last week we reported how our friends in the Motor City upped their own quota by 150 and now they're going ahead to make certain that it will succeed. We don't know whether Detroit is a city of miracles, but LABOR ACTION's friends are trying their best to prove that it is—and we're willing to be shown.

Louisville hit a high spot, too. They have already fulfilled their quota. Sin-

cere congratulations for your speed and diligence. Now that you've got your sails set, what do you say to raising your quota and getting another 25 subs?

We're proud of Streator, Ill., which continues to send its subs in regularly. It won't be long before they complete their quota. Of that we're certain, and we're also certain that they will go way beyond their quota. Akron, too, is picking up fine, showing that they mean to do their job.

There are few cities which haven't yet got started. Cleveland, which in the past set all kinds of records in getting LA subs, hasn't got going. Buffalo, which complained that it thought its quota was too low, hasn't shown much to date, either. Philadelphia is another city we're waiting to hear from. We want subs from the Quaker City and a lot of them. San Francisco and Youngstown-Warren are not even represented by one sub. Once these places get going to sub drive will fairly fly.

So far we've been addressing ourselves to the agents and Workers Party branches. Next week we will have a message for our readers and subscribers.

There's a way they can participate in this sub drive and do their bit for America's greatest labor and socialist weekly.

Note: This correction is for any reader who keeps close tab on our campaign figures: Last week we gave a wrong count on the number of subs secured. We had it listed as 646. The correct figure was 746.

LESS THAN 3,000 MORE TO GO TO REACH OUR QUOTA! LET'S GET GOING!

City	Goal	This Week	Total	Pct.
New York	1,000	74	184	18
Akron	150	7	91	61
Buffalo	150	9	18	13
Chicago	300	—	118	39
Cleveland	200	—	3	1½
Detroit	175	159	379	50½
Los Angeles	250	—	73	37
Louisville	25	—	25	100
Philadelphia	175	—	17	10
Reading	50	—	8	16
St. Louis	50	—	1	2
Seattle	200	—	—	0
Streator	150	13	32	21
Youngstown-Warren	50	8	42	84
National Office	650	19	44	6½
Totals	4,150	289	1035	25



NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Shift in Communist Line at UAW Convention --

(Continued from page 1) No wonder Mr Ganley is alarmed! His article, in which every line is a slander and every other line a lie, aims at mobilizing the Communist stalwarts for the referendum for the purpose of reaffirming the infamous pledge.

provided they insist on an honest conduct of the referendum. THE COMMUNIST RESOLUTION There is, however, another aspect of the referendum and the pledge to which no attention has been paid, but which deserves the greatest and most careful attention. This aspect escaped the delegates at Grand Rapids. The must not escape the attention of the UAW membership, especially with the referendum that lies before them. It is the aspect of the question that the Communist Party and its agents like Ganley are most anxious to keep in the dark. It must be brought to light, particularly because the Communists are the best organized force in the drive to keep labor chained to the no-strike pledge.

In their UAW resolution, however, they say that while the pledge must be unreservedly maintained up to the time Germany is defeated, the International Executive Board, in consultation with other labor bodies, shall "REVIEW and decide a FURTHER policy on the no-strike pledge for the balance of the war to drive Japan to unconditional surrender" PLUMPTING FOR STALIN At first blush this proposal seems to have been made for the purpose

What their resolution really means is this: Up to now the Communist Party has gone along in support of Roosevelt and American capitalism—and therefore of the no-strike pledge—for one reason and one only: because it suited and was needed by the Russian Stalinist bureaucracy. The Communists in this country are willing (and instructed) to continue going along with Roosevelt and American capitalism if the latter makes accept-

the Polish people. Let us assume for a moment that Roosevelt (or his successor) does not go along with Stalin on this point. The American Stalinists would then refer back to their Grand Rapids resolution and show how they proposed to "review and decide a further policy on the no-strike pledge for the balance of the war." Of this we may be absolutely sure. We may be equally sure that they would then pose as the most "radical" unionists in the country, even calling strikes one after another, whether they are in order or not. It happened before; it can happen again.

STOP THE UNION-WRECKERS In other words, the Communist machine is nothing else but a tool, a blackmail and blackjack weapon, of the Russian bureaucracy and its foreign policy. What the American labor movement must see to, however, is that it is not subverted and converted by the Communist machine into the same kind of tool used for the same purpose. Labor needs to restore to itself the great weapon of the right to strike. But it needs it to strengthen and defend itself—not as an instrument in the claws of the Stalinist autocracy.

The auto workers especially, who are about to vote on the question in their referendum, ought to read and re-read the resolution presented at Grand Rapids by Ganley and Tappes. If they study it intelligently they will understand the real aims of the Communist termites in the labor movement. They will understand also why they attack so violently and consistently us Trotskyists, who know their role and their game through and through, and who have the habit of telling the labor movement the truth about them!

On the results of the referendum will depend to a large degree the answer to the question: What is going to happen to the UAW, the pioneer and pillar of the CIO? What the Communist machine wants to make out of the UAW, and out of the labor movement as a whole, should be clearer now than ever before. To crush the dastardly plans of the Communist stooges and their conscious or unconscious allies, requires vigilance, militancy, courage, outspokenness and clarity in the UAW membership. In the next few weeks it requires a decisive majority vote in the referendum in favor of—repealing the no-strike pledge!

The Bosses Sat Up and Took Notice

The fighting spirit of the rank and file delegates to the recent convention of the United Auto Workers Union aroused fear and trembling among all the leaders of the union.

It also caused fear and trembling in other circles. Witness, for example, the unhappy admiration with which the convention was reported in the September 21 issue of Iron Age, an outstanding organ of big business:

The UAW, says the reporter for this magazine, "may be as unwelcome as a weed, but it is certainly as persistent and perennial. That is because it is made up of men and women whose passion for their union is as gripping and positive as the horse player's determination to get a bet down on the Kentucky Derby. . . . It could no more be legislated out of existence or into impotence than could Europe's underground." The UAW's president, R. J. Thomas, bleats that the government permits the union to live only because R. J. Thomas enforces the no-strike pledge so piously. Iron Age, on the other hand, tremendously impressed by the convention's revolt against the no-strike pledge, advises automom's capitalists that it would be most educational for them to attend UAW conventions, because "they would be rewarded with a new concept of the strength of the movement which swept across their shops during the last decade."

of snagging some votes in favor of the pledge. How? By suggesting, without saying so in so many words, that after Germany is defeated and some reconversion to civilian production takes place, the Communists are ready to leave a door open for a repeal, or a modification, of the pledge. This was the position of the Reuther resolution, and undoubtedly the Communist resolution we have quoted was calculated to win some Reuther supporters. But that is only at first blush. In reality, we believe, there is a profounder and more sinister significance in the section quoted. The Communist gang wants to leave itself an open door of an entirely different kind and for an entirely different purpose. And thereby they once more reveal their true role in the labor movement of this country.

able agreements with Stalin. These agreements concern above all the imperialist aims of the Kremlin. If Washington and Wall Street go along with Moscow's plan to enslave the Baltic countries, the Balkan countries, Poland and part of Germany (in return, of course, for Moscow support to American imperialism in its "sphere of interest"), everything will be all right. The Communists will continue their present policy. BUT, if, after the defeat of Germany, the imperialist thieves fall out among themselves, and American imperialism does not okay Russia's annexations, the Communists, again in Stalin's interests, are prepared to change their present policy overnight! Let us assume for a moment that once Germany is defeated the imperialist victors quarrel openly over who is to devour the Polish nation,

Ganley doesn't give a hoot in hell about those "mandates of the convention" that stand in the way of his objective. What he clearly wants is the THWARTING of the convention mandate which FORBIDS the leadership from carrying on any "educational" campaign "in favor of the correct (?) policies of the CIO." The convention mandate forbids the leadership from using its office, or the union press or funds, to put over the no-strike pledge again in the referendum.

Ganley wants to GET AROUND this clear and unambiguous convention mandate. That is what he means by saying that the union administration "must find ways and means of expressing their opinions." The Communist Party (or Association!) termite in the unions are always happy to abide by a majority decision when it is THEIR majority—and only then! Just what measures Ganley and his allies in the UAW leadership plan to take to flout the convention decisions on the referendum, remain to be seen. The membership, you may be sure, will keep a close watch on these slippery gentlemen. It is doubtful if the membership will allow itself to be bulldozed or muddled by Ganley's lies about the "new Trotskyite-Lewis caucus" and the "Reuther-Trotskyite coalition."

The best elements in the rank and file know what happened at Grand Rapids. They know that the no-strike pledge has been a noose around their neck, around the union's neck; and they want to rid themselves of the noose. They have the opportunity of doing so in the referendum—provided they are wide-awake at all times,

"New conditions may affect our no-strike pledge after the defeat of Germany. Hence immediately upon the termination of the war against Germany, the International Executive Board shall, together with the National Board of the CIO, and after consultation with the other boards of organized labor in the United States who gave the pledge, review and decide a further policy on the no-strike pledge for the balance of the war to drive Japan to unconditional surrender."

What is the meaning of these two obscure sentences? What is behind them? At no time, up to now, have the Communists put forth their position in such language. At no time, up to now, have they made any distinction between the application of the pledge up to the defeat of Germany and its application between the time Germany is defeated and the defeat of Japan.

Companies Provoke Eastern Shipyard Strike

NEW YORK—While the delegates to the national convention of the Shipbuilding Workers were busy reaffirming the no-strike pledge, the workers of the Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Company were learning its bitter consequences. The company has been provoking the workers in various ways and the workers have patiently looked to their elected union leaders for help. The latter, in the latest trade union fashion, write up every grievance on a slip of paper. The workers, meantime, sit by idly while the company

and the union officials play cat and mouse. The grievances, of course, are buried in the graveyard of the WLB. The latest provocation was a concealed wage cut. The workers in the plate shops, who were getting first-class mechanics' rates of \$120 per hour, were asked to do the same work for a helper's rate of eighty-eight cents. In anger, the workers rose to defend their standard of living. Thousands of workers in the yards went out on a sympathy strike, the crane operators, who had grievances of their own, went out to the

last man. The only answer which the leadership could offer them was: "Stay on the job." The situation became so tense that Terry Foy, president of Local 16, called a membership meeting to discuss the problem. It was hard for him to control the indignant membership at that gathering. All the speakers had only words of condemnation for their union. One union militant asked for a referendum on the no-strike pledge at the shipbuilding workers' convention which was still in session. Foy ruled the motion out of order. The decision of the chair was appealed six times but still Foy chose to ignore it.

The workers, who called off their strike because they could not get the support of their leadership, returned to their jobs with bitterness in their hearts. The bureaucrats who ignore the needs of the workers would do well to look at the handwriting on the wall. KEARNY, N. J.—A one-week stoppage of 150 crane operators at the Port Newark and Kearny yards of the Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. ended October 1.

Their demand was for the opportunity to work their regular forty-eight-hour week, without being laid off because of rain, snow or other conditions. Until very recently the company had always found work for them, and the changing of this practice was the

immediate cause of the strike. The company also has been downgrading in many departments, cutting skilled workers down to helper's pay and, in addition, violating seniority. Many stoppages, sit-downs, etc., have resulted, and these, combined with "send-homes" of large numbers of workers, have had the yards in turmoil. The top union officials did nothing but tell the workers to stay on the job, and, in general, gave themselves a smaller reputation than before.

A general membership meeting, which 2,500 attended, was held after the crane-operators had been out a week. The official board members did not even give a decent report of the situation. The tone of the meeting was highly sympathetic to the crane men and antagonistic toward the top officials. Several attempts to bring in voting for Roosevelt as a solution for the difficulty were booted down. The crane men wanted assurances that arbitration would start immedi-

ately if they returned, and that the case would not be dragged out in usual WLB style. Finally the crane men left the general meeting for several minutes and came back with a decision that they would return on condition that arbitration would be started within forty-eight hours. A motion calling on the national convention for a referendum on the no-strike pledge was ruled out of order by the chairman.

The meeting adjourned, leaving all other problems unsettled. During the entire walkout the crane men displayed remarkable solidarity to the last man, resisting all sorts of pressure. If they obtain such an unheard-of thing as a prompt and favorable settlement for Local 16, it will be due to their bravery, militancy and solidarity. The unsettled problems of layoffs, down-grading, pay cuts, send-homes, etc., are posed sharply for solution by the entire shipbuilders' union and all the workers.

Max Shachtman Speaker at N. Y. Workers Party Mass Meet

An audience of over 225 persons filled the hall at the Irving Plaza at the first public meeting of the season held under the auspices of Local New York of the Workers Party, at which Comrade Max Shachtman spoke on "What Next in Europe?"

Local New York is now proceeding with its plans for further public meetings. On Friday, October 20, the Workers Party School gets under way. On Sunday, October 22, Comrade David Coolidge, just returned from the United Mine Workers convention, and Max Shachtman, who attended the history-making automobile workers convention, will speak on the 1944 national elections and the tasks of the labor movement. Other activities will follow.

This highly successful meeting started with a brief contest among the New York branches for the greatest number of subscriptions to LABOR ACTION. Each branch had appointed one representative to participate in this competition. The Brooklyn branch, whose representative seemed to be in twenty parts of the hall at the same time gathering subs for the paper, came out on top.

Later in the evening the audience contributed generously in a collection for the coming issue of The New International which will carry the complete discussion articles of the German comrades on prospects for the working class in Europe. (Incidentally, Local New York has been turning in an increasing number of subscriptions to The New International. How

New York Workers Party School

The 1944-45 season of the Workers Party School opens on Friday, October 20. Four six-week sessions are scheduled, to run through May, 1945.

The first session will have two classes: The Role of the Negro in American History—David Coolidge Principles of Marxian Economics—Joseph Carter

Both classes will be given at the same hours—from 8:15 to 10:15 p.m. All sessions will meet at the Labor Temple, 14th Street near Second Avenue, Manhattan. Rates are \$1.00 per course.

Other classes planned for later sessions include: The Marxian Theory of the State—Max Shachtman Applied Marxian Economics—Joseph Carter

Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Europe, 1918-33 —Max Shachtman

Russian Revolution—Albert Gates

Trade Unionism—David Coolidge

We urge all those who are planning to attend the school to register immediately by filling out the blank below and mailing to the Workers Party School. On the basis of last year's attendance at our school, we can safely predict that these classes will fill up very quickly, so get your registration in early.

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

Enclosed please find \$1.00 for registration in the following class:

Name of Class ..... Name ..... Address ..... City ..... Zone ..... State .....

Bulova Watch Co. Hires Labor Spies

NEW YORK (WDL)—Additional information, strengthening the charges by Watch Workers Local 122, International Jewelry Workers Union, AFL, that the Bulova Watch Company hired spies to report the names of workers favorable to the union has been uncovered, the Workers Defense League announces. Evidence proving the firm was using illegal tactics to smash attempt at organization of its employees was presented to the NLRB by the union.

Late in June, unfair labor practices petitions were filed with the board. These accused Bulova's Woodside, L. I., plant of putting informers on the payroll, maintaining a company union and generally overstepping the bounds of the Wagner Act.

It was believed that the apprehended labor spy had confessed his role to Local 122 when the Bulova management refused to "come across" with promised pay for his undercover work. Thoroughly disgruntled, he sought some measure of revenge in baring his activities to the union.

DON'T MISS "Capitalist Barbarism or Socialism?" in the September issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL 114 West 14th Street New York 11, N. Y.

"I Am an Undesirable Citizen" Out of the Past

By RUTH PHILLIPS

The mining bosses of the West, plagued by the militancy of the Western Federation of Miners, were continually on the lookout for a way to break the union. They tried to terrorize striking miners with thugs. They carried on a campaign of vicious propaganda against the union and its leaders, but the workers stood firm against all attacks.

On December 30, 1905, ex-Governor Stuenberg of Idaho was killed by a bomb attached to the gate of his home. A man named Harry Orchard was arrested for the murder. He confessed to this crime and to twenty-six other murders, claiming that he was the tool of the leaders of the Western Federation of Miners. He implicated Big Bill Haywood, Charles Moyer and George Pettibone. Idaho officials, unable to get their hands on the three men legally, kidnapped them from the state of Colorado and brought them to Idaho. They were put into prison, where they stayed eighteen months before the case was brought to trial.

The Mine Owners Association thought that the stage was all set for railroading the leaders of the WFM and breaking the union. They neglected to reckon with the American working class and world-wide public opinion. The case attracted interest all over America, England and Europe. They cry of frame-up was taken up by millions.

A defense fund was started. Clarence Darrow, the most famous lawyer in America, gave his services to defend the men. Eugene Victor Debs, the great American socialist, rallied to their defense, writing in The Appeal to Reason that "their only crime is loyalty to the working class."

The vituperation of the capitalist press came down upon Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone and their defenders. Theodore Roosevelt publicly called them "undesirable citizens." Whereupon, throughout the land, union men, housewives, college boys, socialists, by the tens of thousands, spouted buttons in their lapels reading: "I Am an Undesirable Citizen."

Bill Haywood's trial was to be on May 9, 1907. Beginning on May 1, huge demonstrations took place in big cities all over the country: 50,000 in Chicago, 100,000 in New York, 200,000 in Boston. They carried placards reading: "Roosevelt Can Show His Teeth. We Are Not Afraid. We Stand by Our Brothers in Idaho." They chanted: "If Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone die, the workers will know the reason why." Debs called upon the workers to resort to a general strike if the defendants were not set free. The mighty labor movement gave warning to the bosses that their frame-up would be smashed.

In his final address to the jury, Clarence Darrow said, in part: "If you decree his death, amongst the spiders and vultures of Wall Street will go up psalms of praise. But if you free him, there are still those who will reverently bow their heads and thank you twelve men for the character you have saved. But on the broad prairies, where men toil with their hands; out on the broad ocean where men are sailing the ships; through our mills and factories, deep down under the earth, men who suffer, women and children weary with care and toil... will kneel tonight and ask their God to feud your judgments... to save Haywood's life."

The jury brought in a verdict of "Not Guilty." The case against Moyer and Pettibone folded up. Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone were saved from death by the militant intervention of the American working class.

The Western Federation of Miners gained in membership. The fight had made Haywood a hero to thousands of workers, and strengthened the labor movement.

LABOR ACTION 1 CENT A WEEK

IS ALL IT COSTS TO RECEIVE IT REGULARLY, AT HOME!

If now you receive LABOR ACTION and now you don't, that's because our volunteer distributors can't always cover your particular plant or yard with sample copies of "America's Leading Labor Weekly."

Why not make CERTAIN of getting your copy by receiving it at your home—every single week!

Our subscription rate is the best buy in the country—less than one cent per issue—and this for the only paper that tells the unvarnished TRUTH about war, fascism, profiteering, the aims and aspirations of the progressive labor movement, national and world events, racial and minority problems, etc., etc.

6 MONTHS...25c -- 1 YR...50c

Hand yours to distributor...or mail it!

LABOR ACTION 114 West 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

YES, I want LABOR ACTION. Please send it to me regularly. Enclosed find twenty-five cents in stamps or coin for a six-month subscription [ ] fifty cents for a year's subscription [ ] (Check which.)

Name ..... Address ..... City ..... Zone ..... State .....



# Lerner, PM's Advocate of Annihilation

By WILLIAM GORMAN

The dizziest political character of the year is Max Lerner, the "reformer" from The Nation and the New Republic and now editorial writer for the New York newspaper, PM. Usually when somebody suffers from a split personality he visits a psychoanalyst. But Lerner spreads his confusion over a million words and to some hundred thousand readers.

In this case Lerner is saying yes, no and maybe on the question of Germany. Lerner notes that the German cartels are dangerous to peace and are a cause of fascism. We agree. Therefore we say the German workers should take over the cartels and confiscate the property of the monopolists, Nazis and war-makers. We say the German workers should take over the cartels because from 1918 to 1933 they fought one long, bloody battle against the monopolists, their Kaiser, monarchist generals, deceiving politicians and fascist bands. The red flag flew in Kiel, Soviets were formed throughout Germany, a Commune was founded in Bavaria, armed workers went into battle in Hamburg, one general strike after another paralyzed the Junkers and militarists.

## LERNER PREPARES HIS "POSITION"

To all of this, Lerner, the "socialist," is blind. He has hitched his wagon to the imperialist war and unavoidably—to their post-war plans for Germany. As is known, the Hull plan is to subjugate German industry, and the Morgenthau plan is to destroy it. Lerner thinks that the control over German industry will be ineffective, so he chooses the second plan, whining all the time that "you cannot change an industrial into an agricultural country without lowering the living standards of the people" (PM, September 27). Lerner sheds tears for his own political crimes. What hypocrisy!

In his final editorial on the subject (PM, October 4) he is for a German "democratic" revolution but he thinks it very unlikely. "There will be only a very small minority of the German people who will be capable of helping rebuild a decent Germany." After more than twenty-two years, the Italian masses burst the oppressive chains of fascism. The fascist rats were sent running for their lives. This was an extraordinary lesson for the "socialist" skeptics. Not Lerner. He just about writes the German working class out of existence.

Lerner blunders on. "If the generals and State Department officials display the same fears of social change that they have displayed in Italy, then the game is up—as far as getting a German democracy is concerned." First it is worth noticing that Lerner blames the State Department and the generals. Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin simply don't exist. The small fry are villains. The big ones are angels. Secondly, why the "if"? Lerner knows very well "the fears of social change" that the State Department displays." Thus he's dooming the German revolution for a second time. The conclusion? "If... all hope of a democratic German revolution has been lost, I shall unhesitatingly favor... the Treasury plan... to destroy the big industrial potential of Germany." You see, the German revolution is unlikely. In fact it is well-nigh impossible because American imperialism is going to bury it. After that is accomplished, it will be correct to destroy German industry and bring ruin and starvation upon the masses of people. Have you got that dizzy feeling? Indeed, what a fantastic mind a man must have to hatch such nonsense!

## JUSTIFYING GERMAN DISMEMBERMENT

We remember very well Lerner's cautious and pious praise for the great German revolutionist, Rosa Luxemburg. She represented the "other Germany." She wrote such beautiful letters from prison. It's a shame she was murdered. How remarkable, how befitting that Lerner can praise Rosa Luxemburg only in her martyrdom! For when alive and free she brilliantly castigated the Lerner's of her day as cowards, deceivers, betrayers and confusionists!

Even as we pull down the curtain on Lerner's sickening performance we must not underestimate his importance. Though he says little, he writes a good deal. He now has a large public. To the already existing confusion, he adds his own. He has "style." He can be lyrical and well-intentioned. He can slur over class differences and conflicts. He is always ready to sing a different tune.

But double-talk and doubt are luxuries only Lerner can afford. The American working class must be very clear on this subject. Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin are preparing a gigantic hangman's noose for the German working class. They will cut the country into pieces. They will rob it of machines and human labor. Though plundered and pillaged, the German working class will not be silent. We here must demand: Hands off the German working class! The German ruling class has committed some of the most atrocious crimes in all history. That is exactly the reason why we will stand solidly with the German workers in their heroic efforts to open a new, proud and shining page in the struggle against fascism, imperialist robbery and oppression.

# Churchill, Defender of the Empire, Now -- Bargaining Away Poland's Freedom

By WALTER WEISS

On September 28, Winston Churchill, the Voice of the Empire, made another of his weighty reports to the British Parliament.

If we judge by newspaper headlines, the most important section of the speech concerned the probable time when the war would end. Mr. Churchill thought it very likely that several months, rather than weeks, might be required.

A reading of the speech itself, however, reveals that it contains another section far more significant. It is the part that deals with the Polish problem. Here Mr. Churchill uses toward his Soviet ally the strongest possible language consistent with diplomacy.

"It would be an 'affectation,' he begins, to pretend that the Western democracies and the Soviet Union have an 'identical' attitude toward Poland. He then sets forth the area of supposed agreement among the three powerful Allies: They have all declared themselves in favor of a strong and independent Poland and of 'safe' frontiers for Russia. Having thus expressed once more his willingness to grant Stalin territorial concessions, he comes to his key passage:

"All the more do I trust that the Soviet government will make it possible for us to act unitedly with them in this solution of the Polish problem and that we shall not witness the unhappy spectacle of rival governments in Poland, one recognized by the Soviet Union and the other firmly adhered to by the Western powers."

Churchill makes it clear that he does not rule out a future clash over who shall control the new and "independent" Poland. He places the burden of avoiding such a conflict squarely on Russia; it is up to the Soviet government to make united action possible. As for Britain and the United States, they are not deserting the exiled Polish government in London but support it "firmly."

## WINNIE IS FIRM!

As motivation for his firmness the Prime Minister reminds us that the British declared war on Germany precisely "on account of her aggression against Poland." As a result "the British race"

(note this well—not the British nation, but the British RACE, a good Nazified expression, which Churchill uses twice in the speech) feels special duties toward Poland.

Churchill wants nobody to think that the British capitalists entered the war to protect their Empire or that one of their greatest present fears is the extension of Russian power in Europe. Their prime concern, now as in 1939, is the independence of Poland. Oh, absolutely!

It is true that Churchill ends by warning the members of Parliament not to speak rashly on the Polish question, saying that he is still hopeful of a satisfactory solution. His government can be trusted to do all that is necessary without being egged on, since "we recognize our special responsibility toward Poland." That is to say, Churchill is determined to protect British interests against Russia.

Stalin replied to Churchill's warning by having his puppet Polish liberation committee adopt at once an even more hostile attitude than before to the London Poles. When General Sosnkowski was removed as a concession to Russia, his successor, General Komorowski (commonly known as General Bor) was forthwith denounced by the liberation committee as a criminal, whose head they were determined to have.

## THE ANGLO-AMERICAN POSITION

A confirmation of the significance of Churchill's speech, if any were needed, is contained in a London dispatch published in the New York Times of October 2, which makes the following points:

1) The Soviet attack on Bor is a rebuff to Churchill and Eden, who urged the Poles to sacrifice General Sosnkowski in order to appease Stalin.

2) "It can be said WITHOUT QUALIFICATION (emphasis ours—Ed.) that the question of Poland's future has been a factor in cool exchanges between Mr. Eden and Soviet Ambassador Fedor T. Guseff and was a major reason for the Foreign Secretary's sudden departure for Quebec to urge a firmer hand and a clearer understanding in dealing with Russia."

3) Both Churchill and Roosevelt (the latter through U. S. Ambassador to London Winant) have assured the London Poles of support "through thick and thin, regardless of Soviet backing of the rival group."

The Polish people are obviously pawns in the imperialist rivalry for power that exists among the big members of the Grand Alliance. As W. F. Carlton pointed out in last week's LABOR ACTION, it is such matters as control of Poland which explain the failure of the recently concluded Dumbarton Oaks conferences, which were supposed to establish the principles for an international peace organization.

"Comrade" Stalin insists that, whenever Russia is accused of aggression (in Poland, for example) he must be allowed to vote in the peace organization on his own case and to veto any action that might be proposed against him. He is quite right too, if you accept the principles of an imperialist world. If his support of one Polish gang is "aggression," so is Anglo-American support of the other gang. Why should Roosevelt and Churchill have a vote on the matter, while Stalin sits by?

## UNSETTLED BARGAINING

It is conceivable that the Big Three of World War II may be able to strike some bargain on the Polish question—at the expense of the Poles and other peoples. That is what Churchill hopes for. The recent British landings in Greece, openly admitted in the American press to be unnecessary from a military standpoint, are obviously designed to strengthen Churchill's general European bargaining position as against Stalin, who now has a strong "Communist" Party in the traditionally British-influenced Greek peninsula.

It is perfectly apparent that, so long as capitalist imperialism survives, there will be new conflicts. Japan and Germany may be crushed, but new clashes will arise among the self-styled "peace-loving nations." No more than the present war will these be conflicts for Polish independence, the Four Freedoms, or any such noble aim. They will be struggles over the imperialist division of spoils.

# FDR Stands Pat on Wage Freeze --

(Continued from page 1)

some slight revision upward in the formula, though nowhere near the workers' demands. That is why the President's actions come as a double slap in the face to labor leaders like Philip Murray. They have been trying to hold the rank and file in check, from breaking the no-strike pledge and from breaking with Roosevelt politically by assuring labor that the President would take the ceiling off the Little Steel formula.

## CONTORTIONS OF "FALA" PHIL

The contortions of Philip Murray in trying to make this story of the President's "sure" liberalization credible is of great interest to those with a fondness for acrobatics, but it should be anything but entertaining to a duped labor movement. A cynical Washington observer is quoted as having noted that "Murray is not out on the end of a limb; he is two feet off the end of it."

However, Murray may yet have his reward; there is an unsubstantiated rumor that Mrs. Roosevelt will have him perform at her next press conference with rural educators. His imitation of "dead dog" will no doubt be very convincing and he should at least get a piece of sponge cake for his labors.

At the auto workers' convention, Murray was much concerned with keeping an aroused rank and file, sick and tired of WLB stalling and company anti-union machinations from repealing the no-strike pledge. To buttress his feeble arguments for maintaining labor's ball and chain, the no-strike pledge, he stated that "I am as sure as I'm living that the Little Steel formula will be revised by the War Labor Board." This was a few days after Murray had conferred with the president, presumably on this topic.

That was September 12. From that point on the Roosevelt knife started

sliding into Murray's back with startling (to Murray) regularity. On September 15, Chairman William Davis of the WLB made a promise that the hearings would proceed with dispatch and grandiosely promised that the board would concern itself with the problems of the wage cuts which were inevitable with cutbacks in war production and looming large with the impending defeat of Germany. At the same time he stated that the board might not make ANY recommendation to the President about revising the formula, though the WLB panels had just made their reports finding the demands justified.

That very same night, Murray, speaking before the convention of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, again predicted that Roosevelt would revise the Little Steel formula!

Then the WLB voted down a resolution offered by the labor members setting October 15 as the deadline for the board's decision and declaring that the decision was not to be tied in with military developments. Evidently Murray was getting worried about Davis' statements about V-E

Day—fearing a postponement till then.

The peace of mind of the labor leaders was not then improved when War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes, Roosevelt's favorite and "Assistant President," reiterated his strongly held position that the President's "hold-the-line" order must be maintained and that there should be no change in the formula.

Exactly two days later, September 29, the labor leaders heard their master's voice calling them to the White House, where they were to be brought sharply to heel. The six members of "Labor's Combined Victory Committee" went to see Roosevelt.

Roosevelt refused to make any promises or commitments to labor about revising the formula. Green of the AFL could not say that the formula would be changed. Murray, a man of faith, on the other hand felt sure it would be changed, though he could not say when. Both Green and Murray said that they had not asked the President to make any commitment, feeling that it was not proper to do so, but had laid their case before him.

# "The Voice" --

(Continued from page 1)

making business contacts in Wall Street. But, lest we condemn Dewey's choice of an adviser on foreign affairs unwittingly, let us not forget that touchstone of Goodness and Badness—Good fascists, Bad fascists; Good Quislings, Bad Quislings.

An old music instructor of his heard the mellifluous tones of Dewey's acceptance and wrote to him: "How proud we were when we heard your beautiful acceptance speech... I might almost say there is a new 'The Voice' and I don't mean Sinatra."

We agree. "The Voice" is a new one. But the tune is old and familiar. And calling the tune are the big capitalist politicians of the Republican Party.

# An Analysis of the Shipbuilding Workers Convention --

(Continued from page 1)

ing upon Velson, with the assistance of the FBI, a case was made out for his membership in the Communist Party. So Velson was removed from the GEB and was prevented from holding office in his own local. But this year Velson sat in the convention hall and pulled the strings which ran the show. Today Green is more at the mercy of Velson than Velson was at the mercy of Green a year ago.

## HOW TO FIGHT STALINISM

Then how is one to fight Communist

domination of the union? By opposing the specific policies they advocate.

But that is where the rub comes in for such self-proclaimed anti-Communists as Green. There was not a single important issue before the convention upon which Green differed from the Communists. Whether Green likes it or not, he is in a political bloc with the Communists. Basically, blocs are determined by what one stands for. Not only do the Communists have the same policies in the union as Green, but the Communists are more active, more ruthless and more

fanatical in carrying them out.

What is Green's policy on the no-strike pledge? He is 100 per cent for it. The Communists are 101 per cent for it.

What is Green's policy on labor support to the War Labor Board? Green is in favor of keeping labor members on the board despite the kicking around which the WLB gives to labor. The Communists are just as willing to have labor take a kicking around to keep the WLB going.

What is Green's policy on support of Roosevelt and the line of the Political Action Committee? Green is 100 per cent behind the policy of complete faith in Roosevelt and tying labor to the Democratic political machine through the PAC. The Communists support this same policy 100 per cent.

The three points summed up here are not chosen at random. They are the three main questions that came up before the recent convention. They occupied, all together, perhaps 75 per cent of the time of the convention. Each question found Green seeing eye to eye with the Communist line.

Does this mean that Green is a Communist or that he supports the

Communists? Of course not.

All it means is that Green and the Communists each represent within the labor movement outside powers which today are allied in their immediate aims.

Green represents in the labor movement (as does the entire officialdom of the CIO) the Roosevelt Administration. Green supports the policies of the Administration 100 per

## NEXT WEEK:

The Meaning of Dumbarton Oaks  
By Albert Gates

Politics at the Ship Workers' Convention  
By Susan Green

The Plight of the Packing House Workers  
By Mike Stevens

cent. He supports the Administration in its war aims, in its conduct of the war, in its wage and price policies, and its general line on the home front. He carries out this Administration policy within the union by supporting the no-strike pledge, the War Labor Board and the PAC campaign to re-elect the Democratic Party politicians.

The Communists represent the Russian government. Before Russia became involved in the war the Communists fought Roosevelt tooth and nail. They wore buttons which said "The Yanks Aren't Coming" and Roosevelt fought back. He had Browder clamped into jail on a trumped-up charge. The FBI began persecuting the Communists in various ways.

However, after June, 1941, when Russia was invaded, the Russian and American governments began to see eye to eye on world politics. After Pearl Harbor they became active military allies and after the Teheran conference they became active political allies.

As a result, the Communists have supported their boss' (i.e., Stalin's) ally 100 per cent. Today they stand 100 per cent for support to the Administration and its policies. Roosevelt's man, John Green, and Stalin's man, Irving Velson, have no quarrel over policy nor could they have under the circumstances. As a result their fight is a dirty, unprincipled, undercover fight for posts and power with no policies involved.

Green thought he had scored a victory when he licked Velson in the 1943 convention. But he had done

nothing of the kind. In any case it was meaningless. For their policies remained the same. In fact, the Communist elements did a better, a more energetic, a more efficient job in carrying out the line of the Roosevelt Administration (no-strike pledge, WLB, PAC, etc.) than Green himself. More than that, both Green and the Communists saw their real enemy in the progressive rank and file groups that were conducting a fight against the policy of appeasement to the government boards and corporations. (Part II next week)

# Preparing a New League of Nations

By W. F. CARLTON

The press has come out in bold headlines announcing that a world peace plan has been agreed upon. Upon examination, however, it turns out that the agreement is still only ninety per cent. It is obvious that if after ninety per cent of agreement you have to go to war over the remaining ten per cent, you do not go to war only to the extent of ten per cent. Even if you agree on ninety-nine per cent and then go to war over one per cent, the war is a one hundred per cent war.

This ninety per cent business comes from a statement by Roosevelt. There were ninety per cent when Russia left the conference. At that time Churchill made a long speech on the war, during which he touched on the question of Poland. He said that it would be most unfortunate if some agreement was not arrived at. Otherwise, the following situation might arise:

The British government might find itself supporting one Polish government and the Russian government might find itself supporting another. That, said Churchill, would be very unfortunate. That is a sufficient per cent to cause a war, even if Churchill and Stalin were ninety per cent agreed on Brazil, India, Burma, Canada and even Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania. People never fight about what they agree upon. They fight always upon what they disagree about.

## AGREEMENT WILL NOT PREVENT WAR

This does not mean that Britain and Russia are going to go to war tomorrow about Poland. But what it does mean is that here before the Second World War is finished and even while the fraternal Allies have the best of all moral reasons for agreement, they have to threaten one another and agree to differ. It is not impossible that some sort of final agreement may be patched up. Churchill, for instance, may have to bow to Russia's superior strategic position in regard to Poland. But Churchill did not work for the destruction of German domination of the continent for the purpose of substituting Russian domination. Neither did Roosevelt go to the support of British imperialism for any other purpose except to keep European capital divided. Whatever agreement they may come to, the seeds of the Third World War are there for everyone to see. Nobody knows it better than they. And that is why they cannot come to an agreement on the question of voting on the Council. Everyone wants to be in a situation where, as the difficulties sharpen, the voting regulations are such that he can put the blame on somebody else. Thus, of course, he will be able to present himself to the workers at home not as the aggressor but as the one who kept to the law and was forced by greedy enemies to take up arms purely in self-defense.

That is exactly what all the seven weeks of conference were about. To fool the people with the idea that the Second World War is the last world war. And, further, to arrange matters in such a way that, when war does approach, each one is in a position to say: "See, workers and farmers, if only the others had stuck to the peace plan, as we arranged at Dumbarton Oaks, there would have been no war. However, inasmuch as war has been forced upon us, you have once more to shed your blood. At any rate, you can be sure that this time, when it does come to an end, we shall arrange a perfect peace plan, which will work, etc., etc."

## PREPARING FOR NEW STRUGGLES

Last week I pointed out the preparation for the future that these peace plans were making. America is seeking bases all over the world. Stalin has a military academy where he is preparing boys of the age of eight to be soldiers. General Marshall is preparing America's peacetime army so that America will not be caught "unprepared" in the future. To these may be added de Gaulle, who is frantically exciting the French people about the necessity of France once more becoming a great power. By this, of course, he means a heavily-armed, imperialist power, and observers of French politics do not hesitate to say so openly. At the same time he hopes by this means to distract the French people from the difficulties which are to be solved at home.

But the very course of the war itself shows exactly how much these gentlemen believe in peace plans. Thus Russia during the past few weeks has been engaged in strategic military operations in Finland, in the Baltic states, in Hungary and in the Balkans. Russia has been busy everywhere, except in front of Warsaw, where she allowed the Germans to massacre the Polish masses. These Polish masses, we may note, were the very ones who objected to Russian domination of Poland.

The British, as we know, are very much interested in the imperialist domination of Greece. It is perfectly obvious that it is only a matter of time before Stalin's army will administer a smashing defeat to the German troops in the Balkans. But Britain cannot wait for this. Oh, no. Churchill is so anxious to deliver the Balkans from German domination that he also must take a part in the defeat of the German armies now stranded in that area.

This is the way they settle their problems. This is the way they have always settled them. So that even now, while they still have to finish off Germany, they are busily engaged staking out claims in the only way they can understand—by force of arms.

**Detroit Meeting**  
**The Fight for Post-War Jobs**  
LABOR ACTION FORUM  
Sunday, October 22, 8:15 p.m.  
Labor Action Hall  
2650 Arndt (at Gratiot & Chene)  
ADMISSION FREE

**Los Angeles Attention**  
**PUBLIC MEETING**  
**The Campaign Issues of 1944**  
LABOR ACTION FORUM  
OCTOBER 20 8:00 P.M.  
Embassy Hall 843 So. Grand



## Editorials

### Labor Leaders Uphold President-- FDR Upholds Little Steel Formula

The struggle over the Little Steel formula is drawing to a head. Forced by the rising tide of rank and file dissatisfaction and opposition to the wage freeze and the no-strike pledge which made possible Roosevelt's anti-labor wage stabilization law, the labor leaders have been speaking more openly and consistently than ever before for a revision of the Little Steel formula. Leaders of the AFL and the CIO, especially those members who serve on the infamous WLB, have been voicing their protests against the continuation of the formula with almost monotonous regularity. Yet they have not done, and have no intention of doing, anything concrete to force its revision.

Every effort of the rank and file to revert back to genuine militant unionism, to rescind the murderous no-strike pledge, met with the fiercest resistance of the labor bureaucrats who beg for faith in Roosevelt to do something for labor as an answer to the millions of workers in the country. The workers are getting sick and tired of it all, sick and tired of the endless promises made to them by Murray, Green & Co., sick and tired of the endless backstabbing that comes from the Administration in Washington.

Just consider the facts for a moment.

#### LABOR NEEDS ITS OWN POLITICAL PARTY

The labor leaders have given thousands of pages of testimony in Washington which proved to the hilt that labor was being robbed, that millions of workers have not received a wage increase since the war began, and that those who did enjoy a rise in wages found that cancelled out by the enormous rise in the cost of living. The labor leaders proved beyond a shadow of doubt that there has been no real control of prices. The labor leaders also proved that the equality of sacrifice program was another of Roosevelt's great myths, that it just wasn't true, that the only force in American society which sacrificed were the workers in industry and the workers in uniform. What has been the result of all this testimony?

This being an election year, FDR let the hint fall that he was "considering" a revision of the Little Steel formula. The WLB jumped into the ring to do some shadow boxing, too. It was seriously considering the individual cases before it (thousands of them, too) indicating that there was a good chance that wage increases would be allowed. And Philip Murray, the man whom FDR ridicules with unkept promises, also with monotonous regularity, only recently staked his life at the auto workers' convention on a revision of the Little Steel formula.

But now the report has come from Washington disclosing, according to reliable sources, that FDR will not consider a revision of the formula, at least not be-

*The cost of living has risen way beyond wage levels. As the war draws to a close the workers are beginning to realize that there will be little left for them after reversion but unemployment and depressed wages. They will have gone through the prosperity created by the war, the long hours, the back-breaking labor, worsened conditions of work, loss of many labor standards won by their union organization, and a weakening of their union structure, with little or nothing to show for it. At the same time they observe how big business has enriched itself many times through the direct and wilful assistance of the government in Washington. Still, every effort made by labor to improve its lot has been met by rebuffs from Roosevelt, Byrnes, Vinson, Davis, et al.*

This is really retribution. Roosevelt asked labor for a no-strike pledge. The labor leaders gave it to him without any guarantees given to labor. Big business gave a promise in return for the no-strike pledge not to lock out workers (as if business would do such a thing in the midst of its greatest profit "earnings"). But big business received its guarantees in the form of excessive war profits. It threatened not to produce until these profits were guaranteed! And it got its profits, enough to carry it over any slack period.

fore the elections. The WLB has made it clear that it will do nothing until FDR acts. Byrnes has made public his opposition to any change in the wage structure. Big business has joined the Administrative pack with a campaign to uphold the President's policies!

Thus, once more, labor is getting a stab in the back. Once more the labor leaders who lie prostrate before the men in the White House, swearing that they love him; that no matter how many kicks they receive from him, their loyalty is unchanged.

Oh, yes; one of these days a revision of the Little Steel formula will come. It will come when it is too late to do most of the workers any good. It will come when cut-backs take place, when unemployment is on the rise, when overtime is cut down and the Sunday and holiday work is eliminated. Then the workers can ponder, while looking for jobs, or cashing relief and WPA checks, what equality of sacrifice really means. They can ponder over the real meaning of the no-strike pledge. They can ponder over the policy of the officials who tied the labor movement to the political machines of big business, of the same industrial lords and financial giants which keep labor in industrial slavery.

Labor has no other road but to fight for rescinding the no-strike pledge. Labor has no other political path but to build its own political party based on a labor program fighting for a government of all toilers, a workers' government.

### Willkie -- A Liberal Imperialist

The death of Wendell Willkie, former standard-bearer of the Republican Party, robbed American capitalism of one of its most astute representatives and defenders. Before he entered politics, he was noted as one of the most rabid anti-New Dealers, representing at that time Commonwealth & Southern, a notorious utility company enriching itself by robbing consumers with extortionate rates and its own workers with low wages. By his activities, Willkie endeared himself to the reactionary industrialists and financiers. Yet as a strange individual phenomenon, Willkie certainly underwent a transformation. Nobody can deny this.

He entered politics and became a champion of "liberalism." He contested with Roosevelt in the 1940 election on the ground that he was a true liberal and would institute a better New Deal than its originator. In the field of foreign affairs he maintained that he was more forthright and intelligent than the President. As a defender of civil liberties he certainly stood a few yards ahead of FDR and made the impression on many that he was a good deal more sincere than the Democratic boss.

In any case Willkie made a race for the presidency in 1940, rolling up the greatest vote in Republican Party history, even though he was beaten. He continued after his defeat to be an important figure in the politics of the country, even representing Roosevelt on the international field and

doing a little spade-work of his own. But through it all there was no question but that he represented the interests of a large section of the American capitalist class, a definitely large section of Wall Street.

It is impossible to explain Willkie in this short editorial. But his position in capitalist politics is not difficult to assess. Willkie represented a section of American imperialists who advocate an "enlightened" imperialism, an imperialism not directly and openly based on the fire and sword, but an imperialism which is to be rooted in the enormous productive apparatus of American industry. Willkie felt that he was crusading for a new internationalism, an internationalism which would pave the way for domination of the world by American capitalism based upon its ability to outproduce and outsell any competitor by means less expensive than military and less dangerous than war.

That is why he played the role he did in recent years as the enlightened and intelligent capitalist leader. His book, "One World," was predicated on the above beliefs. In order to realize those aims, he understood that the interests of American imperialism required peaceful relations at home and a measure of concession to the American working class. That is the true role of Willkie, a product of the particularly new conditions created by the Second World War and the present stage of disintegration of world capitalism.

## Jefferson Caffery -- Portrait of a U. S. "Career Diplomat"

By L. ERNST

The State Department last week sent as American Ambassador to France, cockpit of European revolution, an old hand at smashing revolutions, Jefferson Caffery.

The press describes Ambassador Caffery as a "career diplomat" and lists his extensive experience in the American diplomatic service. However, most papers did not mention Caffery's most "distinguished" service in the interests of American imperialism, namely, his role in smashing the revolutionary movement in Cuba in 1933.

Cuba was ruled for many years by a corrupt, ruthless puppet of Wall Street by the name of Machado. His government was kept in power by all the methods of bribery and corruption familiar to Latin American dictators. But in addition he achieved a notoriety for cruelty practiced by his armed thugs, the "Porros" bands. They spread terror and death throughout the island to chop down any opposition to Machado.

In the summer of 1933, the people of Cuba finally revolted to free themselves from Wall Street rule and drove Machado and his cut-throats from power. The American Ambassador to Cuba at this time was a new appointee of the new "Good Neighbor" Administration that took office in March, 1933. His name, Sumner Welles, was little known at the time.

Ambassador Welles took a very active part in what was going on in Cuba. In doing this he carried on the traditions of years of active intervention in Cuban politics by American ambassadors. With most of the island owned by American banks, by the sugar trust and by the electric power trust, the job of the American Ambassador was to make sure that the interests of the American capitalists were protected against the Cuban working people.

WELLES AND THE REVOLUTION

Welles got together with the pro-Cuban politicians and engineered a new government to take the place of the discredited Machado dictatorship. The new government was headed by a colorless, "middle-of-the-road" politician by the name of Cespedes. It was the aim of Welles to use Cespedes to maneuver through the upheaval until the people's anger against the Machado regime had been satisfied and everyone would go back to work satisfied that things would now be different.

However, the workers and peasants wanted to see some drastic changes in their conditions. The Cuban middle class, led by the university students

and professors, were likewise dissatisfied. They wanted "Cuba for the Cubans." By this they meant, of course, that only Cuban capitalists have the right to exploit Cuban labor. As a result, on September 5, 1933, the new Cespedes government was also forced out of office. Its place was taken by a government of a five-man committee or "Junta," headed by a very popular professor, Dr. Grau San Martin.

The Grau government was considered a terrible danger to American capitalist interests in Cuba. It was the very thing that Welles had schemed to avoid. The government was determined to free Cuba from Wall Street domination and institute a government that would protect the interests of the Cuban capitalists, with concessions to the Cuban workers to insure their support. This can be seen from the program of the Grau government, which promised to safeguard "absolute independence and national sovereignty." It outlined the following specific points:

1. Special tribunals to try the Machado criminals for their crimes against the Cuban people.
2. The eight-hour day.
3. A law requiring employers to employ at least fifty per cent native Cuban labor.
4. A minimum wage law for cutting sugar cane.
5. Establishment of a Department of Labor to enforce these labor laws.
6. Suspension of payments on debt to Chase National Bank.
7. Seizure of American-owned electric utility monopoly (Compania Cubana de Electricidad).
8. Removal of Mr. Chadbourne as head of the Sugar Export Corporation, where he represented the American sugar trust.
9. Reduction of electricity rates.
10. Increased sugar quota under allotment system for small sugar mills.

According to a report made by a committee of the Foreign Policy Association which went to Cuba to investigate conditions, the attitude toward these reforms of the Grau government was very hostile on the part of the vested interests. Says the report:

"The Grau government aroused intense hostility on the part of the business interests, the older political groups, the Spaniards, the ABC and many Americans. Mr. Welles, the American Ambassador, was strongly opposed to the regime and the United States refused to recognize it. . . . They charged that the Grau regime was demagogic, anti-American and incompetent. . . . Today, however, some of Grau's enemies admit that

he was the only President who had attempted to improve the lot of the submerged majority."

CAFFERY CALLED IN

Welles continued to conspire with the Cuban reactionaries in an attempt to overthrow this "radical" government of Grau. However, in November, 1933, Welles was called back to Washington. Whether the State Department was dissatisfied with his inability to overturn the Grau government and recalled him for that reason is not known. The reason given for his recall was that his presence was needed at the forthcoming Pan-American Conference.

In his place as new Ambassador to Cuba now appeared Jefferson Caffery. From November to January, 1934, Ambassador Caffery continued the work of anti-Grau conspiracy begun by Welles. The American interests contacted an ambitious army officer who rose to prominence during the revolution, one Colonel Fulgencio Batista. The latter had been a sergeant in the army during the Machado dictatorship. He took a leading part in organizing the non-commissioned officers. He now held a top position in the Army under Grau.

The Batista clique undermined the Grau regime and with the help of the reactionary interests the Grau government was overthrown in January, 1934. During this period the American Navy had appeared off the Cuban coasts to bring further pressure against the Grau supporters. This was the inauguration of the Roosevelt policy of "Good Neighbor" relations. The overthrow of the Grau government was engineered from Washington by the State Department and Jefferson Caffery received the credit for carrying it out.

A DANGER TO FRANCE

In place of the Grau government there was installed a weak-kneed President by the name of Mandiata, who was willing to do the bidding of Wall Street and its Ambassador Caffery.

The Foreign Policy report notes that: "In contrast to the refusal to recognize the previous regime, the United States announced its recognition of President Mandiata five days after he took office."

Caffery had shown his ability to overturn a government put in office by a popular revolution. This is, no doubt, one of his biggest recommendations for his present job in France. However, the French workers may prove a little more difficult to handle than the Cuban professors of the Grau movement.

### Current "New International" Features Articles by German Internationalists and Marxist Scholar

There are still copies available of the important September issue of The New International. This number features the first installment of an extremely significant document by the International Communists of Germany, entitled "Capitalist Barbarism or Socialism?" and deals with the development of declining capitalism and the tasks and perspectives of the labor movement.

Note to members of the Socialist Workers Party and readers of the Fourth International: This article was refused by the SWP for publication in its journal, despite the fact, as stated by the authors, that their document was in one sense the outgrowth of criticisms of their "Three

Theses" by members of the SWP.

The document, which came from London, is an exhaustive study of world capitalism, the real meaning of the present war, the state of the labor movement and what kind of program the international socialists need to revive the political movement of labor in order to achieve a change in the social order.

Another interesting article which is in this number of America's outstanding Marxist theoretical journal, came from Australia. It was written by W. H. Emmett, an outstanding Marxist scholar and author of the "Marxian Economic Handbook and Glossary." The article deals with some aspects of Marxian economics

and one of its world-famous critics.

The September issue of the NI is rounded out with articles on the trade union movement in the United States by David Coolidge, a review of pre-war French capitalist leaders by J. R. Johnson, and a criticism of the anti-Marxists by James Barrett. Copies of The New International may be obtained by sending twenty cents in coin or stamps to: The New International, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Better yet, you can get The New International regularly every month by subscribing to it. The subscription rates are: \$1.50 for one year; \$1.00 for six months. (New York City rates are \$1.75 for one year; \$1.25 for six months.)

## AMERICAN FASCISM

Ford's Flunkey Finances  
Gerald L. K. Smith

By CARL DAVIS

The White House Campaign Expenditures Committee is having one helluva time trying to find out who are the financial backers of America's fascist-minded rabble-rousers, anti-labor racketeers and avowed fascists and their organizations.

Already, Joseph Kamp, noted supporter of fascist doctrines and professional labor-baiter dealing in red scares (he makes his living digging up the "dope" for wary industrialists) has been cited for contempt for his refusal to disclose his source of financial support. Frank Gannett, owner of a large number of newspapers and a notorious truth-raper, is another of a long string of reactionaries whose stock-in-trade is anti-labor propaganda bought and paid for by big business. He, too, refused to reveal his sources of financial support, which runs into millions of dollars.

A small sensation, however, was caused by that demagogue, Gerald L. K. Smith, who, while he refused to list all his financial backers, did say that among them was Harry Bennett, former head of the Ford Company service squad, now a vice-president and reputed to be running the Ford empire. Smith stated that he received \$2,000 from Bennett to aid his struggle against "communism and labor racketeering" (read: unionism).

BENNETT'S FEELINGS WERE HURT

Bennett, employer of thugs and organizer of goon squads to fight unionism, was hurt no end by Smith's disclosure. What a dirty thing to do! He only gave this fascist scum and wearer of the cloth money so that he could finance radio talks against "communism and racketeering." And what does old Reverend Smith do but tell a story that gives the impression that Bennett was supporting him politically. Ain't true, says this ex-football player and ex-pug, now turned "industrialist." Smith is just picking on him because he wouldn't support the political beliefs of America First.

Bennett went on to say: "I do not support Smith's political beliefs. I have told him so publicly and privately and in no uncertain terms. He was given no money by me for his own political purposes. As a matter of fact, no one suspected that, at the time I gave him the money, he had any political ambitions such as have been evidenced of late."

He only gave him the money to help break the back of the rising Automobile Workers of America (CIO); and that, according to Henry Ford's servant, makes the contribution justifiable.

But there is more to this story. Bennett said that he gave Smith names of others in the automobile industry who were also interested in a little union busting campaign. What moneys he received from these other auto barons, Smith has so far not revealed. But there is no doubt that he received "aid" from them, too.

WHOSE MONEY WAS IT?

Whose \$2,000 was it that Bennett gave to Smith? Well, the facts on this aren't too clear. The Ford public relations officials told reporters that they weren't sure whether the money belonged to Bennett personally or to the Ford Company. They "assumed" the money was Bennett's.

But, LABOR ACTION reader, can you imagine Bennett, who was personnel director of the Ford Motor Company at the time he gave the money to Smith, shelling out \$2,000 of his own funds in the interest of the Ford Company? And that Mr. Ford knew nothing about this? That's just about too much to expect!

Labor has often charged that Ford was one of Smith's backers. It could never document this charge. But Smith's testimony is a living proof that this charge had its basis in fact. Let anyone try to dissociate Henry Ford from Harry Bennett, just remember that Bennett is Ford's employee. In the many years during which he served his master for good pay, he carried out the policies of the head of the Ford empire.

Bennett is no free individual acting on his own behalf, especially where it was a case of combating the militant Auto Workers Union. He acted in the interests of the Ford Company when he instructed his goon squads to beat up union organizers; and he acted in the interests of the company when he gave money to Fascist Gerald L. K. Smith for the same purpose. What Bennett is really boiled up about is that Smith mentioned his name as a contributor. If the Reverend hadn't said a word, Bennett would not, of his own accord, have admitted giving him any money.

It isn't only a matter of "Ford's \$2,000... thrown down a rathole," as R. J. Thomas says. What is important is that Smith's testimony showed that when it comes to material support to an individual fascist or fascist movement you will always find big business as its financial mainstay.

Fascism does the work of big business. It did it in Italy. It did it in Germany. It will do it wherever it has the chance. That is why it is silly to think that big business, the industrialists and financiers of America will ever fight fascism seriously. The bigger and stronger the labor movement, the more direct becomes the link between big business and fascism. The labor movement must organize the fight against fascism.

## LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interests of Labor

Published Weekly by the  
LABOR ACTION PUBLISHING ASSN.  
114 West 14th Street New York 11, N. Y.  
(Third Floor)

Vol. 8, No. 42 October 16, 1944

ALBERT GATES, Editor  
MARY BELL, Asst. Editor

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

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

## Should Labor Support Roosevelt?

- If not, should Labor support Dewey?
- What is the role of the Political Action Committee?
- What about a Labor Party in 1944?

DAVID COOLIDGE,

National Labor Secretary, Workers Party, recently returned from the Mine Workers' Convention

MAX SHACHTMAN,

National Secretary, Workers Party, recently returned from the Auto Workers' Convention

Sunday, October 22nd  
8:15 P. M., Admission 25 Cents

Irving Plaza  
Irving Place near 15th Street