

**WORK FOR A WORKERS WORLD;
JOIN THE WORKERS PARTY!**

LABOR ACTION

MAY 24, 1948

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

UAW FIGHT KEY TO CIO WAGE VICTORY!

Jews Defend New State as Palestine War Flares

But Rightists Hold Upper Hand in Israel Government; Irgun for Jewish Expansion

By AL FINDLEY

On May 15, 1947, immediately after the British mandate over Palestine was terminated, the independent Jewish state of Israel was proclaimed. No sooner was it born than it was bombed by the attacking armies of the Arab League. The provisional government is claiming jurisdiction over those portions of Palestine allocated to the Jews in the UN partition plan.

The government is composed of a council with representatives from all parties and a cabinet of thirteen. It is a coalition cabinet, under the leadership of the Jewish social-democratic party, the Mapai or Palestinian Labor Party. Both the premier Ben-Gurion and the foreign minister are from the Labor Party. Dr. Chaim Weizman, liberal pro-British leader, has been elected first president of the new republic with only the Revisionists voting against him. The Achduth Avodah Party and the lone Stalinist in the council abstained. The division of the council is roughly about 16 for labor and left-wing parties and 18-20 for liberal and conservative bourgeois parties.

The on-again off-again unity of the Irgun and Haganah has finally been consummated. It provides for the military coordination of the two groups leaving the Irgun free to act as a unit and use its military force to influence political alignment in favor of the rightists. The Irgun also has wide latitude even in military affairs. This unity was opposed first by the Hashomer Hatzair and the Achduth Avodah parties, who were later joined by the Labor Party. But despite the opposition of the entire labor movement the Irgun unity was carried through by the bourgeois elements, proving who controls the Haganah.

The Stern group, on the other hand, has been incorporated within the Haganah, and its commander given the rating of major. Both the Irgun and the Stern group have announced that they will fight to incorporate all of Palestine into the Jewish state.

ARAB PLANS

The Arabs have not proclaimed any government, neither for part nor for all of Palestine. The armies of all the Arab states are invading Palestine, and are also using their air force to bombard Tel Aviv. These armies have already occupied most of the Arab portions of Palestine and are setting up "administrations." It is unclear whether they are acting in a coordinated plan and have only temporarily sidetracked the Mufti's Arab Higher Committee, or whether they are continuing their rivalries and are vying with one another as to who can do the most in defeating the Jewish state and, at the same time, incorporate those sections of Palestine they conquer into their own realms.

This writer was wrong in predicting that the Arab states would limit themselves to sending "volunteers." The pressure of the nationalist ele-

ments, plus dynastic ambitions, have forced the feudal rulers to risk a military adventure that can bring only destruction and delay the unification so essential to the economic development of the Near East. It is clear that the opposing forces are about evenly matched and the struggle, unless stopped, will be a prolonged one and a bloody one. The rules of war are being disregarded. Using the Irgun communique on Deir Yassin, the Arabs are justifying their slaughter of all the prisoners of Kfar Etzion.

But LABOR ACTION was right in its analysis of the American position. As soon as Truman announced his support of trusteeship LABOR ACTION predicted that "intransigent Harry" would shift again. In addition to vote-catching considerations, American policy is primarily concerned with preventing a war which would give Russia the opportunity to intervene on one or both sides. After the military power of the Jews had been demonstrated, the U. S. gave up its hope of preventing war by abandoning partition, and is now trying to limit the war and prevent all-out warfare.

UN HOPELESS

The U. S. recognition of Israel was a move to get the jump on Russia and also to head off the Arab League. It failed in its second purpose. The speed—only a few minutes after the proclamation—was a surprise to everyone, including the U. S. delegation in the UN.

The United States is now taking the lead in trying to get UN action to stop the fighting. Russia is sup-

(Continued on page 4)

Why We Need a Labor Party!



Sees Crushing Defeat for Stalinists in NMU

CP Union Wreckers Resort to Foulest Lies in Slander Campaign Against Rank and File Caucus

NEW YORK, May 5—Elections for all officers in the National Maritime Union-CIO—began on April 1, 1948—have now reached the half-way mark. Every post in the union is on the ballot, 130 positions in all, including everything from president down to dispatcher. Some time in July the results will be announced. It is a foregone conclusion that the Rank and File Caucus slate, headed by President Curran, will win hands down. The so-called "Progressive" or "Save the Union" or "Fight the Shipowners," etc. etc. slate (read Stalinist slate), until now the machine of the union, will go down to defeat, electing very few of their number.

This turn in the tide of the largest sea union in America did not take place overnight. Opposition to the Communist Party has existed and smoldered ever since the inception of the NMU. Some of it was healthy, some of it reactionary. By and large it resulted from the constant change

of line by the leadership with each fluctuation in Kremlin foreign policy. This resulted in serious organizational and contractual losses. The flip-flops alienated thousands of NMU members who left in disgust to join other maritime unions, since they found it almost impossible to fight for a change in leadership. It made possible the growth of an opposition union, the Sailors International Union-AFL on the east coast. It guaranteed the separate existence of the Sailors Union of the Pacific (SUP), Marine Firemen (MFOV) and Maritime Cooks and Stewards on the west coast.

So today, almost fourteen years since the revolt of seamen took place in the Sailors Union on the west coast against its corrupt leadership, we have the phenomenon of seven different sea unions, all primarily because the CP would tolerate no opposition where it ruled and would only permit unity with the other unions if

they would allow Stalinist policy to dominate.

TIGHT CONTROL

Added to this we find, in examining the various Maritime Agreements with the shipping companies, that the NMU, by far the largest union and with the most militant membership, also has the WORST agreements. This shows up mostly in working conditions. This fact alone has in recent years driven many sailors who were being organized for the first time into the AFL unions.

The war and the Roosevelt-Stalin pact brought with it the most reactionary line the CP had ever followed in maritime. The leadership just couldn't sacrifice enough of the seamen's conditions. The mere mention of any job action by a crew would bring down on its head the vilest insults and threats of calling the FBI. Any seaman overstaying the government request of only 30 days as after

three months at sea was placed over to the draft board. This task of informing on workers—performed by a trade union! Thinking back to that time, it seems almost unbelievable after hearing the Stalinists rage and rant against "police state" and "thought control" NOW.

But all the corrupt policies and practices of the CP have now caught up with them. The membership is giving them the boot, and in a union that has always been the prize of the American Stalinist Party. Just one indication of how powerful the control of the CP Waterfront Section is at present, is the fact that more than 75 per cent of all posts are held by Stalinists.

EMPLOY SLANDER

In the last two months the "hacks" (as the Stalinists are known on board the ships and on the waterfront) have unleashed a campaign against their opponents and former cohorts in the NMU that has put to shame any previous attacks this monstrous party has launched against opposition to them in the labor movement. They have organized the most flagrant lying and scandal mongering, and launched lies so enormous as to take one's breath away! The ordinary rank and file confronted with this, is so baffled he often has no answer, especially since the people leading this CP campaign and spreading these tales have been looked upon by the average guy as fairly responsible representatives of the union.

Every few days there is a new series of fantastic charges against the leaders of the Rank & File Caucus, or a breast-beating confession by a CP stooge who joined the caucus for the express purpose of confessing three months later.

In line with their present policy, the "hacks" aboard the various ships, to prove their super militancy, call for the most adventurist actions which they choose to refer to as "job action." This is pure hokum of course since in MOST cases the Stalinists, so hell bent on showing off their new line, build these "actions" around beefs that are not genuine, or insignificant.

(Continued on page 2)

Nationwide Union Support For UAW Strikers Can Break Government-Boss Offensive

By WALTER JASON

Wall Street might well be said to be operating under a new slogan, "Two down and one to go," for its government in Washington broke the coal strike and the threatened railroad strike by means of governmental injunctions.

The "one to go" is the UAW-CIO, America's most aggressive and democratic union, with an excellent tradition of spearheading the labor movement ever since its great sit-down strikes built the CIO in 1936 and 1937.

Wall Street made a fool out of Philip Murray, CIO president. The steelworkers got nothing in their negotiations and Murray capitulated, fearful of taking on the vast struggle indicated by

Union Announces Plans to Strike General Motors

DETROIT, May 17—The UAW-CIO today announced it would summon 225,000 General Motors workers to join the strike battle against the auto industry which began with the Chrysler walk-out.

"Our members will not trespass on GM property after May 28," said T. A. Johnstone, acting director of the GM department of the UAW-CIO, in the absence of Walter F. Reuther, UAW-CIO president.

This public announcement came after a meeting of the top policy committee of the union in Detroit today. It was in line with the report Emil Mazey, acting president of the UAW-CIO, gave to Chrysler delegates last week.

The significance of this move is two-fold. It is part of the overall strategy of the UAW-CIO leadership to bring the full economic power of the 900,000 members behind the wage drive, and it is a fitting answer to those critics within the union who have been claiming that the Reuther leadership intended to make "guinea pigs" of the Chrysler workers. The Stalinists and their allies had little to say on this score today.

The inevitable skirmishes between cops and pickets began this week, when pickets tried to block a police attempt to help some hourly-rated employees enter the Highland park plant of Chrysler. After a slight scuffle, police officials called for state intervention, and Governor Sigler responded eagerly, so that state police already are on the scene. Since Highland Park is a separate city, with its own police department, Police Commissioner Toy of Detroit was unable to bring his "riot squads" into action.

The mood of the UAW-CIO ranks (Continued on page 2)

Murray's "No Strike" Deal Backfires on Steelworkers

By ANNE RUSSELL

The steel industry has just cut the price of steel \$1.25 a ton and, thus, it claims, started the fight against inflation. Only the steel industry would try to get away with such a transparent maneuver. Make the steel big enough, is their motto, and you can get away with it.

They have just banged the door hard in the face of the Steel Workers Union, which reopened its two-year contract and requested wage increases to meet rising living costs. Very impolitely, the steel companies said nothing doing; and very politely, Steel Workers' President Philip Murray replied that the union will abide by its contract and not strike. The steel workers last got an increase in April 1947, when the contract was signed, and under this procedure will have to wait until 1949 before any relief from skyrocketing prices.

In a grandstand gesture to enlist public support for the industry's stand, the United States Steel Corporation proclaimed that it was cutting the price of steel \$1.25 a ton; they were going to take the lead in

the long overdue battle against inflation; and they would set the pace by this price cut. Soon after General Electric and Westinghouse Electric jumped on the bandwagon; they too would cut prices on their products and would oppose the wage demands of the United Electrical Workers (CIO) as "inflationary."

These events raise important questions for the entire union movement. Does the American labor movement continue to retreat under the blows of Wall Street and its Washington administration? Does the American working class continue to bear the brunt of inflation and the high taxes for government expenditures in war preparation? When does the retreat turn into a counter-offensive?

Within the framework of this increasing triumph of reaction, in which the labor movement retreats and retreats, one major CIO union has just begun to fight. It is the UAW-CIO.

GM IS NEXT

The UAW-CIO leadership and ranks could not, by their whole history, just go along with the wage freeze policy that has been imposed on the Steelworkers. The UAW-CIO could not be intimidated by the retreats and defeats elsewhere. When Chrysler Corporation tried to follow the steel pattern and said "No" to all UAW-CIO demands, the workers responded readily to the union's call for strike action.

But this is just the beginning of the struggle. Chrysler Corporation provoked the walkout. It turned down all union demands, because its Wall Street owners want to test the UAW-CIO to see if it can be weakened or destroyed during the course of the strike struggle.

General Motors is next. GM has taken the same adamant attitude toward the union as Chrysler. Among the rank and file GM workers the (Continued on page 2)

AN EDITORIAL ON THE SITUATION IN PALESTINE

War of Independence or Expansion?

All UN roads lead to war. This is again being demonstrated in Palestine.

The UN, set up with fanfare to bring peace to the world, is again showing that it cannot prevent or halt war even by fifth-rate powers, such as the states of the Middle East—let alone war by the major warmakers who control its deliberations.

Cannot? The Anglo-American leadership of the UN has proved that it has no wish to do so. If the U. S. and Britain had deliberately set out to fan the flames of Jewish-Arab hostility, they need not have acted differently.

Compelled by the falling apart of the British Empire to recognize the independence of Palestine on paper, the UN drew a braided line through that tortured country of mingled nationality, erecting a state-boundary wall between already suspicious and jealous peoples. The Jews were assured of a state of their own—a state completely outfitted with salients, corridors, enclaves and angles sticking into the sides of the surrounding Arab world, with military lines

athwart each other and commercial routes interpenetrating. The Jews cheered.

Then Washington ran out on its own partition plan, and the Arab leaders in turn were encouraged to proceed with their plans to enforce a Pan-Arab Palestine by force of arms in the interests of reactionary Arab landlordism. When this had already gone virtually to the point of invasion, the White House flip-flopped, backtracked and reversed gear again in a precipitous recognition of the new Jewish state of Israel, again encouraging the Jews.

If meanwhile the British line was more consistent, it was more consistently directed toward fomenting the Pan-Arab reaction against the partition.

TOGETHER—AGAINST IMPERIALISTS!

As long as the two peoples can thus be "sliced" against each other, the shadow of imperialist domination does not leave the scene. This is the end of UN policy.

If there is to be peace at the eastern end of

the Mediterranean, and if the Jews and Arabs are to live in fraternal unity, no one can look toward the United Nations or to American and British imperialism to bring this about. If there is to be peace, it has to be made by the peoples.

LABOR ACTION has made clear its belief that the partition of Palestine into two non-viable states was not calculated to achieve any real solution of the Palestine question, and cannot. We have reiterated that, before partition, the road to a basic solution lay only in the joint struggle by the socialist workers of the Jewish community together with the oppressed peasant masses of the Arabs to throw off the yoke of their common oppressor—BRITISH IMPERIALISM, based on the two ruling classes, Arab landlords and Zionist capitalists; and such Arab-Jewish cooperation from below COULD HAVE forged a united Palestine in the fire of anti-imperialist struggle.

Now that partition is virtually an accomplished fact, this basic road only takes a different form.

(Continued on page 3 in edit. column)

No one falls for the double-talk that this cut will reduce prices—least of all the company itself despite its full-page ads to the contrary. When (Continued on page 4)

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Union Ranks Set to Beat Chrysler

DETROIT, Mich.—The first week of the Chrysler strike was marked by the splendid job the rank and file did in closing down the plants, and establishing mass picket lines.

In spite of the inevitable minor mistakes made in handling the walk-out and organization of the strike, the big event was a real success. The power of the UAW-CIO was demonstrated in no uncertain fashion. Chrysler is not going to produce any cars during this strike.

Although the Chrysler delegate conference voted unanimously to shut everything down, the fact is that some local unions permitted office-workers to enter the plant, and this created some confusion.

Since officeworkers don't and can't build cars, this hardly affected the decisive aspects of the walk-out. And since the officeworkers in those plants like Dodge did get the pay-roll out, many workers were well satisfied, for they got their checks on Friday.

At Local 7, in the main Chrysler plants, the union had convinced the officeworkers to go out on strike simultaneously. It was a good manifestation of class solidarity. However, it also meant the members of Local 7 did not get paid on Friday, and this created some resentment. So the local union is trying to negotiate with the corporation for the payment of the Chrysler workers.

The fact is that the whole situation arose from the failure of the local

union leaderships to follow the decision they unanimously adopted. Local 7 was left holding the bag. Those kind of mistakes can and must be eliminated.

THREATEN INJUNCTION

Chrysler has utilized the confusion over the officeworkers to rush into court and get an injunction restraining mass picketing. A Macomb county judge, adjoining Detroit, granted an injunction affecting the pickets at Mound Road plant.

Of course, the UAW-CIO members, with their vast strike experience, understand and expect these kind of strike-breaking moves from the courts and government controlled by the auto industry.

The purpose of this kind of injunction is to irritate and to attempt to demoralize the strikers. The result is more likely to produce the opposite effect. It simply serves to teach more workers the nature of the forces opposing them, be it the companies or their government.

Last Friday, Chrysler ordered all its foremen to report to the Jefferson and Kercheval plants, for example, to get their pay. Police Commissioner Toy, the labor-baiter, had his "riot squad" poised for action, and Chrysler wanted a fight so it could rush into court and get an injunction in Detroit affecting all its main plants.

The UAW-CIO did not fall for the provocation. Enough pressure was put

on the foremen by the mass pickets so that only a handful walked through the lines. Then, when Toy and company hoped to start something, the union announced it would let in the other foremen, who had demonstrated they didn't want to walk through any picket lines, to get their pay. The "crisis" was solved.

There will be more provocations. The whole purpose is to get the UAW-CIO involved in endless injunction fights, and legal tangles. However, as long as the production workers stick solidly together, Chrysler won't build cars, injunctions or no injunctions, and that is the economic pressure which the UAW-CIO can always maintain.

UNION NOT SCARED

No sooner had the strike begun than Governor Sigler, and local officials tried to get each other to start criminal proceedings against the UAW-CIO under the Bonine-Tripp law in Michigan. At first none of the officials was anxious to openly take a strike-breaking role. But the auto manufacturers put the pressure on, so that this week some legal action against the UAW-CIO is expected.

The UAW-CIO leadership headed by Emil Mazey has taken a good position on this problem. They aren't scared. Quite the contrary. At the Chrysler delegate conference last Tuesday night where the walk-out was again ratified, Mazey gave the

delegates a real hard-hitting speech, that put some pep into the secondary leaders from some of the locals. Only now are some of them beginning to realize the serious character of this strike. It is a real fight, and to the finish.

Over 100,000 other autoworkers will be affected within a month by the Chrysler strike, for these "feeder plants" send most of their production to Chrysler. Involving them in the strike, like Briggs 212 has become, would strengthen the walk-out and develop the solid spirit in the entire UAW-CIO that is required for victory.

Strike Leader



EMIL MAZEY

Labor Notes From The West Coast

By WILLIAM BARTON

OAKLAND, Calif., May 14—The activity of the labor movement on the West Coast has in recent weeks been overshadowed by more important events in other parts of the country. But all is not quiet. The CIO's Food, Tobacco and Agricultural Workers' Local in the San Francisco area. This anti-union action in the midst of a wage drive will probably be met by almost complete resistance of the local's membership, including its anti-Stalinist elements.

A more fantastic incident has been very injurious to the East Bay Area labor movement, still riding high from last year's general strike. John Fernandez, president of UAW-CIO Local 76, hoping to put himself in the spotlight like his International President, Walter Reuther, publicized that his car had been tampered with as part of an attempt upon his life, then admitted that he had done it all himself. He has already been fined \$25 by the Oakland courts for his antics, and many members of his own local are violently mad.

The strike of International Association of Machinists, and several AFL Molders' and Boilermakers' locals, with the central demand for wage increases for machinists in the San Francisco Bay Area, shows little sign of any immediate termination after six weeks. Several smaller shops have substantially agreed to the unions' terms, but the larger plants are still offering about half of the workers' wage demands. In Seattle, the striking mechanics at Boeing Aircraft find themselves up, against the type of adamant attitude on the part of employers that has recently become very typical.

However, the biggest blow-off may come on the waterfront next month. The contract between the shipowners and most CIO waterfront unions expires on June 15. Many issues are in question, including wage increases. But the important battle is likely to be over the employers' attempt to whittle down union control over hiring hall, won after long and bitter struggle in 1945 and 1936.

A vote of longshore members of the CIO Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, decisive unit of CIO maritime workers on the Coast, has decisively approved strike action. The Union's Ship Clerks have also voted in favor of a strike, while other maritime organizations are in the process of taking their strike vote.

Although the union movement in this section is faced by a stubborn and prepared capitalist class, an equally serious danger comes from within the labor movement itself. The AFL Teamsters have started one

of their typical raid attempts against the CIO Warehousemen, whose contracts are not up for renegotiation but who are pressing for wage increases. The teamsters are using a "patriotic" appeal to garner workers from the Stalinist-led Local 6 of the ILWU, leading CIO Warehousemen's local in the San Francisco area. This anti-union action in the midst of a wage drive will probably be met by almost complete resistance of the local's membership, including its anti-Stalinist elements.

A more fantastic incident has been very injurious to the East Bay Area labor movement, still riding high from last year's general strike. John Fernandez, president of UAW-CIO Local 76, hoping to put himself in the spotlight like his International President, Walter Reuther, publicized that his car had been tampered with as part of an attempt upon his life, then admitted that he had done it all himself. He has already been fined \$25 by the Oakland courts for his antics, and many members of his own local are violently mad.

Stalinists Face Defeat —

(Continued from page 1)

actions—have not been given the floor at ship meetings to express their point of view. There have been "actions" pulled recently on the S/S Argentina and the S/S Washington where the men were won over to a policy proposed by the "hacks" on the ships, of not signing on the vessels until the beefs were settled. The crew voted to do so. A few days later the Stalinist port officials urged the crews to sign on, without having anything settled, but with the loss of a few days' pay for hundreds of men. They then told the membership that only because their is "no unity" in the union was the beef not won! This, of course, also proves that the Rank & File Caucus are the "agents of the shipowners and supported by them."

LIE TO NEGROES
Perhaps the most disheartening thing in this fight is the effects of the CP campaign on the vast majority of Negroes in the union.

The CP accuses the leadership of the Rank & File Caucus of wanting to make a lily white organization of the NMU. The leaders aren't accused of this openly—since this would be smashed to bits. Men like Curran, Stone, Lawrence, etc., all Rank & File, have since the union's inception, been in the forefront of the fight against Jim Crow. They have helped establish the policy of no segregation and no discrimination in the NMU. This is all done via the famous organized whisper campaign... Where they think it will work, they tell Negroes that this word "Caucus" comes from "caucasian." The many Negroes on the Rank & File slate are denounced as "Uncle Toms" and as a cover for "Jim Crow."

The effect of these enormous lies repeated so often to Negroes in a union whose very foundation rests on the unity of black and white, has been either to win them over to voting the CP slate or neutralizing them into a state of fatalistic demoralization. Many Negroes have separated themselves from all whites in the union. Garveyite ideas have made much headway among others. A few, but unfortunately a small minority, have recognized these lies and slanders for what they are. Why? Again because the CP has been for years and still is the apparatus. The apparatus speaks these things—so, some seamen reason, "perhaps there is more than a grain of truth in all that!"

What will happen? Of course this attitude among the Negro members will disappear when the elections are over, with the Stalinists out of office and the NMU continuing on the path it has been traveling since it started, in 1937. Only this time, the NMU will be freed of the parasitic gang that has kept it from being the unifier of all maritime labor.

Will You Now Stop Draining Ours, Mister?
"Wall Street to have own blood bank." A. P. dispatch.

Well, What-Do-You Know?
"Banker puts faith in sound credit." Headline in N. Y. Times.

Subscribers — Attention!
Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

12-21
If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW
EXTEND YOUR SUB

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL

Six months (26 issues) at \$6.00.
 One year (52 issues) at \$11.00.

NAME _____ (please print)

ADDRESS _____ APT. _____

CITY _____ ZONE _____ STATE _____

Bill me Payment enclosed (Stamps, currency or Postal Note)

UAW Leads Key Fight —

(Continued from page 1)

response is already indicated by the strike votes that are now being completed. The UAW-CIO leadership expects a hard fight in GM, according to Emil Mazey, acting president of the union, in his speech to the Chrysler delegate conference Tuesday night May 11.

On Sunday, May 16, the Ford Motor Company added its weight to the Wall Street campaign. In reply to union demands for wage increases and other concessions, the Ford Motor Company insolently proposed wage cuts and the introduction of piecework.

The spectacle of a billion dollar corporation making millions of dollars in a period of inflation and demanding that the union permit a cut in wages is something that should give every union man and woman pause for thinking. Such arrogance on the part of the corporation can be explained only as Ford's way of informing the world that this giant corporation will do its part in Wall Street's anti-labor campaign.

The insulting character of the Ford corporation's proposals is emphasized by the fact that this corporation claims it wants to lower wages so it can give "the public a break," when every ten-year-old child knows that Ford just raised its prices on all 1949 models by hundreds of dollars.

WAR AGAINST LABOR

The united front of Chrysler, GM and Ford should serve as a warning to all UAW-CIO members. It signifies that the auto barons are united in their determination to defeat the UAW-CIO. Victory over the UAW-CIO would be a decisive one over the entire labor movement precisely because of the militant tradition of this great industrial union.

All these events testify to the fundamental fact that Wall Street is fighting a class war against labor. Wall Street is class conscious. The capitalists know what they want. They are united. The next main battlefield is the auto industry, and this is the challenge before the UAW-CIO and the whole labor movement.

Study these excerpts from a letter sent to all employers by Earl Bunting, chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers. Read them and reread them. For they indicate the kind of struggle ahead:

"These Socialistic windbags and Leftwingers of the labor unions are obsessed with a bitter hatred of private business. They care nothing about the fact that salaries and wages

do not depend on arbitrary decision. They care nothing about the fact that the consumer is the lifeblood of business. They care nothing if your business is doomed—if its operation brings losses only. What these spellbinders do want is to strike down property rights to the level of Socialism....

"So I say, let's turn on the heat and go to bat, let's defend your rights and mine—rights to make a profit—rights to manage our own business.

Not This Way

Fostering illusions about the nature and character of the strike struggle ahead serves only to disorient the workers. Let's hope the UAW-CIO leadership cuts out sending out any more nonsense like the following quotation from a press release of the UAW-CIO Public Relations department:

"The strike of the Chrysler workers is a fight to prevent American so-called free enterprise from committing suicide by a conspiracy to starve its own customers."

Wall Street has shown that it is entirely capable of handling its own class interests without any advice of would be saviors among the labor leaders. It is time to put the concern of the American working class first, last and always.

Let us go all out in these crucial months ahead with the utmost expenditures of energy and manpower and purpose, before the public, showing up those who would destroy our free economy in their true blood red color....

In event some union member does not know whom the NAM means by "Socialistic windbags," we must remind you that it is the Reuther leadership of the UAW-CIO.

The Wall Street campaign against labor is easy to see and its mode of operation is crystal clear. It expects and will get full support from its government in Washington. It has the newspapers, the radio and other means of propaganda to use against the workers.

HURT BY DISUNITY

What about the labor movement? It is a tragic fact that labor has seldom been as divided as it is today. Not only are the CIO and AFL and the railroad brotherhoods separate organizations, and that is bad enough. The fact of the matter is that even the CIO is not united. Philip Murray and the steelworkers union let down the UAW-CIO. The Stalinist-dominated UE-CIO leadership is hardly on speaking terms with other CIO leaders. The most elementary strike strategy demands unity of forces and purpose. The UAW-CIO by itself cannot whip Wall Street, although it did and will put up a terrific struggle. Against a united capitalist class there must be a united labor movement. Extending the strike of the Chrysler workers will not answer the question. It will serve primarily to throw the additional forces

of the UAW-CIO into the struggle.

But what is a far greater need is that the entire CIO throw its resources into this struggle. The coal miners had a nationwide strike but a government injunction stopped it. The railroad workers threatened a nationwide strike. The government injunction stopped it. The UAW-CIO can and might in the course of a period of time find itself in a general strike. This just begins the struggle. It does not end it. Only the unity of the entire labor movement behind the struggle assures victory for the UAW-CIO and the union movement as a whole.

To outline the coming struggles and the problems involved indicates what progressive unions throughout the nation must demand and fight for. Strike struggles, especially when they concern a powerful union like the UAW-CIO, cannot be lost on the picket lines. They are lost in conferences in Washington and in courtrooms or by the failure of the union movement to stand solidly behind a great strike struggle.

Neither John L. Lewis by himself nor Walter Reuther nor Philip Murray nor any other leader can hope in this period to defeat the united Wall Street even in an elementary economic struggle. United action, UNITED STRATEGY and a recognition that this is a class struggle in which either Wall Street or labor will triumph are indispensable prerequisites to victory.

In the final analysis, this is the responsibility of the ranks—of every one of us in the shops. We must DEMAND the immediate convocation of local and national inter-union conferences at which our actions can be combined, our joint strategy planned. We must raise this DEMAND at every local meeting!

Fisher Body Votes to Strike

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND, May 16—At a special meeting held Sunday, May 16, Fisher Body Local 45, UAW-CIO, voted overwhelmingly in favor of strike action, if necessary, to back up the United Auto Workers in their demands on General Motors Corp. This vote was made necessary by the refusal of GM to concede even one single point in close to two months of top negotiations.

With the GM contract expiring at the end of April, the Auto Workers presented their demands for a new contract. Among the things asked for were a 25.1 cent an hour wage increase to meet the increased cost of living (up to 10 cents of this to be applied to a pension plan if one could be worked out), improved vacation plan, increased social security, a real stewards system, guaranteed 40 hour work week, union shop, and pensions. These are the things the auto workers need and deserve. Against them can be matched the \$600,000,000 profits of General Motors for 1947, with the first quarter of 1948 giving this corporation the highest income on record for any quarter in its history.

As union statisticians have shown time after time, GM could meet the demands of the UAW and still have profits for the coupon clippers and brass hats of industry. However the negotiators for the company haven't budged an inch in spite of endless meetings. Instead GM has countered with proposals to weaken the union

and prevent much needed wage increases.

Fisher Body workers in Cleveland remember the long strike in 1945-6, when they were out six months. At that time they stayed out after most GM workers went back to work, over the issue of piece-work. That strike wiped out the workers' savings and put them in debt. Since that time irregular work weeks and sky rocketing prices have combined to keep them living at an unsatisfactory level. The prospect of another strike does not make them happy, and many in the shop have expressed opposition to such action. Up to this week-end the leadership has failed to present the issues to the workers in such a way as to arouse the militancy they have displayed in the past. At today's membership meeting, which was very well attended, it was shown that the union demands were just the corporation was able to meet these demands, but absolutely refused to grant anything. Faced with this situation, what was left to be done? There could be no other answer. Not a single member spoke against authorizing strike action, and the vote was about 870 for and 60 against.

This does not mean that there will be a strike for sure. However, if General Motors continues its obstinate stand, there is nothing left for GM workers from coast to coast to do but to shut down the factories to enforce their just demands.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The current New International carries special articles on the Czech events. Order your copy now from NI, 4 Court Sq., Long Island City 1, N. Y.

GM Strike—

(Continued from page 1)

was indicated both by these events, and the kind of support the Chrysler workers are getting. Ford Local 600 voted \$125,000 to the Chrysler strike fund.

In GM plants, the strike vote returns indicate a strong strike sentiment, and the UAW-CIO is moving forward to a full dress showdown with the auto barons.

The GM contract expired last month, and the one month extension ends on May 28. Johnstone has already expressed himself as being for a "no-contract, no work," policy.

Resentment in the Ford plants over the company proposal to cut wages has already led to strike talk in those shops. Negotiations between Ford and the UAW-CIO begin on June 1.

Editorials

Independence Or Expansion? --

(Continued from page 1)

There is a war on—not yet full-scale war as this is written, but not far from it. The socialist working class of the Jewish territory has chosen to follow its Zionist leadership in achieving a separate state. As Marxist socialists—that is, as the only consistent democrats—we believe in and accept the democratic RIGHT of all peoples (including the Palestinian Jews) to self-determination, to work out their own destiny as they see fit. We said this even while advising against the EXERCISE of this right to the point of separation.

The politics from which the Pan-Arab war and threats of invasion flow is perfectly clear—the aim of depriving the Jews precisely of this RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION. There is therefore not the slightest iota of common ground between the Arab landlords' opposition to partition and our own. While we are more firmly than ever of the opinion that the Jews' choice of separatism was a mistake and a setback for the only long-range solution, we believe that the imposition of "unity" upon Palestine by Abdullah, the Mufti or the Arab League would be a reactionary solution even more disastrous in its consequences AND A VIOLATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS OF PEOPLES.

STRUGGLE ENTERS A NEW STAGE

To recognize the RIGHT of the Jews to self-determination, if it is not merely to be a pious obeisance to a formula, requires socialists also to recognize the right of the Jews to DEFEND their choice of separate national existence against any and all reactionary attempts to deprive them of that right, whether by Arab feudal lords or UN imperialism. That is why we demanded recognition of Israel by the government, and why our British comrades particularly must demand similar action by the Labor government—as the concretization of the demand that the imperialists keep out. That is why we demand the lifting of the imperialist embargo on arms to the new Jewish state.

But the defense of Israel's right of self-determination against a reactionary war of invasion is only one side of the picture. Surely even the Zionist leaders do not believe that the "Palestine question" will be over if only Abdullah stops short of Israel's borders! On the contrary, it only enters a new stage. On the one hand, the Jews face the possibility of permanent guerrilla warfare, unending "border incidents," and above all, such permanent national hostility with the Arab world as would make national existence a nightmare for the Jewish splinter state. On the other hand, the unreproved demands by the Irgun and Stern gang for the conquest of all of Palestine raises the same question of future relations. For the socialist working class of Palestine that question is posed in terms of the present struggle as follows:

ARE THE JEWS—SOCIALIST WORKERS IN THEIR MAJORITY—TO WAGE A WAR OF NATIONALIST EXPANSIONISM, OR A REVOLUTIONARY WAR FOR THE REUNIFICATION OF PALESTINE FROM BELOW AGAINST BOTH THE JEWISH AND ARAB RULING CLASSES?

Today their struggle is a war of defense in the immediate circumstances. But tomorrow their struggle will inescapably be transformed into one or the other! It is to this question—what kind of policy do we advocate now for the Jews in Palestine in order to bring about the reunification of the country—that we recur next week.

Let Us Get Started Now!

Our readers know that we have been more than critical of the stand taken by the leadership of the United Automobile Workers Union for independent political action AFTER 1948. Where some readers have argued that we should have taken the statement of the UAW executive board at its face value, whatever its limitations, and hailed it as a step forward, we have subjected it to severest criticism as representing in the circumstances an evasion of political action now on the promise of doing something in the future. We have insisted that the time for such action is NOW and that promissory notes are, in the situation, more than a little suspect, even if the UAW leaders are more to be trusted in this respect than some other labor leaders who have found it expedient to mouth out a few sufficiently vague promises for the future.

There was no reason to delay action which is mandatory for the American working class. No other need is as basic, at the moment, to labor's future as independent political action, as a

labor party. However, it must be recognized that precious weeks and months have been lost. It is admittedly too late to put a national labor party in the field for the 1948 elections. But there are at least two things that can be done, that have to be done, immediately.

1. Put local LABOR PARTY candidates in the field for whatever post or posts seem suitable to the local situation—congressman, mayor, governor, councilman, anything—and call upon labor to vote for these EXCLUSIVELY.

2. Prepare NOW for the labor party that is promised LATER.

The first of these requires, we think, little argument. The possibilities in any given city or state are known. In some cases it ought to be possible to contest almost the entire slate of candidates. In a city like Detroit, where the UAW IS the labor movement, it requires only will to enter the elections independently and vigorously. The same holds for other cities in one degree or another. Pittsburgh means steel, and steel means steelworkers who are organized in a powerful union. It matters little for the present whether the number of candidates we put forward is one or one hundred, so long as it is clear that this candidate or these candidates are labor's and so long as, in calling upon workers to vote for them, we refuse to vote for any candidates of the Democratic, Republican or Wallace-Stalinist parties.

The second, we believe, is virtually self-evident. A labor party, based upon the unions and seeking to lead the people of the United States, cannot be built overnight. It cannot be ordered into existence. Its organization as a powerful national instrument of the American working class demands careful planning and consistent effort. In short, it demands considerably more than promises.

At some time a labor party will develop. Impelled by the initiative of a strong and courageous union, it can be speeded into existence. That is why we address ourselves to the UAW so frequently on this issue, although it is as much the need and responsibility of the steel worker, the packinghouse worker, as the auto worker. The UAW membership has on numerous occasions demonstrated that it is in advance of other sections of the labor movement. There is an active political interest among the ranks of the UAW, an alertness towards the broad problems of the American people. At least one leader of the union, Emil Mazy, is publicly committed to advocacy of a labor party. While the heads of other unions refuse to do so much as breathe the possibility of independent political action, the UAW leaders at least make promises, and that's something. Altogether, we think this reflects the temper of the militants in the UAW. Hence we feel ourselves justified in asking UAW militants specifically to raise the issue and push it forward.

Promises have been made. Very well. Let us ask token payments on those promises now! Postponing action until 1949 is a scandalous evasion of labor's needs today. But suppose we leave that aside. If we are to have our independent political action, our labor party, in 1949, it must be prepared in 1948. We can start on the groundwork immediately.

Concretely, what argument can be made against assembling local conferences at once to consider the necessity of a labor party? Concretely, what argument can be made against planning for a national conference, to meet, let us say, at about the time the UAW convention meets in the fall? No argument—that is, no argument can be made against these propositions by anyone who professes to believe in a labor party or independent political action.

We see no reason for pussyfooting, or suicidal politeness. Promises have been made. The union membership has every right to demand that an earnest of intentions be offered forthwith. Else what proved to be too late for 1948 will prove to be too late for 1949, for 1950, 1951 and 1952.

The point is: let's start now! Let us propose that unions be called to local conference to plan a national conference at which a program will be drafted and final plans made to launch the labor party.

Let us make this an issue in our unions today. Let us especially at our UAW local meetings call upon the UAW leadership to start the ball rolling!

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism
Published Weekly by the
Labor Action Publishing Co.
114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.
General Offices: 4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel: IRonsides 6-5117

Vol. 12, No. 21 May 24, 1948
Emanuel Garrett, Editor
Editorial Board:
Hal Draper, Henry Judd
Business Manager: Paul Bern

Subscription Rates: \$1.00 a Year; 50¢ for 6 Mos.
\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada, 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, 1874.

WORLD POLITICS

Stalin-Truman Notes & Peace:

Of far greater importance than the question of who won the now-concluded Battle of Diplomatic Notes between Washington and Moscow—and whether Molotov was guilty or innocent of a breach of diplomatic "courtesy" in revealing Ambassador Smith's letter—is the profound reaction this event had among the masses of people everywhere. Perhaps nothing has served better to illustrate the understanding prevalent everywhere that the problem of war or peace is, in essence, the problem of the struggle between the two great world rivals, American and Russian imperialism; as well as the universal longing and desire for an end to the present uncertainty and the assurance of real peace.

The eagerness, almost pathetic and deeply emotional, with which great masses of people seized upon these notes and wove into their contents their own desires and wishes is a reaction that socialists everywhere must understand and make use of to the full. From Moscow, the UP reported how "Russians crowded five and six deep in front of newspaper bulletin boards..." Workers, mothers with children, army officers read the dispatches and then, "As they read, they nudged each other, and made such comments as: 'Good, huh? Good!' For the first time in months, many of them beamed at those among them who obviously were foreigners." Another source reports how, "For twenty-four hours people on both sides of the Iron Curtain in Europe breathed more easily at this faint hint in days of mounting tension of relief from the haunting fear of war."

The same reactions were prevalent in America and are familiar to all of us. The slightest possibility of a relaxing of the calculated strain between the two monsters was seized upon everywhere as an opportunity for hope and rejoicing. As we all know, within twenty-four hours this had all ended, dashed to bits on the sharp rocks of Washington and the Kremlin and the vicious words of Molotov, Truman, Marshall and company. Since that moment, the great issue—so far as the press is concerned—has been, who "won"? Meanwhile, the rapidly dwindling interest in the entire matter is passing away and soon "normal" relations of struggle and strain will return.

STALIN WINS PROPAGANDA BATTLE

It is not difficult to reply to the question, "who won?" Strictly on the propaganda front, Stalinism scored a victory as should be obvious to all. Surely President Truman outdid himself in this turn. Impulsively launching an ambiguously worded note on the sea of diplomatic conflict, he gave the shrewd diplomats of the Kremlin an opportunity to launch a campaign for settlement of the basic issues that divide the two great Powers precisely at a moment when American imperialism has not the slightest desire or interest to make a deal! "The Soviet Government . . . is in agreement with the proposal to begin . . . discussion and settlement of the differences between us," said Mr. Molotov in reply to Mr. Smith's remark that, "So far as the United States is concerned, the door is always open for full discussion and the composing of our differences." All the ludicrous protests that Molotov "revealed" a diplomatic note will not do away with the fact that his proposal to discuss put Truman strictly on the spot and smack up against the wall.

Blunderer Truman, of course, spent the next few days explaining that no invitation for a conference was intended, that nothing had changed and that the note was not a bid (who knows what it was?). Simultaneously, the consternation created by this secret action in the capitals of the 16 Marshall Plan nations had to be calmed down. But the world Stalinist press, with its gang of

fellow travellers, was furiously at work claiming that Russia, which wanted to talk peace, had been repulsed by a belligerent American administration. Meanwhile, a tentative and temporary settlement was not one bit closer than before.

It is difficult to imagine what Truman had in mind in launching his note. American imperialism is, at the moment, on the offensive everywhere. It has begun operation of its Marshall Plan, and is feverishly rebuilding its military forces while preparing for military guarantees to Western Europe. At the moment, it desires no relaxing of the tension but, on the contrary, hopes to drive Stalinism still further back behind the Curtain by screwing up its pressures on all fronts—economic in Western Europe, military in Greece and China, etc. It wants no negotiations, none. Only an examination of the mind of Truman and his "advisors" might provide an explanation to why Stalin was handed this propaganda gift.

THEY CANNOT BRING PEACE

Part of the motivation behind the Kremlin's eager acceptance of this gift is obvious and has already been stated. A fool—who Stalin is not—would have grasped the chance. But there are other motives. There is little doubt that the Kremlin, at the moment, is willing and ready to negotiate. There are many reasons why this is true. Stalin would be quite willing to sit down and work out a deal with American imperialism. How long it would last—in fact, whether one could even be worked out—is beside the point.

Right now, Moscow is consolidating behind the Curtain. A part, an important part, of this process is the upbuilding of these areas industrially and economically, in accord with Russian plans, of course. A successful deal with America, from Stalin's viewpoint, would involve recognition of the Kremlin's hegemony over Eastern Europe and the Balkans—acceptance by America of a division of Europe into twain, such as Wallace now advocates. Secondly, once this division is agreed to, Stalin would like the resumption of greatest Eastern and Western Europe trading and commerce, above all to get capital goods for the occupied lands.

Likewise, all reports make it clear that internal Russian economic life is not going too well. Machinery and capital goods, above all, are needed. Now that the Marshall Plan has become a fact in Western Europe, why should not Stalin offer to trade a quiescent attitude on the part of his Stalinist parties in Italy, France, etc., in exchange, let us say, for several billions of long-term American loans? Why not? The struggle between these two imperialist rivals in Europe, as elsewhere, will assume more and more a struggle of production, productivity, for the next period—in preparation for the next military and political battles. Thus it seems to us that Stalin would be far from adverse to a serious and very concrete discussion with Truman. That it shall not happen today is clear. But tomorrow? The basis for a temporary agreement definitely does exist.

Would it last, even if worked out? Would it mean peace? Of course not. Great masses might hail such an arrangement as meaning "final peace," in their illusory hope and yearning, but it would not endure. The basic political slogan of LABOR ACTION—"Neither Washington nor Moscow"—has no meaning if it does not teach us that neither of the great rivals will bring anything but war, ultimately, and constant tension, currently. The great peace and anti-war potentiality whose existence is so obvious, must be directed into independent paths that lead away from Stalinism and American capitalism; to self-reliance rather than dependence upon diplomatic soundbells and double-talkers.

Henry JUDD

Books You Should Know...

THREE PAMPHLETS BY LEON TROTSKY. Available through LABOR ACTION Book Service.

By ABE STEIN

A tireless fighter in the cause of the socialist revolution, Leon Trotsky fused his rich talents as a thinker, writer and orator and forged a uniquely persuasive and powerful weapon. Trotsky's many pamphlets are sparks from this sword. Though each one was written for some specific occasion, they have exceptional value for us because Trotsky's genius for compression enabled him to place the problem of the moment in its proper historical setting and resolve it in terms of the revolutionary struggle. What Trotsky said on the 20th anniversary of the Communist Manifesto applies to his own work: it "astounds us . . . by its freshness."

As a matter of fact, Trotsky's pamphlet on the Communist Manifesto serves as illustration. Trotsky penned his thoughts on the Manifesto for a significant and happy occasion, the first Afrikaans edition of the Manifesto issued by our Fourth International comrades in 1937. He did not limit himself to a perfunctory tribute. He subjected the Manifesto to critical review.

In the essence of the matter, Trotsky insists, history has proved Marx

and re-affirms the Manifesto's analysis of capitalist society, its inevitable decline, the nature of the capitalist state, the historical role of the working-class and the international character of the proletarian revolution. What Trotsky has to say on the deficiencies, omissions, "errors" and the out-moded sections of the Manifesto we leave to the reader to discover for himself. Needless to say, Marx and Engels would have approved of Trotsky's critical approach, since his aim, unlike the swarm of revisionists, is not to blunt the revolutionary edge of this work, but to give it greater contemporary sharpness.

Another pamphlet which is a marvel of compression and generality is Trotsky's pamphlet on the Russian Revolution, originally delivered as a lecture to an audience of Social Democratic students in Copenhagen in 1932. For those who lack access to Trotsky's "History of the Russian Revolution," this summary outline is indispensable. Every aspect of the Russian Revolution, from its social origins, through the taking of power, to its decay under the blighting weight of the bureaucracy, is sketched here. Whatever one's disagreement with Trotsky's definition of the Russian state and the role of the bureaucracy after its victory, the theoretical breadth of this pamphlet, its concise treatment of a variety of political questions, give it a value far out of proportion to its 16 pages.

In view of the continuing Stalinist efforts to denigrate Trotsky's character, falsify his ideas and distort his historical role, a pamphlet worth reading now, is Trotsky's speech,

transmitted from Mexico to a New York audience at the time of the Moscow Trials. Called "I Stake MY Life," it is Trotsky's challenge to the Kremlin clique to stand before the bar of progressive humanity and prove the fantastic accusations levelled against him.

Again Trotsky seizes the occasion and sets a particular event, the Moscow Trials, in the proper historical perspective. His brief but searching analysis of the Stalinist bureaucracy, its moral degeneration, and the terrible consequences for the working-class and all mankind if it goes unchecked are put down with passionate intensity. What Trotsky says in this pamphlet is worth quoting as his own answer to the current Stalinist attempt in France to insinuate that Trotsky abandoned the proletarian revolution. We quote: "The Moscow Trials are perpetrated under the banner of Socialism. We will not concede this banner to the masters of falsehood! If our generation 'happens to be too weak to establish socialism over the earth, we will hand the spotless banner down to our children. The struggle which is in the offing transcends by far the importance of individuals, factions and parties. It is the struggle for the future of all mankind."

In his final sentences, we can trace to its source, Trotsky's devotion to the cause of Socialism. "Under all the severe blows of fate, I shall be happy, as in the best days of my youth! Because, my friends, the highest human happiness is not the exploitation of the present but the preparation of the future."

FRENCH COOKING AT ITS BEST!

"A LA BONNE FRANQUETTE"

At the Village Bar & Restaurant
31 Eighth Ave. (Corner Jane St.)

Complete Dinner \$1.25
A la Carte from .90

YOU'LL MEET YOUR FRIENDS THERE!

By JACK RANGER

THE BEST THE SYSTEM CAN OFFER

The workers in the United States have, in the period from 1941 to the present, enjoyed the best that the capitalist system has ever given them or is ever likely to give them. There have been more jobs available than ever before. Money wages have been higher than ever before. More goods have been turned out than ever before.

Yet, just how much better off are we today than we were in 1939?

Let us sit as a jury-and-judge and pass our judgment on what capitalism has to offer us—not in its worst days, not from 1929 to 1939, but in its palmiest days, flushed with war and postwar prosperity.

Today let us receive evidence from one of the journalistic bulwarks of capitalism. Not from the CIO research department, not from socialist archives, but from the U. S. News and World Report, issue of May 7, an article entitled: "End to Easy Raises in Pay: Workers' Gains and Losses." "Pay raises are going to come harder from now on," the article begins. "This is to be true of raises in wage rates and in salaries as well." The remainder of the article is a succinct report of what has happened to various groups of workers since 1939, measured by changes in weekly "real" incomes (that is, wages adjusted for cost-of-living increases, after federal taxes).

WHAT HAPPENED TO WAGES

Here is what the report shows:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WORKERS: Earned \$36.16 in real wages in 1939; earned \$30.35 in real wages in July, 1945; earning \$30.94 in real wages today.

LIGHT AND POWER WORKERS: In 1939, \$34.38; in 1945, \$33.82; today, \$32.26.

RAILROAD WORKERS: In 1939, \$36.17; in 1945, \$34.98; today, \$36.74.

PRINTING AND PUBLISHING WORKERS: In 1939, \$32.42; in 1945, \$31.58; today, \$33.55.

IRON AND STEEL WORKERS: In 1939, \$27.52; in 1945, \$33.88; today, \$31.20.

SCHOOL TEACHERS: In 1939, \$27.64; in 1945, \$26.54; today, 26.41.

RETAIL WORKERS: In 1939, \$21.17; in 1945, \$21.04; today, \$21.10.

AUTOMOBILE WORKERS: In 1939, \$32.91; in 1945, \$35.63; today, \$33.33.

CONSTRUCTION WORKERS: In 1939, \$30.24; in 1945, \$37.00; today, \$35.58.

TEXTILE WORKERS: In 1939, \$16.84; in 1945, \$22.35; today, \$24.83.

SOFT-COAL MINERS: In 1939, \$23.88; in 1945, \$34.07; today, \$40.35.

RETIRED FEDERAL WORKERS ON PENSIONS: In 1939, \$23.01; today, \$16.70.

VETERANS ON COMPENSATION: In 1939, \$23.00; today, \$18.70.

That ends the simple exhibit.

In the light of this evidence, do you believe: "the changes in 'real' take-home pay since the war end have meant only modest gains or actually have brought losses," as observed in U. S. News. "All the strikes and turmoil of the last three years led to a general marking up of price tags, both for wages and salaries and for goods. Yet the net addition to living standards, except for a few groups, was not great."

PROVES NEED OF NEW WEAPONS

In the light of this evidence, do you believe: That the trade union leadership of the United States through its policies has adequately protected the interests of the American working-class?

That if this is the BEST that capitalism has to offer, the capitalist system is worth defending?

That socialism, with its program of collective ownership of the means of production under the democratic control of the workers, and production for use and not for profit, could possibly do worse than capitalism at its best has accomplished?

That the workers can afford to continue their struggle for better living conditions without a new weapon, the national labor party?

It Won't Work, Bud

"It has been said that any economic system can succeed if people have faith in it."—From Trends, April 1948, a bulletin published by the National Association of Manufacturers.

With the Deep Thinkers

"It has been found by the economists that the larger the income of a family the greater is the percentage of its savings out of income."—From Trends, April 1948, a bulletin published by the National Association of manufacturers.

PUBLIC FORUM

The Future of Palestine

SPEAKERS:

HAL DRAPER

Editor of The New Internationalist

ED FINDLEY

Writer for Labor Action

PLACE: Stuyvesant Casino, 140 Second Ave.

TIME: Friday, May 28, 8:00 P. M.

Admission: FIFTY CENTS

Auspices: WORKERS PARTY

THESE BOOKS ARE AVAILABLE THROUGH LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE, 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

and Engels a hundred times right. The materialist conception of history, and its most important postulate, the class-struggle as a key to the understanding of historical development, have withstood the test of events. Indeed, says Trotsky, it is precisely the epoch of Imperialism which brings "all social contradictions to the point of highest tension" and gives the Communist Manifesto "its supreme theoretical triumph."

In like manner Trotsky reviews

The BOOK SERVICE

Now Has These Hard To Get Items:

by Leon Trotsky

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION 10¢
WHITHER FRANCE (Chap I) 10¢
THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO TODAY 10¢
I STAKE MY LIFE 10¢

Above 4 for 30 Cents

MA VIE \$1.50

by T. Cliff

THE MIDDLE EAST AT THE CROSSROADS 10¢

by K. Tilak

THE RISE & FALL OF THE COMINTERN \$1.25

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, New York

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

Mr. Churchill Throws Bouquet To Vyshinsky in His Memoirs

By ERNEST ERBER

(Continued from last week)

It is by now a well known fact that a secret relationship existed between the Reichswehr and the Red Army beginning in 1921. The victorious allies, through the instrument of the League of Nations, had turned revolutionary Russia and defeated Germany into pariah nations. Russia was blocked off from normal diplomatic and economic relations with the rest of the world. Germany was disarmed and forbidden to rearm by the stringent clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. Russia had the freedom to build a strong military machine and had the manpower, but lacked the necessary industry and "know-how." The German general staff could not conduct the experiments necessary to develop their armaments, especially artillery and aviation, on German soil due to Allied controls. The Russian and German army staffs, therefore, came to a secret agreement to supplement each other's needs. The Russians permitted German military men and technicians to work in Russian industries to develop their war material and experiment with it on Russian soil. In exchange, the Germans shared their inventions and developments with the Russian army and trained Russian personnel in its use. The secret understanding was worked out by the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Chicherin, and the German Ambassador at Moscow, Brockdorff-Rantzau. However, its execution was left in the hands of military men like von Seeckt and von Schleicher on the German side and Frenze and Tukachevsky on the Russian side, who operated through an elaborate conspiratorial apparatus to conceal their work from the eyes of French and English spies and German liberals and Social Democrats. (In 1926 the latter created a sensation by a big expose in the Reichstag about the secret shipment of Russian-made bombs to the German army.) It is quite likely that the Berlin-Moscow military liaison was maintained through some third capital, like Prague, in order to hide its tracks. Meetings between Russian and German attaches in Prague would be less likely to be observed than in Berlin.

The Russian and German general staffs had more than technical needs as the basis of their collaboration. Both of them considered Anglo-French imperialism and the network of alliance of small states on the Continent (Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia), as the main enemy. Russian foreign policy proceeded from this point of view from the very beginning and had no fear of Germany except in the event that it fell into the hands of pro-French and pro-English elements. For this reason, the German Social Democracy, with its strong orientation toward the League of Nations was fought as a deadly enemy by the Comintern. The German nationalist politicians and military leaders took their lead from Count Reventlow's dictum that "in domestic affairs Bolshevism is the main enemy; in for-

ign affairs the capitalist of the West." They were willing to teach the Russians how to make the most advanced weapons in return for a share of them for the Reichswehr, even though they knew that the same Soviet ships that unloaded mysterious crates for von Seeckt's agents in Stettin also unloaded similar crates for the secret arsenals of the military apparatus of the German Communist Party.

After the 1923 events, the German revolution receded into the background as a disturbing element in the Reichswehr-Red Army collaboration and the alliance grew ever stronger. However, a new disturbing element arose in the form of Hitler. Unlike the conservative Right, Hitler was not an unequivocally pledged to a war against the West instead of the East. Though Hitler was contemptuous toward the French, he held out an offer of friendship toward England, while speaking about Germany's need for the bread basket of the Ukraine. Following Hitler's victory in 1933, Stalin became thoroughly alarmed and undertook a complete reorientation of Russian policy. He began his orientation toward the West, which led to the Stalin-Laval pact, entry of Russia into the League of Nations, the slogan of collective security and the policy of Peoples Frontism. Hitler in turn began his anti-Russian policy of the anti-Communist alliance, especially friendship with Japan. Germany and Russia were squaring off against each other and the collaboration between the Russian and German military men was drawing to an official close.

It is now known that a group of German generals opposed Hitler's anti-Russian orientation and insisted upon the old policy of "the main enemy is in the West," above all combating the nightmare of another two-front war for Germany. Is it not possible that a group of Russian generals likewise opposed Stalin's policy of rapprochement with the West? It certainly is not excluded. Moreover, the hopes of such a group for Russian-German alliance would have found encouragement in the higher circles of the Russian leadership that Stalin himself had concluded that Hitler was here to stay after his successful blood purge of the Roehm opposition in 1934 and that it was necessary to keep open a bridge toward an agreement with Hitler if the "collective security" policy breaks down. General Krivitsky, the former military intelligence agent of the Russian army in Western Europe, adduces considerable evidence for the latter double orientation of Stalin's. The best evidence, of course, is adduced by history itself, in the form of the Hitler-Stalin pact in 1939.

LIAISON NOT ILLICIT ON STALIN'S SIDE

Is it not a possibility that the Russian and German military men who had a common view on the need for an alliance between their respective countries maintained the conspirative connections that had existed

since 1921? It must not be excluded. Whether it will ever be established by documents and witnesses is dubious. We do know that the phenomenon of the German generals, headed by the Marshals von Paulus and von Seydlitz, entering the Russian propaganda service after Stalingrad can only be explained by an understanding of their past views in opposition to Hitler's anti-Russian orientation and in favor of a war against the West. It is therefore not excluded that Czech secret service men came upon traces of what was now a German-Russian liaison.

However, considering Stalin's policy as a whole and knowing his methods of work, and understanding that the Russian military leadership was far more closely controlled by the political heads of state than was the case with the German military leadership under the Nazis, there exists the greater probability that the liaison between the Russian and German officers was illicit ONLY ON THE GERMAN SIDE. If it is true that Stalin was keeping open a second line of action, that of an understanding with Hitler, he would have desired a sub rosa relationship with those in Germany who favored an understanding with Russia. It was all to his advantage and committed him to nothing. If the time for an alliance with Hitler arrived, such contacts within the German general staff would be of tremendous value to Stalin. It is therefore more likely that the German-Russian contacts that the Czechs discovered were not news to the Kremlin but part of a well-oiled conspiracy.

In any case, the existence of such a liaison between German and Russian military men cannot possibly be considered the basis for the great Russian purges. It is estimated that the purges in their totality between 1936 and 1939 accounted for two million victims in the form of execution, imprisonment, forced labor or demotion to obscure posts. This, says Churchill, was "perhaps not needless." Why? In order to pave the way for the Hitler-Stalin pact which was signed only some months after the purges ended? Or in order to get rid of the pro-Nazi elements and to make Russia a firm friend of the western democracies, such as Churchill is the first to prove that they are not?

PURGES DESTROYED REVOLUTIONARY OPPOSITION

There is no longer any mystery about the reasons for the purge. They represented the last stage in Stalin's consolidation of totalitarian power and the final triumph of the new bureaucratic ruling class over those who were in any way connected with the Russian Revolution. Stalin knew that his regime would undergo severe tests in the war that loomed ahead. He knew that he might be forced to make sharp turns in policy. He knew that the Russian people would be subjected to inhuman misery. The purge was assurance that no one would survive who could become the center of opposition to Stalin. This is known to everyone today, including such skilled apologists for the Moscow Trials as Walter Duranty. He wrote recently as follows:

"... a rather bright young Soviet Russian said to me at the San Francisco conference:

"I can hardly understand how your President (Roosevelt) dared lead your country into war when he knew that at least 40 per cent of the electorate was in opposition to him and to his policies," he said.

"There you have in a nutshell the difference between Russian political thought and our own. To the Russian opposition means treason, to be punished—as it was punished in the middle thirties—by exile and execution."

If this truth has not yet dawned upon everyone, it is being taught to many in the hard way. Among the latter is Benes, who was so anxious to do a good turn for Stalin. Churchill, today the leader of His Majesty's Opposition, most certainly does not subscribe to the view that opposition is treason. He does, however, believe that opposition to Stalin is treason—that is, if it is opposition that seeks to revive the Bolshevik program of workers' democracy and Socialist internationalism.

Personal Messenger

"As I stand at the door of your hearts, praying for unity with you and for your cooperation with me in the mission which Christ has sent me to do." Speech of Archbishop McIntyre of Los Angeles reported in the N. Y. Times.

Don't Get Excited, But

"Key officials in the wartime civilian defense organizations were alerted to prepare for any eventuality," by Police Commissioner Arthur W. Wallander yesterday. "This does not mean that an emergency is imminent," Mr. Wallander commented. Dr. Harry S. Mustard, Health Commissioner, said his department had perfected a "disaster mobilization plan" about two months ago. "We are in a position to mobilize our facilities and forces instantly," he declared." N. Y. World Telegram.

American Imperialism in Latin America—A New Stage

What Did Bogota Conference Mean?

By A. FERRARA

(Continued from issue of May 10)

The bourgeoisie of Latin America came to the Bogota Conference seeking the support and aid of American Imperialism. Hence its willingness to grant the United States ready access to South America's raw materials and its willingness to enter a military alliance in preparation for World War III. In exchange the native bourgeoisie expected the offer of such material and political aid as would help it solve its current economic difficulties and bolster its rule. Above all, it demanded, and still does, American aid in carrying forward the process of industrialization which was given a considerable impetus during the second World War. This demand was concretized in the request for a general fund of 6 billion dollars to be used in the development of basic industries in Latin America.

For several reasons the issue of industrialization is unopposable for the Latin American bourgeoisie. Unless it acquires the most advanced equipment for its industries it is in danger of losing its war-won domestic markets (and profits) to foreign competition. Besides, the absolute decline of Europe, Latin America's most important pre-war market, compels it to develop native industry as the consumer of its industrial raw materials. Finally, and most important of all, industry must be developed if World War III in the not too distant future is not to have the same disrupting effects on the South American economies as World War II.

Dependent on the metropolitan centers for industrial and consumer goods, the war-time scarcity of goods in Latin America set an intolerable process of inflation into motion, a process which has extended into the present period. The social turmoil and political overtures epidemic in South America today are largely traceable to this cause. While the bourgeoisie flung itself into an orgy of financial speculation and industrial expansion, the masses suffered untold misery and want.

MARSHALL MAKES U. S. LINE BLUNTLY CLEAR

However, as the Bogota Conference showed, the intentions of American capitalism towards Latin America are aggressive in the extreme. The United States has no intention of subsidizing the grandiose plans of the South American bourgeoisie. In his speech to the Bogota Conference, the American Secretary of State, General Marshall, announced that the American government was willing to contribute a fund, not of 6 billion dollars as was proposed by the Colombian government, but of . . . 500 million dollars. While dangling this unappetizing carrot with one hand, Marshall raised a big stick with the other. He bluntly told the Conference that only private American capital could supply the desired funds, and that this private capital must have adequate protection against expropriation and limitations on its right to withdraw profits from the country where it is invested. In pursuit of this goal, the United States pushed an economic declaration through the Conference in defense of foreign (American) capital. While

the Bogota Conference approved this resolution, a third of the delegations declared their countries would not ratify such an agreement.

Marshall was referring not only to the future of American capital in Latin America but to the fate of past and present American investments, which amount to about three and a half billion dollars. At the present time, many large American manufacturing companies in Latin American countries are closing up shop because of restrictions on the right to send profits back to the United States. In addition, there is the ever-present spectre of expropriation. American capitalism is determined to prevent a repetition of what happened in Mexico in 1938, when the entire American and British investment in oil was expropriated.

Despite existing difficulties however, American investments in Latin America continue to increase because they are profitable. One specific example will serve as illustration. In 1946, after paying taxes and royalties to the Venezuelan government, the Creole Petroleum Corporation showed net earnings of more than 83 million dollars, the highest earnings in the history of this Standard Oil subsidiary. Furthermore, the profits reaped by all direct American investments in Latin America in 1946 amounted to almost 275 million dollars and constituted 49 percent of the income derived from all direct American investments abroad. A qualitative analysis of American investments in Latin America reveals that a major share of this capital is invested in the exploitation of mineral resources and raw materials. And because of its highly profitable nature, more capital is flowing into this type of investment than any other. But this type of capital investment only continues and intensifies the colonial enslavement of the Latin American economies.

PRESERVING U. S. MARKET IN LATIN AMERICA

The aggressive stand taken by American imperialism is not restricted to defending and extending the "rights" of foreign capital in Latin America. There is also the question of the "right" of access to the Latin American markets. For the United States, the Latin American market has become of paramount importance. In the pre-war period, the United States supplied roughly about 30 percent of Latin America's imports. Moreover the United States was steadily losing ground to Germany and England who offered markets for Latin American products. In 1947 however, the United States alone supplied about 65 percent of Latin America's imports. Translated into the language of money this means that whereas in 1939, the United States only sold 548 million dollars worth of goods to Latin America, in 1947 this same area bought 4 billion dollars worth of American commodities. The increasing importance of Latin America as a market for the United States is reflected in the fact that while only about 17 percent of American exports went to this area before World War II, it took almost 30 percent of the 14 billion dollars worth of goods which the United States poured into the world market in 1947.

However, the end is in sight. With the exception of Cuba and Venezuela every country in Latin America has set up restrictions of one sort or another against the unlimited entry of American goods. Four reasons compel the Latin American countries to take this course hostile to the United States. First, a developing unfavorable balance of trade, since Latin America is buying more than she is selling. Secondly, the desire to conserve war-time acquired reserves of gold and dollars. Because of the inflation in the United States, the purchasing power of these reserves has diminished considerably. Thirdly, Latin America is glutted with consumer goods from the United States. As one official of the Mexican government put it when announcing import restrictions "There are enough canned foods stocked in Mexico to last three years; enough refrigerators for two years; radio and phonograph stocks are sufficient to last for more than two years . . . and so forth." Finally, there is the desire of the Latin American bourgeoisie to protect their war born industries from the competitive flood of American goods. Despite the endless number of treaties signed and diplomatic conferences called, the United States can no more halt the contraction of the Latin American market than King Canute could reverse the waves of the sea. The Geneva Agreement for the reduction of Tariffs, and the Havana Free Trade Charter are just so many paper victories the United States has won to win unconditional entry into existing world markets.

Being aware of this fact, the United States is not just relying on diplomatic agreements in this struggle. It is using the full weight of its economic power. For instance, any country violating the Havana Free Trade Charter by setting up "unwarranted" import restrictions loses its right to borrow gold and dollars from the International Monetary Fund. The United States, of course, has the largest number of votes in this fund and can decide one way or another in any given situation. Another example: in the Sugar Act of 1948 which sets quotas for the foreign suppliers of sugar to the United States, there is the infamous 202E clause. This clause empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the quota of any country "that denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation or industry. While this clause was specifically aimed at Cuba (the largest supplier of sugar in the American market) for passing a law stating that a certain amount of goods leaving Cuba must go on Cuban owned steamship lines, it was also designed as a warning to the rest of Latin America.

To defend its capital investments throughout the world as well as in Latin America, American imperialism created a potent weapon in the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development. No country which has defaulted payment on its bonds, or expropriated foreign capital without "adequate" compensation, can borrow from the World Bank, which has a potential lending power of billions. Because of this fact, many Latin American countries are today resum-

ing payments on American loans made in the 1920s.

RULING CLASS FOLLOWS AN IRRESOLUTE POLICY

Aggressive American imperialism is sure it can cut the Latin American cloth to its own measure, that is, exploit it as an exclusive colonial dependency. Its confident attitude is based on certain consequences of World War II. Before the second World War, the United States was but one among several imperialist powers striving to maintain and extend spheres of influence in Latin America. Hence Roosevelt's conciliatory "good neighbor" policy of trade concessions and government loans. Oriented toward the European market and nourished on European capital, the Latin American bourgeoisie could play off the German-English bloc against the United States with varying degrees of success. The "independent" attitude of Argentina, for instance, rested on this fact. World War II all but liquidated Europe as a political and economic factor in South America. England's decline illustrates this fundamental change in the Latin American scene. While the United States continues to pour capital into Latin America at the average rate of about 50 million dollars a year, the English have been forced to liquidate almost a billion dollars worth of their investment in the last few years. In a word, the Latin American countries are today at the mercy of American imperialism.

The Bogota Conference marks a turning point in Latin American politics, inasmuch as it bluntly established the decisive position of the United States. Will the Latin American bourgeoisie submit or will it struggle? Stern economic necessity will compel it to act in defense of its interests. Insofar as such measures infringe on the "rights" of American capital and trade, it will come into conflict with the United States. But no section of the Latin American bourgeoisie, not even the Argentine, contemplates a serious struggle against the United States at the present time. A serious struggle against American imperialism would have to begin with the program of revolutionary expropriation of foreign capital. And only the oppressed masses can supply the power, the driving force to execute such a program. Before such a prospect, the Latin American ruling class, an exploiter in its own right, shrinks back.

Rejecting a program of revolutionary struggle that might jeopardize the rule of their class, the Peron, Dutra's and Aleman's will snatch at economic concessions, move forward one step, and under pressure from Washington move back two. A concrete example of this wavering course is provided by Mexico. In 1938 Mexico expropriated American oil interests. In 1946 Mexico is again opening the door to American exploitation of its oil fields. Not long ago Mexico received a loan of 50 million dollars from the United States to stabilize its currency. At about the same time, Mexico moved against United States trade by initiating import quotas.

Until some decisive change in the world situation such as war or depression takes place, the struggle of the Latin American bourgeoisie will continue to take the irresolute and contradictory form outlined above. Only if the Latin American working-class takes leadership can a genuine and liberating struggle against American imperialism develop in the near future. A discussion of this important problem we reserve for another article soon.

Jewish State

(Continued from page 1)

porting these moves. It is highly probable that the U. S. embargo on arms to the Near East will be lifted in the near future.

England, contrary to expectations, has not recognized the Jewish state and is permitting its officers to direct the Transjordanian invasion of Palestine. Its senior partner, the U. S., will probably close its eyes to this glaring "complicity" by Britain.

Russia, too, after a few days of suspense has recognized the Jewish state. The Russian satellites who had been expected to be the first to recognize Israel held up action, awaiting word from Moscow, after the French Stalinist press attacked the government of Ben-Gurion as subservient to the Western powers. With Moscow's recognition, they are sure to fall in line.

One thing the events in Palestine have underscored is the complete impotence of the UN. The UN, far from being the hope of peace, has proved itself again to be nothing but the tool of the big imperialist powers, especially the U. S., who use it when they see fit. After talking for weeks, the UN adjourned without accomplishing anything.

It proves again what Marxists have always said—that despite the illusions of statesmen that they decide events, the actual power to decide things lies in the hands of the people, in this case the Jews and Arabs of Palestine.

Caterpillar Plant Vote Routs Stalinists; Run-Off Required

CHICAGO—The results of the NLRB election held in Peoria, Illinois at the Caterpillar Tractor Plant on May 12, show a defeat for the Stalinist-led Farm Equipment Workers Union and make necessary a run-off election between the UAW-AFL and the UAW-CIO.

Behind this situation lies a background of Stalinist misrule which resulted in a body blow to the workers. The Caterpillar workers have for years been fed up with the FE leadership. The first evidence of this came over the sellout role of the Stalinists during the war, when the workers' interests were subordinated to the demands of the war Russian-American alliance. The complete leadership came over to the United Automobile Workers and asked for a charter which the UAW granted after getting Murray's approval. However, the Stalinists moved fast. With Gerald Feilde, their organizational director, in command, they took over the local office, expelled the leadership, and at a crucial point before an NLRB election produced a wire from Phil Murray which condemned the "raid." The FE came out successful. Since then there have been other attempts by the International Association of Machinists and last by the UAW-AFL, to take over jurisdiction through NLRB elections.

This year because the Stalinists had adopted the principle that they would not sign the affidavits required under the Taft-Hartley law, the company refused to bargain for a new contract. The FE called the workers out on strike on April 8 for a new contract and recognition. The company sat back at this point, and let the opposition unions do the rest for them.

UAW-CIO ENTERS

Months ago the UAW-AFL and the IAM had petitioned for an NLRB election, and a hearing was ordered during the strike. At the Board hear-

ing, FE moved to dismiss the petitions as being untimely, and containing forged signatures.

The Board examiner ruled against FE and for the AFL. At this point the UAW-CIO presented cards for two per cent of the plant. The UAW-CIO said it was not interested in an election at the plant and that if the AFL would withdraw, the situation would be solved; however, it added, that if the Board ordered an election, the UAW would want its place on the ballot. The election was then set for May 12.

The FE strategy was to instruct its people to vote "NO UNION," hoping that way to continue as the bargaining representative. The UAW actually started its campaign only during the last week. The AFL organization, which had submitted 9,000 cards, obtained 4700 votes; the CIO-UAW, 2600; No Union, 2100; and IAM, 1400. Therefore a run-off is necessary between UAW-AFL and UAW-CIO.

HARVESTER ACTS TOO

The situation in this plant reflects the tragedy of the labor movement today. With workers waging defensive fights all over, we find here a fight between unions as to who shall be the bargaining representative. The Stalinists, who always subordinate the workers interest to Russian foreign policy, have created this situation, but the labor leaders who prevent labor unity are as much responsible.

The Caterpillar situation has emboldened the rest of the farm implement manufacturers. International Harvester Company has just issued its own "contract" to the FE in the plants the latter represents. The document is a vicious attack on grievance procedure and rates of pay for machine shop workers. The company feels that in order to retain recognition FE will agree to anything, and that, if they resort to strike, jurisdictional feuds will take care of the rest.

"No Strike" Deal Backfires—

(Continued from page 1)

the steel union proposed that action on their wage demand be extended until the effects of this price reduction could be seen, the company firmly declined. It had the union right over a barrel. The justification originally given by the union for signing such a two-year contract was to "stabilize" wages which in turn was to keep steel prices steady also.

The wages are frozen all right; that part of the deal worked out just fine and the company is highly gratified with the bargain made. But what's on the other side of the ledger?

ASTRONOMICAL PROFITS

As far as price increases are concerned, since April 1947 the steel trust has jacked up the price several times to the tune of \$11.32 a ton. Hence a cutback of \$1.25 still leaves them a substantial margin of profit.

Ben Fairless, head of U. S. Steel, told a Congressional hearing that the new price increases were "in the public interest." So arrogant was Big Steel's attitude that even reactionary Senator Taft had to rap U. S. Steel's knuckles at the time of their last \$5 increase in February, asserting it was an unjustifiable inflationary increase.

Price increases have proceeded at a rate of 3 to 1 compared with wage increases. As a result, profits in the industry are reaching astronomical heights. The net profit for 1947 amounted to over \$17 billion for the industry, an increase of 59 per cent over 1946. U. S. Steel alone cleared \$127 million in net profit. The industry is having a field day gouging the American consumer.

The hands of the union are tied by the two-year no-strike contract which the conservative leadership insists on respecting, although the steel barons

have flouted their part of the bargain not to raise prices. The union leadership allowed itself to be cornered, but that is no reason why the nation's steel workers should accept this weak-kneed policy.

Nor can the battle be won by running full-page ads humbly appealing for public sympathy and support. That's not the way steel workers won their past victories.

BOSS OFFENSIVE

The policy of the steel companies must be seen for what it is: a brutal offensive against the living standards of the steel workers and an attempt to set the pattern for all of American industry faced with the third round of wage increases. The acquiescence of the steel union to this arrogant refusal to discuss wage increases seriously damages the position of the auto workers and the unions which are now negotiating for wage increases.

All the more reason why the steel workers at their convention should have rejected this do-nothing policy of the leadership. Short on action, these leaders are long on talk. With verbal belligerence Murray thunders at the steel companies: "We have legitimate, licensed extortion and it is driving the people of the United States into economic fear. . . . Never in the history of our country has there been such an orgy of extortion. It must be stopped."

And how does Murray propose to stop it? His program is to assure the companies that the steel workers will be good boys and stay in line, and to fill the air with whines and complaints about how unappreciative the steel companies are despite the good behavior of the union. Such a policy can only reinforce the steel trust's offensive against the union.

That the steel workers stand ready

to fight was demonstrated by the type of appeal that was used at their recent convention to get them to adopt a dues increase. The resistance of the delegates was softened by a speech from Murray which appealed to their militancy and readiness to do battle. He pointed out that some 107,000 members are under contracts due to expire before December 1948, and that it is "reasonable to assume that 50 per cent of them will be fighting with their backs to the wall."

Unfortunately, no delegate rose to challenge Murray's U. S. Steel policy, which cannot but fail to weaken the struggles of future steel strikers. U. S. Steel sets the pattern for the other steel companies; their refusal to grant wage increases will be aped by the other companies. Nor will they be stopped merely by Murray's waving of the big stick.

LABOR CAN MEET IT

The steel industry's vicious anti-union policy is highlighted by full-page ads now running in the slick magazines. Typical of the bilge produced is one by Columbia Steel and Shifting Company.

In big type the ad asks: "What's your definition of a traitor?" Their answer includes this gem: "A nationwide work stoppage in any one of our basic industries, such as coal, steel, or transportation, causing shutdowns can damage America more than if some traitor sold out every plane, gun, or atomic secret we possess."

True, they don't urge the death penalty for strikers; that much is left to your imagination, but it wouldn't be overtaxing it. Such an ad is not accidental; it is part and parcel of big business's offensive against labor. It is the propaganda barrage. The steel workers can meet this offensive only by organizing a counter-offensive of their own.