

# This Is How Equality of Sacrifice Works!

The accompanying figures demonstrate all too clearly the underlying cause of the ten-day strike in the Dodge Main and other plants of the Chrysler Corporation, which ended on March 5. The profit statement of the Chrysler Corporation hit the papers two days later. The corporation reported that its sales for 1944, the highest of all time, passed the one billion dollar mark for the first time in its history.

**Its net profits for 1944, after taxes and all other deductions, surpassed the previous high of 1943 by almost one and a half million dollars. Big Business has no Little Steel formula to stymie its profit-making. Increases for the bosses are not considered inflationary.**

Dividends for stockholders jumped from \$5.36 a share in 1943 to \$5.70 a share in 1944. Inflationary?

**For Chrysler Corporation:  
\$24,819,489 in Record-Breaking Profits in 1944 After Taxes and All Other Deductions.**

Not when you work hard for money clipping coupons. You'd think a company which benefitted so munificently during the past year would feel a little kindly toward its employees, wouldn't you? After all, the workers were the real source of all that production, and hence, all those juicy 1944 profits.

But if you think that, you're a babe in the woods, a

**For Chrysler Workers:  
An 11% Lag of Wages Behind Cost of Living According to the Most Conservative Estimate.**

Candidate who believes that "all is for the best in this best of all possible worlds."

The Dodge strike was a protest against the vicious speed-up which Chrysler has been trying to reintroduce in all its plants. Speed-up means back-breaking work, more output without a corresponding increase in pay, greater danger of industrial accidents, etc. For the com-

pany it means that it can up that record-breaking 1944 profit to a new record-breaker in 1945.

For the auto workers who are in the foxholes or manning the tailgun on bombers, it means a return to conditions they thought they had eliminated in the union struggles of the past.

Labor can take a chunk out of these profits and get its just due if it takes back its freedom of action, the right to strike. That's the only way to give the returning servicemen a break, too.

Once the strike right is resumed, other steps in labor's declaration of independence follow: getting off the WLB, forming labor's own political party, organizing production for its own interests, the interests of the majority of the people, instead of for private profit.

WE SAY—

**Labor Must Form an Independent Labor Party**

## LABOR ACTION

WE ARE FOR—

**A Guaranteed Annual Wage For All Workers**

MARCH 19, 1945

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR

ONE CENT

### 105,000 UAW Workers Vote --

# AGAINST NO-STRIKE PLEDGE

## Nationalize the Coal Mines

An Editorial

The coal miners of America are once more engaged in a struggle to improve their living standards. This is the fifth time that they have, through the instrument of their union and its president, John L. Lewis, threatened to strike to win their grievances. Four times since the war began the miners left the pits to win their demands. And while they have never won the full measure of their needs, they made gains only because they know how to fight in the face of odds no other labor organization has had to face.

From the day Lewis first made known the fact that the miners would again strike for their rights, the cry of the wolf-pack was heard throughout the country. The Administration and all its agencies opened up a chorus, followed by the yellow press, the multitude of parasitic columnists and "labor experts," and pulling up in the rear, but more vicious than all, the Communist Party and its Daily Worker. They yelled for the scalp of John L. Lewis. But no one should be misled by that howl. When they say "Lewis" they really mean the miners' union and every rank and file coal digger in the country.

Even before negotiations between the miners' union and the operators were completed, the Daily Worker demanded of the government: Stop the coal strike! Seize the coal mines!



AGAINST THE COAL MINERS

**UNDER ATTACK FOR DEMANDS** This demand was made against the coal miners, not the operators. In all the dirty, foul attacks made on Lewis because he announced that the miners would take a strike vote under the legal provisions of the Smith-Connally Act, not a harsh word was said against the bloated coal operators who refused to grant the miners' demands.

The demand on the government to seize the coal mines brings up the whole question of nationalization of the industry. Government seizure of the mines is not nationalization, as some workers believe and as some union leaders would have them believe. Under government seizure, property remains in the hands of the bosses. The government merely uses its force to compel the workers to stay on the job. The company loses nothing, since its profits are guaranteed by the government and the forced exploitation of the workers. See what happened in the Montgomery Ward strike. The government seized Ward's business went on; its profits were secured. But the union has not yet won its main demands and just grievances.

Should the government seize the coal mines, it would not mean that it was doing it for the purpose of advancing the interests of the coal miner. On the contrary, it would preserve the rights, interests and property of the coal operators and the banks who stand behind them. When the Daily Worker demands that the government seize the mines, it means that they should be seized against the miners' union!

**NATIONALIZE THE MINES**

The lesson of the miners' struggles is clear. The coal operators have long ago outlived their usefulness. They are a parasitic growth on the mining industry, living off the sweat and toil of the coal miners. Coal mining faces a desperate future and every coal miner knows this. But the coal miner needs and wants security—not just for the moment, but when the war is over, and for all time!

The war has enriched the coal operators, but it has basely provided for the livelihood of the coal miners and their families.

The strike weapon is indispensable in the fight of the coal miners, but it is not enough.

The miners, supported by the whole labor movement, must again raise the demand for nationalization of the coal mines under the control of the workers and their union organization.

**FOR POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE**

But that is only part of the struggle. One year ago, LABOR ACTION, in raising the slogan: Nationalize the coal mines, wrote:

"After the rotten experiences with the present government, and the parties that back it against labor, is there any reason to believe that it will grant this demand? Not any more than it granted the much more modest demands made in the past.

"In that case, let labor, which is more powerfully organized than ever before in world history, get a government of its own! The present government is a government of, for and by a minority—the capitalist minority. A government of labor would be a government of, for and by the majority—the working class majority. And it would protect the elementary rights of this majority, which is as it should be."

To get a labor government, labor needs its own party and its own program. It needs an independent Labor Party to win its demands. Coal miners of America! Demand the nationalization of the coal mines under workers' control! Organize a Labor Party to win and enforce your demands!



By MARTIN HARVEY

DETROIT—The first report on the balloting in the recently concluded referendum on the no-strike pledge held by the United Auto Workers (CIO) was issued by Ben Garrison, chairman of the referendum committee. He announced that a preliminary count indicates that the pledge was upheld by about two to one by the 300,000 auto and aircraft workers who voted.

A final count, broken down by regions, will be issued later but Garrison's report is a summary of what the official vote will be.

Two things stand out in this report. First is the fact that, despite the unprecedented barrage of propaganda, lies and intimidation carried on by the reactionary press, the government, the bureaucratic labor misleaders and the Communist Party, 105,000 auto workers stuck to their guns and voted "NO." This is no mean accomplishment for the UAW Rank and File Committee, which spearheaded the movement to rescind the infamous pledge.

## Detroit Strikers Back; Issues Still Unsettled

By ARNOLD CRAMER

DETROIT—Despite the end of the Dodge strike and the vote of Briggs Local 212 (UAW-CIO) to return to work, the UAW was seething here because of the continuation of the corporation drive to smash the unions and the entry into the battle of the U. S. Senate Mead Committee on the side of the auto corporations.

The Briggs workers voted to return to work at a meeting held on March 9 after a compromise had been accepted by the union. The union had forced the War Labor Board to act on its case before the strike was ended and eight of the fifteen minor union officials who had been discharged by the Briggs Body Corp. were ordered reinstated.

Like the recently concluded walk-out at the Dodge main plant here, the dispute stemmed from company attempts to speed up production in preparation for peacetime auto production. The company fired seven union members for their alleged participation in a strike protesting this speed-up some weeks ago. The current strike began as a protest against this open attempt to break the union and eight more union leaders were then fired.

Before the end of the Briggs strike, the UAW Executive Board, meeting in New York City, voted to "con-

(Continued on page 2)

NO." This is no mean accomplishment for the UAW Rank and File Committee, which spearheaded the movement to rescind the infamous pledge.

No one knows how many tens of thousands of dollars were spent by the forces of reaction within and without the labor movement to keep the no-strike pledge. Arrayed on their side was not only money but the power and prestige of the government, the propaganda machine of the big daily press and the unscrupulous power machine of the Communist Party. Yet 105,000 workers refused to be shouted down.

**TOTAL VOTE SMALL**

The figure of 105,000 "No" votes, by the way, can be accepted only tentatively. As was reported in LABOR ACTION, ballots were distributed by the referendum committee in a completely irresponsible manner, some even getting into the hands of corporation executives. A protest against the conduct of the vote has been entered by the Lansing UAW locals, although it seems unlikely that the UAW top leaders will do anything about it.

The second fact of significance is the extremely small vote, only 300,000 out of a total membership of over 1,200,000, including members in the armed services.

The smallness of the vote can be attributed to several factors. There is the conflict in the minds of many workers between defense of the union and support to the imperialist war. Most workers are ready to ad-

(Continued on page 2)

## "Voluntary" Slave Bill Already in Effect

By WALTER WEISS

The Senate last week finally passed a manpower bill, which has been widely described in the press as a "voluntary" bill so far as labor is concerned.

There are harsh penalties—maximum fines of \$10,000 and jail terms of one year—but these are for employers only.

It sounds unbelievable. When has either house of Congress during this war been so kind to the workers, so tough on business?

The fact is that Congress has not changed its stripes. The newspaper descriptions are not only unbelievable, but also untrue.

The Senate bill actually gives legal town, New Bedford, Newark, Philadelphia, Chicago and elsewhere. Commission has been doing in ALL-DRAFTING LABOR IS ON

The WMC has been placing employment ceilings on less essential businesses and ordering the employers involved to drop a certain number of workers. These workers are then forced by "controlled referrals" into certain plants, where wages and working conditions may be worse than on their old jobs.

Usually the conditions are worse. Otherwise there would be no need for compulsion. But, in any case, the effect of the system is that the workers are subjected to forced labor. They may choose between that and starvation.

Roosevelt and all his lieutenants keep calling, on every possible occasion, for the harsher May-Bailey bill, passed by the House of Representatives. They prefer work-or-jail to work-or-starve. They want as tough a bill as they can get.

Actually Roosevelt will not be terribly dissatisfied if the two houses finally should get together on the Senate bill. In one way it goes even further than the House version. It covers women as well as men, all workers instead of those up to forty-five.

On March 8 the President told his Senate leaders to get what they could in a hurry. Why in a hurry? Because, obviously, events of the war are daily making the reasons openly given for slave labor look more foolish. (The Senate, we should add, did hurry. A

few hours after the President's demand, they passed their bill, 63 to 16.)

**FDR WANTS TOUGHER ONE**

As LABOR ACTION has explained in previous issues, the President is using supposed war needs to get a law by which he hopes to control labor in the post-war period.

His plan is to have some kind of law passed now—the harshest law that Congress will give him. Later, when a suitable occasion arises, he will press for "complete national service."

Is this our imagination? Not at all. The President said as much in his message to Congress on January 6. And in a press conference on March 9 he advised reporters to read that message again.

The most disgraceful part of this story is that the top labor leaders have supported the Senate bill, just as they have previously backed WMC orders. Like the capitalist papers, they lyingly describe it as a "voluntary" bill, when it is in fact a step toward slave labor.

Here again, as in the case of the no-strike pledge and the War Labor Board, the workers are being sold out by their own leaders.

The unions are hurt by such leadership. But active unionists in the United Auto Workers are showing the way to all other CIO and AFL workers. They have organized a rank and file group with a fighting program and a newspaper of their own. That's the way to start the job of saving the unions as fighting organizations.

Anti-Labor Offensive On

# THE LEGISLATIVE FRONT

## Michigan

By ARNOLD KRAMER

DETROIT—In an attempt to intimidate the Chrysler and Briggs strikers, a bill to outlaw wildcat strikes has been introduced in the State Legislature at Lansing.

The bill provides for the incorporation of all unions and declares all unions not incorporated to be illegal. Membership in an unincorporated union is made misdemeanor and persons who solicit membership or take dues in such unions face felony charges. Workers who participate in a strike, picketing or similar actions are guilty of a felony. Legal unions could be sued for any loss of property in actions which violate any anti-strike laws.

A. P. Decker, one of the sponsors of the bill, recently demanded the death penalty for all war plant strikers. The other sponsor, Charles R. Feenstra of Grand Rapids, failed to have a similar bill passed two years ago.

The bill does not have much chance of passing, at least in its present form, but the threat of such reactionary legislation must be faced by all workers. The purpose of such bills as this one is to smash the labor movement and allow big business a clear field in putting over any wage cuts, speed-ups or discriminatory practices they desire.

### A FALLACY EXPOSED

This bill, just as the Smith-Connelly law, will be used by the labor bureaucrats as a club over the workers to keep them from taking militant action. Their argument runs: when labor is militant this antagonizes the reactionaries, who start a counter-offensive against labor. Therefore, refrain from militant action. Let the companies walk all over you because as bad as conditions are now you will only make them worse by strikes or similar action.

This argument falsely assumes that the corporations and the government wait for some militant labor action to start an anti-union offensive. The fact is that big business has been waging a constant union-busting drive throughout the war. Ford, General Motors, Chrysler and all the other corporations, big and small, have been introducing speed-ups, firing union stewards and committeemen and making a mockery of union contracts and collective bargaining.

The use of legislation to break the unions, however, can be successful if labor limits its defense to isolated shop actions. The employers must be met on their own ground. When a corporation introduces a speed-up or fires a steward, action by the union against that particular corporation can be sufficient. When the capitalists as a class, however, through their control of the government, act joint-

ly against the whole labor movement, isolated action is not enough.

### POLITICAL ACTION NECESSARY

When the capitalists act politically, labor must reply politically. When the capitalists use the Democratic and Republican Parties to carry out their will, labor must form its own party to carry out its will. If the present government—both state and national—represents the capitalist class against labor, the working class must take upon itself, in the interest of the great majority of the population which works for a living, to form its own government, a labor government, to representing the working class against capital.

The formula is a clear one:  
Against the economic offensive of the employers—a labor union.  
Against the political offensive of the employers—a labor party.

## Colorado

By ROBERT SHERMAN

The "people's" representatives are still hard at it trying their best to smash the labor unions.

The Colorado State Senate approved a report from its Labor and Industrial Relations Commission (fancy name for old-fashioned union-busters) on amending the present Labor Peace Act which, if allowed to go through, would make the unions as defenseless, from a legal point of view, as an amateur boxer with Joe Louis.

Falling in their previous attempt to choke the unions with legal restrictions when the Colorado Supreme Court declared sections of the Labor Peace Act unconstitutional, these miserable nonentities and provincial incompetents, whose political conditioning is attuned to the wishes and interests of the industrial overlords, react in typical fashion by ignoring the public they are supposed to represent and attempting to replace the sections declared unconstitutional with equally reactionary and restrictive amendments. At the same time they voted down a proposal to make employers equally responsible with the unions for violations of the act.

The Labor Peace Act (the word "peace" being used, no doubt, under the assumption that when labor lies prostrate, peace—for private profit—will prevail) as it originally stood aroused active opposition from both the CIO and AFL, with bitter and long-drawn-out court and Senate hearings taking place. This legal formula follows the same pattern used by labor-haters throughout the country in similar attempts.

### REGIMENTING UNIONS

Unions would be, under the benevolent hand of the industrial commission, a boss's outfit. They would be required to file

itemized lists of financial disbursements, property on hand and financial statements and—to add insult to injury—would be required to pay a fee for having the commission file and index the reports, which would be made available for use to everyone, especially the boss, who could appraise the strength of the union and proceed against it accordingly.

No union funds could be used for political purposes, and fees and dues would be subject to approval by the commission. In other words, the boss, through his commission, would be actually running union affairs.

Upon request of ten union members (any ten boss stooges in the union) the commission could send a reporter (to be paid by the union) to report all proceedings within the labor organization, an action tantamount to having the board of directors of the company sitting in at union meetings.

A union member (any boss stooge) having a complaint against the union could have recourse to the commission with penalties for violation punishable by a fine of \$500 for each separate "offense." The boss, you see, is worried sick over the possibility of one of his employees being mistreated by the nasty union so in retaliation would proceed to drain the union treasury of its resources.

Unions would be prohibited from collecting any money as a condition for the "privilege of work," a provision which would in effect outlaw the closed shop. How they dread and fear the closed shop!

### A BITTER LESSON

Now, organized labor should and will fight this particularly vicious and obnoxious piece of pro-boss-anti-union legislation proposed by the lackeys of the owning class, but that isn't the whole problem, for it is one thing to write the labor movement out of existence and quite another to try and prove it to the labor movement.

The important lesson to be learned is that as long as labor votes for capitalist politicians, whether they be "friends of labor" or not, they will continue to get a royal rooking every time from these gentry. Remember the May-Bailey work or fight bill was supported by candidates elected by the support of labor and the PAC. Be they Democrats or Republicans makes little different. In the last analysis, when it comes down to the question of which side to be on, the rich or the poor, the owners or the workers, these "representatives" will show their true colors.

The crying need of the hour is for the working class, the real producers, to declare their independence from their enemies, who can only produce periodic depressions and wars, and to plan society for the benefit of the majority in peace, in freedom and in plenty.

The first step in this direction is the formation of an independent Labor Party.

## NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

# From Vinson to Davis to Taylor

By Sam Adams

The President has shuffled his infield around, but the players are still the same.

Judge Fred M. Vinson has been moved up from his post as Director of Stabilization to the place once held by Jesse Jones as custodian of the billion dollar loan agency of the government.

Lawyer William H. Davis first limbered up a little and took Vinson's place as Director of Stabilization.

Dr. Charles W. Taylor then stepped into Davis' post as chairman of the War Labor Board. NOTHING HAS BEEN CHANGED!

What, if anything, has been changed by the new set-up? Nothing!

Before departing his post as Director of Stabilization, Vinson, who had already barred any increase in the basic wage rates of the American workers, made rulings on fringe demands which have approximately the same aim: preventing an equitable adjustment in wages. That makes it a little easier for Mr. Davis, who can now excuse himself on the ground that Judge Vinson has

firmly established the policy of his department. But Mr. Davis does not need any excuse.

Before he departed his post as chairman of the WLB, Mr. Davis handed in a report to the President advising no revision in the Little Steel formula—no increase in the basic wages of the workers, even though he and his cohorts admitted that the cost of living was at least eleven per cent above any wage increases granted workers. To make certain that no fight over his new appointment would arise, he made a public statement upon his nomination that he was not in favor of wage increases!

And now we come to the new chairman of the WLB, Dr. Charles W. Taylor. He is well qualified to fill Davis' shoes, since he is the author of the infamous Little Steel formula which is destroying the living standards of millions of American workers. Dr. Taylor further distinguished himself by helping to write the report to the President urging the maintenance of the wage freeze and no change in the Little Steel formula.

### LABOR'S PATH

Thus the men now responsible for maintaining

the President's stabilization program (read: wage freeze), are two gentlemen who have made it all too clear that they are against any upward revision of the Little Steel formula, against any increase in the basic wage structure and for the maintenance of the wage freeze!

Bad men, say the labor leaders. "Intolerable," says Phil Murray, head of the CIO. But Davis and Taylor are not acting on their own! They are acting in the name of President Roosevelt!

President Roosevelt appointed these men to their posts!

President Roosevelt appointed them because he knows they will be faithful to his program and will carry it out completely!

The lesson is clearer than ever, even if the labor officialdoms prefer not to see it.

### LABOR SHOULD GET OFF THE WLB.

LABOR SHOULD RESCIND THE NO-STRIKE PLEDGE AS AN INSTRUMENT WHICH BINDS ITS HANDS AND MAKES IMPOSSIBLE A STRUGGLE FOR HIGHER WAGES AND THE MAINTENANCE OF A DECENT STANDARD OF LIVING.

# Militants Lose in UAW Local 719

By ROBERT MILLER

CHICAGO—The struggle for progressive unionism in the UAW-CIO took a setback last week when the Progressive Group of Local 719 lost the local union elections to the Communist-controlled ticket.

Running on the phony platform of "unity," the group dominated by the Communist Party elements in the local was successful in pulling the wool over the eyes of the membership as to its REAL program: hooking Local 719 to the party line of Kremlin Joe. The "unity" proposal of the CPers and a few glib union activists who gobbled the bait—hook and line—was a phony because it was supposed to be based on a "minimum" program. Quite naturally such a program could not include controversial issues like the no-strike pledge, getting off the WLB, an independent Labor Party, because the Stalinists and the Progressives differ violently on these fundamental issues.

It is a credit to the Progressive Group of this local that it refused to rise to the bait and continued to give battle on a realistic and forward-looking program. To have fallen for this phony offer of "unity" would have meant that the Progressive Group was giving up its program and disbanding as a group.

The Stalin gang prattled unity throughout the election campaign and was successful in convincing a majority of the small number that turned out to vote that such a unity could gain results for the men in the shops.

However, the most important reason for the defeat of the Progressives can easily be seen from the unusually small vote for a general officers' election in this local. Fewer members voted now than in the convention delegates' election held last summer. In the past, convention elections have always been much smaller than general elections. At that time the issues were clear and unambiguous and the members flocked to the standard of the Progressive Group and sent a scrapping delegation to the UAW convention that was instrumental in setting up the national Rank and File Caucus in the UAW.

The small vote in this election indicates that the membership of this local voted with their feet by staying away from the polls. The election came only a few days after the publication of the WLB directive on the General Motors case. This case had been pending since October, 1943, and the gains made by the union in this directive are so insignificant compared to the needs of the membership that it is little wonder that so few people turned out to vote for the officers who were to direct the affairs of the local for 1945.

The membership of the UAW has seen its conditions in the shop go from bad to worse; is today living through a terrific speed-up campaign

started by the corporations, has already lost hope that the UAW leaders will ever take any real action to smash the Little Steel formula and is rapidly losing confidence in the union.

A study of the literature it issued during the election campaign shows the Progressive Group of Local 719 understands the seriousness of the situation as well as the solution for it. Their program closely follows that of the national UAW-CIO Rank and File Caucus. Their eleven-point program really goes to the heart of the problem facing the workers, not only in this local, but throughout the country. We think it is important enough to print it in full:

1. Oppose a labor draft of any kind. No slave labor!
2. Rescind the no-strike pledge!
3. Eliminate the War Labor Board!
4. Smash the Little Steel formula!
5. For an escalator clause in all wage contracts, hitching wages to the rising cost of living.
6. For an independent Labor Party. End company unionism in politics!
7. For a minimum bonus of ten per cent to all night shift workers in GM plants.
8. No disciplinary layoffs or firings without full utilization of all grievance machinery.
9. For a guaranteed annual wage.
10. Put out a real local paper!
11. Build up the local strike fund!
12. Elect officers who support the program of the workers in the shop!

Anyone who stops to think for even a minute can see that this group knows what the score is. In a telephone interview with one of the Progressive Group candidates for a top office in the recent elections, this reporter was informed that the union militants intend to continue their fight for this program until it is adopted by the UAW on a national scale. He indicated that the defeat of the Progressive Group in this election was just the loss of a minor skirmish.

The Stalinist-Unity gang did not publish a word in all of their campaign literature about the labor draft bill. A leaflet of the Progressives had this to say about it:

"You didn't see one solitary word in the 'Unity' paper about the LABOR DRAFT, commonly known as the SLAVE LABOR ACT. Are the Unities for it or against it? WE ARE UNEQUIVOCALLY AGAINST IT! We will fight this slave labor proposal to the best of our ability. So will everyone else in the labor movement who has the real interests of the workers at heart. Could it be that they are keeping quiet about it because the Daily Worker has come out IN FAVOR OF national service legislation?"

Though the CP forces were able to

sidetrack the important issues facing the workers with their phony "unity" appeal, they will not be able to do so for long. The conditions in the shops will force these issues to the front and only the union militants and

progressives will be able to give realistic and successful leadership when the battle lines will be openly drawn between the plutocratic corporations and the men and women who have to toil for their daily bread.

# No-Strike Vote--

mit that the no-strike pledge hobbles labor and should be rescinded. More important than that, they carry this belief into practice, as is continually demonstrated by the many thousands of workers who have taken strike action during the course of the war. Yet the propaganda barrage and the prejudiced wording of the ballot must have made many workers feel unwilling to commit themselves finally on this important question.

Side by side with this confusion there was the feeling that rescinding the pledge, justified as it was, would not materially change conditions. The workers, the truth hidden from them for years by their own leaders, could only feel that against the massive power of the government—the many administrative boards, the reactionary Congress and, behind it all, the Army—strike action was a puny and ineffective weapon. Undoubtedly some of them felt that rescinding the pledge probably wasn't worth the effort; that new ways of selling them out would be devised by their so-called leaders.

### ONLY FIRST STEP

What these workers unfortunately failed to realize was that the right to strike was not a complete program, a panacea, but only the beginning, the first step, without which

further progress was impossible. When you combine rescinding the no-strike pledge with removal of the labor members from the WLB you have taken the second step—destruction of the graveyard of labor's grievances.

To combat the power of the capitalist government, the political arm of the capitalist class, labor must build its own political arm, a Labor Party. We need mention only these two points to indicate the tremendous possibilities that lie ahead for a militant, fighting labor movement. If these possibilities had been made clear, if they had been brought home to every UAW member, there would have been an entirely different story to tell.

The purpose of this analysis is not to explain away a defeat, for there was no defeat. The purpose is to point forward from what can only be considered a partial victory. The Dodge and Briggs strikes in Detroit, the release of 100,000 textile workers from the no-strike pledge, the retreat of the UAW Executive Board from its early willingness to discipline striking workers indiscriminately, all demonstrate that the conclusion of the UAW referendum marks not the end of the road but merely a milestone in the struggle for progressive, fighting unionism.

# Detroit Strike Issues--

sure" Mike Novak, president of Dodge Local 3, for his support of the Dodge workers during their strike. This is quite a comedown from their usual dictatorial removal of local union officers who displease their royal majesties. The bureaucrats are caught in a tight squeeze between the rank and file, which is clearly not going to stand for any more of such foolishness, and the corporations and government officials, headed by President Franklin D. (Slave Labor Law) Roosevelt, who insist on harsher penalties against militant unionists.

### ATTACK ON LABOR

The officialdom was again put on the spot when the Mead Committee opened hearings in Detroit on the labor situation. The committee first provided a sounding board for George Romney, head of the Automotive Council for War Production, representing the auto corporations. He lashed out bitterly against the UAW and presented the program of "big business."

Putting into words what the workers of Detroit have been feeling in practice, Romney keyed his testimony with the demand for a speed-up. He charged that the union "interfered" with management's God-given "right" to run "their" plants as they damn well please. Not letting the facts interfere with his figures, Romney announced that labor productivity had declined since the beginning of the war. He introduced charts to "prove" this but they had as much relation to labor productivity as a comic strip cartoon. ALL figures in existence, from government, labor and other sources, point to the tremendous increase in labor productivity during the war.

But Romney was not concerned with the truth. He was purely and simply interested in justifying the speed-up.

In this vicious purpose, he was ably assisted by Senator Ferguson of Michigan, a member of the committee, who provided some scare headlines for the local papers: "Ferguson Catches Workers Loafing" was

the front-page smear in the Free Press.

### THOMAS, REUTHER BEG PARDON

It should, however, have interested the leaders of the UAW. But such a weasel-worded defense of unionism was presented by UAW President R. J. Thomas and Vice-President Walter Reuther has not been heard in a long time.

Both of them pointed out, correctly of course, that production per worker had not gone down but had gone way up during the war. But when asked why the union didn't do anything to keep women workers from getting dressed before the quitting bell, Reuther replied that the union tried to prevent such terrible things from happening but that management (management) wouldn't cooperate. No doubt he was expecting a senator to pat him on the head and say "Nice boy, Walter."

Is Reuther opposed to workers cleaning up on company time? Is Reuther against the union taking a

part in setting production schedules? How else can you interpret his plea and the plea of Thomas that labor doesn't want to interfere with management. And who, pray tell, has a better right to interfere with management than the worker who is being "managed"?

These gentlemen can only defend their union by conceding their positions to the enemy. We want the bosses to exercise all the prerogatives of management, they say, but the mean, nasty corporations abuse these prerogatives. And that gets our members sore and they resort to militant action and we can't stop them. Why don't you tell those mean corporations to play fair?

This pitiful picture of the UAW bureaucrats is painted against the background of the wonderful militancy and solidarity of the Dodge and Briggs strikers—a startling contrast between the power, the prestige, the glory which organized labor can achieve and the weak-kneed and vacillating leadership with which it is saddled.

# Oregon Woodworkers Resolve: Defeat FDR'S Slave Bill!

Whereas, the International Woodworkers of America and the CIO through its Political Action Committee, endorsed and helped to elect Franklin D. Roosevelt as President of the United States, and

Whereas, President Roosevelt immediately upon the convening of a new Congress, vigorously renewed his demand for the passage of a National Labor Draft Law, and

Whereas, the Communist Political Association is one of the most vociferous advocates of the vicious anti-union May-Bailey bill, and

Whereas, all of organized labor, the CIO, AFL, the United Mine Workers and the Railroad Brotherhoods are unalterably opposed to the labor draft in any form, and

Whereas, in the words of R. J. Thomas, president of the UAW-CIO, "if we adopt the methods of our enemies in order to defeat them, we have lost an important, perhaps the most important, battle for freedom from tyranny."

Therefore be it resolved, that Local 307, International Woodworkers of America, most thoroughly condemn Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the Communist Political Association for their attempt to enslave free American labor, and brand both as enemies of labor and fitting associates of the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Further resolved, that copies of this resolution be mailed to the office of the International Woodworkers of America, the CIO, President Roosevelt and to the public press.

**Labor Action Book Service**  
114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

**Sale On Workers Party Publications**

**PLENTY FOR ALL—The Meaning of Socialism** Ernest Lund .10

**CHINA IN THE WORLD WAR** Max Shachtman .10

**FOR A COST-PLUS WAGE** Max Shachtman .05

**INCENTIVE PAY—Speed-Up, New Style** Albert Gates .05

**INDIA IN REVOLT** Henry Judd .25

**Value—55 Cents**  
**Special Combination Offer—40 Cents**

**Planning to Buy New Books? Why Not Order from Labor Action Book Service?**

**SPECIAL OFFER**

**1944 BOUND VOLUME**

of

**LABOR ACTION**

The Marxist Analysis of Labor and Political Events of 1944 in a Permanent Form

**Price: \$2.50**

**Labor Action,**  
114 West 14th Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF LABOR

Published Weekly by the

Labor Action Publishing Ass'n

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

CH. 2-9681

(Third Floor)

Vol. 9, No. 12

March 19, 1945

ALBERT GATES, Editor

MARY BELL, Ass't Editor

Subscription Rate: 60c a Year; 35c 6 Mos. (75c & 40c for Canada, Foreign, New York City, Bronx) Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. Under the Act of March 2, 1879

From the PROGRAM of the WORKERS PARTY

For the defense of all democratic rights! Against wartime dictatorship measures! Abolish wage-freezing and job-freezing!

Restore full and unrestricted collective bargaining rights of the unions! Rescind the no-strike pledge! Repeal the Smith-Connally anti-strike law!

Expropriate the "Sixty Families"—the plutocratic three per cent of the population who own ninety-six per cent of the national wealth! national systems. No handing over of government-owned and owned plants and facilities to private ownership!

A one hundred per cent tax on all war profits above a five per cent maximum on invested capital! Immediate renegotiation of all war contracts to cut the fabulous profits to this level!

Government planning to guarantee the highest national production and income, a year-around job and a minimum annual wage to all, and a rising standard of living!

Conscript all war industries! Nationalize the banks, big industrial monopolies and transportation.

For a two hundred and fifty billion dollar five year program to provide decent housing for all, extensive public works, rural electrification and modernization!

For a guaranteed \$5,000 annual income to all workers' families, made possible by a planned rise in the total national income and a thirty-hour maximum work-week.

All discrimination against Negroes, Jews or other minorities in the armed forces or by employers in industry must be made a criminal offense!

NO-FRATERNIZATION BAN FAILS

By V. JENSEN

American and British news agencies this week featured—without comment—a little item showing that the Army is having difficulty in maintaining the no-fraternization ban in Germany. The agencies quoted an American soldier, a member of one of the first units to enter ruined Cologne as saying the soldiers "began to feel sorry" for German civilians when the fighting was over. Denying that it was just the pretty girls who came out with refreshments for the weary soldiers, Sergeant Francis Mitchell said: "They (the civilians) were mostly children and old people—just sort of helpless and glad they were not being killed. It's hard to keep that icy front when people act friendly; also we Americans used to have some respect for old folks."

RULE WORKS—WITH CLUB

The sergeant declared that no-fraternization rules worked only after the MP's arrived. "We're supposed to hate people—to be very tough customers. But as soon as the fighting is over it works just the other way—we begin to feel sorry for them. Non-fraternization works if someone is there with a club, but right at the front where a soldier is risking death, you cannot scare him with a \$65 fine."

We think that the sergeant echoes the sentiments of most of the front-line soldiers and gives the lie to the desk soldiers and chair-borne infantry on Stars and Stripes and Yank and the amateur German-haters like Max Lerner of PM, who have been trying to work up a hate frenzy against the German people.

Watching frightened German civilians crawl from their cellars and emerge into rubble-filled streets of the city that has been laid flat in the Allied advance, infantrymen instinctively feel that here are no criminals, racially polluted, but human beings, victims of the destruction of war, and the first victims of Nazism. For expressing this sentiment they can be and are fined \$65.

Meanwhile their officers are doing business as usual with minor Nazi henchmen, in such cities as Aachen and Munchen-Gladbach, whom they allow to maintain their old positions of civil

service influence, thus giving the Nazis an opportunity to terrorize genuinely democratic elements in the community. To be sure this is not called fraternization nor is it punishable by fines—this is "restoring order."

FRATERNIZING—WITH NAZIS

Nobody raises a fuss when the Nazi henchmen are kept in charge in conquered towns and wine and dine Allied officers—in the line of business of course. But when the German people offer beer and pretzels to American soldiers, this is everywhere interpreted as a subtle, Machiavellian underground Nazi plot.

The \$65 question is: Why?

Could it be that the Allied army leaders are anxious that there should be no protest, no expression of human sympathy on the part of their armies of occupation when the German workers will be made to pay in starvation and misery following a hard peace or when they may be deported in tens of thousands as slave laborers to Russia and other countries, while the ex-Nazi officials stay behind to maintain "order" in Germany?

WORLD POLITICS

By REVA CRAINE

Chapultepec and Oaks

The recently concluded Inter-American Conference was correctly described in last week's LABOR ACTION as a diplomatic attempt to bring the Latin and South American countries more securely under the economic domination of the most powerful of the Western Hemisphere nations, the United States. The problems which the conference decision raised, more than anything else, reveal that this is true.

By the Act of Chapultepec, now hailed as the modern Monroe Doctrine, the twenty republics pledged to take united military action against any American nation which resorted to force in settling inter-American disputes. Since the United States is the only country which can supply the necessary materials for such action, it was generally understood that this country's vote would be the decisive one in declaring war.

At the same time, the United States is partner to the Yalta decisions on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for the world security organization by which any one of the seven permanent council members of the future world organization may veto any proposed action against an aggressor. This means, for example, that if the United States wished to take military action against one of the South American countries, Argentina, for example, England, through the world organization, could veto such action.

Argentine Sidedish

It is generally agreed that the threats made in the Act of Chapultepec are aimed primarily at Argentina, the only South American country absent from the Mexico City gathering. The criticisms and charges leveled at Argentina by the others had nothing to do with the fact that that country is run by a dictator, that there is no political freedom in that country. The conditions put to Argentina were primarily that she join the Allies in declaring war on the Axis and endorse the economic decisions arrived at by the conference. Of the latter, the most important sections are those which guarantee that the Latin and South American countries continue to supply the basic products and strategic materials, needed by the Allies in the conduct of the war; that the United States would supply these countries, after the war with needed machinery and equipment. In other words, the Latin and South American countries will serve as the sources of vital raw materials which the United States will purchase and also serve as a market for the sale of machinery and for investments for the United States.

The proposed condition to Argentina that she hold free elections and guarantee other political liberties was dropped because, as it was explained in the press, "some delegates felt that this would be interfering in Argentina's internal affairs." Free elections are certainly the last thing the other South American dictators would consider a fair condition. Even the United States does not put such a condition to them as a basis for recognition, but on the contrary manages to remain on very friendly terms despite the absence of that condition. (Brazil, Bolivia, etc.)

The real reason for Argentina's peculiar position lies not in the fact that she is a totalitarian state, but rather in the fact that she is the only country in South America not completely under the economic heel of the United States. Argentina is the last economic foothold of England in the Western Hemisphere; Argentina also considers herself as a potential rival to the United States in South America. Her agricultural products compete with those of the United States. In addition, she is more interested in becoming the leading industrial country of her continent than in being a mere supplier of raw materials to the United States. She seeks to become the leading power in South America.

Argentina is not at war with the Axis because she does not see any immediate economic benefits that she could obtain from such participation and does not wish to enter merely as an appendage of the United States.

An American Dilemma

It is precisely over Argentina that the contradiction between Chapultepec and Dumbarton Oaks becomes real. What if England should veto any action that the United States should propose to undertake against the recalcitrant?

At first the American delegation was divided on this question. Some thought the United States must have the right to deal with inter-American affairs without any interference by any European power. But this did not look so good for the build-up that was being made for the San Francisco confab to be held next month, at which the Yalta decisions on world organization were to be presented for adoption. And yet the United States does want this free hand in the Western Hemisphere. And Chapultepec meant the Monroe Doctrine accepted and agreed to by all the countries from which the United States wants to exclude her imperialist rivals.

How to overcome the dilemma? The Inter-American Conference discussed this problem and approved a resolution which called for such changes in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as would permit the American republics to solve their own disputes—that is, inter-American disputes would remain the exclusive province of the Americas and the United States would be free from any restraining influence by England and Russia. This, of course, was presented as an "original" idea which came from the Latin and South American countries themselves, for the next day it was announced that the United States would not take responsibility for the Latin-American criticisms of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

Bargaining Point?

Of course, the United States officials hastened to assure the world that this did not necessarily mean "that they would oppose settlement of purely regional disputes by regional machinery. They merely made clear that they wanted to go to San Francisco with a free hand and without any obligations to support the other American republics there."

In short, the United States will appear at San Francisco ready to strike a bargain. She will feel herself free to choose between various aspects of Chapultepec and Dumbarton Oaks, depending upon what concessions she can wring from the other big United Nations. In the meantime, she holds as a club over England's head the threat to exclude her from any say in South America, and the Act of Chapultepec remains a club over the head of Argentina which will be used to swing her into the orbit of the United States.

Editorials

The Decisions Made at Yalta

Last week President Roosevelt made his report to Congress on his conference with Churchill and Stalin in the Crimea. There was nothing unusual to record in this report since the decisions of Yalta on the partition of Europe and the division of spheres of influence and control in the rest of the world had already been made public.

Roosevelt's speech had two purposes: to win the confidence and support for his foreign policy of those congressmen who either had not made up their minds on such matters, and those who were his opponents and suspicious of his actions and commitments; to use the Senate as a podium to speak to the people at large, to overcome their well-warranted suspicions that some dirty deals had taken place at Yalta.

FDR MORE COY THAN CHURCHILL

For the rest, the speech told less than Churchill did in the House of Commons. Churchill really went to bat for the rape of Poland. His defense of Russia and Stalin's honesty merely emphasized the state to which British power had been reduced. No, Roosevelt did not go that far, but his comments on the Polish question were just as determined as those of Churchill. He took care to omit mention of Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, countries for which he felt great pain, when Stalin seized them during his alliance with Hitler. These countries were incorporated into the borders of Russia before Russia became an ally of America and England, therefore no mention of the loss of their independence, which was guaranteed by the Atlantic Charter, was possible. Stalin forbade it.

The big feather in Roosevelt's cap, so he said, was the agreement on Dumbarton Oaks. The agreement provides that in

case any of the Big Five is an aggressor against another country, that may be discussed by them. The veto right of any one power, which Russia insisted on in the beginning, could prevent any discussion of such aggression. Now the discussion may be had, but no action against any aggressor may be taken if one nation vetoes such action. Of course, the whole thing is a big show. War isn't going to be decided by votes in the future any more than it was in the past.

POWER RULES SUPREME

The most important aspect of Dumbarton Oaks, however, is its thoroughly anti-democratic character, i.e., its totalitarian, big-power concepts. The Big Five, determined in composition by the Big Three, select the nations which will be members of the United Nations (they must all declare war on Germany first) but the small nations have no real power. All the power in the United Nations resides in the Big Five (at this time the Big Three). Why? Because only the Big Three have the military arms and resources to effect any decisions. And since the small nations have no real power to back up any decisions, it is, in the minds of Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill, a democratic prejudice to give them any rights except advisory ones.

In his report on plans for Germany, Roosevelt did not reveal much. His remarks dealt with the obvious and professed aims of the Allies to destroy Germany's armed power, in other words, her industrial power. But in an aside Roosevelt disclosed that other things were agreed to in secret on what to do with Germany which will make that country an inferno to live in. A well-thought-out part of the speech stated that it might not be so bad to enslave millions of German workers, but added, tongue in cheek, that no decision was taken on this matter!

Vote for Myra Tanner Weiss

The Socialist Workers Party is running Myra Tanner Weiss as a candidate in the mayoralty election in Los Angeles. She is running on a progressive and militant program on a local and national scale. The program on which she is running demands the fighting union program of rescinding the no-strike pledge, scrapping the Little Steel formula and the withdrawal of the labor members from the War Labor Board. The platform also includes a plank calling for the building of an independent Labor Party.

Myra Tanner Weiss is the only candidate running for Mayor of Los Angeles who is a serious opponent of the shameful Jim Crow and racial discrimination which still disunites the Los Angeles labor movement. She also stands for a program of local improvements, most important of which is slum clearance.

The Workers Party has very serious and fundamental disagreements with the Socialist Workers Party. We believe that the Socialist Workers Party support of the war of Stalin's Russia and the war of Chiang Kai-shek is in sharp contradiction

to their plank for international support to the European Revolution and working class solidarity against the imperialist war. Nor do we agree with many practices of that party nor its concept of what a revolutionary socialist party should be.

For various reasons, the Workers Party is unable to run a candidate in this election; therefore, despite our serious differences with the Socialist Workers Party, we will support the SWP candidate on the basis of the minimum program on which she is running.

LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party urge all the workers in Los Angeles to vote for Myra Tanner Weiss, to record themselves in favor of militant unionism in Los Angeles and against the brutal and ghastly world imperialist slaughter. Don't throw your vote away on a capitalist politician! Vote for the only candidate of a working class party. Vote for Myra Tanner Weiss, whose platform represents the interests of the working class. Vote for the candidate who comes from the ranks of the working class and union movement.

Akron Rubber Workers Report

By BILL FORD

AKRON, March 11—With the announcement today that a WLB-appointed arbitrator has ordered General Tire & Rubber Co. to rehire the last nine men of the seventy-four fired early last year after Sherman H. Dalrymple, international president of the United Rubber Workers, had expelled them dictatorially from the union, this famous case is now drawing to an official close.

Raymond Sullivan and Howard Haas, leaders of the Local No. 9 rank and file protest movement against Dalrymple's infamous expulsion policy, who likewise felt the bureaucratic axe, are included in the arbitrator's order for all to be rehired with full seniority but no back pay.



PUT UNION MEN IN ARMY

These men and many more of the others, have long since been in the Army. Militant rubber workers are wondering what steps are being taken at least to procure furloughs for them so that they may resume their jobs as critical tire production men!

PROGRESSIVES CARRIED FIGHT

Credit for the reinstatement of all these men belongs entirely to the efforts of progressives in the URWA who conducted a bitter fight against Dalrymple's illegal and ruinous dictatorship last year. That fight forced the Dalrymple majority at the last international convention held in September, 1944, to agree to reinstate the workers into the union and get their jobs back for them. Without that struggle, which lasted for months prior to the convention and up until the very last day of the convention, Dalrymple and his fel-

low union wreckers of the General Executive Board would have left the men to their fate.

As things now stand, Dalrymple still lays successful claim to the unconstitutional powers he utilized in expelling the General Local No. 9 members for violation of the no-strike pledge. Indeed he has been utilizing those powers on every occasion possible all over the country when workers, dissatisfied with company refusal to settle grievances, leave their jobs. Aided by his Kremlin-minded henchmen in Local 101 at the U. S. Rubber Co. in Detroit, Dalrymple has made a shambles of that local union SINCE the convention.

What is the answer for the rank and file rubber unionists to the monstrous, undemocratic and anti-union actions of Dalrymple and his cronies? Obviously, that answer must be found, and soon, if all the unions' past gains are not to be sacrificed in the face of increasing corporation gouging and governmental restrictions on labor.

STRUGGLE HAS ONLY BEGUN

Just a hint to that answer can be found in the battle of the progressives last year through the convention. An organized opposition caucus of rank and file members on a national scale must be undertaken. Unfortunately at this moment such does not exist. Last year's opposition grouping, led by George Bass of Akron Goodrich Local No. 5, has not survived in organized form, the two-to-one beating administered by Dalrymple to them at the convention in New York. The eclipse of the Bass forces subsequently in their own local has materially affected the course of the anti-Dalrymple opposition.

The biggest fault of last year's progressive caucus lay in its watered-down program and outlook. With its lack of consistent action to rescind outright the vicious no-strike pledge, which is the basis of Dalrymple's self-assumed powers, the caucus floundered. It concentrated on putting across its own slate of candidates without properly organizing the struggle around a progressive program. By that fact it gave the impression that it was fighting only for office.

On the vital issue of independent labor political action through the formation of a Labor Party, the anti-Dalrymple group kept silent and did

not differentiate itself at all from Roosevelt's friend "Dal." In this day and age, when all of labor's major demands are being "settled" against labor by the Democratic Party political tools of the industrialists, the caucus lacked the realization that progress for labor now and in the future can come only from a clean break-away from the illusion that the Democrats or Republicans can offer economic security.

THE WAY OUT

From the experiences of their struggle last year against Dalrymple's no-strike pledge and his all-out devotion to Roosevelt's policies for labor, it is now becoming increasingly clear to militant rubber workers that they have only one way to win back

What Labor Draft Really Means!

PHILADELPHIA, March 9 (AP)—A father of nine, expecting his tenth child, faces immediate induction for refusing to switch to war work at lower wages. Henry Huston, thirty-six years old, called for pre-induction physical examination today, was reclassified from 2A to 1A, his wife said, when he elected to remain at his hosiery mill job, paying \$70 to \$80 weekly. "We need that kind of money," said Mrs. Huston.

genuine collective bargaining and renew the democratic vigor of their organization. That way is to begin immediately to reassemble on a local and a national scale all those workers who understand or who can be educated to understand the practical necessity for throwing out the no-strike pledge, recalling the labor members from the WLB and declaring the political independence of the unions from the disastrous Dalrymple company-union type of alliance with Roosevelt.

Any further attempts to dodge a forthright discussion of these principal issues and failure to organize a substantial group in their favor will mean that at this year's convention Dalrymple and his contented colleagues will win another victory.

There is every reason to believe that success would attend efforts of progressives in presenting their own program.

C P Thuggery in Farm Equip't

CHICAGO—The UAW-CIO, as reported previously in LABOR ACTION, has begun to "absorb" the Communist - Stalinist - infested and controlled United Farm Equipment & Metal Workers of America. In early February the drive began at the huge Caterpillar Company plant in Peoria and in about two weeks a majority of the 17,000 Caterpillar workers were signed up. The FE, although holding bargaining rights for the workers, never had a majority of them in the union. According to latest reports, the UAW has already petitioned the NLRB for an election at Caterpillar.

On February 23, the process of "absorption" spread into Chicago, where the UAW organizers began a campaign in the McCormick and Tractor works plants of the International Harvester Co. At the time of this writing, the week after the drive began in Chicago, over 2,000 of the approximately 5,700 McCormick workers were in the UAW, while a little over 1,000 of the approximately 6,000 Tractor workers had signed cards. The difference between the two locals lies in the fact that the Communists at the Tractor works have a more efficient Gestapo system with which to prevent the signing up of workers.

In an effort to prevent the workers from joining the huge UAW, the Communists have resorted to the most desperate measures. At the McCormick works most of the chief stewards and two grievance committee men suspected of UAW sympathies were either suspended or expelled. At the last McCormick stewards' meeting the majority of the stewards who were not yet suspended resigned their posts and declared their allegiance to the UAW. The majority of the grievance committee did likewise.

COMMUNISTS ATTACK

The Communist thugs have beaten up McCormick workers and UAW organizers distributing UAW leaflets at the gate, while their propaganda has been only of the name-calling variety—tagging the UAW drive as nothing more than a "Hanley plot." Hanley, former president of McCormick Local 108, is a militant unionist. He was defeated by the Communists in the last election.

All of these moves on the part of the Communists, however, only lend impetus to the drive, as the workers begin to understand the caliber of their "leadership." It becomes obvious to them that the Communists are

fighting to preserve their anti-labor, anti-union policies, their jobs and control of the union.

While the UAW drive is, of course, not a "Hanley plot," it is being carried on at the McCormick works by the organizers of Local 108. It has been they, for the most part, and not the UAW organizer, who signed up the workers, distributed the leaflets, and took the physical beatings meted out by the Communists.

These men are determined to take their union into the UAW because they know (1) that the UAW is the biggest and most powerful union in the world, more capable of fighting for the workers than the FE International under its misleadership of Communist Party members. (2) That the UAW is the most democratic union in which the workers can express their opinion in an organized manner without being expelled or persecuted. (3) That the UAW rank and file are the most militant in the country.

In all of these things the progressives in Local 108 are correct.

We urge all those workers in the FE plants who have not done so, to join the UAW in a step toward better unionism.

# HOW THE COMMUNISTS BETRAYED THE ELAS IN GREECE

By JIM TANAKOS

The editors of the New Leader and others who should know better are continuing their nonsense that the uprising of the Greek people was engineered by Greek Stalinist-Communists. Every important fact proves exactly the opposite to be true.

From the very first days of the German occupation in Greece, when the EAM underground organization was being formed, the Greek Moscow-led Communists have acted as the most conservative wing within it. In 1942 when the National Committee of the EAM voted that the King should not be permitted to return, the Stalinists were the only ones on the National Committee who fought against this motion. This is typical of the course they pursued right down to the present day.

Last year when the EAM refused to enter the Papandreou government in Cairo, the Greek Stalinists, with the aid of U. S., British and Russian officials coerced and agitated the EAM for six whole months until they eventually forced it to enter the government. EAM ruled at least three-fifths of Greece during the period of the German occupation. EAM was the government and it didn't want to share its power with the British stooges who were "in flight" in Cairo. The Stalinists forced it into the Papandreou government.

### PEOPLE ROSE UP

After the Moscow-led Communist leaders of the EAM entered the Pa-

pandreou government, they took the reactionary cabinet members to the ELAS-held sections of Greece and paraded them around as "friends" in order to soften up the people for the day when these ministers returned as the government to Greece. Then, after the Papandreou government officially moved into Greece, the Communists collaborated fully in every one of its ventures. The Communists voted for the re-establishment of the army, the ages to be drafted, and agreed time and again to the disarming of the underground. They approved all appointments, sat down with the British banking experts and decided financial policies, while their stooges dashed up and down the countryside to curb the demands of the people.

But the people refused to disarm, despite the appeals of their Stalinist leaders. The Quislings were not being brought to trial. The collaborators were still roaming the streets and fascists were still in office at home and abroad. The Greek consul in the U. S., a Mr. Lely, is an appointee of the fascist dictator, Metaxas. The police who had persecuted the workers under the Greek and German fascist dictatorships were still on their jobs. In addition, British imperial troops were streaming into Greece, while 15,000 Greek soldiers were locked in British prisons throughout the entire Middle East for being against fascism.

The Greek masses fought back. By this time additional proof was given them why they should be suspicious

of the government, even if their Stalinist leaders were members of it. The Sacred Battalion and the Holy Brigade, made up of Greek royalists and fascists, were brought to Greece. Some of these fascists had been working with the Germans and had left Greece only a few months before. Now they were returning under British officers.

The ELAS began to protest. Even the Stalinists raised their voice above a whisper for the first time. When

the people of Athens staged their unarmed demonstration on December 5th and were shot down in the streets the ELAS resisted and prepared to defend itself.

**LUBLIN-ATHENS: A DIFFERENCE**  
The Communists were forced to go along. They could not refuse for they would have lost the leadership of the movement and would have run the risk of the movement going leftward—if their capitulatory and restraining arm was not there.

It is one thing to be on the Lublin Committee, with Russia next door and Stalin's army in your back yard. But for the Communists in Greece to remain in the leadership of the EAM or to exist as a party, or under the circumstances to remain alive even, it was necessary for them to go along with the masses.

The real proof that the Communists had a hot potato in their hands and wanted to put it in cold water in a hurry is the action they took only

forty-eight hours after the shooting started. Mr. Sofoulis, an anti-EAM-ite political hack of the Liberal Party, announced that he would form a government to replace Papandreou. He did not offer one single guarantee that his actions would be any different from Papandreou's or that he favored the workers and not the fascists. The one thing about him that was certain was that he is a thousand times more a foe of the ELAS than Papandreou could ever be.

The Communists immediately announced that they would join the Sofoulis government. With the hated Papandreou government out of the way, the ELAS might have been tricked into thinking that this government would be different. The British refused to permit Papandreou to resign and the Communists were forced to continue leading a struggle they did not want.

The actions of the Stalinists are not those of people trying to take power in the interests of the workers. They are the actions of typical sell-out artists who have been forced to lead a movement in struggle—or else lose control. This type of class-collaborationist tactics has been seen time and again in the labor movement.

It would be wrong to minimize the stranglehold of the Kremlin bureaucracy on these puppet organizations known as Communist Parties. Stalin did not order the Greek struggle. His boys in Greece did everything to prevent it. It was too big a risk along the path of social revolution which

might have set off the spark in other places. But, once it began, Stalin was willing to take advantage of it and force a frightened Churchill to come out flat-footed on the question of Poland.

### POWER POLITICS AND GREECE

At Teheran it was agreed that Poland would come under Russia's sphere of influence and Greece would go to Britain. Churchill had been stalling for months without declaring himself for the Lublin Committee. If Churchill expected cooperation from the Communists in Greece, Stalin wanted his Lublin stooges to be recognized openly by Churchill. Churchill obliged with a speech to that effect in the House of Commons. But the ELAS in Greece continued fighting because the Stalinists could not stop it.

The Communist Party in Greece is a Stalinized party and will continue along that line. But hundreds of its members who lived in prisons and concentration camps for years—put there by Greek and German fascism and now by the British and Greek governments—will not continue to be blind religious worshippers of the Stalinist policies. In the Greek Communist Party five members of the Central Committee and scores of party members were killed during the struggle by the ELAS against the German fascists, and many more have been killed during the past few weeks. It is out of situations such as these that we will see splits in the Stalinist Parties of Europe and throughout the world.

## The Upper 1% Lives Well

By SYLVIA MERRILL

Children, at the tender age of ten, unless they live in a Southern textile mill town, don't generally go to work. For that matter, children at that age don't generally have more money than you can count on the fingers of your hands—but the child of this story was not named Helen Smith, but Gloria Laura Morgan Vanderbilt, who was forced to begin life at that tender age with \$3,806,762.

As a child, her custody was disputed by her mother and her aunt and the court granted her a mere \$34,500 a year for her living expenses while the case was pending. This she spent in part as follows:

- \$175.79 for ginger ale and soda water
- 125.00 for medical treatment of a cat
- 30.75 for a movie projector (so that she would not run the risk of catching cold in a theater)
- 415.00 for toys
- 153.00 for a single dress
- 1,000.00 for a month's rent of a summer house
- 125.00 for a French teacher (as much as it took for care of a sick cat)
- 30.00 for one hat
- 1,391.00 for dental and medical care
- 11,515.39 for servants' hire
- 1,995.00 for detectives' hire
- 12,000.00 for legal expenses

If you followed the newspaper stories that appeared

in the next eleven years, or until the time when she was twenty-one, you were told of many facts about Gloria's troubled existence—but never did any story so much as hint at the fact that she had to go to work.

It may be hard to believe, but Gloria didn't even have to clip the coupons. When people are the inheritors of that much money they even hire coupon clippers. They are called "legal advisors" who watch the investments of these poor "idle rich." They receive handsome fees for their labors. Gloria, as we know from the pictures of her at the various famous night spots, was even able to manage a good meal and a drink on her frugal budget. She was even able to get married. All that time, the bonds, which formed the major part of her investments, just stayed there as nice and calm as you please and collected dust.

At twenty-one she was able to handle her own money. They figured it all up, deducted expenses and found—\$4,295,628. The original investment had grown by \$488,866. OH, FOR A RICH UNCLE!

In case anyone is mystified as to how this little girl was able to save this much money when almost everyone who isn't in Gloria's class has been spending the last eleven years either keeping the wolf from the door or keeping one step ahead of rising prices—let alone extensive saving—be assured it doesn't take a Houdini to master this trick. It requires no rabbits, no mirrors, no sleight-of-hand. All it requires is a rich grandfather to start the ball rolling.

## Cyprus: A British Colony

By CHRIS SIKOKIS

On February 12, at the World Trade Union Conference in London, the representative of the trade unions from Cyprus, V. Ziartides, took the floor and gave his views on the war, trade union unity and imperialism. Although his speech was the nearest thing to a condemnation of British imperialism to be uttered at this conference, the London newspapers gave it very favorable publicity. This is the first time the boss press of London has ever quoted favorably a member of the Cypriot working class. And there is a reason for it—in Ziartides' speech.

Cyprus is an island inhabited by 380,000 people, 310,000 of whom are Greek. Cyprus is a British colony although the people have very definite wishes and desires to be part of Greece, with which they feel they have in common three thousand years of identical history, traditions, language, religion, customs, etc. These people of Cyprus have risen time and again over a period of years, with arms in hand, to free themselves from British imperialism. But Britain has ruthlessly kept these people in subjugation and has even denied them the most elementary rights of free speech, press, assembly, organization and even the right to teach Greek history in the schools.

### CONDITIONS ON ISLAND

The present war has worsened the already existing horrible conditions on the island. Demonstrations and general strikes have occurred and many of the workers' leaders have been imprisoned. The cost of living has risen 300 per cent in the past three years, according to the unions, and the British Colonial Office admits the figure of 278 per cent. Wages are frozen.

But Ziartides did not mention these things in his speech and that made the capitalist press happy. Ziartides' speech (which was translated on the floor by E. Papaioannou, editor of the Stalinist Cyprian News of London) had a section on civil liberties and some militant phrases against imperialism but his conclusions were to make a "new world" by having this conference apply the principles of the Teheran Conference. This part, of course, the capitalist press liked best of all.

The capitalists of England know that the labor conference had been called to work out the best methods of lining up the workers of the world to support the Teheran and Yalta agreements of the imperialists. If Ziartides was speaking for the workers of Cyprus and if these workers are willing to wait for the Teheran agreement to work out their fate, abandoning the struggle for freedom,

then British imperialism has nothing to fear.

### NOT A NEW STRUGGLE

The struggle for liberation of Cyprus is not something new. Cyprus revolted against Turkey in 1821 when Greece was fighting for her national independence. Turkey suppressed this revolt, but it took a great deal of effort and shooting and hanging of Cypriots before she could put down this revolt.

Cyprus was then tossed around for a few years by the imperialists until she eventually came under the rule of Britain in 1878. The people didn't want this—but when did im-

Britain. A delegation went to London to remind the heads of Britain of their promise, but they were laughed out of Downing Street and returned home empty-handed.

When the present war broke out, Great Britain formed a Cypriot battalion, but nobody answered the call to "the colors." The people had learned their lesson in the last war. Britain decided to make a few "democratic" concessions to the people (which she is already beginning to take back), hoping that this might fool them again. Political parties for local elections, unions with limited powers and a limited freedom of speech and press were permitted.

### STILL GIVING RUNAROUND

The cost of living on the island, as mentioned before, has impoverished the working class. The Stalinist committees have been meeting with the British authorities for the past three years and have accomplished absolutely nothing. The workers got tired of this runaround and have on many occasions taken matters into their own hands. The war plants of Leukosia went on a ten-day strike because their demand for a wage increase of one selina a day was denied. General strikes took place throughout the island on August 27 and October 25, 1943. Mass demonstrations took place at the same time as these general strikes, and the police arrested the leaders, imprisoned some of them and fined the others. Fifteen thousand government war project workers struck on March 1, 1944, because their demand for an increase in wages from 28 to 38 selinas had been denied. A general sympathy strike was declared by the unions and the entire island laid down its tools.

Last summer when the underground movement in Greece was clearing that country of the Germans the Cypriots felt the time had come for them to begin active agitation for unity with Greece. Sir Parkinson, British commissioner of the island, announced that no meetings or demonstrations would be permitted, but on August 17, mass meetings and demonstrations took place in several cities. The leaders were arrested and held for trial. But the trials were postponed because thousands of workers gathered in front of the courts and the officials did not dare to hold them. August 28th was declared "National Manifestation Day" and all the workers went on a general strike and once again held meetings and demonstrations, demanding their democratic rights and the right of self-determination.

These are the people that Churchill and the Stalinists think they will stop from struggling by feeding them illusions about Teheran and Yalta.

### BLOCK THAT LIE!

From Robert Minor's column in the Daily Worker:

"For if the coming into existence of a great socialist state were not a vast event of development in world democracy—then it would have been impossible for Teheran or Yalta to have happened at all. In that case the vilest and most nonsensical lie of all history would be true—the filthy lie that Russia was allied with Nazi Germany."



perialists ever ask the people what they want? The day the first British commissioner stepped on the island he was handed a manifesto by the inhabitants telling him that the people were accepting the occupation by Britain only if it represented a transition stage of union with Greece. The struggle has in one form or another gone on since that day.

During the First World War, the Allies told the Cypriots that if they fought in the war they could have "self-determination" to decide their own fate. Thousands of Cypriots fought with the Allies, only to discover when it was over that the imperialists were only fooling, and that the people were still slaves of Great

### Small Wonder

The royal servants [of Ibn Saud visiting Roosevelt aboard a destroyer] continued to mistake the ship's Negro mess boys for slaves of the U. S. Navy.—New York Times, March 5.

## Cleveland Transit Men Win Concessions

By JAMES SHEA

CLEVELAND—After having held a referendum on an agreement between the union and the management, officers of Local 268 of the Streetcar Men's Union have decided to hold another one for "confirmation."

Just what prompts them to have another vote on an agreement which was overwhelmingly approved in the first one, 2,508 to 337, isn't quite clear. It appears to be a fear on the part of the officers that the men didn't fully understand what they were voting for, although it was explained at length in a pre-referendum bulletin. The agreement called for time and

a half after forty-four hours, continuation of daily overtime rates after eight hours, spread time after eleven and a half hours on scheduled work, and continuation of present spread time rates on unscheduled work for the operators.

A concession was made by the union to eliminate meal allowance time on Sundays in order to improve schedules. The miscellaneous men were granted time and a half after forty hours. In addition, they are to be paid from time called, not to exceed an hour, when they are called out on special work.

In spite of the fact that there will

be no raise this year, the agreement represents a great gain for the men. The operators had previously been paid time and a half only after six consecutive days of work or eight hours in the day, and this since last year only. The miscellaneous employees were paid, according to last year's agreement, only after forty-four hours of work, or eight hours in the day.

The Cleveland Press, as was to be expected, moralized on the agreement. They welcomed the fact that this year's negotiations were completed "with no strike or threat of strike as in the last two years.

### A LITTLE PRODUCT OF THE WAR

Absentee owners in the United States will shortly receive checks totalling \$30,000,000 in profits which have accrued to them in France during the Nazi occupation and which were left intact during the Nazi rush to get out of Paris.

These checks, according to a New York Times correspondent, range from \$520,000 to the du Pont Company in Wilmington, Del., to \$1.14 to the Thomas Crowell Company of New York. The du Pont Company acts very much surprised: "The du Pont Company has no plants in France and knows nothing about this report. The figure mentioned may represent dividends on certain long-term investments in French industries and royalties on processes licensed to French industry before the war," says a company representative.

The headline on this story is very apropos: "U. S. Firms Get Loot Nazis Left." U. S. firms get the Nazi loot, not the people whose exploitation created those profits, not the French workers who gave their lives to oust the Germans and who for four long years starved and died under Nazi rule! The reward for the sacrifices of the French workers is what? It is dividends to a rich firm more than 3,000 miles away which does not even know that the dividends exist or what they are for!

## Conditions of the European Jews

By J. KAAREN

Although the Nazi liquidation of the Jews of Romania, Bulgaria, Poland and Hungary has ceased, the Jews are still in great danger, and this time from the "liberation" tactics of their new oppressors, the Soviet regime. The few reports that do manage to leak out from Soviet occupied territory which is generally closed to foreign news correspondents reveal that the Jewish survivors of the Nazi slaughter campaign are again finding it difficult to exist.

### JEWISH REPRESSIONS

According to stories written by Joseph Levy, New York Times Balkan correspondent, and also statements made by David Ben-Gurion, chairman of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, who recently went there to see about the possibilities of emigration of Bulgarian Jews to Palestine, about 40,000 Jews are living under extremely destitute conditions. They are not even permitted to take shelter in former Jewish public buildings. They are denied any civil rights in connection with return of jobs or return of property, despite democratic phrases in their new constitution. The group in the government most antagonistic to helping the Jews is the Communists.

Mr. Ben-Gurion's statement says in part: "The Jewish Communists in Bulgaria are stressing the danger that

can arise from a forced return of Jewish property, arguing that this way leads to increased anti-Semitism. It is possible that owners of large buildings may get some of their property back, but small shopkeepers and artisans have no chance whatsoever.

### "SOVIETIZATION"

"The members of the Bulgarian cabinet informed me that the new constitution provides full rights for every Bulgarian and allows Jews to emigrate from the country, but in practice the obstacles to leaving are enormous since seventeen affidavits must be submitted, including a statement by the applicant that he owes no debts to the government nor to private people."

Another report in the Jewish press deals with the repatriation of Romanian Jews who were put into concentration camps in the Ukraine by the Nazis, and now wish to return to their former homes. The Soviet members of the Allied Control Commission have decreed that only those Romanians who were born in Southern Bukovina and in the part of Romania known as the Old Kingdom will be allowed to return to Romania. All those Jews born in Bessarabia or in Northern Bukovina, both sections now claimed by Russia, are automatically considered Soviet citizens and they may not return to Romania.

New York Readers:

## WORKERS PARTY FORUM UNDERLYING CAUSES OF WORLD WAR II

Speaker: Herman Fenwick

Sunday, March 25 Admission 25 Cents

AT

HOTEL DIPLOMAT

Mezzanine Room, 108 West 43rd Street, Near 6th

### HOPKINS FORGOT TO TELL THE POPE

The following two items are from the New York Times: "ROME, Jan. 30—A possibility of the first strike in the history of Vatican City arose here today. Several hundred electricians, truck drivers and printers are involved...."

"It was recalled that early last month the Avanti (socialist newspaper—Ed.) observed that the wages of Vatican workers who belong to regular Italian labor groups could no longer cover the cost of living."

"ROME Feb. 1—The threat of the first strike in the history of the Vatican ended today with the announcement of wage increases amounting to nearly 100 per cent in the case of some of the lowest brackets of workers, while the better paid will get ten to thirty per cent more."

What! Didn't Harry Hopkins, the President's personal representative, on his recent visit to Rome, tell the Pope about the employers' not-so-secret weapon, the no-strike pledge?

## CP Lines Up With Detroit Companies

DETROIT—The Communist Party, through its Daily Worker, continues its current pro-employer, anti-union, strike-breaking policy. This time it does its little bit to help knife the Dodge and Briggs workers here.

Listen to the Daily Worker of March 2. One imagines that he hears the voice of the Briggs and Chrysler managements:

"A strike conspiracy is rapidly unfolding in this huge war center... The Briggs strike, the 161st in the eight Detroit Briggs plants since Pearl Harbor, was called at the instigation of Trotskyite leaders of Local 212 of the CIO United Auto Workers Union in protest against the dismissal of thirteen committeemen and stewards. The thirteen were charged with inciting strikes."

It would be hard to compress more lies and distortions into so few sentences.

It is a LIE offered first to the public by the Briggs company that there have been 161 strikes. The Daily Worker repeats this lie. It is a LIE that the thirteen were discharged for "inciting" strikes.

Most shameless of all is the language of the Daily Worker, plagiarized from the reactionaries and employers in their attacks on unionism. When the Communists still retained a trace of pro-union fighting spirit, and that was a long time ago, the employers accused all unions of being led by "communists." Strikes were "instigated" by agitators who were in a "conspiracy" of some deep and dark nature. What was—and is—the purpose of this kind of talk? To throw a smokescreen around the real issues involved in union organization and strikes. To hide the desire by the big capitalists to rule as absolute dictators over their workers.

The Communists simply substitute the word Trotskyite where the employers used to say Communist but the rest of the language remains unchanged.

The National Maritime Union, which takes its usual cue from the Daily Worker, demands that the UAW Executive Board remove the officers of all locals who support their striking members. And of course there is the usual telegram from the NMU demanding (pardon me, requesting) that Roosevelt initiate an investigation of these elements "seeking to incite a general strike situation in Detroit automobile plants."

And some people persist in calling the Communists the radical "left wing!"

DETROIT READERS, ATTENTION!

LABOR ACTION FORUM

MARCH 25th:

WALLACE AND LABOR

APRIL 1st:

NEGROES IN TRADES UNIONS

Sunday evenings

Admission Free

LABOR ACTION HALL

2650 ARNDT — Gratiot at Chene