

# GREETINGS, AUTO WORKERS!

## Workers Party Speaks to the Union Movement

By MAX SHACHTMAN  
National Secretary, Workers Party

The Workers Party is a national labor political organization, but it is not a trade union. LABOR ACTION is a national labor paper, but it is not the organ of any trade union.

Why, then, do both the Workers Party and LABOR ACTION concern themselves with the affairs of the American (and for that matter, the international) trade union movement? Why, indeed, do they devote nine-tenths of their time and activity to the work and problems of the trade union movement? Why are they so much interested in the "internal" affairs of the unions, as well as the relations of the unions to the employers and the government?

These are questions that any trade unionist may legitimately ask. They deserve a simple and clear-cut answer. The occasion of several important CIO union conventions, and especially now the convention of the UAW, which is the most important of all, is a fitting one for such an answer.

The Workers Party is not, we repeat, a trade union, although ninety per cent of its membership belongs to trade unions. It is a political organization; but a political organization of a special kind.

In the first place, the Workers Party, as its name implies, is a working class organization through and through. By this we mean that it stands first, last and always for the working class, for its immediate interests and for its historical interests. In every fight labor engages in, regardless of who "started" it or what mistakes labor may be making, the Workers Party is one hundred per cent on the side of the workers and opposed to their class enemies, the capitalists and the capitalist governments.

In the second place, the Workers Party is a socialist and internationalist organization. It works for the establishment of a socialist society, that is, a society organized without class division or privilege or rule, and operating exclusively for the benefit of the producers of wealth, the men and women who work with hand and brain. Such a society, we believe, is possible and necessary. It is an inevitable successor of the bankrupt system of capitalism under which labor is now exploited and oppressed.

Such a society of free men, living and working amid abundance and in security and peace, can be established only by a workers' government which lays the foundations for it. A workers' government is simply a government ruled by the workers in their own interests, and not in the interests of a handful of capitalist monopolies.

We cannot even think of such a government except as one established by the organized working class, certainly not as one established "in its name" by a minority which does not enjoy the support of organized labor.

The organized working class today is the trade union movement. Without the agreement and active support of the majority of this movement, any hope of a workers' government, to say nothing of socialism, is an empty dream. We therefore say openly that the winning of this support for socialism is the main aim of the Workers Party.

But the struggle for socialism is not merely for something far-off. It is a fight for the best interests of the workers NOW, as well as tomorrow. Why? Because if these interests are not defended today, there will be no working class movement tomorrow capable of fighting for its highest and noblest goal—complete freedom.

To fight for the best interests of the workers today, now, means, from our point of view, to transform their existing organizations into organizations much better equipped for fighting labor's battles than they actually are—better equipped from the standpoint of understanding, of program, of leadership.

The fact is that nine-tenths of the American labor leadership think only in terms of preserving capitalism, which is the source of our troubles, and of keeping the unions under the direction of capitalism. The Stalinists of the so-called Communist Party think and act only in terms of bringing the trade unions under the domination of the reactionary Russian bureaucracy.

We of the Workers Party simply aim at having the workers take over complete, democratic control of the unions. We want to see a thoroughly militant and aggressive working class policy adopted in the unions, so that labor no longer truckles to the bosses and their government, but fights them consistently with the aim of establishing their own government.

We urge a radical break with all capitalist politics in the unions (which is the kind of politics the labor leaders are now carrying on) and the adoption of working class politics, beginning with the formation of a National Labor Party, completely independent of the two capitalist parties.

Naturally, the trade union leaders, the bureaucrats and the Stalinists do not like our program and the educational work we conduct. That is why they fight so bitterly against our ideas and even lie about them. Therefore, we are compelled to fight against them and their harmful activities. That is why we

(Continued on page 2)

## Grumman Incentive Pay Plan Reveals Scheme to Rob Labor

While the Administration and its various agencies, big business and the Stalinists keep pushing for the adoption of incentive pay plans by the whole labor movement, the Grumman Aircraft Corporation has revealed its plan for incentive pay which bears out all the charges that it is a scheme to rob the workers.

The Grumman Corporation admits that the detailed method of arriving at its rates cannot be applied everywhere, but it advises the adoption of its "principle." And it is this principle, as expressed in its figures, which is precisely the one adopted by industry and all the advocates of incentive pay. The scheme, briefly, is to get a great deal more production for a little more money. Here is the Grumman formula:

Pct. Incr. in Output	Pct. Incr. in Pay
10	5
20	10
30	15
40	20
50	25
60	30
70	32½
80	35
90	37½
100	40

More than 100 No further increase

There it is in black and white. Up to a sixty per cent increase in production, the workers will get half an increase in pay. From a sixty to a hundred per cent increase in production, the workers will receive much less than half an increase in pay. For over a hundred per cent in production the workers will get nothing beyond a forty per cent increase.

## Bosses Have Billions in Reserve for Rainy Day

The Facts Behind the Campaign of Big Business to Increase Still Higher Its Wartime Super-Profits

Under Secretary of War Patterson has revealed another part of the story about war profits. For some time LABOR ACTION has published reports on the mounting profits of the big corporations and the huge salaries which the officials of these monopolies have given themselves.

During all this time the greedy vultures of big business have been shedding tears and yelling about high taxes eating into their "legitimate" profits! In recent weeks, under the direction of the National Association of Manufacturers, big business has organized a campaign to abolish the renegotiation of contracts law on the ground that this law took away its profits.

Of course, this is the biggest lie of all! The renegotiation law did not destroy the super-profits of big business; it merely reduced them a little. It still leaves them many billions in profits—the largest profits in the history of the country, larger than the profits of 1929!

The renegotiation law was put into effect as a safety measure to prevent such scandals as would rock the whole filthy system. Government officials speaking against the abolition of the law are afraid that the "captains of industry" will ruin everything if they are not kept a little in check. That the law has had little or no effect on profits is revealed by their own figures.

But this, says Nathan Robertson of PM, is conservative and low, because it does not take into consideration "war taxes subject to refund to corporations after the war" amount-

ing to \$13,000,000,000! Nor does it take into consideration \$14,000,000,000 of collateral benefits "which the corporations may realize in part from plants financed by the government on which they have options.

Under Secretary of War Patterson estimated that by the end of 1944, war contractors, i.e., big business, will have piled up a post-war reserve equivalent to \$42,000,000,000!

PM points out that, whichever figure you take, \$42,000,000,000 or \$55,000,000,000 (this includes tax refunds to corporations), it is larger than the total pre-war national debt. This same figure is also greater than the total national income during the last year of the Hoover Administration in 1932!

There is an additional joker in the tax law. It provides that if a corporation should lose money after the war, it can draw on refunds "not only on its wartime excess profits taxes, but also on its normal and surtaxes during the previous two years." These taxes will amount to \$26,000,000,000 for the years 1943 and 1944. And big business will be permitted to draw on these funds.

Here is a revealing picture of the "sufferings" of big business: a \$42,000,000,000 direct post-war reserve; \$13,000,000,000 in tax refunds to go back to big business; \$14,000,000,000 in collateral benefits. The total is \$69,000,000,000! All of this on top of other profits and enormous salaries!

There is your "equality of sacrifice" in the war!

## Report and Comment on the IUMSW

# Ship Convention Muffs Vital Issues

By DAVID COOLIDGE

Many shipyard workers who were delegates to the ninth convention of the Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers must be asking themselves by now just why this convention was held at all. The delegates have had time to think over their recent convention held in New York last week and the most militant and intelligent of them must be amazed that they sat quietly through four days of indifference, lethargy, futility and bunkum.

The dullness and gloom that pervaded this convention were punctuated only by the discussion on the "Velson case." This "case," however, which we will report on later in this article, certainly was no credit to either side.

To add to the general dullness of the convention, there was an unusual array of stupid and puerile speeches by government officials. While all of these government officials are attending the conventions for a purpose—to put over the line of more production for less pay, for labor to work longer hours, to admonish the unions to do police duty against "absenteeism," to harangue the delegates about "this is labor's war"—their presentation at the shipbuilders' convention was really a miserable spectacle. It must have been embarrassing to President Green to have to stand there like a master of ceremonies in a night club, asking the audience to give a hand to some ham of a performer.

**The Zombies Take the Floor**  
There was Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard. He is a regular visitor to labor conventions. He always makes the same speech. We remember his speech at the CIO convention last year when he gave as proof that this is a "workers' war," the fact that there are more workers in the United States than there are corporation lawyers, corporation presidents or millionaires.

Admiral Land was present to give the delegates some "inspiring remarks," as President Green put it. The admiral began his remarks by saying that he had "known Johnnie Green for many years." He had also known the meaning of a dollar for fifty years, because he had come up the hard way. In his youth he had worked from sunrise to sunset. "We have a common purpose and a common future," said the admiral. "War is hell. Production costs in Canada and England are lower than in the

United States. Absenteeism has cost a hundred ships since Pearl Harbor. In some yards there is too much beating the whistle. Team work is needed. We are all interested in the profit motive. That applies to management and it applies to labor. We all wait for payday. We want no profiteers. Labor, management and government must sit down and plan jointly. I have come to the conclusion that labor leaders are smarter than management. Some day this global war will cease. God speed the day. I haven't told you anything new."

This was the kind of rubbish that President Green called an "inspiring message." An inspiring message from the man who a few months back talked about labor organizers like a Southern backwoods deputy sheriff. This was the "inspiring message" delivered to workers who just recently were denied a small increase of nine cents an hour in wages.

A delegate from Local 43 took the floor to say that Admiral Land was interested in "our production record; we wish that he would be just as interested in our health record." The admiral was invited to visit the Bethlehem-Fairfield yard during the lunch hour to witness the conditions under which workers are forced to eat their lunch.

**Bull Session Goes On**  
General DeWitt was present to represent the Army with a speech. It would be difficult to say just what the general was trying to get across. One thing we remember is that he said he didn't know anything about ships. This seemed to be the high point of the general's remarks.

A representative of the British Embassy was present to make a speech. There were the usual speeches by Carey and Haywood, representing the CIO. This is formal procedure, of course.

Charlie Irvin, official press agent for Sidney Hillman and unofficial press agent for Franklin D. Roosevelt, was on hand with a few of his best platitudes. Brother Irvin is convinced that the "Declaration of Independence has never been put into practice, and it won't be until it is put into practice by working men."

According to Irvin, the only way for workingmen to put the Declaration of Independence into practice is to vote for Roosevelt for a fourth term. "I don't believe that the American people will ever go back on the man that never went back on the working people," said Irvin with a great deal of fervor and emphasis.

All of this speaking, most of it irrelevant and nonsensical in any labor convention, took place in four short days at their disposal to devote to serious problems that vitally concerned the welfare of themselves, their families and their union. About half of the working time available to the convention was consumed by these speeches, waiting for committee reports and other time-wasting devices, some due to inefficiency and others no doubt deliberately planned by the leadership.

**The "Unanimous" Decisions**  
The overwhelming majority of resolutions were passed "unanimously." We say it this way with quotation marks because, although this was what was announced and although no delegate voted against, it was and is clear that the real feelings of the delegates were not expressed in the voting. A fourth term for Roosevelt, reaffirmation of the no-strike pledge, support of Roosevelt on extending the war in Europe and ideas on post-war planning were embodied in resolutions and passed unanimously.

Of course, it isn't true that all the delegates to this convention favored a fourth term for Roosevelt. We don't believe that all of the six hundred delegates to this convention are so naive, backward and politically immature as to believe that independent political action means to vote for Roosevelt or a Republican.

Many of the shipyard workers have come to this country from Scotland and England. They know about the labor parties in those countries. They must know that even with the present policies of these labor parties they represent an advance in many respects beyond the point that labor has reached politically in the United States. There must have been hundreds of delegates in that convention who know that they should have voted against the resolution supporting Roosevelt for a fourth term and in favor of an independent working class Labor Party, free from Roosevelt and Willkie.

Also every delegate to that convention, except the most reactionary, is against the no-strike pledge. How can the rank and file of labor be in support of such a union-breaking device? The very fact that numerous strikes take place is proof enough that the workers are in practice against this pledge given to Roosevelt without their consent. One delegate spoke against the no-strike resolution but he did not vote against it.

By ALBERT GATES

The fourth convention of the United Automobile Workers, the most important since it was founded, will gather in Buffalo on October 4. This is an event of tremendous importance to the entire American labor movement, for the UAW is the largest single union in the country and one of the most militant in the world. Its decisions, whatever they may be, will have a powerful influence upon the whole future of the labor movement. By the adoption of a militant, progressive program, the auto workers' convention would be in a position to advance a thousandfold the cause of labor.

As a socialist newspaper interested in the establishment of a free society and the abolition of all forms of exploitation, and for the reason cited above, LABOR ACTION is greatly interested in the convention of the UAW.

Since America's entry into the war, the labor movement has been dealt a series of blows. This is not merely the result of the impact of new conditions, but in large measure is due to the policies and practices which the labor officialdom has adopted at the behest of Roosevelt and his administration.

Under the program of "national unity" and the guise of "equality of sacrifice," the union movement has surrendered the weapons which guaranteed its existence, its health and its growth.

In a recent article on the convention of the UAW, we wrote: "With America's entry into the war, the UAW faced a new situation and a series of new problems which affected labor.

"The conversion of the auto industry to war production, and the placing of the whole country on a war footing, exacted its toll of the labor movement in the same proportion that it enriched industry and the profit-bloated bosses."

Capitulating to threats from the President, the union officialdom gave a no-strike pledge, accepted the Administration's domestic program, which froze wages, established the WLB operating under the Little Steel formula, upset the struggle for equal wages, strengthened wage differentials, and in general so tied down the unions that big business has enjoyed a veritable holiday of anti-unionism.

In return for these concessions by labor, the President promised that no advantage would be taken of the unions and they would have "maintenance of membership." Moreover, out of respect for their sacrifices, Roosevelt promised control of profits, barring of new war millionaires, holding down the cost of living, price control and rationing to guarantee equality in the distribution of consumer goods.

After nearly two years of war, it is clear that the domestic program of the Roosevelt Administration has become a program against labor's best interests. The no-strike pledge has given the bosses the weapon they have long been looking for. Under it they have sought to break union contracts, the shop steward system, grievance committee functions, and many other instruments for improving the conditions of the workers which the labor movement had won after years of hard struggle.

In turn, the no-strike pledge has been a noose around the neck of the unions. It has prevented them from fighting back effectively.

The wage freeze and the hold-the-line order, coming on top of the absence of consumer goods and deterioration in quality of goods, has lowered the living standards of the people. In seeking to overcome this situation by demanding wage increases, the unions have run up against the wall of the infamous War Labor Board.

**Campaign for Incentive Pay**  
In opposition to the demands of the workers for wage increases, big business, the WLB, the WPB, the Administration, some labor leaders and the Stalinist union-busters have proposed the nation-wide adoption of incentive pay. Thus, the unions face the danger of the reintroduction of the old-time piecework speed-up schemes which can result only in an increase in the profits of the bosses. These are some of the main questions which have agitated the mass of the rank and file of the union movement.

The dissatisfaction of the rank and file in the UAW has been especially acute. They have seen how the Roosevelt program, adopted by the union bureaucracy, has had one important result: it has enriched big business at the expense of the workers. It has given monopoly greater control of labor; it has weakened the union movement.

Only these conditions can explain the rapid growth of rank and file groups into the auto workers' union, each of them fighting for one or more progressive measures.

Thus, for example, groups in local unions have gone on record against the no-strike pledge, against the WLB, the Little Steel formula, for recall of labor members on the WLB, against the wage freeze, for wage increases, and almost all have announced their opposition to incentive pay.

**Michigan Progressives**  
At the Michigan State CIO convention, a high point was reached in adopting a progressive union program. The decision adopted there, while not everything necessary to a fully organized and conscious progressive program, went a long way in that direction by its unmistakable opposition to Roosevelt's domestic program. It even took a strong step forward in the direction of independent political action of labor as a means of fighting the boss political parties and the reactionary anti-labor Congress.

So acute are the issues which confront the general union movement and the UAW that the existence of two leadership factions, the Reuther-Leonard and the Addes-Frankenstein groups, reflects, even though partially, the struggle within the union for a militant program. An examination of the program of these two power-couples reveals several important things. The Reu-

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued on page 3)



NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Highlights on the Shipyard Workers' Convention

By JOHN BERNE

Secretary - Treasurer Van Gelder opened the convention with the remark that it was an "opportunity to the rank and file" to deliberate on their problems.

First, the leadership tried their damndest to keep controversial matters off the floor. Second, the hot air merchants, including admirals and generals, took up too much precious time gassing.

Discussion on Few Resolutions

In the early part of the convention some discussion developed on the resolutions on organizing certain yards, on improving food conditions in the yards, and on the organizing of ladies' auxiliaries by all locals.

The first discussion indicated very clearly that not only in the yards mentioned in the resolution, such as River Rouge, but from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes to the Pacific, workers are aware of the need for an intensive organization drive and of the inadequacy of what their leaders are doing in this respect.

On the resolution for improvement of food conditions, delegates complained about fifteen-minute lunch periods in some yards. Other delegates related how they spend a half-hour waiting in line for something to eat which is not edible when they get it.

President Green thought these were "beefs" to be taken up at locals, which was his way of cutting off discussion on even this comparatively uncontroversial question. However, this did not prevent a delegate from Fairfield Local 43 from extending to Rear Admiral Land of "union organizers should be shot at dawn" fame—then seated on the platform—an invitation to visit his yard during the lunch hour.

The delegate from Local 50 took the opportunity for getting in the party line on incentive pay. He referred to it as a means of "cupping" wages and—believe it or not—of improving health. This is a brand new one: Sweatshop piece-work will improve health!

It was rather significant that the delegates placed so much emphasis on the organization of ladies' auxiliaries. They recognized the danger of the heavily financed, high-pressure campaign waged by the National Association of Manufacturers against unionism through the press, the radio, the movies and the schools.

Bartering Away Labor's Might

A delegate from Local 36 was the only one with spunk enough to oppose the resolution upholding the shameful no-strike pledge. He said that in effect labor's no-strike pledge was an approval of the Smith-Connelly bill and that by continuing the pledge, labor is sticking its head out to be cut off by even more reactionary legislation.

Whereupon President Green turned insult into injury by warning the delegates that the resolution is not a token, but means what it says. In his opening speech President Green

Truck Drivers Win Strike

LOUISVILLE — Forty-four truck drivers at the Air Reduction, Sales Corp. of this city, members of the AFL Truck Drivers Union, Local 89, carried out an old-fashioned strike, pickets and all, and in three days' time they won.

During the previous two weeks these workers had pulled two stoppages as a warning to the company, which refused to ask the War Labor Board for ten cents an hour raise, as recommended by a U.S. conciliator. Instead of taking heed, the company shifted recognition from the regular union to a company union.

This time the workers voted to strike unless the company filed for the wage increase and recognized their union by Thursday morning. Pat Ansbury, business agent, tried to prevent the "unauthorized strike," but when the company made no move by the deadline, the workers quit.

Despite arrests on the picket line and solemn appeals from Tom Flynn of Indianapolis, acting president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the men held "solid" for three days and won their demands in full.

The press congratulated Ansbury and Flynn for the role they tried to play, but we congratulate the workers. This was the first full-fledged strike in Louisville since the mayor maneuvered the labor leaders into a local no-strike pledge. The strike was no surprise, however. The workers here are getting sick and tired of thirty-five to fifty cents an hour wages and of being tied down

had said: "If we cannot find some other way to win our demands than to cease production of war material, it simply means we are mentally bankrupt and unworthy of leading great masses of American citizens."

The point President Green willfully overlooks is that the bosses are NOT mentally bankrupt. They understand only too well that when the workers are pledged not to use their economic power, "some other way"—whatever it is—is nothing they have to be afraid of.

For Boss Follies

There were at least two resolutions supporting Roosevelt, aside from the many thousands of words to the same effect issuing from the platform. One resolution pledged support to the Commander-in-Chief, etc. The other pledged fourth term support to FDR as "the friend of labor," etc. When a delegate from Local 36 stated that this second resolution only repeated the previous one, President Green declared that a little repetition is a good thing. Further discussion was scotched. "The resolution tying a mighty union to the coattails of a

What the Rubber Workers Decided

By BILL FORD

AKRON—The eighth annual convention of the United Rubber Workers, CIO, has ended with the defeat of the major progressive proposals coming before it. Yet at the same time the wide gulf existing between the policies of the official top leadership and the interests of the 160,000 organized union rubber workers has never before been so thoroughly exposed at a URW convention.

It can be said quite truthfully that if the progressive forces had gone to the convention as well prepared to carry through their program as the Dalrymple-Burns-Stalinist leadership went prepared to slash it to bits, the progressives might well have ousted the misleaders, who now hope to wipe out the last traces of the URW's former militancy.

The first major controversy to break out was on the issue of demanding a referendum vote of the membership on such questions as the no-strike pledge, instead of the international officers being permitted to give such pledges on their own. If a record vote had been taken, it is probable that this resolution would have carried. However, the delegates had been confused by the unexpected introduction earlier in the day of a Resolutions Committee majority report upholding the no-strike pledge, against which they did not fight, even though Goodrich Local had gone through to rescind the no-strike pledge.

President Dalrymple and Board Member Burns scathingly denounced the referendum proposal, saying it would bring "disaster" to the union. As if it were not precisely the Dalrymple-Burns no-strike pledge that daily is bringing REAL disaster upon the URWA!

In the more than two hours of debate on this question, only four progressives spoke, although their supporters were many. The earlier bungling of the no-strike pledge issue detracted seriously from the effectiveness of the progressive argumentation.

On the resolution presented by Goodrich Local demanding the withdrawal of all URWA members from the War Labor Board and calling on all other unions to do likewise, the discussion, led by the international officers and Stalinists, again took the same bitter turn. President Bass of Goodrich Local demanded passage of the resolution and that the convention should sit in session until it devised way and means to handle adequately the problems of the membership in the future.

By this time the top leadership of the international had succeeded further in lining up delegates from the numerous smaller locals, as well as consolidating the split of opinion in Firestone and Goodrich Locals, and again defeated a progressive measure. Their tune was: "The WLB grants maintenance-of-membership, the check-off, and small wage raises here and there! Support the Commander-in-Chief!" In this instance, too, the progressives failed to slash hard enough in exposing how the

capitalist politician was passed unanimously.

The Velson Case

The Velson case, of course, was the high spot of the convention. In a fundamental sense, it was a waste of time and a spectacle unworthy of a union convention. Whether Irving Velson, now an ex-member of the General Executive Board, belongs to the Stalinist Communist Party and thereby violated the amendment to the union constitution barring Nazis, fascists and communists from holding office, is hard to prove, in view of the tactics employed by these gentry. And it is a shameful thing for union men to snoop around the offices of the capitalist government getting confidential information on each other, as the special union committee on Velson did.

This is not said to condone the Stalinists, who use the unions to further Uncle Joe's foreign policies. Every reader of LABOR ACTION knows how we constantly expose the turncoats serving the Kremlin in the unions. The vote of 400 to 200 against

Velson should have been cast, but not on whether he is a member of the Communist Party or not. For instance, by his own admission, Velson went around the country disrupting shipyard workers' rank and file strike against very real grievances in accordance with the no-strike pledge. This is sufficient ground for condemning a union official. To remove a man MERELY for his political views or affiliation, however detestable, is outrageous, undemocratic and dangerous.

However, Velson was carrying out the policy not only of the Stalinists but of the General Executive Board of the IUMSWA. By the same token, the whole leadership should have been condemned by the convention for first bartering away labor's only weapon and then breaking up rank and file strikes. Instead, John Green was re-elected president and Philip Van Gelder secretary-treasurer.

George W. Wright was replaced by John J. Grogan of Local 16 as vice-president. Grogan is running for New Jersey State Assembly in Hudson County on Boss I-Am-the-Law

anything he may propose to "win the peace."

The final progressive defeat came in the rejection of any Goodrich Local member for a post on the General Executive Board. This action was the bureaucrats' revenge against Goodrich Local for being the largest and most militant of all the rubber locals! And nobody but George Bass, president of this local, can understand why he rose to...nominate Dalrymple for his ninth term.

A Progressive Group Needed! The Akron Beacon Journal reports of the convention consciously promoted the cause of the bureaucrats throughout the session, reveling in playing up to Dalrymple and quoting him: "You can go back to your home locals and tell the members that Dalrymple will be a damn sight tougher in enforcing the policies of this organization next year than he was last year."

It acutely summed up the difficulties and backwardness of the progressives in the following sentence: "The point is, however, that there is not an organized minority bloc that fights the administration on every point and which always votes and sticks together."

Until such an "organized minority bloc" that is, a progressive group, based on a clear-cut appraisal of the economic and political problems facing the rubber workers, arises and becomes a majority in the international, the URWA rank and file can expect nothing but further blows from their Dalrymple-Burns-Stalinist leaders.

On other important but less controversial questions, the delegates turned down a demand to raise dues from the present \$1.00 per month, demanded night shift bonuses, paid lunch and rest periods, equal pay for women, and pleas for "justice" to Negroes. No question was raised against political support to the Hillman "political activities committee" or to granting FDR a blank check in

war profiteers are damned glad to get off by granting such small crumbs to the protesting workers.

Union Democracy Is Hit The third progressive rout took place over the power of Dalrymple to intervene in local union affairs and expel from membership workers "responsible" for work stoppages. This issue arose over the suspension of some Detroit Local 101 members some months ago—allegedly for striking against the upgrading of Negro workers. The Local 101 members denied that their strike was over this question, saying the strike was against the company's (and their Stalinist local union officials') refusal to settle a wage grievance.

A three-hour fight took place on this, the progressives challenging the constitutionality of Dalrymple and the General Executive Board to so discipline their local union members. By this time the "Get Goodrich Local" howlings of the bureaucratic officialdom and their Stalinist lackeys had reached a peak, but the progressives still could rally more than one-third of the delegates to their position in behalf of the preservation of union democracy.

On other important but less controversial questions, the delegates turned down a demand to raise dues from the present \$1.00 per month, demanded night shift bonuses, paid lunch and rest periods, equal pay for women, and pleas for "justice" to Negroes. No question was raised against political support to the Hillman "political activities committee" or to granting FDR a blank check in

Interracial Projects in City Now

The city of Lackawanna is built around the tremendous Bethlehem Steel Co. plant situated here. Two housing projects opposite the plant, Albright Court and Baker Homes, are composed mainly of these steel workers. Both white and colored workers are living in both these projects in perfect harmony.

While thousands of colored workers in this area are looking for production jobs, Bethlehem Steel is importing large numbers of Southern colored workers to assume underpaid jobs in the plant.

A new housing project of four hundred units, Ridgewood Village, has just been built to alleviate the housing shortage in Lackawanna. But Ridgewood Village is not to be settled as were Baker Homes and Al-

bright Court. Jesse Dawson, federal housing administrator, has cooked up a scheme to segregate the white and colored workers, and Mayor Hughes of Lackawanna is backing Dawson for political reasons.

Dawson Hatches Jim Crow Scheme

The scheme is to make Ridgewood Village and Baker Homes all-white projects and Albright an all-colored project. Thus Dawson is trying to force the white tenants of Albright into Ridgewood Village at great hardship and financial loss to them. The basic rent in Ridgewood is about six dollars more per month and they have ice boxes instead of electric refrigerators and coal instead of automatic gas heating, all of which increases the cost about \$11.00 more per month than Albright. In addition, there will be no telephones in Ridgewood and the project is several miles further from the plant. All this the white workers must endure to fulfill Dawson's Jim Crow scheme.

On the other hand, the incoming Negroes, together with those now living in Baker and Albright, will all be squeezed together in the one 200-unit Albright project.

Wedge in Union Labor

To all intelligent Lackawanna workers Dawson's scheme spells

trouble. With the colored workers penned in at Albright and the white workers in Baker Homes and Ridgewood, there will prevail the old story of racial tension being aggravated by separation instead of lessened by mutual understanding and friendship.

Segregation of this type will stir up racial feelings that do not exist today and will drive a wedge into the ranks of labor within the shop. The union that all have fought for would be the first to be destroyed, and all the workers, white and colored, would be helpless before the steel bosses.

LWCC Four-Point Program

Fortunately, however, the workers at Lackawanna have not been fooled by Dawson's scheme. They have not forgotten working class solidarity nor the wisdom of sticking together regardless of race or creed. The people are rallying around an excellent four-point program proposed by the Lackawanna Workingmen's Welfare Committee, a local organization. The program consists of the following points:

- 1. That no one be compelled to move from Albright Court.
2. That Albright Court be opened to all war workers, regardless of race, color or creed.
3. That the following statement be retracted: "Under advice from the regional office in New York City, Albright Court is to be made a colored project," and that copies of this retraction be sent to all tenants of Albright and that the white tenants be specifically advised that they are under no compulsion to move.
4. That all new applicants, regardless of race, creed or color, be permitted to enter Ridgewood Village.

'Minneapolis Case' to Go to Supreme Court, Says Farrell

James T. Farrell, noted author and chairman of the Civil Rights Defense Committee, which is directing the defense of the Minneapolis labor case, has issued the following statement: "The decision of the Eighth U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals upholding the conviction of the eighteen members of the Socialist Workers Party and Teamsters Local 544, CIO, defendants in the Minneapolis labor trial of 1941, strikes at the very heart of civil liberties in the United States. Immediate steps will be taken by the Civil Rights Defense Committee and the American Civil Liberties Union to appeal the convictions to the U. S. Supreme Court and test the constitutionality of the Smith Act."

"The Minneapolis defendants were the first to be convicted under the Smith 'Omnibus Gag' Act passed in 1940. This act made the mere expression of opinion a federal crime. Under its provisions a man could be sent to jail for circulating such docu-

ments as the Declaration of Independence and Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address, both of which advocate revolutionary doctrines.

"The Smith Act is clearly unconstitutional and violates the rights of free speech and free press guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. "The defendants in the Minneapolis case are 'guilty' of nothing but exercising their constitutional and democratic rights of free expression. The upholding of their conviction sets an extremely dangerous precedent which can be used in witch-hunts against other trade unionists and minority political groups.

"This case has been nationally recognized as the test case of civil liberties in World War II. Scores of labor unions, liberal publications, civil liberties and progressive organizations have protested the convictions. Both the CIO and AFL have condemned the Smith gag law."

World Events By Europeans

Stalin's SS Elite Troops

Only three years ago the Moscow radio proclaimed that "fascism is only a matter of taste." Since then there has been the Nazi attack on Russia and for a while the Moscow radio fumed again in the old style against the "Nazi dogs."

Now the Moscow radio has announced the constitution of a Union of German Officers in Moscow. Among these officers are three members of the SS Elite Corps staff. The founding of this organization is announced with much official approval. The line has changed again: not all Nazis are scoundrels. Oh, no. Only those who do not see the light in time and have not enough sense to go over to Stalin.

Alter and Ehrlich were murdered because they were socialists; the three leading SS officers now in Stalin's hands are officially welcomed and backed. Maybe some of these Nazis were in charge of one of the concentration camps where thousands of communists were tortured to death; maybe some of them gave orders to hang workers, to kill Jews,

to massacre the population of some Balkan village. What does this matter to Stalin? They are useful and that is all he is asking.

Fascists are scoundrels, but once they join Stalin they are to be welcomed. The other Allied governments are treating with reactionaries and militarists, but even they have not yet dared to welcome outright Nazi leaders.

We have already dealt with the German National Committee established in Moscow. Not much more needs to be added. Only those who are consciously or unconsciously blind do not yet see that Stalin aims clearly at the establishment of a counter-revolutionary regime in Germany made up of officers, repentant Nazis and other reactionary elements, and also in Europe. De Gaulle in France, the Union of German Officers in Germany—and many other surprises—are still in store. In this field, too, Stalin is a worthy successor to the Czars. His regime becomes a main bulwark of reaction in Europe.

Vishinsky Joins Allied Body

The Allies have permitted Vishinsky, the distinguished prosecutor in the Moscow witch-hunt trials, to be appointed Russia's representative in the Inter-Allied Mediterranean Committee. Churchill and Roosevelt have had some very sweet words for Stalin in their recent speeches, but in spite of all this it is clear that the diplomatic conflicts between the Anglo-Saxon powers and Russia become ever more acute.

The recent Russian successes have been very disquieting for Washington and London. It is felt in these capitals that perhaps the Russians will be in a position to impose their demands in Europe before England and America have a large army on European soil to counterbalance the Russian influence. It is symptomatic that for the first time not only "liberal" forces in this country and in England claim a second front, but also that outright reactionary imperialists feel the need for a speedy

landing in force on the European continent. This arises, not out of sympathy with Russia, but on the contrary, from a fear of Stalin.

It is also symptomatic that as a reply to Stalin's fake German committee, both Churchill and Roosevelt have stressed that not only Hitler's regime but also the Prussian army must be utterly destroyed.

In Yugoslavia, too, fighting between the Mikhailovitch forces and the Russian-backed "Partisans," after a temporary lull, has started again. This is another indication that Russian-Anglo-American relations have taken a turn for the worse.

All this is not to say that there is no possibility of arriving at a settlement of these disputes. This might still be the alternative for the near future, but, on the other hand, a pact by Stalin with part of the Nazi leadership, and the constitution of a Russo-German bloc is not at all to be excluded.

The New Badoglio Regime

After all, Badoglio is going to be the flag-bearer of the war for "democracy" in Italy. The negotiations we no doubt rather difficult and, in view of public reaction, it is a bit hard to make Allied "public opinion" swallow this pill, but the decision has been taken. See Churchill's recent speech full of praise for the "moronic little King" and Badoglio. It has already been semi-officially

announced that the AMG will only have a restricted sphere of influence in Italy. Indeed, why maintain an expensive police apparatus in Italy when Badoglio and the King will perform the same functions just as efficiently? Badoglio plays the same role as Petain (in reverse), but he also will soon feel that sitting on bayonets is a rather uncomfortable position.

Workers Party - -

(Continued from page 1) are compelled to speak up clearly and boldly about all important union problems and actions.

These problems are not the private affairs of bureaucrats, but of the whole working class, which we are part of. And we permit ourselves to say that we are a million times more a part of the working class and the labor movement than are the capitalists and capitalist spokesmen with whom the present labor leadership works hand in glove and whom they always invite to union conventions for speeches and "good advice."

Always with the workers! Always in support of the workers and their struggles! Always with the union movement! That is the position of the Workers Party.

That is why its members are among the most faithful and devoted union men, for otherwise they would not be tolerated in our party for a minute.

That is why we invite the attention of the most militant union men to an examination of our program and our work, and to affiliation with our party if they are prepared to join the great, world-wide fight for the free socialist society of tomorrow.

LABOR ACTION Turns the Spotlight on WAGE FREEZING INCENTIVE PAY WAR PROFITS JIM CROW RISING LIVING COSTS "PHONY FRIENDS" OF LABOR NATIVE FASCISTS WORKERS' POLITICS Get Your Copy of "America's Leading Labor Newspaper" EVERY WEEK BY SUBSCRIBING NOW! Special Introductory Offer—Only 25 Cents for Six Months Clip and Mail with 25 Cents for Your Special Sub TODAY LABOR ACTION 114 West 14th Street New York 11, N. Y. Please enter my six-month subscription at the SPECIAL INTRODUCTORY RATE. I enclose 25 cents to cover full cost. Name Address City State If you are a subscriber, why not help a friend or fellow worker get LABOR ACTION regularly by sending in his subscription on this blank?

NEW YORK, ATTENTION! TELL YOUR FRIENDS ABOUT OUR BARN PARTY DANCING MUSIC SINGING GAMES PRIZES REAL OLD FASHIONED BARN DANCE Saturday Night, October 16 IRVING PLAZA 15th Street & Irving Place Admission 75 Cents, tax incl. Victoria Hall Auspices Workers Party



## Work or Fight A New Type Of Slavery

—By Dan Berger

Always in the vanguard of each fresh reactionary movement, the South is pioneering in the introduction of the new "work or fight" laws which the "masters of our democratic republic" find necessary for the prosecution of the war and the protection of their profits.

These laws, which in Maryland have already resulted in the infliction of heavy fines and prison terms for several workers, are patterned on the Austin-Wadsworth bill now pending in Congress.

Prominent among the cases of convictions is that of Nelson Blade, a Somerset County farmer, in whose behalf the Workers Defense League is arranging a constitutional test of the law. Blade has been sentenced to serve six months in jail and to pay a \$500 fine as the aftermath of a trial conducted without formal charges or witnesses against him. His sole crime was unemployment.

He had been rejected as a volunteer by his draft board on December 10, 1941, and was seeking admission to the "Seabees" at the time of his arrest. A similar case brought to light by the WDL involved a worker, classified 4F, who had refused to accept a job paying \$2.00 a week and board. The Free Labor Committee of the WDL has characterized the law under which the convictions were obtained as unconstitutional and as a piece of class legislation.

### FREEDOM FOR WHAT CLASS?

In these cases there can be seen in all its simplicity the fate which was planned long ago for the American workers on the pretext of a national emergency. The bosses have discarded the old slogan about "freedom to work" and have discovered instead the duty of the citizen to work for the "democracy."

Through the press, the radio and the mouths of government officials they have thundered for months against the worker's right to choose his employment and to move about the country in his search for a living wage. Their constant demands for wage ceilings, the curtailment of union activities and job freezing have culminated in an effort to force into real slavery all the wage earners sent to the battle fronts.

Despite the capitalists' inspired drive to alter radically all the old schoolbook notions of citizens' rights and duties, it is not their intention to abandon for THEMSELVES the liberties which their predecessors so thoughtfully wrote into the Constitution. As LABOR ACTION has pointed out repeatedly in the last two years, their so-called freedom of enterprise has become a wild jamboree of war profiteering. The manufacturer's freedom to work or not to work has been his own concern.

### GUARANTEEING BOSSES' PROFITS

In the first years of this war, armament production lists exacted guarantees of subsidies, profits and explanations in the government bureaus while the industrial-emptations. The conversion of planes and tanks hinged not on any national emergency or government decree, but on the assurance of a cessation of the chatter in Congress about unpleasant subjects such as excess-profits taxes.

The cost-plus-profit system has been given to the capitalist class as its natural right. The government has taken outrageous taxes and "voluntary" loans from workers in order to build for the armament producers plants and transportation facilities. All this for the employer's right to produce as and when he pleases.

For the workers, especially the defense worker, there has been one deprivation after another. His union leaders, hastening to their task of conciliating the class enemy, gave up for him the right to strike. His government has with soft words and harsh deeds shackled him to his job and wage level. Freezes, threats, the anti-strike law, the Little Steel formula, discriminatory deferments have all been dagger blows against the class that does the working, the fighting, the dying.

As against these enforced sacrifices, the only inducement to produce which has been offered the worker is either the never-stacked blather of professional patriots—government or Stalinist—or the piecework system dressed up under the new name of "incentive pay."

Even in areas such as New York City, where the number of unemployed rose last winter to an official figure of 400,000, the workers' standards have been attacked on the basis of a manpower shortage. Roosevelt has blandly informed us that the standard of living must fall.

### "WORK OR FIGHT" IS SLAVERY

Where the worker has fought through militant unionism to retain the vestiges of the rights renounced for him by union bureaucrats and treacherous politicians, he has been accused in terms of sabotage and betrayal of his country. He has seen himself attacked for a refusal to accept starvation wages from an employer who is bound by obligations to none but himself.

The "work or fight" laws mean an intensification of the attack. They mean no less than an end to all but formal union organization, an end to any right to strike, even as limited by the Smith-Connally Act and the presidential order. The laws mean an end to the workers' own methods of fighting the inflationary price booms. The laws are the twentieth century's edict of American slavery.

Thus the great myth of civil and economic liberties is once again stripped clean of its phrases. It is now more obvious than ever that the government and the capitalists whose hiring it is, project for the workers of this country no less horrible an enslavement than that which is Hitler Germany's contribution to capitalist culture.

## PLENTY FOR ALL

The Meaning of Socialism

By ERNEST LUND

How the Owners of the Machine Have Mismanaged  
Why the Capitalist System Won't Work  
The Death Agony of Capitalism  
The Way Out  
Why Russia Turned Sour  
How It Can Be Done  
Where to Begin

Price: 10¢ per Copy, Postpaid 60 Pages  
7¢ in Bundles of Five or More

### THE WORKERS PARTY

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

Enclosed please find ten cents for a copy of "Plenty for All."

Enclosed please find \_\_\_\_\_ for a bundle of "Plenty for All."

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

## FEPC Hearings Emphasize--

# The Labor Unions Must Smash Jim Crow

By W. F. CARLTON

Labor is meeting in conventions these days. Every convention discusses its own problems in the framework of the general situation of labor in the country. Both in public discussion or private conference, the Negroes' position in the labor movement will continually crop up. These discussions and conferences will do well to bear in mind exactly what has been revealed at the recent hearings, organized by the Fair Employment Practices Committee, on discrimination against Negroes on the railroads.

The facts themselves are familiar. Yet labor, which faces great battles for its existence in the coming turbulent years, cannot afford to let scores of Negro newspapers, like, for instance, the Chicago Defender, September 25, say things like the following:

"The testimony tended to prove beyond any doubt that the railroads have refused to hire or upgrade Negroes; ignored their seniority rights, maintained their unfair differentials in wages paid Negroes for identical work as done by whites...refused them employment or promotion to jobs as locomotive engineers, flagmen, cabinmen, boiler-makers...trainmen..." and a long and impressive list of discriminations.

### Labor's Big Task

Labor as a whole cannot afford this sort of thing because, first, the wages and conditions of all workers are the concern of all labor; and, secondly, the railroad companies are saying that it is not their fault, it is the result of agreements arrived at with railroad labor. They are excusing

themselves and saying the fault is labor's.

The railroad companies present made no defense. They cross-examined no witnesses. But the railroad brotherhoods made no defense either. Yet Sydney S. Alderman, who made a statement for all the railroads except the Union Pacific, showed the company's main line of defense to be: it is not our fault, it is labor's.

Listen to this: "The agreement with labor organizations (openly approving discriminatory exclusions of Negroes) placed before this committee have been arrived at by processes under the Railway Labor Act and earlier controlling United States labor laws, often with governmental assistance and approval."

See his emphasis. The LABOR unions agree, under LABOR legislation. The government too approved. Why blame us?

### The Railway Labor Act

When the railroad companies have a disagreement with the government they shout loud enough. When they want to attack labor's wages or living conditions they mobilize, hit hard and fight long. But now they shrug their shoulders and say: "Labor is responsible!"

Next comes Dr. Northrup for the government. He is a member of the National War Labor Board. This bureaucrat condemns the Railroad Act. But why? Because "under it the National (Railway) Mediation Board must often designate, as exclusive bargaining agent for Negroes, a union which excluded Negroes or confines them to an inferior auxiliary status...It has refused to take the racial policies of unions into consid-

eration in determining appropriate bargaining units."

Was there ever such impudence and disgusting hypocrisy?

**CIO Sets an Example**  
Very wisely the CIO sent a representative to the hearings, Myers of the National Maritime Union. Myers testified that the NMU, by a referendum among its 50,000 members, had condemned discrimination. It was "particularly proud," said Myers, that his union had abolished discrimination among seamen in the South, where, as he pointed out, it was generally believed "it cannot be done."

Said Myers: "Negro and white seamen work side by side, eat together in the same messroom and are quartered together in the same fo'c'sle." Myers mixed up this fine record with a lot of pro-war talk which had nothing to do with the case.

Most important testimony of all came from L. Abner, a white man and former fireman of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad. He said that promotions of Negroes would NOT lead to disruptions of service. He said that there would be some grumbling. But "seniority plays a great place in a railroad man's life, and he isn't going to do anything in the line of violence to challenge it."

There spoke the very voice of the ordinary progressive worker. Today that type is in the majority in the labor movement.

### Press Suppresses Hearings

The capitalist press for the most part boycotted the hearings. This proves quite clearly that the railroad companies wish the discrimination to continue. The capitalist press does not advocate the wishes or express

the sentiments of labor. The situation is therefore clear. The government and capitalism as represented by the railroad companies have been forced to recognize the discrimination publicly. The responsibility is basically theirs.

They and their press are the great teachers, upholders and practitioners of Jim Crow and discrimination in this country. But they want to smear labor with it. And the railroad unions, by maintaining the discrimination, are not only weakening their union, but are disgracing themselves before the general public, antagonizing the Negroes and opening labor as a whole to damaging blows by capital and its state, just when American labor needs to show the country and the world as a whole that it is the only really powerful force for democracy in the country.

### Labor Can Settle Its Own Problems

The railroad unions cannot remain silent any longer. They should not allow their reactionary constitutions with its discriminatory practices to remain. But we do not want the government meddling in this. The rank and file in the railroad unions, the people who think as Abner, should say to their leaders: "Put an end to it."

And the CIO unions and the labor movement as a whole, as they all meet in convention, should express themselves to their railroad brothers, in clear terms: "This is no time to continue such practices. You owe it to yourselves and to all of us to take the lead. Discrimination and Jim Crow are vices of the boss class. We are not waiting now for big business to lecture us. There, as in all other fields, labor must take the lead."

# A Pamphlet Plugging for the Socialist Ideal

By SAM ADAMS

Before the First World War and for but a short time after, propaganda for socialism was fairly widespread in this country. The socialist movement in those days knew how to talk socialism. While it was wholly inefficient in organizing large groups of workers around the conception of the class struggle and the need for constructing a militant party with the aim of fighting for a socialist society, concentrating almost entirely on the parliamentary struggle, it did quite an effective job of telling millions of people what socialism was.

This propaganda for socialism, and the agitation which supplemented it, was often romantic and sentimental. But the "dream of socialism," as it was often called, taught thousands that socialism meant a society without classes, without the exploitation of man by man, without a production system operating for the purpose of producing profits for a few.

### THE OLD SOCIALIST AGITATION

The old socialist agitators capably demonstrated how socialism could end poverty, unemployment and war by eliminating private ownership of the means of producing the things of life, national and international competition, and the struggle for existence by the overwhelming majority of the population in this and all other countries.

They supplemented this campaign for socialism with a merciless exposure of the evils of capitalist society, its murderous exploitation of the workers, its utter hypocrisy in human relations, and the most evident feature of its class character: the impoverishment of the masses and the enrichment of a small class of capitalists. In addition, the early socialists did a great job in tearing the mask from the great trusts—the railroad, steel, meat-packing and others.

But in the post-war period of 1918-29, this socialist propaganda and agitation disappeared and has remained largely a lost art. There were many reasons for this. We should like to present two of them; first, the rise of the prosperity period, and, second, the influence of the Russian Revolution.

### PROSPERITY AND RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

The prosperity period APPEARED to answer the socialist criticism. The APPARENT strength of capitalism was the thing most obvious to the eye. Paid propagandists of big business, college professors, economists and intellectuals of every variety took to the pen to explain why capitalism was a wonderful society and socialism a mere utopia.

Or else, these paid penmen argued that the new richness of American capitalism was actually paving the way to the kind of life the socialists wanted. Many called it the new capitalism: no unemployment, high wages, workers owning automobiles and their own homes.

But in 1929 the bubble burst and the whole rotten system, built on a foundation of toothpicks, tumbled down. It was quickly revealed that the prosperity period was a fraud; that the capitalist became enriched during that stage, but that the working class, for all its employment, came out of it worse off than ever.

The Russian Revolution had an altogether other influence—in part challenging the propaganda of the prosperity period. The Russian Revolution showed the way to workers' power and it showed what steps were necessary to lay the basis for the future socialism. In the very first years of the Russian Revolution, workers all over the world were thus acquainted with practical steps and problems of the new workers' power. But the socialist goal, the new society, became lost in the support for the first experiment of a modern workers state.

We were to witness a new experience. As the capitalist world system headed into a terrible crisis of decline, the Russian Revolution, which attracted millions the world over, also went into decline. The revolution degenerated at the same pace as the crisis revealed the utter bankruptcy of capitalism. The Russian workers' state went into oblivion and the total result of the experiences of the past twenty years has been the weakening of the world movement for socialism.

### FULFILLING A NEED

The necessity of rebuilding the movement for socialism requires the re-establishment of the art of socialist propaganda and agitation, to tell millions what socialism is, its relation and comparison to capitalism, and how it can be achieved.

These are some of the reasons why the pamphlet, "Plenty for All," is an important contribution. Ernest Lund, the author, is a person who has been concerned with this problem for a long time. He was always disturbed by the lack of simple socialist propaganda and agitation, and, above all, the socialist education of the workers. To help fill a gap in the workers' movement, he sat down and wrote this simple, lucid and educational socialist pamphlet.

A mere glance at the chapter titles of "Plenty for All" will reveal what a painstaking job it is.

# The Auto Workers Convention --

(Continued from page 1)

ther-Leonard faction, except for its position on incentive pay, could hardly be said to have a progressive program. But most progressives now find themselves in or supporting this group and give it better union character. On all other major questions it is not greatly different from the Stalinist-backed Addes-Frankensteen group. But the latter does not even have the one progressive plank of the former. It follows the Stalinist sell-out political line on all major questions, and the biggest danger emanating from this group is the fact that, if it wins a majority of the convention, it will enforce its reactionary program and increase the power of the worst enemies of militant and progressive unionism, the Stalinists.

The pleas against factionalism now spouted by the Stalinists are merely camouflage. They fear the victory of the Reuther-Leonard group because it is an anti-Stalinist group. They are against factionalism out of fear that the struggle may impair their chances of capturing or dominating the UAW.

On the other hand, it is certain that a victory for the Addes group will give it a better field of operation. That is why, while it speaks against factionalism and calls for unity, it slyly asks for support to the Addes-Frankensteen faction.

will give the union what it needs most: a militant and progressive program. And yet that remains the biggest problem before the UAW, as well as the whole labor movement.

The rank and file groups, and the mass of the membership, have indicated what kind of program they want. Summarized, this program reads as follows:

1. For rescinding the no-strike pledge.
2. For wage increases, against the wage freeze and the WLB.
3. Against incentive pay.
4. For organization of the unorganized;
5. For equal wages; against wage differentials.
6. For post-war guarantees to labor; the establishing of a post-war wage fund for all auto workers.
7. For independent political action; for a Labor Party.

This is the kind of program that would revitalize the union movement, guard its strength and prepare it for the post-war period. It would be the means for combatting the anti-union campaign of the auto bosses.

But such a program requires the organization of a national progressive group in the UAW. All the elements for such an organization exist in the numerous rank and file groups and in the militant sentiments of the membership of the union.

progressive group should begin at the convention and should continue after the convention. We believe that this is the most important task before the auto workers: the establishment of a national progressive group around the above-indicated program.

While the progressives are not well organized at this convention, it would be good tactics for them to ally themselves with any forces on the basis of agreement on one or more of the important issues which will come up before the meeting.

The struggle for control of the convention will be sharply fought. It is to the interest of the UAW to prevent, above all, the victory of the Stalinists, or any group under their influence. This means that the de-

feat of the Addes - Frankensteen group is a necessary step in the struggle for the national progressive group and a progressive union.

This means support of Reuther-Leonard in a contest with Addes-Frankensteen and the Stalinists. But such support can only be given to them with open eyes and criticism. It means the progressives can support Reuther against Addes in full consciousness that the former is not running on a progressive platform.

The genuine progressive group has yet to be created, and a progressive program has yet to be won for the union. The extent to which the convention proceedings contribute to this development will mark the extent of its success.

## 'PLENTY FOR ALL' WILL BE ON THE AIR

Over Radio Station WEVD (New York)

Oct. 6, 8:45 p.m. Oct. 20, 9:00 p.m.  
Oct. 13, 7:00 a.m. Oct. 27, 7:15 a.m.

# N. Y. Times Lies About Puerto Rico

—By Reva Craine

The New York Times a few days ago lashed out editorially at the U. S. Governor of Puerto Rico because he had stated that the people on that island are still living at the same low level of existence that prevailed in 1898, and that unless the United States did something to alleviate these conditions, they would have to "suppress" an "angry people."

In a report to the Chavez Committee of the Senate, which was investigating social and economic conditions, Governor Tugwell said, among other things, that Puerto Rico was no better off today than when it was first taken over by the United States from Spain in 1898. Tugwell complains that its people are kept in "humiliating suspense, by implication neither fit to govern themselves nor to become part of the United States."

"The United States," he wrote, "has not prepared the way for the honest settlement of this issue." Pretty strong words, even for a New Dealer who has been kicked around and criticized both by the Puerto Ricans and at home.

### THE TIMES GETS PIOUSLY INDIGNANT

Then along comes the newspaper that prints "all the news that's fit to print" and lambastes Mr. Tugwell for daring to make public the scandal of American imperial rule and ruin of the Puerto Rican population. "Did it ever occur to Mr. Tugwell what use Axis propagandists can make of talk like this in an official report? Responsible officials are in a position to advocate reforms quietly to their superiors. As long as they hold office they need not beligerently and publicly indict the colonial polities of their own government."

What the pious Times really means is that the report to the investigating committee should have been buried in the file morgue in some bureaucrat's office in Washington because it revealed some very unpleasant things about the "colonial policies of our government." Public investigating committees, congressional and senatorial committees, which, nominally at least, are supposed to be responsible to their constituents, should report back to them only if they can say flattering things about the government. If, on the other hand, harsh facts, no matter how true, are discovered, then the Times, so interested in publishing the truth, suggests that these be squelched and not publicly aired. The New York Times' variety of democracy smacks a little too much of the totalitarianism which it so hypocritically denounces at least every other day.

### AN EDITORIAL WRITER ON "PROGRESS"

Not content with suggesting how to keep information from the people, the Times takes Mr. Tugwell to task for his specific statements. What does he mean by saying that the Puerto Ricans are no better off today than they were in 1898? Not true! politely insists the Times. Just look at the facts:

"The population of Puerto Rico in 1901 was 978,000; in 1940 it was 1,877,000. The rate of population growth in the island has, in other words, been even greater than that in the continental United States. An island that can support twice the population that it did in 1898 can hardly be said to be no better off."

And the Times further points out that the imports and exports of Puerto Rico have increased tenfold during this period. How can you say that the island isn't better off? And what about the increase in manufactures? Just to show that it isn't thinking only of money, the Times reminds its readers that illiteracy on the island was reduced from fifty-five to thirty-one per cent, and that new housing projects have been built for the Puerto Ricans. How dare Governor Tugwell ignore all this?

But here are some of the facts that the New York Times did not see fit to print, and we can readily understand why.

In 1898, when the United States took possession of the island, there began a process which has brought ruination and starvation to the Puerto Rican population. The introduction of United States currency at a devaluated rate of exchange ruined the native farmers so that almost all the land was snatched up by the United States interests. The island was converted to a one-crop country, with the result that the Puerto Ricans no longer raised their own food, but had to depend upon imports from the United States.

The 1901 tariff excluded trade with nearly all other countries so that ninety per cent of it fell to the United States. All cargo had to be carried in American ships, the most expensive in the world. This burden had to be borne by the island population.

Today four large American sugar companies control the economy of the country. They are the real masters and profit-makers.

### MORE ON PUERTO RICAN "PROGRESS"

The per capita wealth of Puerto Rico is \$200, as compared to \$738 of our own South, the poorest section of this country.

The minimum wage law applies only to commercial and industrial workers, while the great majority of Puerto Rican workers who toil on the sugar plantations do not receive even this small "blessing." In the sugar factories the average wage is \$8.13 a week; in the coffee industry it is \$2.37 a week. The income of the rural laborer is twelve cents a day to cover all his needs. How much worse could it have been in 1898 if the New York Times assures us that the Puerto Ricans are better off today?

The population has certainly increased, but because Puerto Rico has been deprived by the land-grabbing sugar interests from raising its own food, this increased population lives in a state of virtual starvation. To raise its own food again, the Puerto Ricans would have to confiscate the large landed estates and take over the ownership of their own land. This means kicking out the large absentee American landowners.

Before the present war, 100,000 tons of shipping were required to barely keep the population alive, except for the Americans on the island and the few rich Puerto Ricans. Today the war has cut shipping down to 30,000 tons, which means that thousands upon thousands are not getting fed at all.

The Times points to the increase in population, but it "conveniently" forgets to mention that Puerto Rico has the highest infant mortality rate in the world. People die of hookworm and tuberculosis, and it is estimated that from 25 to 70 per cent of the population has malaria at all times.

Only 44 per cent of Puerto Rico's children go to school. The others are too poor even to get to a school. Of those who attend, half attend only part of the day. Teachers report back that nearly all of the children are undernourished, which is another way of saying that they are slowly starving.

### WHO PROFITS FROM PUERTO RICO?

These are some of the facts that the New York Times would like concealed from the public. They don't quite fit in with the theory that United States "colonialism" has greatly benefited the native populations.

Or could it be that by "improvements and benefits," the New York Times really has in mind the four great sugar companies which in 1936 split close to nine million dollars in profits; the shipping interests, which have monopolized all of Puerto Rico's trade at a tremendous profit; the garment manufacturers, who send down work to be done by Puerto Rico's homeworkers at below-unions rates, with the aim of breaking down union standards in this country? Could it be that the paid advertisements of the sugar refineries dictate the editorial



# The UAW Licked the Piecework and Speed-up Systems Long Ago

By MIKE STEVENS

The history of the labor movement is full of the heroic struggles of the American workers against the boss-inspired speed-up systems. The various speed-up schemes often went under different names, depending upon the circumstances under which they were brought in. But whether it was called speed-up, stretch-out, bonus system or incentive pay, the effect was always the same: more work and less pay.

The reason it seems incredible that anyone in the UAW would dare suggest the return of the speed-up system is because the fight against the system was one of the strongest reasons that banded the auto workers together to form a union.

The government's NRA Research and Planning Division, in its study of the employment and labor conditions in the automobile industry in 1935, reported that "the grievance... mentioned most frequently and... uppermost in the minds of those who testified is the stretch-out. Everywhere workers indicated that they were being forced to work harder and harder, to put out more and more products in the same amount of time and with less workers doing the job."

The various forms of speed-up, stretch-out and bonus systems, with their de-humanizing tempo, made the auto workers "modern times" robots and old men before they were forty. But these old forms of speed-up were really a picnic when compared with the effects that this streamlined speed-up, incentive pay, will have upon the human individual, on workers' solidarity and upon the trade union movement.

The incentive pay scheme is suggested as a method by which production can be increased and the workers receive a percentage bonus on the increase in production. The workers in a plant are divided into groups. A group may be composed of all the workers on a single operation, or all who work on a particular part. The engineers decide what is "normal" output, and for whatever is produced over and above that the workers of that group receive a cash bonus based upon an agreed-upon percentage.

The automobile and aircraft manufacturers, as well as most other industrialists, at the present time sell all of their products to the government. An increase in workers' wages would NOT interfere with their profits but, on the contrary, would increase them, for they sell their products to the government on a cost-plus agreement.

Under the cost-plus contracts, wages are a cost which the corporations receive from the government plus a profit on them. The higher the labor cost bill the bigger the corporations' profits. From this it would seem that the corporations would favor higher wages, but they do not. Not at the expense of their cost-plus profits, of course. They take care of that through other ways. Many corporations have been accused of "hoarding" labor. This way, although they hold the individual worker's wages down, they keep their labor-cost bill high by having a tremendous labor force and thereby maintain this bit of side profit over and above the profit they make on their product, without increasing the workers' wages.

Why do the corporations go through all this scheming to keep the workers' wages down, especially when the government indirectly pays the wage increases?

The corporations have very definite reasons for these moves. The very same reasons why they are now advocating incentive pay. It is an organized campaign to break up and destroy the trade union movement.

If workers receive wages high enough to take care of their families' needs—these workers will do their utmost to defend these wage levels by maintaining and strengthening their unions. But, on the other hand, when the workers receive wages that will not meet even their most basic needs, and the unions seem helpless to improve these wages, the workers will lose faith in the trade union movement and drift away from it.

The millions of new workers in the plants today, uneducated in trade unionism, judge the value of a trade union mainly on its ability to increase wages. The corporations know this well and through their spokesmen in Washington they make sure

that wages are not increased, and that the unions are squeezed tighter into a straight-jacket.

### A Union-Busting Campaign

Among the many books that have been written with advice to manufacturers on how to combat unionism, one of the best known is "Labor Problems," by F. C. Carlton. One of the schemes he suggests on how to fight unions is through incentive pay. Carlton says "incentive wage plans tend to weaken the solidarity of labor." And he is one hundred per cent correct.

When workers are placed on an incentive pay system, their minimum hourly (or piecework) wage rate is low. They are expected to build it up by exceeding the engineers' "normal" output schedule. These workers, in order to make a day's pay will, of course, have to work at a terrific speed to beat the "normal" schedule. Any worker who is slow, or aged, or a casual absentee due to illness, will affect the wages of all the other workers in that group. Because the production of the group will suffer, the workers will not get the bonus.

How will the workers react? What will be the results? The workers will insist that the older and slower workers be taken out of their group. No other group would want them, for the very same reasons, and the result would be that these older workers would be fired or placed on jobs that do not pay as well. The union, in attempting to fight for a worker to remain on his job, despite his age or speed, would meet a stiff opposition from the workers who would feel that the union is not fighting in their best interests. For here is the union attempting to impose a worker on their group, which means less wages for them.

The workers will begin to move away from the union. Seniority under these conditions will fly out of the window. The workers will feel that it is bad enough that the union does not get them wage increases, but to impose a condition upon them that will mean less wages—this will certainly lead to the breaking of workers' solidarity and forcing the workers into the arms of the bosses. One of the struggles between the

trade unions and the bosses has always been that the bosses have wanted the sole right in hiring, firing, promoting, laying off and rehiring. Their policies, they admitted, depended on efficiency and production of the individual worker. The unions have insisted that these policies be based on seniority and many unions have various forms of staggering of work.

Under incentive pay, production comes first. The boss can insist that old or slower workers be laid off or fired and the speed kings be rehired first after lay-offs. The bosses' plans may find a receptive ear among many of the newer and younger workers, who will feel that the older or slower workers are hurting their chances of getting a few more pennies.

### Incentive Pay Will Rob Labor

The bosses also feel that the incentive pay will halt the militant slowdowns that the workers are using to settle their grievances. Under incentive pay, slowdowns would reduce daily earnings and, under these conditions, workers will be expected to object to slowdowns.

With incentive pay, stop-watch studies are necessary and this contemptible system once again will be common. Workers will discover that by stepping up production, there will be days when there is no work for them. But once they have stepped up the processes they will not be able to "leave" work for the next day. They will be accused of restricting production and limiting output.

The foreman's role under incentive pay will be that of continuously speeding up the workers. For he too will be paid a bonus on the increase over "normal" that his group or groups produce. This is one of the reasons the manufacturers had in mind when they fought so hard to keep the foremen out of the unions.

As in all other forms of speed-up, the "normal" will be continuously changed. Experience shows that as the workers establish higher levels of production the "normal" will be raised. This has been a stock in trade trick of the bosses for many years. Even Karl Marx mentioned it in the first volume of his work called "Capital." And there is no reason to believe that the bosses have

changed since. The argument that the trade unions can control incentive pay is utter nonsense.

A boss can claim that the new machinery he has installed or any pretended changes in the design of his present machines, or the material he is using is different than what was used before and therefore a job should be rerated and refined. What is the union going to do? Take it to the War Labor Board? Has any worker any illusions as to what the WLB will do? AT BEST the WLB will hand down a compromise, which means the "normal" will be raised only half as much as the boss asked. As the "normal" is raised, the workers will be forced to speed up more and more in order not to suffer a wage cut.

As mentioned above, under incentive pay, wages are low and the workers are expected to make up the difference through a bonus. Whenever there is a lack of tools or machinery, or material, or mismanagement, the workers suffer a wage cut. The Lesson on General Motors A few weeks ago the General Motors Company proposed that an in-

centive pay system be instituted in the agreement to be negotiated with the UAW. This is the same company that spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep the workers from organizing. Now that they are organized, the company hopes to break the union by bringing in the speed-up piecework scheme.

When the auto workers rebelled in 1936, they closed sixteen General Motors plants in fourteen different states—and one of the workers' biggest grievances was the speed-up. Some of the UAW leaders may have forgotten. But the workers remember when they were "tired as if they were dead." The men formed the union to stop the speed-up, to stop the shakes, to stop the de-humanizing tempo. The auto workers have had their bellyfull of speed-up systems, and any attempt to force it on them again will find them once again singing:

"When the speed-up comes  
Just twiddle your thumb.  
Sit down! Sit down!"

### A Reply to a Reader--

## On the Question of Russian Morale

By MAX SHACHEMAN

The question of the fight that Russia is making in the war continues to be a subject of lively interest. It has aroused much admiration, wonderment, perplexity and confusion. In different circles, and for different reasons, it has also caused a lot of concern.

A letter to the editor from a reader in El Segundo, Calif., gives us another opportunity for setting forth our own point of view on the question. Here is the letter in full:

### The Letter to the Paper

"To Labor Action:

"I am a constant reader of LABOR ACTION, and note in reading it that you are very much anti-Soviet. However, there is one question I fail to understand. That is the splendid morale and fighting ability of the Soviet people in the present war. What is behind it and how do you account for it? If the Soviet people are slaves, as you claim them to be, why do they not turn on their masters and do away with them? Every man, woman and child, it seems, is now fully armed. Why could they not use all these weapons in getting rid of their rulers if they desired to do so?"

"My impression is that the people, army and rulers, are all united as one, and seem to have complete confidence in one another. That, I assume, is one reason for their magnificent morale. All the people of the Soviet Union also seem to have the idea that all the land and productive machinery therein belongs to them, which is perhaps another reason for their incredible morale."

"The Soviet people have demonstrated to an astonished world that they have the morale to fight and win against overwhelming odds. Whatever the reason is, they appear to have what it takes, and I would appreciate your opinion as to the cause of their superhuman morale and strength."

"Thanking you for an early reply,  
Yours truly,  
"I. C. F."

This friendly letter deserves a friendly reply, and we shall try to make it as much to the point as the complicated subject permits.

### What Is Anti-Soviet and Pro-Soviet?

In the first place, our reader has gained an entirely false impression

from LABOR ACTION, unless he is trying to say something different than the words "you are very much anti-Soviet" actually express.

LABOR-ACTION is no more anti-Soviet than it is anti-Russian or anti-German or anti-American. It is, however, ANTI-STALINIST, and most decidedly so. It is opposed to the ruling bureaucracy, which exploits, oppresses and terrorizes the Russian people. It champions the principles and institutions upon which the great Russian Bolshevik Revolution was based, including the institution of the democratically-elected and democratically-controlled soviets of workers and peasants which once ruled Russia.

One of the main reasons why LABOR ACTION combats so irreconcilably the Stalinist bureaucracy is precisely the fact that the latter destroyed the soviets and along with them all semblance of working class rule and working class democracy in Russia.

Under Stalinism, the Russian workers and peasants have no right to participate in free elections. The only "right" they enjoy is to vote for candidates appointed by the bureaucracy. Even these candidates, after being "elected," can be and have been removed from the top and even shot without trial, by pure and simple secret police order. The meetings of the representatives to the so-called soviets have no more meaning than a meeting of Hitler's Reichstag.

### Rights the Workers Have Lost

The workers not only do not have the right to present their own candidates in the meaningless Soviet "elections," but have no other rights, either.

The right of free press does not exist—only the bureaucracy can publish its papers and express its views.

The right to assemble freely does not exist—except for the secret assemblies of the bureaucrats.

The right to free speech exists only for those who repeat what the bureaucracy permits them to say.

The right to organize exists only for the bureaucracy, and for nobody else.

If the workers tried to strike to redress their grievances (and it is only necessary to read the official Stalinist press to get an idea of how

great these grievances actually are), they would be thrown into prison at the least, and shot down like dogs at worst.

The workers have no right to quit their jobs, or transfer from plant to plant or town to town, without permission from their employer; that is, they are tied to their jobs like serfs.

The people in general no longer have the right to free and universal education, the higher stages of which are now reserved exclusively to the bureaucrats.

These are some of the things accomplished by the ruling bureaucracy, which has wiped out the achievements of the Russian Revolution. They represent some of the reasons why we are anti-Stalinist, and not anti-Soviet but pro-Soviet. We are for kicking out the reactionary bureaucracy and all its works, and restoring Soviet democracy.

### Why They Fight So Well

But if the Russian workers and poor peasants are slaves, how is it that Russia has fought so well? How account for what is called the "high morale" of the people? That is the real question in the mind of our reader and of many, many others.

It is not a simple question that can be answered glibly in a simple phrase. It is many-sided, complicated, and even contradictory.

Let us first bear this in mind: Heavily oppressed people and even slaves have fought well before this and are fighting well even now, for their oppressors and against a foreign foe.

The Greek people fought with bravery against the foreign invader of their land, even though they lived under and were led by the brutal military dictatorship of General Metaxas.

The Japanese soldiers, who are not much different from slaves of a reactionary dictatorship, fight with terrible tenacity, even though they are themselves invaders of foreign lands.

Much the same may be said about the Germans.

The morale of the British, who are themselves an oppressor people but who were threatened with invasion and subjugation, has been fairly high both in defeat and in victory.

No people that has reached any significant level of consciousness wants to see its land overrun and it-

self enslaved by another nation or people. This is usually true even when its own ruling class enjoys no popularity among the people. All other things being equal, and as a rule, a people will fight bitterly, courageously, with great devotion and many sacrifices, to beat off the invader, even though it may mean fighting under the rule of tyranny at home.

### Experiences in History

History is strewn with such examples, and many more can be seen in the present war. When the invader attacks, especially when the invader has the rightly notorious reputation of fascist Germany, it is anything but unusual if the people should rally behind whatever government they have, be swept or appear to be swept into a close national unity, and create a situation which impresses others with the idea, as our reader puts it, "that the people, army and rulers are all united as one." That has happened in Russia; but it also happened in Greece, and it has been more or less the case in Finland from the day it was drawn into the war.

What is "unusual" is when the opposite is the case, as in France, for instance. A "special" explanation is more called for in France than in Russia!

To be sure, there are important supplementary reasons for the situation in Russia. National morale is not like a cow, which is pretty much the same animal in all countries. It differs from country to country, from time to time, from situation to situation.

Germany could make a blitz-advance into France for a few hundred miles in various directions, and France was practically finished before it could get started or draw a second breath. But in Russia, the German blitz could not advance once and twice and three times the distance of the whole of France without achieving the victory it gained in France. The geographical difference between the two countries was one of the most decisive factors in maintaining Russian resistance and in facilitating Russian recuperation from heavy defeats and even routs.

There are many other problems involved in this decision. These will be considered in another article next week.

## The Shipyard Convention - -

(Continued from page 1)

ceived information on Velson from a government body. This government body was reported to have put the committee under oath not to reveal the source of the information.

As to whether or not Velson or any other union member is a member of the Communist Party is not the important side to this case. There were some important aspects to this trial, however. One is the exclusion amendment itself. The amendment was included in the constitution in 1941 before the Stalinists had become the howling "patriots" they are today.

It is our opinion that if such an amendment had not been included in the constitution already it would not have been presented to this convention, for instance, unless for reasons entirely different from those which motivated the union officers in 1941.

It was declared on all sides that Velson was a "good union man" and a good organizer. He had been given important tasks by the GEB. The case dragged on for eight months and Velson was expelled from the GEB just before the convening of the convention. Velson and the rest of the Stalinists are just as patriotic now as Green. To be sure, the Stalinists will change their line should Stalin, in the course of the war, decide to make another deal with Hitler. The Stalinists are just as rabid supporters of Roosevelt as is Green and the other IUMSW officers. This, too, of course, will change if Stalin and Hitler get together again. Whether or not a change in line by the Stalinists is likely, is beside the point. We are only talking about how the local Stalinists get their line and how they act on orders from the Kremlin bureaucracy.

The fact that Velson is a member of the Communist Party in no way justifies the constitutional provision for expulsion on the ground of such membership. It is a bureaucratic measure that can be and is used in the labor movement against any and all militants. Moreover, it is a substitute for democratic procedures and education. A merciless exposure of the Stalinists in an anti-labor force would have a thousand times more value than the present action. The difficulty the Green administration finds in such democratic and educational methods is that it stands close to the Stalinists on so many issues.

### What Motivated the Action

What might have been involved in Green's motivations brings us to the second important aspect of the Velson case. That is the fact that in the GEB and in the convention Velson was supported by Van Gelder, secretary-treasurer of the IUMSWA, and by Walter Pollard, Green-appointed dictator of Local 9 in San Pedro, Calif.

Reports had been going around for many months before the convention that the Stalinists would attempt to take over the union at the next convention. It was reported that Van Gelder was their man. It had been known for some weeks that Pollard, out in Local 9 in San Pedro, formed a bloc with the Stalinists in the local. Pollard maintained this bloc in

the convention. The sixteen delegates whom Pollard had appointed to sit in the convention, against the instructions of the GEB, voted solidly against Velson's ouster from the GEB. Pollard, who is a GEB member, and Van Gelder spoke from the convention floor for the retention of Velson on the General Executive Board.

It was clear that although the Stalinists would not attempt to oust Green or to assume the leadership of the International, the reports about their projected plans to acquire greater influence were in large measure true and factual. Whether or not Van Gelder was involved in these maneuvers, we have no way of knowing, but the evidence certainly supports the belief that Pollard was consciously involved in them.

We are of the opinion that Green and other officers knew about this plot of the Stalinists and that Green's attitude on the ousting of Velson was dictated in part at least by these considerations.

It should be reported right here that the three delegates who were democratically elected to represent the members of Local 9 in San Pedro and who were financed to the convention by contributions made privately by the membership, voted to sustain the GEB on the Velson expulsion. The important aspect of the vote of these three delegates, Bailly, Malloy and Turner, is that they refused to vote with the bloc of sixteen Pollard-Stalinist-appointed delegates. These three real delegates were seated by the convention on recommendation of the appeals committee. We will deal in detail with Pollard, the Stalinists and Local 9 in another article.

### The Evidence the Union Used

A third aspect of the Velson case is the source from which the evidence against him came and how it was obtained by the GEB. It seems clear from the testimony given that the information came from one of the government's police agencies, such as the FBI or Naval Intelligence; or that it came from the Dies Committee. Did the unnamed government agency approach the GEB or did the GEB's investigating committee seek out the unnamed government agency? What is the attitude

of Green and other officers' of the IUMSWA toward information obtained from government agencies about members of the union? Where will they draw the line? Is it to be the policy of the GEB of the IUMSWA to accept uncritically any information about their members given by government agencies? Are Green, the GEB and other union officers ready to accept passively reports on workers given by government agencies? Is Green ready to proceed summarily against any member of his international that is labelled "subversive" by a government agency? The employers have the same standards as the government. Will Green accept the word of the employers also? Green knows that this is a very handy tool to be used against any militant worker, a club that is poised over the head of the whole labor movement.

### Where the Convention Failed

All in all, the convention of the ship workers was a sad affair. There was no discussion on the most serious and vital questions facing the ship workers and the labor movement. There was no discussion on wages, taxes, working hours. Not a word on the WLB and, above all, not a word on the Roosevelt work-or-fight decree of August 16.

There was no committee report on wages and working conditions. According to the Shipyard Worker of September 17: "Green declared that this committee's actions would have been academic, since wage problems today are mainly resolved by the NWLB and the Director of Economic Stabilization."

It was a cowardly performance by the top officers of the international and the leadership of the local unions. The convention did virtually nothing that will benefit the shipbuilding workers. It got nowhere.

The delegates did not protest at the convention. It is to be hoped that when they make their reports to their own local unions they will at least speak their minds and tell the truth openly and frankly. And then when they come back next year to their national convention they will have learned how to speak in an organized way in the interest of the thousands of working people they are supposed to represent.

### 389,000,000 People in Revolt!

India's masses in revolt against British imperialism... The astounding facts and figures behind the rebellion of the most cruelly exploited victims of world capitalism... The story you have never read before.

## INDIA IN REVOLT

100 Pages By HENRY JUDD 25¢ Postpaid

## THE WORKERS PARTY

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

### What AMG Tried to Do

One does not have to possess an overly active imagination to guess what kind of reception this will elicit from the militant anti-fascist workers of Milan and Turin who at this very moment are continuing their remarkably heroic resistance against the Nazis. For surely—every Asst. Secretary of the State Department must know—when these Italian workers risked their necks in demonstrations and strikes which caused Mussolini to topple, they did not do this to put Badoglio in power.

Yes, indeed, the American and British "statesmen" are brewing themselves a terrific mess in Italy. Apparently they haven't quite decided which course to follow: (1) to attempt to govern Italy by the AMG;

or (2) to allow Badoglio to set up a puppet regime. In either case, they're in for a headache.

The AMG has proved itself a thoroughly reactionary outfit, basing itself on the old ruling elements. In Sicily it refused to have anything to do with the anti-fascists, but instead played ball with the local secondary fascist leaders. It retained the old "collective bargaining" contracts of fascism, the nature of which you can well imagine. It promised free collective bargaining... "in the future."

Apparently, however, a section of the Allied leadership has come to the conclusion that the AMG, with its explicit prohibition of political activity in areas it takes over, its ban on strikes, its narrow limitations on civil liberties, its generally reactionary and unattractive character, is too crude and raw to attract any support or enthusiasm among the people whom it rules. The result is that the AMG is being gradually played down.

The AMG, it now appears likely, will step aside in favor of a puppet Badoglio regime. It has been decided that "Quislings" are preferable to gauleiters. As a New York Times dispatch of September 22 put it:

"Of course the AMG is already in Italy, but there has been much less said about it than when the organization first moved into Sicily. It would be reasonable to guess that AMG's role in Italy will not expand much and may not even continue if the Allies can work out a formula revolving around Marshal Badoglio that will meet military needs with-

out stirring up too much political dissatisfaction."

We here see the beginning of a general political process which will be repeated, in one form or another, in a number of European countries when they are taken over by the Allies. The attempt of the Allied governments to rule Europe with AMG will soon prove a failure, at least in terms of soliciting the necessary support of the people involved; the next step will be to prop up reactionary puppet regimes with Badoglios, Girauds, Mikhailovitchs, etc.

But here enter two factors: (1) the peoples of the occupied countries have no stomach for these outmoded militarists and will insist on being allowed to decide their own destiny; (2) the Stalin government, in order to gain a wider sphere of influence in Europe for its own imperialist aims and at the expense of its partner-rivals, will attempt demagogically to utilize the genuine complaints of the European people against AMG and the various "Badoglios" for its own purposes.

The Allies will be in a terrific dilemma. But why speak in the future tense? They already are. As soon as they clear the German troops out of Italy, or most of it, they will face this dilemma: What kind of government for Italy? The pressure of the Italian workers, once again able to raise their voices, and the demagogic proclamations from Russia will make the regime of Badoglio decidedly uncomfortable.

Here is where people like Count Storza come in. Storza is the pro-

fessional capitalist "democrat" who solves problems by letting them get up in clouds of words. He is puppet No. 2. When Badoglio fails, it will be Storza's turn, or someone like him. Certainly he, with his democratic words, will elicit a certain response from the Italian people. But, then, this will be no comfort for the Allies either.

### The People Will Intervene

For once they might find it necessary to play with fire by actually owing some kind of democratic regime to take power in Italy, the process thus begun, as they know only too well, might not so easily be controlled. From the pliant Storza, Italy might move to the more independent Salvemini, who has the unfortunate vice of honesty; if nothing else. And from him: the Italian people could and might move to a workers' government, a socialist regime.

Is all this idle speculation? By no means. Secondary only to the gigantic military problems they still face in Europe, the Allied leaders worry about how to control post-war Europe. As the London Tribune writes: "It is no victory for British Tories (and American Tories, either R.F.) if the defeat of Hitler is purchased at the price of European revolution."

There is the dilemma: attempt to rule Europe at the point of a bayonet, which cannot long be done; or attempt to set up puppet regimes, which have a habit of succumbing to popular pressure, which then in turn begins to play an increasingly domi-