

Coast Unions Withstand Bosses Attack

(Continued from Page 1)

fusing to man the freighter Oregon at Los Angeles because it was laden with aviation gasoline destined for Italian Somaliland.

Thirdly: the organization of the Maritime Federation on the Pacific Coast, uniting all the maritime unions in common action and inspiring to a solidarity hitherto unknown. An organization justly feared by the shipping companies and whose example spread to the Gulf ports resulting in the setting up of a similar federation there.

Fourthly: the question of wages and working conditions established in the Pacific Coast ports, superior to those prevailing on the waterfronts anywhere else in the country. And most important in this connection, the union control of manning the ships and handling the cargo through joint "hiring halls", these representing the gains that resulted from the San Francisco general strike, enforced by the vigilance of an active leadership and by the unparalleled militancy of the rank and file.

Fifthly, and lastly, we have here a case of the most vicious, the most sinister and the most rotten connivance of corrupted high paid national officials with the shipping companies, sometimes using government agents as intermediaries, the former operating by the methods of circumventing strikes, threatening expulsions and actual expulsions of whole locals, herding scabs to man ships in Eastern ports and giving them union cards in order to help break the courage, the militancy and the very existence of the Pacific Coast unions.

Frisco Local Target for Attack

In these most recent events the San Francisco longshoremen's local 38-79, of which Harry Bridges is president, became the direct target. The Grace Company liner Santa Rosa had been picketed in New York for failure to comply with union conditions but it secured, with the help of the top union officials a crew from the Great Lakes which was spuriously supplied with union cards. Arriving at San Pedro it was again picketed by the Maritime Federation and subsequently diverted to the San Francisco port, which the avowed threat of the employers "to force a shutdown." The longshoremen's union considered the Santa Rosa as carrying "hot cargo," and, therefore, not to be unloaded, and insisted on an examination of the crew's union cards.

Immediately the Waterfront Employers' Association countered by breaking off relations with local 38-79. The opportunity the bosses had waited for had come. All members of the Employers Association were advised not to order any men through the hiring halls. These hiring halls were made the center of the attack. Through them the unions were able to regulate the hiring of crews so that each received its proper share of the work available and the unions were also enabled to prevent any effective blacklisting by the employers. Naturally, such an institution became

a thorn in the sides of the latter and they were determined to move heaven and earth to have it smashed.

The Attack Fails

So far, however, this attempt has failed. All the carefully laid plans and all the dastardly connivance of the reactionary national officials with the employers could not break the maritime unions on the Pacific Coast. In the most splendid manner they all rallied to make common cause against the combined attack. The Central Labor Councils of Seattle, of San Francisco and smaller cities voted full support to the longshoremen, even local reactionaries did not dare oppose it. The Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast voted full support as did numerous local unions up and down the coast. Still the longshoremen's union had to make a retreat and consent to a stipulation being written into the agreement signed before the federal administrator, Judge M. C. Sloss, by which it gives up its right to job action and pledges itself to handle "hot cargo" while disputes are referred to the judge for settlement. This is a serious retreat and it calls to mind the fact that Harry Bridges has once before caused strained relations with the other maritime unions when advising them to refrain from "job action."

It should be clearly understood, however, that the Pacific Coast unions were compelled to make this retreat essentially because of the conniving treachery between the employers and such officials as Joseph P. Ryan of the International Longshoremen's Union and Victor Olander, Paul Scharrerberg and Andrew Furuseth of the International Sailor's Union. The maritime unions of the Pacific Coast have attained an advanced position by their militant methods of struggle as well as in regard to conditions gained. For these reasons they had to bear the brunt of the attack and bear it alone. And it is a foregone conclusion that for them to maintain this position it is necessary that the maritime unions, particularly in the East, be similarly organized and establish a far greater degree of cohesion and solidarity.

The dramatic events of this protracted Pacific Coast struggle can best be understood when related in chronological order. At the same time each one of them contain lessons necessary for militant unionists to assimilate if they are to be on guard in future events. In practically every instance we see reflected the conflict between the old school of corrupted trade union leadership and the newly awakened rank and file militancy. But in its broader implications, it is the conflict of the capitalist owners of industry and their labor lieutenants pitted against an advanced section of the working class.

The Strike Award

Out of the San Francisco general strike grew the special award of the National Longshoremen's Board providing for the present working

conditions on the waterfront. The longshoremen gained the six-hour day with a wage scale of 95 cents per hour and \$1.40 for overtime. Subsequently all other maritime workers made gains. The sailors established a wage scale of \$62.50 per month, the stewards \$50.00 per month which compares to the lower rate on the East Coast of \$57.50 and \$45.00 for these two crafts respectively. According to the new award all cases of dispute were to be handled by the local Labor Relations Committee, and in the event of disagreement to be referred to Judge Sloss for arbitration. One of the important and at the same time one of the most bitterly contested gains for the workers, contained in this award, was the provision for all hiring of crews to take place through "hiring halls" jointly operated. Through this medium the unions were able to exercise almost complete control over hiring and firing of crews. Of course, it should be remembered, that all of these gains were made only after a whole series of struggles consciously aimed at an immediate goal.

Gains Consolidated

Following up these gains the unions further strengthened their position enormously by organizing the Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast, embracing all of the maritime unions and counting a total of 35,000 members. Ordinarily there would not be anything startling for A. F. of L. unions of related crafts within one industry to combine in the establishment of a federation. This has been a long established practice by the various departments already in existence, comprising the building trades, the metal trades, the printing trades and others. But after the lessons of the general strike, which had brought forward a determined leadership in the local maritime unions, and in fear of a rising tide of militancy, the top bureaucrats took an entirely different view of the matter.

The newly gained cohesiveness made the workers conscious of their organized power which they did not hesitate to use. Ships with non-union crews, or with cargo loaded anywhere by scabs, found difficulties in every Pacific port. While the federation is in no sense as fully effective as an industrial union it did inculcate a high degree of solidarity and unity of action all along the coast. Even as a mere step in that direction it became a splendid tribute to the idea of industrial unionism. From the point of view of the employers this situation appeared ever more desperate. The business revival began to make its way; profits showed new and excellent prospects, buttressed by the enormous government ship subsidies, and lo and behold, the workers on the waterfronts and on the ships insisted, through their unions, upon their modest share as specified by the federal award. They insisted on union control of working conditions. The maritime unions had become a powerful force.

Following their acceptance of the federal award the employers confined themselves to guerrilla warfare, but only in preparation for their day of the general offensive. This assumed varied forms. In one instance sailors were commanded to unload steam schooners at a scale of 95 cents an hour. The sailors refused, so the employers had to hire longshoremen, but they would subsequently tie up the schooners, leaving them lying idle in the ports; first dozens of them, later scores. Petty violations of the provisions of the award were common occurrences. Ships carrying "hot cargo" called at the ports right along while a hue and cry went up against the workers' refusal to unload them. But in all these situations the workers also learned how to resort to a special kind of job action through what was popularly called "quickie" strikes. They met the strategy of guerrilla warfare rather effectively.

All the time the employers prepared for the showdown. The local Chambers of Commerce, the Hearst press and the radio loud speakers blared out their shouts for a showdown while an important part of the plans were concocted right in the international union offices.

Joseph P. Ryan, the president of the I.L.A., had bungled things for the bureaucrats during the coast-wide strike when he failed to carry a single vote for his outrageous settlement proposals. He was already badly discredited on the Pacific Coast. So the gentlemen receiving the high salaries in the sailors' union, Paul Scharrerberg and Victor Olander, came to the rescue of the employers when help from these labor lieutenants was needed the most. Paul Scharrerberg, who was often denounced by Tom Mooney as one of his jailers, had himself been expelled from the sailors' union of the Pacific because of his treacherous activities during the tanker strike. Victor Olander, one of the left-overs of the old Gompers' regime, required a good deal of his training in the kind of politics where an opponent is never met openly until all the traps are securely set. At the I.S. U. convention in January, when serious disputes on the Pacific Coast were in a deadlock, these two gentlemen appeared to administer their blow.

Union Charter Revoked

The sailors' union of the Pacific Coast was indicted for having refused to unload the steam schooners at 29 cents an hour, for having combined with other unions in the Maritime Federation and for having taken into its ranks members of the dissolved Marine Workers Industrial Union. The sailors' union on the Pacific Coast was expelled and its funds tied up in court litigation. What was the purpose of this action? Here we will let the New York Times, which carries "all the news fit to print," give the answer. In its issue of January 31, George P. West reported from San Francisco on the

"staggering blow to the hitherto victorious maritime unions" by the charter revocation. He added:

"Shipowners are jubilant as they abandon carefully laid plans to lay up all ships early in February and thereby lockout sailors and longshoremen as a final desperate expedient in combatting the militant leadership of Harry Bridges and his allies. Instead they now announce they will wait until the I.S.U. has organized a new Pacific Coast unit.

"If the local leadership refuses to recognize the new union and work cargo the responsibility will be transferred to the men and the issue fought out as a strike instead of a lockout."

"We've Got the Men!"

Matters did not work out entirely in this fashion, and chiefly because of the fact that the bureaucrats of the I.S.U. allied in their nefarious scheme. They did not rally any of the sailors on the Pacific Coast to their banner. It turned out to be as stated by Earl King, one of the leaders of the Maritime Federation: "They've got the charter, we've got the men." The Maritime Federation stood its ground and remained solid so the employers had to change their strategy and move for the showdown precipitated by them selves when they broke off relations with longshoremen's local 38-79 on April 14.

This long protracted struggle is now settled—at least for the time being. The shipping companies and the waterfront employers have once again experienced the power of labor when well organized and given militant leadership. They have also experienced a new lesson, namely that they cannot entirely depend upon the top bureaucrats, be they ever so corrupted, once the rank and file workers have become conscious of the despicable role these individuals play. To the workers it should have become increasingly clear that real gains are made only through conscious struggle and when their organizations are made a means for this purpose.

Significance of the Retreat

But the retreat embodied in the present agreement leaves the Pacific Coast maritime unions in a weakened position. The pledge to handle "hot cargo" can become extremely dangerous and can easily serve as a treacherous means toward the breaking up of the solidarity and the organization attained, not only on the Pacific Coast, but elsewhere. Under no conditions can the unions afford to agree to handle "hot cargo" of the kind that is actually loaded by scabs under the conditions of a strike in other ports. That would mean the giving up of the very right to an organization.

But, as stated at the outset in this article, the key to the problem remains the organization for common action in all the ports in the country. The establishment of the Maritime Federation of the Gulf Coast district embracing about 10,000 maritime workers is one important step in this direction. When followed up on the Eastern coast, regardless of the opposition of the reactionary bureaucrats, the retreat made can again be turned into a new advance.

New York Labor Unites for Monster Parade

(Continued from Page 1)

by the participating bodies. They stand opposed to the great parade that will take place on May Day with or without the official support of these powerful unions. It would be the greatest error to give up the street parade of hundreds of thousands of workers in order to have, instead, a polite gathering at the Polo Grounds, interspersed with a few innocuous or labor-dividing speeches and sporting events. The United Front May Day Committee has correctly rejected such a demand. The parade through the streets in the manner to emphasize and mobilize Labor's increasing solidarity and understanding of its problems on this historic day.

The officialdom and lackeys of the A.C.W., I.L.G.W., and Millinery Unions have endeavored in the local unions to have the membership declare for participation only in the Polo Grounds meeting and to declare against marching on May Day with the United Front. These attempts to sabotage the mobilization of labor's organized ranks have been sharply rejected by the largest locals of these unions. They will march in the United Front demonstration and also later take part in the Polo Grounds affair, thus trying, if possible, to cement labor unity on May Day despite the official edicts and aims of the union officialdom.

The leaders and sponsors of the Polo Grounds "celebration," the heads of three major New York unions, are allegedly progressive leaders of labor, even "socialists", who want a Labor Party; they are "class-conscious"—especially for Franklin D. Roosevelt. Yes, they are even outstanding leaders of a major movement for industrial unionism, the Committee for Industrial Organization—Dubinsky, Zaritsky, Hillman, et al. But they are playing the bosses' game, they are playing a backward game in trying to divide the ranks of labor on May Day; by their hope and aim to diminish, if they cannot break up, the forthcoming gigantic United Front May Day demonstration. These sponsors of the Polo Grounds turn-out show their real "progressive" color by their open, declared support of Roosevelt, the Democratic president, for the 1936 national elections. These are the Judases of labor on May Day and every other day. It is even said by many that these progressive and "socialist" leaders in these unions may try to turn this allegedly May Day affair at the Polo Grounds into a demonstration on behalf of Roosevelt.

The policy of the United Front May Day Committee is to endeavor

to prevent any "competition" between the Polo Ground and U.F. May Day parade and demonstrations. This is correct. The United Front May Day Committee calls upon the members of these unions and other organizations to give full support to both demonstrations and to endeavor to give to the Polo Grounds gathering a distinctly working class character. Many organizations have already signified their intention to take part in both gatherings—among them many unions and also the Socialist Party. The United Front May Day Committee is doing everything possible to unify labor's ranks on May Day; failing so far to get the I.L.G.W., A.C.W. and Millinery Workers Unions to call off the Polo Grounds get-together in favor of one gigantic, united May Day Parade, culminating at Union Square, the May Day Committee continues to call, with some success, upon workers' organizations to support both demonstrations. Nevertheless, it would be folly not to recognize that fundamentally the counter-Polo Ground demonstration has as the aim of its sponsors the sabotage of May Day solidarity, and cannot help but effect in some measure the size of the genuine May Day demonstration supported and organized by the United Front Committee.

The Stalinists

The Communist Party (Stalinists) are an important part of the United Front May Day Committee represented on all committees of the U.F. But this year the Stalinists are watching their step in this united front in order not to upset the apple cart as they have so often done in past years. Gone are their cries of "Social-Fascist!" against the Socialist workers; gone are their howls for the fictitious "united front from below"; gone their stupid, false setting-up, in all the circumstances then, of independent and dual trade unions; gone much of the lunatic tactics of the notorious "Third Period". The Stalinists have jumped out of their skins both in fright at their misdeeds, and in their desire to promote their opportunistic and social patriotic line on the war question, in the unions, the 1936 elections, their ballyhoo for a third capitalist party, euphemistically called a Farmer-Labor Party, and similar objectives reflecting their somersault.

The Stalinists could, if they wished, easily dominate the May Day United Front Committee mechanically through their numerous stooge and duplicating auxiliary organizations. But they are refraining from so doing and are letting the S.P. Militants run the show, even though organizational-ly the "Militants" could stand more practical assistance on various aspects of the demonstration. But having gotten into the United Front, and with opportunity provided to proclaim their substitute—a Farmer-Labor Party for a genuine revolutionary party, they are content this time to let well enough alone and to act as primly and politely as a little Lord Fauntleroy.

The W.P. and the United Front

The Workers Party of New York is participating in the May Day united front and is represented on the Executive Committee. We are giving full support to the basic objectives of May Day. We, better than any other organization of labor, can fittingly participate in and promote the United Front on May Day and on other specific issues and occasions. Our Party has always held a sound position on the tactic of the united front as a medium for the mobilization of wide masses of workers on specific matters. Our Party, unlike the social-patriotic Stalinists, never labeled Socialists as "Social-Fascists", even though the W.P. continued to make criticism of the inadequacies of the socialists and other bodies in respect to program, theory and action.

Among the main slogans are: for the defense of the Soviet Union; for the class-war prisoners; against war and Fascism; for a farmer-labor Party, etc. Our organization, the Workers Party, as per its official position, is against the slogan and formation of a "farmer-labor" or "Labor" Party. Under the circumstances, we regard it as a petty bourgeois combination, a bulwark, if formed, against a developing militant and revolutionary working class. Nor, for that matter, does a genuine base, rooted in the mass of labor unions, actually exist today. For the most part the existing "labor party" movements are fictitious organizations, or rather, paper bodies with some scattered individual support. But the complete position of the Workers Party on this issue is expressed essentially in its declaration of Principles and in other expressions of policy toward concrete manifestations of such a movement. Suffice that the Workers Party, while giving full support to the 1936 May Day and the arrangements thereof, states its separation from the advocacy of the Labor Party slogan in the parade. Members and supporters of the Workers Party! March on May Day in the United Front! Workers! Mobilize for Labor Solidarity against Capitalism!

Frame Negroes

(Continued from Page 1)

Vergie Terry, and her boy friend, were brought to "identify" them. The Terry woman declared that the prisoners had attacked her twice in five minutes, and that they had worn caps, overalls, and masks. Clayton does not possess a cap and has not worn overalls in five years. Nor did the state produce the masks during the drum-head trial of the boys.

The boy friend claimed that he had been thrown face downward in a ditch. Records of the United States Weather Bureau prove that it had rained three days and nights preceding the alleged date of attack. This plump did not complain that his clothes were soiled, although he would have been drowned had he been thrown in a ditch.

Not a single Negro was impaneled on the jury which tried the boys, but the Supreme Court of Arkansas failed to reverse the death sentences on this score. Unless there is a wave of national protest, this Arkansas Scottsboro case will result in the deaths of two innocent Negroes. We must answer this stupid savagery of the Arkansas planters by funds and protests. Funds should be sent to the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, Box 5215, Memphis, Tenn., and protests to Governor Harvey Purnell, Little Rock, Ark.

WORKERS

Protect Yourselves Against the Hazards of Life. Join the WORKMEN'S SICK & DEATH BENEFIT FUND OF THE U.S. 1881-1935

Organized, managed by and for workers with only one purpose: to render protection to members and their families, and to support all endeavors and struggles for the improvement of toilers.

About 50,000 members organized in 350 branches. Reserves \$3,400,000.

Health benefit graded according to age at entry. Sick benefit payments from \$25 to \$900—to men and women, according to classes.

Monthly assessments from 45c to \$2.10.

For further information apply to Main Office: 714 Seneca Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Donkey and Elephant Gird for Election Spree

(Continued from Page 1)

Tories, of the selfish few, of those who would rob the people of their liberties; concern for the common man; the great aims of social security and neighborliness; protection and aid for agriculture; against the corruptions of the mighty; for a true peoples' government. An admirable program, in short, for a genuine People's Front. The Democrats are abandoning hope of toning down the attacks in the Republican press, since they find that every publicly avowed protestation of friendship for big business only spurs the Republicans to new heights. They are falling back, therefore, into a purer form of demagoguery.

The Republican Scramble

The Republicans have a somewhat more difficult, and less rewarding task. They are confronted with a most undignified scramble for the Presidential nomination. Landon, Borah, Knox, and Hoover are now in the lead, with Landon out in front at the moment. Landon, however, is suffering from the too ardent kiss of Hearst, and none of these four seem to have sufficient support to secure nomination on an early ballot. The old-line politicians maintain tight control of the Convention through the device of having "uninstructed delegates" elected from most of the states; and it is not improbable that they will engineer the nomination of a compromise dark horse—perhaps Vandenbergh of Michigan, or Stewer of Oregon, the latter of whom has been selected as the Keynoter for the Convention.

The Republicans will have somewhat more trouble than the Democrats over the wording of their platform, particularly because of the strategic position in which Borah may find himself. As a concession to Borah, they will no doubt take care to point out that the Republican Party is the genuinely liberal party in terms of the true

American tradition, and that the great task before us is to prevent the tyranny of the state over the individual, to guard our cherished liberties from socialistic regimentation, and to oust the soviet from the White House. They will then go on to show that this means a sound monetary system, balancing of the federal budget, ending of corruption and extravagance, and a cessation of interference with legitimate business.

Aim of the G. O. P. Struggle

It can hardly be thought, however, that the Republicans seriously believe that they have a chance in November. Every indication is for a decisive victory for Roosevelt. The struggle for Republican nomination, therefore, is largely a struggle for control of the Republican Party machinery and what this can bring apart from actual possession of the Federal Administration. And apart from this, the Republican campaign will be run not so much to try to secure election as to put continuous pressure on Roosevelt to prevent him from getting too far out of line with the aims of the industrialists and financiers back of the Republican Party; an object which is not so difficult when it is remembered that these aims correspond in all important respects with the aims of the industrialists and financiers back of the Democratic Party.

It is hardly necessary to point out that, words and slogans aside, in their concrete significance, programs and activities, there is at the present time no important difference between the two parties. They both represent, from top to bottom, the fundamental social interests of the big bourgeoisie, of finance-capital. The axis of the aims of each is simply to keep capitalism going, with the largest possible percentage of its fruits going to the bourgeoisie.

other) government—the war question—there is no dispute even in words between the two parties. Both see the next war approaching rapidly and inevitably, and plan to have the United States in a position to enter it in its later stages to reap the largest reward from the re-division of the world. Roosevelt has successfully carried through the largest peace-time armament budget in the history of this or any other country; and no Republican cry for economy has ever mentioned the armament expenditures. Even the D. A. R. and Hearst have recently "raised Roosevelt in public for his devotion to the "national defense", and on this subject there are no stricter judges.

Differences Superficial

Doubtless the two parties differ to some degree in the details of their schemes for managing the political aspect of the great bourgeois business of exploiting the masses. For example, there is more sentiment for direct relief as opposed to work relief in the Republican than in the Democratic Party. Nevertheless, the difference here also is largely on the surface. Both are agreed that relief should be kept as low as is compatible with the prevention of too much mass resentment. The Republicans talk more about a "balanced budget"; but they, like Roosevelt, are not willing to levy sufficient new taxation to attain it; and there are as many inflationists among the Republicans as among the Democrats. The differences in general tariff policy between the two parties have disappeared; and there remains only individual deals on tariffs involving individual backers of the respective parties. The Democrats have, it is true, a more aggressive farm policy; but this is largely an ideological difference—one of the differences in the means by which the two try to maintain their mass bases, rather than any fundamental cleavage.

There was once a day when these two parties faced each other with lines sharply drawn, when they presented themselves to the country as the political representatives of two mortally opposed classes together with their subordinate allies. Through them the slaveholders of

the South fought it out against the industrialists and merchants of the East. But this issue required a Civil War, not merely an election, to settle. And as a necessary part of that mighty struggle for state power, the Republican Party was led to wipe out utterly the class which opposed it, first in part by arms, and then by uprooting the social basis upon which it was constituted. In the succeeding years the bourgeoisie consolidated its victory, and finance-capital replaced the industrialists and merchants.

The Only Major Struggle

Henceforth the only major social struggle is between imperialist finance-capital and the proletariat. This struggle is not yet, however, reflected to any important extent in the parliamentary domain, and cannot be directly expressed in any possible contest between the Republican and Democratic parties. Consequently, the masses, in choosing between them, have only the question—has Marx expressed it—or which group of brigands they shall elect to take the lead for four years in exploiting them.

Nevertheless, even the electoral contest between these two parties is not without social significance. For one thing, the business of government has become the biggest of all businesses, and there is a genuine rivalry in determining who shall have the right to its profits. But much more important than this, the elections are a major means for spreading illusions among the masses, for preventing the masses from understanding what the true issues of modern society actually are. Exaggerating the appearance of differences between the two parties aids the bourgeoisie in sustaining the belief on the part of the masses that it is a vital question for them whether the next Administration is Republican or Democratic. Thus the masses are hindered from learning that the only political struggle of real importance for them is the struggle not against one or another of the parties, but against the bourgeois state itself in its entirety, is the struggle for the overthrow of the state.

But it is doubtful that this illusion can be sustained much longer

by the quadrennial electoral contest between Republicans and Democrats. The puppet show is becoming too unconvincing. Consequently, the bourgeoisie will have to turn to a new device to stave off the mass growth of revolutionary political struggle against the state. Two devices are possible: a mass Fascist movement—though the time for that has not yet come, and probably will not for some years; or a reformist party—a People's or Labor or Farmer-Labor or Progressive Party—whereby the beginnings of deep revolt can be channeled into safe directions. Preparations for the latter alternative are already under way. Indeed, Roosevelt himself has transformed the Democratic Party a considerable distance along the path, and, with the active help of the trade union bureaucracy, is making it into the "Labor Party of 1936". Labor's Non-Partisan League, supporting Roosevelt this year, is jockeying into a position where later it can gather up the leftward movement of the masses into an avowed Labor Party, under firm anti-revolutionary control.

Only one strategy can defeat this perspective: revolutionary strategy, revolutionary agitation and organization. The reformist distinctions between "friends" and "enemies" among the bourgeoisie, between the Liberty League and Farley, between the Supreme Court and Congress, between Hearst and The Times or Scripps-Howard, merely plays the game of Roosevelt this year, and the subtler game of the Third Party advocates in the years to come. Our attack must be against capitalism; our struggle must be for socialism. And for this attack and this struggle there is one, and only one, political weapon: the revolutionary party. Our task is to forge this weapon. There is no other that will serve.

PAUL LUTTINGER, M.D.
DANIEL LUTTINGER, M.D.
5 Washington Square North
1-2 and 6-8 Except Sundays and Holidays.