

WORKERS' FORUM

Write to us—tell us what's going on in your part of the labor movement—what are the workers thinking about—tell us what the bosses are up to—and the G-men and the local cops—and the Stalinists—send us that story the capitalist press didn't print and that story they buried or distorted—our pages are open to you. Letters must carry name and address, but indicate if you do not want your name printed.

Worker Finds Soldiers Have Little Faith In Holy War

Editor: Last Sunday while attending a non-political picnic in the County Park, I got in with some soldiers from a regiment of the regular army camped in the park. After having a round of beer together, we got into a conversation, and the boys were pretty open about their opinions of army life. I gathered that most of them had joined the army only because they couldn't find jobs elsewhere. They all expressed the idea that they would rather have any kind of "half-decent" job than be in the army.

They seemed certain that war will come and that they will be among the first under fire. I asked whom they expected to fight and what they thought they would be fighting for. They answered resignedly that they didn't know—that they could only do just as they were ordered. One thing they seemed to be sure of—they would not be fighting to save democracy. When I asked them whether they believed that the coming war would create jobs for them to come back to or help the working class in general, they were in agreement that there was little hope of jobs when—and if—they returned.

At this point one of the soldiers broke in with a reference to "fifth columnists." Another immediately told him to "shut up," that he had been six years in the army and knew what he was talking about. The latter then went on to tell of his bitter experiences while he was unemployed. After the discussion, he had a private conversation with me on the whole question of what the war was about and what it would lead to, and insisted that I contact him again.

It seemed unusual to me to find soldiers so open to this type of discussion. It made me think that possibly the army ranks will not be the quiet sheep in the coming war that they appeared to be in the last.

R. L.

Political Prisoners Must Not Separate From Others In Jail

Editor: Last week's Appeal has an account of hunger strikes in the prisons of India over a demand for better treatment for political prisoners. I don't know much about the situation there, but I immediately wondered what would be the correct policy here with respect to the conduct of political prisoners, especially since we can expect an increasing number of political prisoners with the development of the war situation.

In my opinion, the political "offender" in prison should not distinguish himself from the "common criminal" in any social sense. There are class lines in prison also, and "better treatment" often means association with grafting politicians, jailed cops, forgers, stool-pigeons—the "rats" gallery—and ostracism by the "popularity."

The political prisoner should be especially careful not to demand the soft jobs like working in the warden's office, or waiting on table in the guards' mess. A demand for reading and writing material comes under a different heading, but here again, the demand should be raised not as a special one for political prisoners, but as the right of any prisoner.

Perhaps the demand for better treatment for the political prisoners in India is a result of their receiving worse treatment than the others. That is most likely. It will be the case in America. The prison guards were particularly brutal to "conscientious objectors" and radicals imprisoned during the last war. In every instance, however, the political prisoner should attempt to solidarize himself with the other prisoners, and be careful to raise no barrier between himself and them.

Buffalo, N. Y.

Join the Socialist Workers Party

Fort Dix Soldiers Win Demand For Better Chow

FORT DIX, N. J., Oct. 26—Recruits of the National Guard regiments, in training here, have won the first round of the classic "beef" of the privates over bad army food.

They forced recognition of their complaint against the poor preparation of the food, and in a number of cases secured better cooks of their own choice.

A number of the complaints were backed by the threat of a "letter home to my Congressman," which apparently proved a powerful-enough suggestion to some of the officers, who want to keep in good with the politicians for promotion's sake.

The ranks are not too backward in objecting to the new non-commissioned officers recently appointed. A National Guardsman, talking to several of his buddies, was heard to declare, "Why the captain must be off his nut to appoint such a s---b for sergeant. He should have asked some of us guys beforehand for our idea of the guy. We know the men from before they were in the army."

SWP Broadcasts to Minnesota Workers

Grace Carlson, Candidate For Senator, Puts Our Military Program On the Air

MINNEAPOLIS, Oct. 28—In the second of a series of radio broadcasts, Grace Carlson, SWP candidate for U. S. Senator from Minnesota, gave "The Socialist Answer to War and Fascism." Speaking over Station WLOL tonight Comrade Carlson charged that the senatorial candidates of the other parties had no realistic program against war. "Their feeble anti-war declarations, lacking the necessary economic interpretations of the causes of war, are as futile in this period as the action of a man who tries to hold back the tide with a broom."

Quoting at length from the Manifesto of the Fourth International, she urged listeners "to compare this forthright program against war with the confused, misleading and utterly inadequate declarations of the other candidates."

On Monday, November 4th, at 7:45 P. M. Comrade Carlson will again speak over Station WLOL on other issues of the campaign. At a meeting to be held in the Odd Fellows Hall in St. Paul on November 1st, Comrade Carlson will speak on "A Proletarian Military Policy." She promises if elected to introduce a bill into the U. S. Senate providing the trade union movement with military equipment and instructors so that the workers might receive their military training, not under the labor-hating army machine, but under their own auspices.

Two election rallies have been planned for Sunday, November 3rd. V. R. Dunne will speak at the meeting at 919 Marquette Avenue in Minneapolis at 3:30 P. M. Comrade Carlson will be the speaker at the Duluth Election Rally which will be held in Foresters Hall at 3:00 P. M.

Ten thousand copies of a special Minnesota Campaign issue of the SOCIALIST APPEAL were distributed in working class neighborhoods of St. Paul, Minneapolis and Duluth.

C. Johnson, Campaign Manager, said "The workers received our election issue very enthusiastically. Our only regret is that we did not have another 40,000 for distribution. All signs point to a great wind-up of the campaign."

Buffalo, N. Y.

War Scene Shifts To Mediterranean

(Continued from Page 1) as he moved in Poland, in Finland, in the Baltic States, and in Rumania, to push that frontier a little outward to gain whatever defensive advantages he can against eventual Nazi attack.

In each of those previous instances, Hitler graciously acquiesced in Stalin's moves. As far as he was and is concerned we may be certain that these concessions to the Soviet Union are written down in the page of his private ledger under the heading: "To be rectified later."

Stalin Frozen Out? In the present case the obvious object of Stalin's concern would be the Dardanelles, the straits that join the Mediterranean to the Black Sea. The total silence out of Moscow and the evident uncertainty in Ankara as the Italian attack on Greece began suggested strongly that in this instance Hitler may well have told Stalin to keep hands off the straits and to seek his leavings in the northeastern provinces of Turkey, in Persia, Afghanistan, or on the moon, while the Axis takes over the vital Dardanelles and moves beyond them.

Whether this is the case, the coming days or weeks will have to show. Meanwhile the press is filled again, as in every other like situation since the war began, with speculation over the possibility of a switch in Kremlin policy. Wish-fulfillments die hard. In terms of his reactionary policy, Stalin will not, dares not, cannot move against Hitler. He has put himself and his regime in Hitler's straitjacket and cannot quite so easily loose himself now.

The Turks at best meet a blank wall in Moscow when they ask—as they must be urgently asking right now—what they can expect if they fight. They may be urged to give in while they can or may be bluntly told that if they fight, it's their own funeral, not Stalin's.

Choice of one or two rooms furnished or unfurnished in Bronx, kitchen privileges—refrigerator. Single or double—Excellent opportunity. Write S. W. P., 116 University Place, c-o Kellner.

Stalinists Supporting Pro-Wilkie Stand of John L. Lewis

John Llewellyn Lewis, Master Opportunist, has taken his stand. And all the lesser and cheaper Opportunists are dancing around the huge black hole he made in labor history, hoping to be able somehow to break the fall they face when, in a moment, they leap in after him.

Noisest and most frantic of these filthy and cowardly followers of false leaders is the Communist party, now confronting the logical outcome of its policy of tagging along behind the heftiest and most unprincipled of labor big-shots. This Stalinist caricature of a workers' party has for so many years wantonly tossed aside all consideration for the basic interests of labor that now, as it faces the necessity of openly supporting the most brazenly advertised candidate for Wall Street that American politics has ever seen, it needs only toss three formulae about in the air for a day or two and they pull out the one it wants for the line.

It is of course from the labor stooges of the Communist Party that the statements emanate. There are two alternative lines used by these "labor leaders." The first is reported extensively in the October 27 issue of the Daily Worker in the form of letters, telegrams and public statements made in the name of a number of CIO unions securely under the domination of the C. P.

"MERELY" SUPPORT LEWIS This line presents an equivocal support of the great John L. but pretends, with a very delicate accent, a hesitation about endorsing his choice of candidates in this election. A few samples of this line are all that are needed, since the rest of them follow the formula represented with such rigidity that the C. P. must have sent out a sample statement and carefully restricted the liberties to be taken with it.

From the farm equipment workers' union in Chicago (located in what is known to Chicago workers as the Little Kremlin on Oakley and Ogden) comes a statement which expresses "Complete support for John L. Lewis' leadership of the CIO" but also declares that "the CIO affiliate would refrain from endorsing any political candidate."

Another such item reports that "New York leaders of CIO unions wired John L. Lewis approval for his sharp criticism in Friday's broadcast of the Roosevelt administration on its pro-war program, but most of them made no endorsement of either Wilkie or Roosevelt."

Still another item indicates the fear the C. P. has that Lewis' act of treachery will have inevitable and serious repercussions in the ranks of the CIO. It quotes Allan S. Haywood, national director of the CIO and Michael J. Quill, president of the Transport Workers Union and ardent C. P. stooge, as having "warned 200 delegates of the Third Annual Convention of the Connecticut Industrial Union Council, against permitting political differences to divide union ranks."

ONE STEP FURTHER In another set of statements, appearing in the October 28 issue of the Daily Worker, the development of the line along its logical course toward open support of Wilkie can be seen. Lewis Merrill, president of the CIO United Office and Professional Workers and C. P. mouthpiece, has this to say:

"If there is any man who has earned the right to counsel the workers of this country, it is John L. Lewis. The vigorous application of the policies of the CIO is more important to labor than the question of who occupies the White House for the next four years. (This from the spokesman of a party which is supposed to have as its chief function the politicalization of the experiences of workers!—Ed.) The tremendous contribution of John L. Lewis to the creation of these policies and to their fulfillment in real life is the best answer to his critics."

"Efforts to interpret his decision as determined by anything other than his desire to better the lot of those who work for a living and of every inhabitant of our country are resented by workers regardless of their political opinions."

Six national officers of the National Maritime Union, headed by Joseph Curran—all Stalinists—offered by telegram their "full and unwavering support" to Lewis when he "called for the defeat of President Roosevelt and the election of Wendell L. Wilkie." (Daily Worker, Oct. 28). Their statement said at a further point: "We are sure that the great number of organized and unorganized workers and their families will recognize your (Lewis') sincere motives in their behalf and give you their support and loyalty which you deserve in this fight." And they conclude with the pious hope that Lewis' action will "bring about an overwhelming defeat to Franklin D. Roosevelt."

C. P. ALIBI FOR LEWIS But the official statement of the C. P. itself, carried editorially in the issue of October 27, takes the cake. It does not go to the length of its stooges in the labor movement but it makes up for that by a thoroughly disgusting cover-up of the real implications of the Lewis statement.

Totally disregarding the fact that Lewis did nothing of the kind, it claims that "the Myth of the New Deal, now abandoned and betrayed, had to be dispelled. Some one had to stand up and cry out the obvious truth: 'The King is naked!' Lewis did it, and thus far performed an historic service."

Forgetting that Lewis, precisely because he has played a role of tremendous importance in the development of the American Labor movement, is guilty in his support of Wilkie of a greater act of political treachery than a lesser figure would have represented, the Daily Worker can find nothing better to do than turn the scorn which should have fallen upon Lewis on those in the labor movement who, though not one whit better than he, are certainly no worse. The Daily Worker says:

"There can be nothing but contempt for the howls and cavilling against Lewis, which come from the camp of Roosevelt's 'Labor' lieutenants. Among these Lilliputians, Lewis has stood forth as a giant. They have groveled at the feet of the War Machine and would deliver Labor in chains for the reward of Roosevelt's smile. Lewis has at least tried to bargain for some definite gain as the price of Labor's vote, even though such bargain is dubious and unsound, and dangerous for the future."

Toward Wilkie the Stalinists are performing the same function as they did in 1936. Then it was "Defeat Landon at all costs"—i. e., elect Roosevelt. Now it is "Up-hold Lewis at all costs," i. e., elect Wilkie.

What scoundrels!

SUGARING THE DRAFT

HARTFORD, Conn., Oct. 24 The State Joint Executive Defense Committee of Connecticut has finally hung a sex angle on military conscription.

It has ruled that the draft registrants' girl-friends may wear the draft pins, given all draftees in this state. This is to encourage the replacing of fraternity pins by draft pins in the ritual of campus love. Sweet and glorious it is to lay down one's life for love's young dream and Wall Street.

Editor: It was with considerable interest that I read your article in the Appeal of Sept. 21, analyzing Sidney Hillman's job as Knudsen's stooge on the Defense Council. As I am working at the Boeing Plant, your use of our recently liquidated strike situation as an example of the role that has been cut out for Hillman is as you say: To Give (to the employers). However, as you uncover the complete story of the Boeing negotiations, there appear other facts which may throw some additional light upon Hillman's work, or at least upon the actual stage of development of his job.

Your story says (after describing the situation at Boeing): "Hillman and Knudsen, working together with the president of the International Association of Machinists, first put through a ten-day truce and then maneuvered the Union back to work with its unmet demands to be thrown to arbitration."

Hillman's Local Helpers What actually happened was that the Local Officials of the Union had been for some time casting about wildly for some device to hold the strike off. Hillman merely supplied the device. Although his press releases

sounded swell, Lundquist of the local union never had any intention of permitting the men to strike. The Company knew this all along—the men in leadership of the Union didn't have any backbone. But the way that Lundquist and his machine grabbed at Madam Perkins' request for a truce made it begin to look obvious. Lundquist was very skillful in handling this and all the other maneuvers by which the strike situation was liquidated and the agreement—which by comparison is lousy—signed. So skillful was he, in fact, that the men began to catch on too late that it was a put-up job between the Company and the Local Union Officials. By now Lundquist has even received some of the most classical subjects of derision and contempt used by the out-house artists and poets in the Boeing wash-room.

However—to get back to the story—both the Company and Lundquist were afraid of the workers and that 97% strike vote. Without help from Hillman it would have been very difficult to pull off. Lundquist would have had either to permit the men to walk out—or to keep them in by such arbitrary and bureaucratic means that he would have been completely exposed. In either case he would have broken his pick-

Actually, in this case Hillman played—along with President Brown of the I. A. of M., only a secondary or auxiliary role to the Local fakery.

Same In Marine Cooks So far as I can learn this was about as far as Hillman's work went also in the threatened strike of the Marine Cooks & Stewards. The last thing in the world that Burke, Cayton & Co. wanted was to put their men on the bricks. Not only would that bring down the wrath of their "brother" Bridges of the Longshoremen but getting on the bricks would put the Cooks in a really good position to settle accounts with a few obnoxious officials as well as the boss. What a relief it must have been to be able to have some heat turned from Hillman!

But set these two cases beside the totally different one of the (AFL) Longshoremen at Tacoma Wash. Here, the workers had what would appear on the surface, at least, to be a beef not nearly so good as either of the other two. They were striking against an old NLRB ruling depriving them of the right to bargain for their own members—giving Coastwise rights to Bridges, ILWU. There was much

more heat generated against this strike than against the other two named and from many more sources. Not only were the government representatives yelling to high heaven about "National Defense," but the entire apparatus of the CIO movement on the Coast was geared to the job of trying to liquidate this strike. Even the great Maritime "Arbitrator," Dean Wayne Morse, who learned the principles of Steve-doring and Maritime Labor Relations while pursuing an academic career at an Oregon cow-college, saw fit to let forth a devastating blast against the Tacoma Longshoremen as being "Unpatriotic" and "Striking against the Government!"

Hillman Failed Here! Yet not only did the Tacoma Longshoremen Strike, but in spite of all this crap they held out until their demand was granted: an immediate rehearing of their case by the Board. Not that Hillman did not attempt to take credit for this settlement as well. However, he undoubtedly had little, if anything to do with it at all.

The moral of this story is something like this: 1) Although Hillman's role is supposed to be a powerful one, it is as yet far from it. A much better title for him would be "Hillman: a Boon to Bungling Bureaucrats." Right now, his main preoccupation seems to be publicity and to get his finger into the pie of as many controversies as possible—if only as far as the newspapers are concerned. He has a long way to go, however before his authority will be as great as his position warrants.

2.) At least as far as the Boeing situation was concerned, the workers in the Plant did not give in to Hillman-pressure, nor were they maneuvered from Washington. The sell-out, like charity, began at home. Hillman-interference doesn't mean too much to the workers yet—except where the Union Leaders directly involved are themselves looking for an easy way out. Then the combination becomes pretty devastating.

AIRCRAFT WORKER Seattle, Wash.

Aircraft Worker is 100% correct. Where workers have half-way decent local leadership, Hillman's strikebreaking moves don't work at this stage of the game.—EDITORS

Coast C. P. Members Learn Of United Front Refusal

LOS ANGELES, Oct. 18—Communist Party members and sympathizers attending a meeting here addressed by James Ford, Stalinist vice-presidential candidate, learned, from a leaflet of the Socialist Workers Party, that the Stalinist leaders had concealed from their followers two offers from the S. W. P. for a united front to fight the California ballot-ban against the Communist Party.

The leaflets gained a friendly reception, few being thrown away. A number of rank and file Stalinists spoke to the leaflet passers and expressed their approval of a united front on the ballot-ban issue. Many leaflets were carefully folded and pocketed.

Contrasting the eagerness of the Stalinists for many years to form a "people's front" with capitalist groups, and their present reluctance to engage in united front actions with workers' organizations, the leaflet declared, "Not so long ago the Communist Party formed 'People's front' alliances with the capitalist class and its agents such as Olson—who now bans the C.P. from the ballot, La Guardia—who breaks strikes and

cuts relief appropriations, Roosevelt—who beats the war drums of American imperialism, Daladier—who prepared the surrender of France's working class to the Nazi war machine, etc."

The appeal concludes: "The reactionary drive will continue as the war-machine of American imperialism gathers momentum. Other issues will arise in the near future, issues on which united action is possible and absolutely demanded. We urge the rank and file of the Communist Party to be vigilant—to demand that the C.P. leadership ceases its blind policy of refusing a united front on issues in defense of labor."

In this, as well as the previous united front appeals, the Socialist Workers Party pointed out that the ban was a blow not only at the Stalinists, but at the political rights of all labor organizations in California. The Los Angeles S. W. P. branches are sending committees to visit the C. P. members to discuss with them the significance of their leaders' refusal to accept the united front.

Hillman Merely Helped to Break Boeing Strike

Editor: It was with considerable interest that I read your article in the Appeal of Sept. 21, analyzing Sidney Hillman's job as Knudsen's stooge on the Defense Council. As I am working at the Boeing Plant, your use of our recently liquidated strike situation as an example of the role that has been cut out for Hillman is as you say: To Give (to the employers). However, as you uncover the complete story of the Boeing negotiations, there appear other facts which may throw some additional light upon Hillman's work, or at least upon the actual stage of development of his job.

Your story says (after describing the situation at Boeing): "Hillman and Knudsen, working together with the president of the International Association of Machinists, first put through a ten-day truce and then maneuvered the Union back to work with its unmet demands to be thrown to arbitration."

Hillman's Local Helpers What actually happened was that the Local Officials of the Union had been for some time casting about wildly for some device to hold the strike off. Hillman merely supplied the device. Although his press releases

sounded swell, Lundquist of the local union never had any intention of permitting the men to strike. The Company knew this all along—the men in leadership of the Union didn't have any backbone. But the way that Lundquist and his machine grabbed at Madam Perkins' request for a truce made it begin to look obvious. Lundquist was very skillful in handling this and all the other maneuvers by which the strike situation was liquidated and the agreement—which by comparison is lousy—signed. So skillful was he, in fact, that the men began to catch on too late that it was a put-up job between the Company and the Local Union Officials. By now Lundquist has even received some of the most classical subjects of derision and contempt used by the out-house artists and poets in the Boeing wash-room.

However—to get back to the story—both the Company and Lundquist were afraid of the workers and that 97% strike vote. Without help from Hillman it would have been very difficult to pull off. Lundquist would have had either to permit the men to walk out—or to keep them in by such arbitrary and bureaucratic means that he would have been completely exposed. In either case he would have broken his pick-

Actually, in this case Hillman played—along with President Brown of the I. A. of M., only a secondary or auxiliary role to the Local fakery.

Same In Marine Cooks So far as I can learn this was about as far as Hillman's work went also in the threatened strike of the Marine Cooks & Stewards. The last thing in the world that Burke, Cayton & Co. wanted was to put their men on the bricks. Not only would that bring down the wrath of their "brother" Bridges of the Longshoremen but getting on the bricks would put the Cooks in a really good position to settle accounts with a few obnoxious officials as well as the boss. What a relief it must have been to be able to have some heat turned from Hillman!

But set these two cases beside the totally different one of the (AFL) Longshoremen at Tacoma Wash. Here, the workers had what would appear on the surface, at least, to be a beef not nearly so good as either of the other two. They were striking against an old NLRB ruling depriving them of the right to bargain for their own members—giving Coastwise rights to Bridges, ILWU. There was much

more heat generated against this strike than against the other two named and from many more sources. Not only were the government representatives yelling to high heaven about "National Defense," but the entire apparatus of the CIO movement on the Coast was geared to the job of trying to liquidate this strike. Even the great Maritime "Arbitrator," Dean Wayne Morse, who learned the principles of Steve-doring and Maritime Labor Relations while pursuing an academic career at an Oregon cow-college, saw fit to let forth a devastating blast against the Tacoma Longshoremen as being "Unpatriotic" and "Striking against the Government!"

Hillman Failed Here! Yet not only did the Tacoma Longshoremen Strike, but in spite of all this crap they held out until their demand was granted: an immediate rehearing of their case by the Board. Not that Hillman did not attempt to take credit for this settlement as well. However, he undoubtedly had little, if anything to do with it at all.

The moral of this story is something like this: 1) Although Hillman's role is supposed to be a powerful one, it is as yet far from it. A much better title for him would be "Hillman: a Boon to Bungling Bureaucrats." Right now, his main preoccupation seems to be publicity and to get his finger into the pie of as many controversies as possible—if only as far as the newspapers are concerned. He has a long way to go, however before his authority will be as great as his position warrants.

2.) At least as far as the Boeing situation was concerned, the workers in the Plant did not give in to Hillman-pressure, nor were they maneuvered from Washington. The sell-out, like charity, began at home. Hillman-interference doesn't mean too much to the workers yet—except where the Union Leaders directly involved are themselves looking for an easy way out. Then the combination becomes pretty devastating.

AIRCRAFT WORKER Seattle, Wash.

Aircraft Worker is 100% correct. Where workers have half-way decent local leadership, Hillman's strikebreaking moves don't work at this stage of the game.—EDITORS

IN STOCK NOW

One or two copies of the following OUT OF PRINT BOOKS

- Germany, What Next? Leon Trotsky \$ 75
- Whither England? " 1.50
- Revolution Betrayed " 2.50
- Bolsheviki and World Peace " 1.50
- Real Situation in Russia " 3.00
- Our Revolution " 5.00
- Problems of Chinese Revolution " 3.00
- My Escape from Siberia " 3.00
- Historical Materialism Nicholai Bukharin 3.00
- Karl Marx Franz Mehring 3.75
- Militarism and Anti-Militarism Karl Liebknecht 1.00
- Portraits and Pamphlets Karl Radek 2.00
- Life and Letters of Lincon Steffens (2 vols. (\$10.00)) Lewis Corey 4.00

MODERN BOOKSHOP
27 University Place New York City

TROTSKY MEMORIAL FUND

This week, the following branches have made payments on account: Detroit, \$40., Los Angeles, \$20., Toledo, \$10., New York, \$75., New Haven, \$2., making a total for the week of \$147.

The scoreboard to date:

Branch	Quota	Amount paid	%
Rockville	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	100%
Lynn	100.00	75.00	75%
Toledo	50.00	25.00	50%
Chicago and Indiana Harbor	150.00	65.07	43%
San Francisco	100.00	35.00	35%
Detroit	200.00	65.00	33%
Boston	100.00	27.00	27%
Newark	150.00	40.00	27%
Flint	150.00	25.00	17%
Los Angeles	150.00	20.00	13%
New Haven	20.00	2.00	10%
New York	1000.00	75.00	8%
Akron	10.00	00.00	00
Baltimore	10.00	00.00	00
Cleveland	70.00	00.00	00
Hutchinson	10.00	00.00	00
Milwaukee	5.00	00.00	00
Minneapolis and St. Paul	1000.00	00.00	00
Philadelphia	30.00	00.00	00
Portland	10.00	00.00	00
Quakertown	7.00	00.00	00
Reading	5.00	00.00	00
St. Louis	5.00	00.00	00
Youngstown	50.00	00.00	00
TOTALS	\$3387.00	\$459.07	13%