

**To Beat the Reactionaries
We Must Join Union
Action with Political Action**

AN EDITORIAL

The clash between John L. Lewis and the representatives of Sidney Hillman at the recent CIO conference in Washington emphasizes once again the chief weakness in the leadership of the working class in the United States today. This weakness is the inability of the present trade union leadership to formulate a working class political program for labor, to organize labor politically and lead the workers to independent political action. With the absence of such a program and such a leadership in the ranks of labor, trade union leaders find themselves quarreling with each other over the virtues or delinquencies of the Roosevelt Administration, in relation to organized labor and the workers.

The conference was called by Philip Murray to organize action against several anti-labor bills pending in Congress, especially the Connally-May Bill, the Vinson Bill and the Ball Bill. All of these bills have one aim and one aim only: to weaken the unions, to destroy their militancy, to render them harmless to the bosses and thereby tie the working people fast to the Roosevelt imperialist war machine. The provisions of these bills make this clear. The Connally-May Bill demands criminal penalties for pickets who try to prevent strike-breakers from entering struck plants. It also provides for government "seizure" of plants struck through "subversive influences or otherwise." Strike-breakers would be protected. And, third, workers who lose their jobs in "seized" plants would find themselves without means of livelihood. Both the Connally-May and Vinson Bills call for compulsory arbitration.

The conference adopted a declaration of policy stating that the CIO condemns these bills and that congressmen who vote for them will be held accountable. Committees were appointed to call on the President, the Vice-President and the Speaker of the House to protest passage of the bills. Despite the fact that this procedure will prove useless and a waste of time, it will do no harm. It might conceivably serve as a platform to serve notice on these three high government officials that labor will not be bound by such vicious legislation. In labor in the past had docilely accepted all the anti-labor acts of Congress, state legislatures and the courts, we would still be working from "sunrise to sunset" and workers would still be hauled into court for "conspiring to raise their wages."

JOHN L. LEWIS CLASHES WITH POTOFSKY

The clash in the conference took place between John L. Lewis and Jacob Potofsky, acting president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Potofsky, of course, was speaking for Hillman. Lewis denounced Roosevelt and Hillman for the military breaking of the North American strike, and Hillman for his rôle in certifying the coal strike to the Mediation Board. Lewis said that the miners had rejected those recommendations of the Mediation Board that were unfavorable to the miners. He was also very critical of those CIO unions which support the Administration's labor policies.

Potofsky accused Lewis of "playing politics" and claimed that Hillman and the Roosevelt Administration needed no defense. Potofsky said that Hillman had exerted great influence on labor policy, and cited the Ford contract as a CIO gain that had some connection with the Hillman influence. CIO workers of course will want to know just what Sidney Hillman had to do with the victory of the Ford workers. They know his connection with the breaking of the North American strike; he was an ardent and slavish supporter of the strike-breaking tactics of Roosevelt and Frankenstein. But we know that Hillman had no hand in the victory at Ford's. The Ford workers won this victory on the picket line before Hillman had a chance to get going with his anti-labor activities.

The charge by Potofsky that Lewis was "playing politics" is the rankest sort of chicanery, skullduggery and treachery. We don't know what Lewis is doing; he hasn't said much politically since he pulled the colossal blunder of coming out in support of Willkie, who represented the most reactionary of the big bosses. We do know, however, what Hillman is doing. We suppose that Hillman's stooges will say that he is not "playing politics." Hillman as a labor leader is engaged in the nastiest brand of politics possible. He is Roosevelt's labor top sergeant. He is the chief trumpeter of New Deal imperialism in the ranks of organized labor. This flunky of the bosses has stated again and again that his first concern is the "defense" program and not the welfare of the working class. He told the CIO convention that he had the full confidence of the President. This should have been sufficient to prove, even to simpletons, that Hillman had abandoned every trace of working class decency and honor.

THE PROBLEMS ARE BASICALLY POLITICAL

This CIO conference and the recent "all out" statement of the AFL reveal the complete political bankruptcy of the trade union leadership. We say political bankruptcy because the problems they are dealing with are really political and not pure and simple trade union questions. This leadership, including Lewis, has no compass to guide it through the distinctly political issues that confront the trade union movement. Of course, Murray is against the anti-union bills in Con-

(Continued on page 2)

North American Workers Win Original Wage Demands

Reap the Harvest of Their Militant Strike Action in Contract Providing Highest Aircraft Wages on the Entire West Coast

By JOHN BORDEN

LOS ANGELES, July 6 — North American Aviation workers this week reaped the rich harvest of their militant strike action last month, gaining their original wage demand of "75 and 10" and again proving beyond dispute that the only way to get better working conditions is to fight for them.

The contract signed this week between the aircraft subsidiary of General Motors and the CIO United Auto Workers, who refused to be intimidated by police tear gas and U.S. Army bayonets, gives North American workers nothing less than the highest aircraft wages on the West Coast and, with but one exception, the highest in the whole country.

Contract Terms
The terms of the contract speak for themselves, providing:

1. A seventy-five cent an hour minimum wage for all workers employed more than three months. Beginners start at sixty cents an hour and get a five cent raise every four weeks until the minimum is reached.
2. A blanket ten cent an hour raise for all workers in the plant, this raise retroactive to May 1.
3. A five cent bonus for night work, with graveyard shift workers getting eight hours' pay for working six hours.
4. Double time pay for work on Sundays and six legal holidays; all other overtime at time and a half rates.
5. One week vacation pay for workers employed a year. Two weeks severance pay for workers who are drafted.

The contract was negotiated by Richard T. Frankenstein, UAW director of aviation, whose ignominious

role in the strike will be long remembered. But even longer will be remembered the fighting determination of the workers at the plant, in fear of whom Frankenstein was pushed to the very limits during the negotiations.

Frankenstein's conciliatory attitude toward the company and the strikebreaking of the U.S. government reveal themselves in the few weak spots in the contract. These cover such matters as arbitration, seniority and the question of the union shop. But it is obvious that workers who are tough enough to get the gains listed above are not going to sit back now and let a bureaucrat ride roughshod over them.

Example to Others
The fact is that the major aircraft companies are at this very moment quaking with the fear that their

workers are going to raise similar demands in the near future and get them in spite of Frankenstein's willingness to do things the easy way by playing ball with the companies. Witness the shameful contract quickly signed a few weeks ago by the AFL with the Consolidated Aircraft Corp. in San Diego. The contract, covering some 14,000 workers, provides the magnificent plant-wide minimum of fifty-five cents an hour! And as a concession—a blanket five cents an hour raise!

Also to be noted in this connection is the latest brain child of Sidney Hillman, labor slicker in Roosevelt's OPM. Hillman is reportedly cooking up a plan to freeze wages in the aircraft industry to assure the plutocrats an uninterrupted stream of profits for the duration, while their workers starve along on wages that

shrink every day in the face of rising costs of living. The announcement of this plan comes so close on the heels of the North American victory that there can be no doubt as to what inspired it.

Douglas Comes Forward

And finally, Donald Douglas, "the biggest of 'em all," who is famous neither for his subtlety nor for his wage scales, issued a statement to his workers on the day the North American terms were announced.

In a compassionate tone that might lead some people to the mistaken notion that Douglas was giving out money from his own pocket, King Donald told his workers that he has gotten together with some other aircraft companies for a discussion in Washington, D. C., to see what could be done about "adjusting and stand-

ardizing wage scales paid employees." Meanwhile, in a feeble effort to cover his intentions, Douglas announced the payment and distribution of bonus and vacation checks totalling \$750,000.

Magnificent, beneficent Douglas! He forgot to include in the announcement some facts relevant to the whole question of profits and wages at his gigantic company. He omitted mention of his BILLION DOLLAR backlog on which his profits are guaranteed in advance on a cost-plus basis! He didn't say anything about the shameful wages his workers now get. And nowhere in his letter was there a word about the CIO drive at Douglas, which is strong for the North American contract and which will be successfully concluded in spite of hell and high water—and soft soap!

These conscripts are being trained for imperialist war. War is evidently expected before the year is out. Those who were drafted first will be sent to the battlefields first. The others will follow. A year's service, indeed! Their service will last as long as the imperialist war—if they live that long, and that's open to doubt.

Most of the draftees resent the prolongation of their conscript term. They didn't want to join in the first place. They were forced to. And now they will be forced to fight the war for which they have been trained.

Now, we have said it before, and (Continued on page 3)

LABOR ACTION

JULY 14 1941

ORGAN OF THE WORKERS PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

THREE CENTS

AMERICAN TROOPS LAND IN EUROPEAN WAR ZONE!

Expeditionary Force Is Sent Without the People's Consent!

While Congressmen talked and his stooge, "argued," Roosevelt moved the stage of "shooting war" immeasurably closer by landing an expeditionary force in the European war zone—Iceland. Roosevelt acted under cover of a heavy barrage of propaganda "arguing the need" of an AEF!

Secretary of the Navy Knox last week told the Governors' Conference in Boston that the United States should clear the Atlantic with its fleet.

General Marshall asked Congress to legislate permission for an expeditionary force anywhere.

One after another, spokesmen for the war administration and jingoes in general urged "shooting war." Even the British general staff took a hand. Wavell and other British generals made public statements (by agreement with the U. S., no doubt) urging immediate American action.

But while they were "urging," Roosevelt was acting. When the troops had landed, the American people were informed. Not before. They had been brought a hair's breadth away from "shooting war." But they had no say in the matter. (Nor did the Icelanders know it. Troops had landed before the news was made public.)

THE WORLD AT WAR
Landing of American Troops In Iceland Settles Question Of "Shooting War" and AEF

By MAX STERLING

General Marshall, chief of staff of the American Army, has requested Congress to pass legislation which will prevent the American youth drafted in the army from returning to their homes after their year of training is completed. He also wants Congress to repeal the law which specifies that American military

forces will not be sent out of the Western Hemisphere.

Before Congress could even consider these requests President Roosevelt informed Congress that American naval forces and marines had taken over Iceland. According to Roosevelt's own interpretation, made at the time of the occupation of Greenland by American forces, the latter is within the Western Hemisphere, while Iceland was definitely outside of it. Thus, without even bothering to consult Congress, Roosevelt has sent the American Navy and occupying troops outside of the Western Hemisphere. This is a fact of tremendous significance to the people of the United States.

This dictatorial move on the part of the President in clear violation of Congress' own law has set a precedent from which it is but a step to the occupation of the Azores, Cape Verde Islands, the Canary Islands and Dakar. More than that, Roosevelt can, by claiming that it is in the interests of American defense, send American military forces to the Middle East, to Vladivostok or to any other part of the war zone.

Why Not Elsewhere?

If American forces can replace the British in Iceland, why not in any other sector of the war? This question is so logical that there is no way of getting around it. The fact is that the whole question of an American Expeditionary Force has come to the fore with a disturbing suddenness. The pledges by Roosevelt and the pronouncements by Churchill that there would not be and that there was no need of an AEF are now exposed as deliberate attempts to lull the American people into a false sense of security. The "democratic" statesmen evidently believe in taking each step in its proper time and behind the backs of the people.

(Continued on page 2)

AEF Issue

The final instance of Stalinist war-mongering came when a resolution opposing the sending of an AEF came up on the floor. The Stalinist leader, John Gates, got up and declared that his organization was in favor of full economic and military aid to Russia and Britain, but that his organization would abstain from voting against it in order to prevent "a crisis in the AEF." In the first vote at least two-thirds of the delegates abstained with Gates.

It was only after the Stalinists made a plea to the delegates that a (Continued on page 3)

Stalinist Jingoes Rule AYC

YPSL Delegate Breaks Jingo Spell by Lashing Out at Latest Flip-Flop

Special to Labor Action

PHILADELPHIA—Faithfully following the recent turn of the American Communist Party toward support of the imperialist war, the American Youth Congress, holding company of all the Stalinist "innocent" youth groups, came out for aid to imperialist Britain and Stalinist Russia at its conference held here over the July 4 weekend.

Without so much as batting an eyelash, the Stalinist youth leaders came out as open warmongers and interventionists at this congress. They pushed through their line to its logical conclusion even though numerous rank and file Young Communist League delegates expressed considerable confusion at the opening sessions, some of them still retaining bits of the old line.

Howe Breaks Spell

The crucial discussion came at the session on foreign policy and war. Ed Strong, a Stalinist youth leader, presented the report of the resolutions committee, which came out for aid to Britain and Russia. Strong in his report declared that the war was no longer imperialist because Russia had entered it on the side of Britain and America; and that therefore it was necessary to come out

with a sharply changed point of view by which he meant support of the war.

There followed, with monotonous unanimity, a dozen Stalinist speakers, each of whom repeated exactly what Strong had said before. The spell was broken, however, when Irving Howe, editor of *The Challenge of Youth*, who was present as a delegate from the Young Peoples Socialist League (Youth Section, Workers Party) got the floor.

In the brief three minutes at his disposal, Howe sharply denounced the Youth Congress for its political flip-flop. "The war in Europe," he declared, "remains an imperialist war, despite Russia's entry into it. Anti-war youth must continue to oppose aid to any of the belligerents in the war; none of them fight in the interests of the people."

The entire subsequent discussion was oriented around the attempt of the YCL speakers to answer the YPSL spokesman. They labeled him a "Quisling," an "appeaser," a "friend of Lindbergh," etc. But the "damage" had been done; the point of view of the consistent anti-war fighters of the YPSL occupied the center of attention.

The Stalinists fully exposed them-



Cover of a CIO folder calling on labor to act against the anti-labor bills pending in Congress

With the Labor Unions On the Picket Line

By David Coolidge

THE STALINISTS AND THE TRADE UNION BUREAUCRACY

Numerous trade unions in the United States are anxious to let it be known that although they accept the policy of the Roosevelt-Churchill governments to grant all aid possible to the Stalinist government, these unions have not changed their attitude toward the Stalinists. This is right, but it is necessary to examine the reasons for opposition to the Stalinists by some of these unions.

The AFL for instance: Bill Green & Co. are against the Stalinists. They are also against the CIO, and they are against the CIO for other reasons than the fact that the Stalinists have some influence in the CIO. The AFL would be against the CIO if there were not a single Stalinist around. The AFL is opposed to industrial unionism. They were against the steel workers before the CIO came along and organized them. One high AFL official said that the reason the AFL had not organized the steel workers was that these workers did not want to be organized. Many of the mass production workers were always scum to the AFL leadership. They preferred the "aristocracy" of labor, the skilled craftsmen.

In the last number of Justice, the ILGWU reaffirms its years-old opposition to the Stalinists. Many other unions are taking a similar position. They are ready to follow the government but they want to make it clear that this must not mean any collaboration with the American Stalinists. They just want to give material aid to the Russian government. Their attitude is the same as the position of the ruling class: anybody who is fighting against Hitler is entitled to material support. Hitler is the main enemy because it is he who is the raging enemy of "democracy."

These trade union leaders say that the Stalinists twist and turn and change their "line" in accordance with the dictates of Stalin. This is true, but these trade union leaders ignore or suppress one important fact: they change their line in ac-

TOBIN "KEEPS HEALTHY" AT WORKERS' EXPENSE

While we have Dan Tobin in mind it will be well to show how great he is and what a great sacrifice it is for him to be president of the Teamsters Union. Tobin had the following inserted in the IBT constitution: "The general president, for the purpose of promoting the interests and welfare of the International and the making of diplomatic contacts with other organizations and institutions, and FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSERVING HIS HEALTH, may, IN HIS DISCRETION, travel in this country and abroad and MAY TAKE PERIOD RESTS. The GEB shall PROVIDE FOR ALL EXPENSES of the general president when performing the services mentioned herein or WHEN TAKING PERIOD RESTS; the said expenses shall include travel in this country and abroad, the full and complete maintenance of his

CLOSED SHOP IS A MIGHTY IMPORTANT WEAPON

The National Association of Manufacturers wants the "closed shop" outlawed. If this can not be accomplished, then they are asking employers to refuse to sign "closed shop" agreements. The action of the UAW-CIO in winning a closed shop agreement from Ford was too much for the big boys at the top of industry. The NAM urges employers "not to discriminate against either union or non-union workers." This lets the cat out of the bag. What employers discriminate against non-union workers and scabs? The NAM further says that "within the last week . . . American workers in defense industries" have been coerced by the government "into joining labor organizations not of their own choice . . ."

We suppose that the NAM is talking about the election at Ford's, where the CIO won a victory in an open contest with the AFL. The NAM's hypocritical position means that it is wrong even to hold an election to determine the bargaining agent for workers in a particular industry. The NAM says that the government has no right to compel employees to belong to any "private organizations."

The NAM hides the fact that whether or not there is a closed shop does not really rest with the government but with the workers themselves. There were closed shops and closed shop agreements long before the Wagner Act and the New Deal administration. Whether or not a union gets a closed shop is dependent on the strength and determination of the union membership. To say that a union which has received the majority of the votes in an election should represent all the workers in the industry is no more discriminatory than to say that Roosevelt shall be President of all the people when he got more votes than Willkie. Of course Lindbergh does not accept this; he wants a new leadership in Washington; he doesn't believe in accepting the decision of the majority. Neither does Hitler.

The closed shop is a device forced on the bosses by labor. Workers must learn to accept it and not be fooled by boss blarney. The bosses of the NAM believe that every work-

ers should bargain individually with the boss, that the boss should have the right to hire whom he pleases and to fire at will. The bosses would like to have a half dozen unions in every industry, including one or two company unions. That is, if there is to be any unionism. The real preference of the NAM is no unions at all. The closed shop following a majority vote of the workers is a guarantee that the workers have a bona fide union of their own choosing. Nobody is discriminated against. The losing side joins the winners and presents a solid front against the boss. The NAM is always yelling for the workers to close ranks with the bosses. What's wrong with workers closing ranks with each other for a change?

There are valid reasons for the workers to refuse to support the Stalinists. We have recited these reasons many times. There are just as valid reasons for labor to support the Roosevelt-Churchill imperialist war outfit. Dubinsky & Co. charge the Stalinists with being against "democracy." Well, we didn't know that Dubinsky, Tobin, Murray, Green and most of the trade union big shots were such great democrats. They may be for democracy at large, but they haven't made very hot records in the unions which they head. It's a real joke to hear the strike-breaker Tobin shooting off his mouth about democracy.

These fellows are all for the war. They will drag the workers in any direction that Roosevelt tells them. They subordinate the genuine interests of labor to the demands of the bosses who are going to war to save capitalism in the United States. That means the right to keep the system of exploitation, low wages, long hours and union busting. The Stalinists are a filthy, treacherous, union-wrecking crew but they are not the main enemy of labor in this country. The main enemy is the boss class and the Roosevelt boss government.

These fellows are all for the war. They will drag the workers in any direction that Roosevelt tells them. They subordinate the genuine interests of labor to the demands of the bosses who are going to war to save capitalism in the United States. That means the right to keep the system of exploitation, low wages, long hours and union busting. The Stalinists are a filthy, treacherous, union-wrecking crew but they are not the main enemy of labor in this country. The main enemy is the boss class and the Roosevelt boss government.

The last sentence means in addition to Tobin's \$30,000 a year salary, \$12 a day hotel expenses when away from home and \$5 a day incidental expenses. Tobin also has a \$20,000 a year "assistant" paid by the union. Tobin really lives in the style of an East Indian potentate while he makes his "diplomatic contacts," and while "conserving his health" through "periodic rests." All that one can say of such an arrangement is that it is a plain racket. No wonder the AFL can't get rid of racketeers. What argument can they make?

er should bargain individually with the boss, that the boss should have the right to hire whom he pleases and to fire at will. The bosses would like to have a half dozen unions in every industry, including one or two company unions. That is, if there is to be any unionism. The real preference of the NAM is no unions at all. The closed shop following a majority vote of the workers is a guarantee that the workers have a bona fide union of their own choosing. Nobody is discriminated against. The losing side joins the winners and presents a solid front against the boss. The NAM is always yelling for the workers to close ranks with the bosses. What's wrong with workers closing ranks with each other for a change?

A LETTER FROM POPOFF SMUGGLED OUT OF JEFFERSON COUNTY JAIL

Dear Fellow Workers:

Most of you are familiar with my case and the ridiculous charge. It is a well known fact that the Appellate Division reversed the decision of the lower court on the ground of insufficient evidence. In ordinary cases such a decision is tantamount to dismissing the indictment. However, when it comes to a worker's case, the DA insisted to try the case again, claiming that he had additional evidence, which he failed to produce.

When challenged by my brilliant attorney, Mr. Klughez from New York, the DA murmured something about measuring certain distances from some hotel to the place of business known as Casino Restaurant. Of course an obliging judge agreed with the DA. It is amazing stupidity, or is it?

Now, friends, the question is one of finances. Bear in mind that taking the case to the Appellate Division is a formality. The Appellate

The American People Do Not Want War! They Should Have the Right to Say So!

By SUSAN GREEN

According to the Gallup poll, 79 PER CENT OF THE PEOPLE WOULD VOTE "TO STAY OUT OF THE WAR"—if a referendum on war takes place.

This is what George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, reports as the "latest measurement" of anti-war sentiment in this country.

With all the pressure propaganda, with all the false invasion scares, with all the warmongers on the radio, in the movies, in the press, the imperialist war-makers could muster the voting support of only 21 per

cent of the people.

Mr. Roosevelt was elected for a third term on the promise to keep the nation out of war. THE OVERWHELMING VOTE HE GOT WAS AN OVERWHELMING VOTE AGAINST WAR.

The platform of the Democratic Party contained an anti-war plank. The vast majority of the American people voted for the candidate of the Democratic Party, who was parading under false colors. IT WAS AN ANTI-WAR VOTE.

THE PLAIN PEOPLE OF THE COUNTRY ARE STILL AGAINST GOING TO WAR!

Political Action - -

(Continued from page 1)

gress. But he and the rest of them do not understand that these bills are a political attack on the unions and the working class, and that this attack can only be answered by a political offensive on the part of the workers.

In the first place, these trade union leaders have to get clear that one can not correctly talk about "defense" measures and "defense" bills in connection with imperialist war. Capitalist wars are conducted between the boss classes of the warring nations. The anti-labor bills introduced into the parliaments and congresses are not defense bills but war bills. Which nation is the "aggressor" is a meaningless question for labor to ask, since the boss class of each nation is the enemy, not only of its own working class but the working class of every country. The boss class of each imperialist-capitalist country must have such measures as the Vinson, May and Ball Bills. They must "pacify" the workers. They must clear away every obstacle to the full prosecution of the war. They must remove every hindrance to the enjoyment of unlimited profits and the perpetuation of their class power. This is what is going on in the United States today and in every other capitalist country. Hitler uses the extreme measures but Roosevelt has given a hint that he will not hesitate to follow. Workers who think this is an exaggeration should do some serious thinking on the North American strike events.

The anti-labor bills in Congress, the call of the NAM for outlawing the closed shop and the forcible breaking of the North American strike by Roosevelt are all cut in the same pattern and from the same cloth. It is a consolidated attack by the bosses as a class against the workers as a class. Murray's committees can talk to the Speaker, the Vice-President and the President until hell freezes over and never make a dent in the class front of the bosses.

THE ONLY ANSWER: A LABOR OFFENSIVE

This class political attack of the bosses can only be answered effectively by a working class offensive from labor: economic and political. Workers' action against the boss class in wartime can not be the same as in peacetime. The imperialist ruling class will not permit it to be so. During wartime they will go into action with the army sooner. They will show their fangs and strike immediately.

The workers in the United States have learned that they must have their economic organizations, their unions. What they haven't learned is that political organization is equally important. This is especially true in a period of imperialist war. The time that workers are told that they should close ranks and cooperate politically with the boss class is precisely the time they should break politically and establish their own working class political weapon, their own class political party. For such a movement the trade union leaders are not much help. They do not understand the issues, they have no political program distinct from the political program of the bosses; they either quarrel among themselves or go over to the bosses completely.

The membership of the unions must think their way through these questions and bring pressure on their leadership for action.

FOR: Speed-up in the organization of the mass production war industries. Full speed ahead with the organization of every aircraft plant.

Militant action in every war industry. Don't yield an inch in the right to strike. Strike in every plant where demands are not met. No dependence on the "Mediation" Board.

Demand that all labor leaders resign from government boards that deal with labor relations. Demand that Murray resign from the "Mediation" Board. Demand that Hillman get out of the government or out of the labor movement.

Break with the Democratic and Republican Parties. Break with Roosevelt and Willkie.

Build the independent, militant Labor Party of the working class.

The Kiplinger Letter to Business Men, dated June 21, states: "THE INTERIOR IS CERTAINLY NOT STEAMED UP FOR WAR." The "interior" is the label Washington gives to the common people of the country.

Hansen W. Baldwin, military expert, states in the New York Times: "THERE IS NO DOUBT ABOUT IT; MOST OF THE BOYS IN THIS MAN'S ARMY DON'T WANT TO FIGHT."

The workers, the sharecroppers, the tenant farmers, the neighborhood storekeepers, and their boys in the conscript camps—ARE AGAINST THE WAR!

BUT MR. ROOSEVELT PUSHES CLOSER AND CLOSER TO THE WAR!

Unknown to the American people, fighting bombers are already operating on the ocean.

Unknown to the American people, United States troops are already on foreign soil.

WHOSE MANDATE IS ROOSEVELT FOLLOWING IN THESE WAR COMMITMENTS? Not that of the majority of the American people!

HE IS FOLLOWING THE ORDERS OF THE BOSSES, THE BANKERS, THE WAR PROFIT-EERS, THE IMPERIALISTS! He is President for the sixty exploiting families—not for the masses!

On June 19 Mr. Gallup wrote: "If a national referendum were taken today on the question whether the United States should go to war now, there can be little question that it would show a large vote against entering the war."

THAT IS WHY THE LUDLOW AMENDMENT HAS BEEN BOUND UP IN RED TAPE AND THROWN INTO THE CONGRESSIONAL DARK CLOSET.

The question put by the Gallup poll was very definite, very specific: "If you were asked to vote on the question of the United States entering the war against Germany and Italy, how would you vote—to go into the war or to stay out of the war?"

TO THIS UNEQUIVOCAL QUESTION, 79 PER CENT OF THE PEOPLE WOULD VOTE TO STAY OUT!

That is why troop movements and overseas operations are kept from the American people! THE PEOPLE DON'T WANT TO GO TO WAR!

But in Washington the talk is for open entry in July or August.

The fact that Hitler's campaign against his erstwhile ally, Russia, to get grain, oil and war materials, means a LONG WAR, does not stop the swivel-chair generalissimos in Washington. THEY ARE PREPARING FOR A LONG WAR!

The people whom the war-makers force to sweat, to suffer, to bleed, to die, don't want to get into the war in July or August or any other time.

The people upon whom the unbearable burdens of war fall don't want to be involved in this worldwide imperialist blood-letting.

The people are entitled to a referendum on this vital question!

THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TO SAY "NO" TO THE IMPERIALISTS!

THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TO SAVE THEMSELVES AND THE NATION THEY BUILT WITH LABOR FROM THOSE WHO LUST FOR WORLD POWER!

We Demand: Higher Wages and Workers' Rights for Conscripts!

Pre-Convention Discussion Articles

In preparation for the coming national convention of the Workers Party, the Political Committee of the WP has opened the columns of LABOR ACTION to discussion articles contributed by party members on the political problems confronting the party. Because of the limited amount of space available, all contributions must be as short as possible in order that we may be able to publish a maximum number of articles. In no case may they be over 1,200 words; in all cases contributors should try to keep their articles below the word maximum allowed.

Statement on PC Position on the Russo-Nazi War

By ERNEST LUND

The position of the Political Committee on the Russo-German war is a grave theoretical blunder. Attempts on the part of those who do NOT consider Russia a capitalist state to justify a policy of defeatism will do incalculable harm to the Marxist principles of our movement—certainly as much harm as those who make no distinction between Russian collectivism and capitalism. While its immediate consequences will not be catastrophic—in the sense of immediately driving our activity from its revolutionary rails—its eventual effect, if not corrected, will destroy the theoretical foundations of our movement.

If Russia is a state that has been closed to finance imperialism and if a German victory will turn it into an economic colony of German imperialism, and if defeatism can be justified only by Russia's military relations with Anglo-American imperialism, then an entirely new concept of the strategy of the world

revolution as related to the struggle against imperialism will have to be developed. Already a local supporter of the PC is questioning the validity of further defensism in China. The inconsistency of defensism in China and defeatism in Russia will also prove too much for the PC. I can only hope that it is the stand on Russia that will be reversed.

The contradiction between the view that an imperialist conquest of Russia will mean a new lease on life for imperialism, on the one hand, and defeatism in the present war on the other, will drive more and more people to seek refuge in the theory that Russia is a capitalist state in the last stages of decay—i.e., fascist. Though its premise is false, its conclusions, at least, coincide.

The position of Shachtman is in every sense as untenable as the position of Trotsky when he denounced the invasion of Finland as a "blow at the world revolution" but called the war progressive.

I have submitted a lengthy exposition of my arguments for a revolutionary defeatist policy for publication in *The New Internationalist*. I ask that every serious comrade thoroughly examine the new developments and realize all their implications before taking a definite position.

World at War - -

(Continued from page 1)

Just as General Marshall's request and Roosevelt's act in providing an AEF belie the President's previous pledges, so now General Wavell has also come forth to "contradict" the assurances of his chief, Winston Churchill. In reply to the question, "Do you hold with the views that only (American) troops are necessary to win the war?" asked of him by an American correspondent, the General replied with that directness so characteristic of military men: "No. Undoubtedly we shall need manpower if the war continues long enough and I have no doubt it will." General Wavell was of the conviction that British manpower would be insufficient. He said: "It will be a battle of manpower in the end." As to when and where American troops should eventually be employed, the general was realistic enough to say that this would be determined entirely by events.

More Steps Will Come

Naturally events will determine when and where a new AEF will be sent. The duration and the outcome of the war in Russia, for example, will certainly influence such a decision. If the Russians succeed in blocking the German advance into the Ukraine and into Transcaucasia for a long time, the American Army, which already numbers one and a half million men, will have time in another year to reach the two and a half million mark. In another year also, the American Army should be far better equipped than it is at the present time.

Of course the American military chiefs prefer and hope for such a breathing space. What is more probable, however, is that events will force America into the "shooting war" long before that. Iceland is in

the German war zone. The decision therefore rests with Germany whether the present occupation shall start the "shooting war." The penetration of Iceland is of course one of the initial steps. There will be many more beyond Iceland.

There are AEF's and AEF's. Iceland is an example of a comparatively small AEF. So long as the Germans are involved in Russia, the small AEF's can proceed to take over step by step those bases like the Azores, Cape Verde Islands and the other islands that are so essential for the Battle of the Atlantic and as stepping stones to the major war fronts in the Eastern Hemisphere. However, more than that may be necessary for American imperialism. It is reported, for example, that in anticipation of a German advance on Transcaucasia, the British and the Russians are working on a new agreement that would establish Russian and British zones of influence in Iran. The British Northwest Frontier Army would then be eventually shifted from India to Iran. In such an eventuality it may very well be necessary for the United States to send a large AEF to bolster the numerically inferior British forces confronting the German military machine attempting to outflank the British in the Middle East. American troops would then follow American war materials, which are reaching the British in the Middle East at the rate of one shipload a day.

Japan Waiting

Also, if the Red Army should suffer such a debacle as will leave Siberia and the Maritime Provinces at the mercy of Japan, the United States may be forced, in anticipation of this, to send a large AEF to Vladivostok to forestall the Japanese and

(Continued on page 3)

The Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

A LETTER FROM POPOFF SMUGGLED OUT OF JEFFERSON COUNTY JAIL

Dear Fellow Workers:

Most of you are familiar with my case and the ridiculous charge. It is a well known fact that the Appellate Division reversed the decision of the lower court on the ground of insufficient evidence. In ordinary cases such a decision is tantamount to dismissing the indictment. However, when it comes to a worker's case, the DA insisted to try the case again, claiming that he had additional evidence, which he failed to produce.

When challenged by my brilliant attorney, Mr. Klughez from New York, the DA murmured something about measuring certain distances from some hotel to the place of business known as Casino Restaurant. Of course an obliging judge agreed with the DA. It is amazing stupidity, or is it?

Now, friends, the question is one of finances. Bear in mind that taking the case to the Appellate Division is a formality. The Appellate

Division has no alternative but to throw the indictment out upon its previous finding.

I know how difficult it is for workers to secure any money, I know what sacrifices you have gone through already, I know it means foregoing some necessities of life itself; but I can assure you that it is the cause of justice for a worker, it is a most brazen frameup.

The DA persisted in testifying over the strenuous objections of Mr. Klughez. He was nearly thrown out of the court for it. Bear in mind, comrades, that it is not just an appeal to a higher court but a question of complete dismissal of the indictment. As it is a matter of law, two reversals for the same reason nullify an indictment.

I am closing now with socialist workers greetings.

Christ Popoff.
Watertown, N. Y.

(LABOR ACTION heartily subscribes to the appeal made by this persecuted worker now serving a 10 to 25 year jail term. We will send all

funds sent for this purpose to the Popoff defense. Funds can also be sent directly to the Workers Defense League, 112 East 19th Street, New York City—Ed.)

HARVARD STUDENTS ARE TOLD TO ACCEPT WAR

Dear Editor:

Graduates of Harvard Law School received an unusual graduation gift this year. It was in the form of a letter addressed to the third year class by three prominent professors, Edward Thurston, Warren Seavey and Edmund Morgan. Opening up with "Within a short time many of you will be called into the service of the United States," it proceeds to attempt to instill the spirit of acquiescence into these men who after seven years of higher education have to look forward, not to the work for which they have prepared, but to army camps and war and death or maiming.

The resentment of the students is recognized: "Some of you may be resentful . . . some may feel that it is unfair . . . that this has been forced

upon you by men who, like our way." But despite all this, "Whether or not the need of an army is great and whether or not the plans for it are wise or fair, the country is committed to such a policy." In effect: we're in it, and maybe it is lousy, but it's not for us to reason why. Like sheep, we must follow our leaders no matter where they go, whether it be good or bad for the American people.

After feeding a lot of hooey to the students about their favored position, their training and education, they can do no better than suggest a willing compliance in doing work they are forced to do, work having no relation at all to their past training. Very cleverly, they write only about the character development to be secured in the army camps. The next steps are completely ignored although every day's news shows Roosevelt and his capitalist associates bringing us nearer to open, full-fledged entry into the war. As pictured by these elderly teachers, val-

NO GOVERNMENT CONTRACT WITHOUT A UNION CONTRACT!

uable experience, ability to understand and moral background will be gained by army experience. But how about those who will never get out of the army? Or if they do, will come back physically maimed and mutilated or mentally disorganized, absolutely unfit to re-enter civilian life? Ingeniously, they speak of distinct advantages which will be of value "as you travel through life," not bothering to consider that the lives of those whom they address bid fair to be cut short prematurely in imperialist war.

These few professors are not alone. Among the rabid warmongers at Harvard, they are almost lost and rescued themselves from obscurity only by this particular act. In the other colleges, the same process goes on. The graybeards, the men who have achieved "positions" in the halls of the mighty, the men whose whole background ties them to the cause of the high and mighty, urge youth to enter a "moral crusade." And joining in the chorus we see priests and ministers and rabbis who talk peace only when there is peace and selves, can not now serve in this

who urge and support war whenever talking peace is at all meaningful. These are false leaders and advisers. In the hundred year old teachings of the socialist movement lies the only solution to the horrors which beset the modern world.

F. H.
Cambridge, Mass.

Editor's Note: We ask the indulgence of correspondents if their letters are delayed in publication. Put it down to space limitations—and the need of a larger paper. We urge you to continue writing us—in fact, to write more often.

Conscript the War Industries Under Workers' Control!

Of Special Interest To Women

By Susan Green

One of the most shameful acts of the Roosevelt government—which has a perispherical of such acts to its credit—is the way in which it tore over a million men away from their normal surroundings into drab camps without provision for decent living. It has become notorious that the facilities for amusement, recreation and education at the camps are just about a million times zero.

In "off hours" the conscripts can lie on their bunks and swap yarns, can go to a large bare room with nothing in it to "recreate" them, or can take a long, expensive ride to the nearest town to stand on a street corner. In a word, the government provided for the conscripts a "street corner-loafer level of existence."

For the officers, of course, it is different.

"DEMOCRACY" HAS ITS CLASS DEMARCATIONS.

Now some smart alics have hit upon the scheme of the USO to soak the parents, relatives, friends and neighbors of the conscripted boys—the vast majority of whom are opposed to the war and to their boys participating in it. They are paying for what is rightfully a government obligation.

Not only are the working people compelled to give their sons for a war they don't want, not only are they thus deprived of normal family income, not only do they pay war prices for everything, not only do they cough up more and more taxes at every turn—but by the use of a lot of sentimental hokum they are induced to pay for things that the government should pay for!

"Dear Mom" begins a slobbering advertisement in all the leading newspapers, and under this salutation is a picture of a conscripted soldier typing a letter with two fingers. This is a typical appeal by the United Service Organizations, commonly known as USO, which is out to lift \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000 more out of a few pockets that can afford it, and many millions of pockets that cannot.

But all this "Dear Mom" stuff does not alter the facts.

So many billions are being appropriated by Congress for the imperialist war program that one can no longer keep track. However, the government does not think it important to spend a few millions of these many billions for well-equipped club houses for the men drafted into the army.

On the other hand, the same government thinks it very important—and emphasizes its importance—that every war contract yield the boss a "fair" WAR PROFIT.

"DEMOCRACY" HAS ITS CLASS DEMARCATIONS.

At a recent convention of the National Association of Retail Grocers great glee was displayed by speakers at the prospect of employing women as grocery clerks. Indeed women were made by the Creator just for such jobs—especially since "TWO INTELLIGENT WOMEN CLERKS CAN SELL MORE THAN FOUR MALE EMPLOYEES."

Here is an indication of the goal the bosses are going to set for themselves. They will try hard to get twice as much out of green women workers as they can get out of experienced and organized men.

Why not? Isn't it "a national emergency"? Purely incidentally, of course, if they can get as much work out of two employees as they did out of four, they will be paying one-half the wages and making twice the profit.

WOMEN WORKERS GETTING JOBS TO REPLACE MEN, MUST ORGANIZE AND DEMAND—AS A MINIMUM—THE SAME PAY FOR SIMILAR WORK. THEY MUST ALSO INSIST ON HOURS AND WORKING CONDITIONS TO PROTECT THEIR HEALTH.

As you know, Senator Wheeler is an isolationist and Senator Pepper is an interventionist.

With these two boss politicians and a convention of women in Atlantic City as dramatic personae, there was enacted an illuminating drama. Senator Wheeler asked for a show of hands of women who did not want to go to war. Practically every hand in the room went up. Whereupon Senator Pepper asked for a vote on the question: "How many women present want to see war kept out of this country?" Again every woman raised her hand.

Here is one of those rare flashes that reveal the marrow and bone of the whole rotten business of war!

Women just don't want war! They don't want it fought in this country—they don't want it fought abroad.

Both the isolationists and the interventionists try with utterly false arguments to win the support of these women.

The former say: "If you don't want your boys to shed their blood on foreign soil, follow us." They don't let on that they belong to that camp of American imperialists who believe their interests will be best served by securing their power over Latin and South America and the Far East, leaving England to fight it out with Hitler. They don't let on that YOUR BOYS MAY BE "MISSING" IN SOUTH AMERICA OR IN THE PHILIPPINES, if you follow them!

The interventionists say: "If you don't want to fight a war in this country, you had better follow us. We'll settle Hitler over there." Not a peep out of the interventionists that they represent the slightly more ambitious imperialist bunch which wishes to spread its hold over the entire world, "helping" England to lick Hitler in such a way that the American "Sixty Families" will become heir to the British Empire as well as the rest of the world. Not a peep out of them that YOUR BOYS "MISSING" SOMEWHERE IN EUROPE WILL HAVE LAID DOWN THEIR LIVES FOR AMERICAN IMPERIALISM—NOT TO KEEP WAR AWAY FROM THESE SHORES.

Women who just don't want war cannot follow either group of boss politicians. There is only one thing for them to do: FIGHT THE WAR-BREEDING IMPERIALIST SYSTEM!

And that goes for British and German, Italian and Russian, French and Japanese as well as American women who just don't want war!

LABOR ACTION
114 W. 14th Street
New York City

Dear Friends:

I am interested in learning more about the Workers Party and its fight against the bosses' war plans.

Name _____
Address _____
City _____

The Cannonites and Defense of the Soviet Union

From Shamefacedness to Solid Brass

By PAUL TEMPLE

Those very principled people, the Socialist Workers Party (Cannonites), have re-discovered the "defense of the Soviet Union."

This event occurs under very happy auspices, for them. While Russia was busy grabbing Poland and Finland, they were also for its defense—but not so happily. The masses of people (not to speak of Churchill, Sumner Welles and Alexander Kerensky) were quite annoyed with Stalin in those days, so the principled Cannonites kept their slogan under their hats. In their public press they merely called the invasions a "crime" and "de-emphasized" the defense angle—to the extent of mentioning it practically only in internal arguments and theses. As recently as their May Day manifesto, there was hardly a peep (in public, where somebody might hear them) from the SWP on this paramount task of "defending the Soviet Union." After all, it was so unpopular!

THE POLITICS OF THIS WAR

Now the "shamefaced defensists" of yesterday splash the headline "Defend the Soviet Union!" across the first page of The Militant and boldly write:

"German imperialism seeks to overthrow the October Revolution and to restore the capitalist system in its degenerate fascist form. This is the essential meaning of Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union. . . . Defend the Soviet Union at all costs and under all circumstances against imperialist attack!"

As if "the politics of which this war is the continuation" is Hitler's desire to abolish nationalized property in Russia, rather than his very real desire to gain Russian resources to prosecute his war against Britain. The manifesto throughout is blind enough to speak as if Hitler's invasion is itself his goal, instead of a means to an end.

The Militant, in addition, prints a ten-year-old quotation from Trotsky calling for the defense of the Soviet Union as "the main fortress of the world proletariat. James P. Cannon himself sends a telegram to Mr. Stalin, via Ambassador Oumansky, calling for the release of Trotskyists from GPU jails so that they might "take their proper place in the front ranks of the defenders of the Soviet Union." (Naturally, he brings this up merely as a helpful suggestion, not as a condition for support, since the Cannonites are UNCONDITION-

AL defenders of the Soviet Union.) In another column Russia is "this one bastion of socialism."

GOLDMAN OFFERS A NEW INTERPRETATION

Shamefacedness being definitely thrown aside, Albert Goldman substitutes solid brass in the next issue of The Militant (July 5). Believe it or not, he blandly denies that there ever was an alliance between Hitler and Stalin; denies that the Cannonites ever SAID there was such an alliance; and remarks that the expression "Berlin-Moscow Axis" was used only by middle-class democrats and the Workers Party.

For outright forgery, this is equalled only by the Stalinists. We have room for only two examples: (a) One of Cannon's rare literary works, an article in the Socialist Appeal of September 29, 1938, denouncing "the joint policy of Stalin and his Axis partner, Hitler," and stating that "the pact of Stalin and Hitler is in fact a military alliance." (b) The article by Trotsky in Liberty of January 27, 1940, if anything, goes further, saying that Russia attacked Poland and Finland at Germany's behest.

Goldman explains the Stalin-Hitler pact (today) solely on the basis of Stalin's desire to avoid war and to strengthen his military position against Germany by taking over adjacent lands. This is a belated plagiarism from the Daily Worker: No alliance with Hitler, only a policy of peace and the defense of the Soviet Union! Like Churchill, Goldman, too, prettifies the Kremlin while calling for its defense.

Goldman attacks our own stand by asking, apparently seriously: If it is true, as the Workers Party claimed, that Hitler and Stalin were partners, how come one partner attacked the other?

"For, if one claims that such a close partnership existed between Stalin and Hitler, then the fact that Hitler found himself in trouble need not and would not lead to his attacking the Soviet Union."

And he positively belligerently asks us to explain how "such an unusual change in imperialist partnerships" is possible! Of course, France changed partners, he admits, but that was because it was defeated, adopting its conqueror as partner. His memory being what it is, he forgets that Finland has changed partners too—this time not with its conqueror! In fact, there is hardly a country in the war that has not changed partners at least once. If Japan decides to pull out of the Axis in the event of successes by London-Wash-

ington-Moscow, Goldman will no doubt again be astonished at imperialist trickery, provided he doesn't deny that there was ever a Berlin-Tokyo Axis.

HOW CARRY OUT THE "FIRST TASK"?

Two more notes on the SWP position:

(1) We have said that the Cannonites are now very brash about proclaiming the "defense of the Soviet Union." But so far they have presented this slogan in a manner completely empty of any concrete meaning. Are they in favor of rendering "material and moral support to the Soviet Union" by the American workers? So far, they have indicated only that that's all right for the Russian Trotskyists—not a word to American workers on the subject. Their manifesto has only one sentence on the question of what to do: "The method to defend the Soviet Union is to continue the class struggle against the imperialists." If this is all the "defense of the Soviet Union" means in practice, in THIS war, it should be made unmistakably clear. But it is not all, as the CP can point out to them.

(2) The Militant appeals to the members of the Communist Party as follows:

"You set the defense of the Soviet Union as your first task. We do likewise. On that basis we appeal to you to give sober consideration to the grave problems of this defense. . . ." Follows an injunction to continue the struggle against capitalism and the war, and then: "This is the only real defense of the Soviet Union and in this defense we stand ready to join you in any action that will advance our common cause."

Since the defense of the Soviet Union is "the first task" of the SWP (here, in the United States, as Roosevelt drives into the war) and since this is a "common cause" with the Stalinists, we presume that the SWP will immediately start a campaign for a united front with the Communist Party to render material and moral aid to the Soviet Union. . . . Or will Cannon wait till the CP becomes more popular?

If defense of Russia is the "FIRST task," naturally everything else must be subordinated to it. In this connection, we note that The Militant has so far kept mum about the question of aid to Russia by the Roosevelt government. This MAY be an oversight (a pretty big one), but in any case it behooves the SWP to make clear its own attitude as well as specify what the defense of Russia means to it outside of literary exercises.

How the Negro March Was Betrayed

Disgusted by Conduct of March Leaders

Although the March on Washington was called off, no adequate report has been made yet to the Negroes as to the reasons. Randolph says that the march was not called off, only "postponed." What does this mean? Everyone knows that a mass march can not be called off and organized over night. They say they are waiting to see what is the effect of the executive "order" issued by the President and to wait for the functioning of the grievance committee that is to be set up.

We can look back now at the "leadership" of the march and do a little thinking.

LOOKING AT THE LEADERS

In the first place the lineup of "leaders" representing so many divergent points of view should have been a warning. Such names as A. Philip Randolph, Frank Crosswaith, Lester Granger, Raymond Logan and Layle Lane had long been vociferous in support of the pro-war Administration. To embarrass Roosevelt now would be the last thing they'd desire to do. And when these are found in the company of J. Finley Wilson, erst-while Republican mogul of the Elks, Ned Pope, former area home relief administrator for La

Guardia and now a member of the Welfare Council of New York City, and William Pickens, old wheelhorse of the "right" wing of the NAACP, Negroes might have been a little skeptical.

Some of those on the committee, with an eye for the main chance—like Granger and Pickens—carved out nice fat jobs for themselves in the defense setup during the hubbub.

HOW THE MARCH WAS CALLED OFF

Consider how the march was called off! Wednesday, June 25, Randolph telegraphed the New York committee that he had received an executive order. "Hold everything!" A stunned silence followed the reading of his telegram. But his stooges, recovering rapidly, immediately pushed through a motion to cease activity. (In order to win a majority it was necessary to exclude the newest members of the committee from the vote. These happened to be Stalinists who had been hurriedly told to support the march after a typical flip-flop of the CP.) Randolph, however, was taking no chances on an adverse reaction. He announced to the press the next day that the march definitely had been cancelled.

A nauseating sidelight on the leaders was afforded by the meeting of the New York committee the following Saturday. After switching the time of the meeting from 6:30 to 5:00 o'clock and notifying only Randolph followers of the change, the committee hurriedly accepted his report and then became preoccupied mainly with the problem of how they could get Negro representatives (that is, themselves) on Roosevelt's "top" committee. In disgust the representatives of the Ethiopian World Federation, the Harlem Labor Union and Young Pioneers, all militant groups, walked out of the meeting.

A straw in the wind was the action of the Youth Division of the New York March Committee which met immediately after Randolph's speech and by a vote of 44 to 1 condemned the action of the national committee and demanded that the march go forward within 90 days.

After the Jamaica Gleaner published a scathing criticism of the committee's action, the director of the New York Urban League, an official of the NAACP and a Negro lawyer visited the owner of the paper and threatened him with loss of support. In general, however, the Negro press maintains a tight-lipped silence on the people's reaction.

U. S. Troops Landed in War Zone - -

(Continued from page 1)

we say it again, we don't give a damn for German shipping or property. We hate in terms more violent than can be used in a public paper the bestial Nazi regime. To fight in a REAL battle against fascism we

World at War--

(Continued from page 2)

to safeguard its position in the Far East. Tokyo is at present deliberating its position in regard to the German-Russian war. No decision has as yet been announced by it as to what the policy of the Japanese government will be. No doubt the Japanese are awaiting a further unfolding of the war. It is certain, however, that the possibility of American intervention in Siberia is taken into consideration by them. However, a Japanese spokesman was quite positive on that subject and he made it clear that such a step on the part of America would very definitely be considered by Japan as an "unfriendly act."

Roosevelt's action in sending an AEF to Iceland should serve to expose all the bunkum about no AEF and no "shooting war." The American people who have in their great majority indicated that they want no part of a repetition of 1917-1918 should nevertheless increase their awareness of the logic of the war and the steps that will be forced upon them by the lying politicians in accordance with this logic. Only such an awareness will enable them to combat with greater ferocity the attempts of the warmongers to push them into the "shooting war."

would be glad and ready to go to any limit. So, too, we feel sure, would the draftees and the great mass of American workers.

But this war is anything but a fight against fascism. It is a war for imperialist control of the world—and fascism or democracy have less than nothing to do with it. "Poor little Finland," the trembling democracy of yesterday, is now fighting on the side of the fascists. Stalin totalitarianism is now fighting on the side of the "democracies." It is even conceivable, though hardly likely for the present, that fascist Italy might switch to the side of the "democracies" (as she switched to the Allied side in the last war.)

Among all the jingo propagandists there is one relatively honest man. Basil Brewer, an editor of the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Mercury, stated his position in a full page ad which appeared in the New York Times of July 2 (and probably in other papers, too):

"WE MUST FIGHT NOW! . . . 'NOT TO make the world safe for democracy."

"To hell with such slogans and confusing catch phrases. 'NOT ONE DROP OF SOLDIER'S BLOOD IS WORTH SHEDDING FOR A SINGLE ONE OF THESE."

"We fight—'FOR OURSELVES AND OURSELVES ONLY."

"We fight for the preservation of our liberty—for the right to rule ourselves in our chosen way."

"Our government in America, its virtues, ITS VERY SINS, shall FOREVER BE OUR OWN." (Emphasis in original.)

Precisely, even though Mr. Brewer goes in for a little "catch-phrasing"

himself. But what he means is amply clear. "We must fight now" so that "our very sins shall forever be our own." And those "sins" are the system of exploitation, profit, mass misery and imperialist conquest.

Mr. Brewer is no politician, merely a newspaperman. He doesn't have to indulge in the "confusing catch phrases" of the politician who speaks for one thing, and effects its opposite.

Mr. Brewer stated the facts as clearly as you can expect from any boss jingoist. And in his belligerent statement is the very point that we must heed. We do NOT want to preserve "ITS VERY SINS" forever. WE DO NOT WANT TO PRESERVE THE PROFIT "DEMOCRACY." AND WE THEREFORE DO NOT WANT TO FIGHT FOR IT.

Roosevelt's propaganda amounts to so many catch phrases calculated to win public support. Behind the catch phrases stand the hard facts of a profit system which must war or die, and which dares not let the people decide their own fate.

Troops have gone overseas. New and more dangerous actions will

come. Time is short—terribly short. There may not be enough time to make our voices heard, BUT WE MUST RAISE THEM NEVERTHELESS, RAISE THEM IN A RISING CRESCENDO OF PROTEST AND ACTION:

LET THE PEOPLE VOTE ON WAR!

AYC--

(Continued from page 1)

sufficient number was mustered to pass a resolution opposing an AEF. It was clear* to all present that the Stalinists were really in favor of an AEF but that they refrained from pressing the issue in order not to antagonize the other elements present at the Congress.

Throughout the Congress, members of the YPSL kept hammering away at the delegates with discussions, frequent and numerous literature distributions and special leaflets prepared for the occasion.

If You Are Not Already a Subscriber to Labor Action, Lose No Time in Availing Yourself of the Special Introductory Offer--25¢ for 3 Months!

No Confidence In Churchill Government

By JOHN MCGOVERN

Editor's Note: We print below some extracts from the recent speech made by John McGovern, parliamentary representative of the British Independent Labor Party, on the issue of confidence in the Churchill government. While the Workers Party does not support the pacifist policy of the I.L.P., we publish this extract because of the truth of what it states and also as an interesting illustration of left-wing, anti-war opinion in England.

BRITAIN'S APPEAL TO GERMANY

And what is the appeal to the German people? It is to get rid of Hitler and Goering and substitute Churchill and Halifax. That is not an appeal that would find response in the mind of any man or woman in Germany. A Halifax! A Duff Cooper! A Churchill! A Beaverbrook! (Hon. members: A McGovern!) A McGovern? That would make a real appeal.

Then they say that this is a war for democracy! The German worker does not see this struggle as you see it.

THE REAL APPEAL

We say to the people of this country that there should be a real appeal to the people of Germany. If you want to make an appeal to German men and women you must have a complete change of Government and have real workers' power.

Take over the land, the banks and industries. Then you can say to the German people: "We have socialized the means of life and have taken them out of the hands of those who were the economic causes which brought about the war." Thus you would make a real appeal to the German workers.

Today I find great support for the Prime Minister that I never found until 12 or 18 months ago. I was talking to a very astute Tory about the Prime Minister and he said to me: "I don't like him, but when you are fighting a set of gangsters you need a gangster to run your government." That was the best that could be said of the Prime Minister!

AMERICA'S CONCERN

America has entered this struggle. Does anyone in his senses think that the American ruling class is supporting Britain because they are imbued with a desire for democracy? They are thugs and gangsters who will not allow the workers even to organize in trade unions, who batten them down in every industrial compound.

America sent representatives here. They represented the banks and the big industrial magnates and came to see whether Britain was safe for capitalism instead of being safe for democracy. They wanted guarantees that there was no danger of this country going socialist. Willkie went back to America and said that the TUC leaders were great guys—HE IS TELLING ME! He wished he could take some of them back with him, they were so tame.

The economic struggle that is going on between Hitler, America and Britain is a struggle for power, for raw material and slave labor, for the rights of the orthodox financiers on the one side and of the totalitarian magnates on the other.

NO FAITH IN PRIME MINISTER

Once they have done the job of defeating Hitler, the people will be thrown on to the scrap-heap, subjected to the Means Test, sent back to their industrial compounds and into the slums, as they were at the end of the last war.

You spur the minds and bodies of the people with slogans, but the slogans have no meaning, coming from the lips they do.

I will go into the lobby against this motion. I have no faith that this war is being waged for anything but the personal motives of a selected few. It is not for democracy, it is not for freedom, it is not for anything decent. Hundreds and thousands of people are being murdered in order to preserve the interests of one section in this country against those of one section in Germany.

I believe that war is all wrong, that nothing decent ever came out of a struggle of this kind, with its brutality and horror.

I have no faith in the Prime Minister achieving anything of lasting benefit to humanity. At every stage I have seen the Prime Minister as an opponent of the working class, ranged on the other side, against the common people in every struggle, whether in a miners' lock-out or a war.

I refuse to support the class that holds power in this country as against another Nazi gang. Remember that they have more in common with Hitler than with decent working class ideals.

New International Will Have Full Analysis Of Russo-German War

The New International announces another splendid 32-page issue chock full of interesting political and theoretical articles. The magazine will be off the press this week.

A partial list of contents follows:

1) A detailed editorial analysis of the Russo-German war which includes comment on its domestic repercussions as well as its relation to the World Imperialist War.

2) The first section of a lengthy review of "The Managerial Revolution" by James Burnham. Albert Gates, who reviews the book, discusses the nature of fascism and capitalism in relation to the Second World War.

3) An article by David Coolidge reviewing the past period in the labor movement, defining trends within it, and analyzing its present position.

4) A discussion article on the Russian question by David Grey.

5) The continuation of Franz Mehring's article on Historical Materialism.

6) A review by Frank Demby of Manya Gordon's book on the Russian workers before and after the Czar. The review discusses the economic conditions of the Russian working class.

This plus other material will go to make up an attractive and interesting issue. Don't fail to get your copy! It's only 20 cents a copy. Subscription rates: One year, \$1.50; six months, \$1.00. Write The New International, 114 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y.

Editorials

OUR PROGRAM AGAINST THE WAR

1. Against both imperialist war camps! For the third camp of World Labor and the colonial peoples!
2. For the right to strike! For the defense of civil liberties and all workers' rights! Stop the persecution of aliens. Against the M-Day plans and war-time dictatorship.
3. Thirty hours a week; thirty dollars minimum pay! Time and a half wages for overtime above 30 hours. For increased wages to meet the rising cost of living.
4. Let the people vote on war! For the right of youth to vote at the age of 18—old enough to fight, old enough to vote!
5. Not a man, not a cent for Wall Street's war! A capital levy to cover the costs of imperialist war. No indirect taxes on the people.
6. Conscript the war industries under workers' control!
7. Expropriate the "Sixty Families"—the three per cent of the people who own ninety per cent of the wealth!
8. No government contract without a union contract!
9. Abolish secret diplomacy! Open the files of the State Department.
10. Full workers' rights for conscripts—the right to organize and to bargain collectively with the officers, the right of free speech, press and assembly.
11. Double the wages of the conscripts! Former employers to pay the wage differential and guarantee return of the job.
12. Withdraw all armed forces from territory outside the United States. Free the colonies. Hands off Latin America.
13. Down with Jim-Crow and anti-Semitism! For full social, economic and political equality for Negroes. End discrimination against Negroes in industry and in the trade unions.
14. For Workers' Defense Guards against fascist and vigilante attacks!
15. For an Independent Labor Party.
16. For a workers' government and a people's army! No confidence in the Roosevelt government.
17. For Peace through Socialism. For the Socialist United States of the Americas, for the Socialist United States of Europe, for the World Socialist Federation.

In his speech, Stalin indicated why the pact had been broken, why he had decided to serve a different set of imperialists. He had signed the Hitler-Stalin pact on one condition—"namely, that this peace (!) treaty does not infringe on the territorial integrity, independence and honor of a peace-loving state." When Hitler did infringe on that territorial integrity and honor (not when the needs and interests of the working millions were brutally violated, as they were from the moment the pact was signed) Stalin called it quits and sought a new plundering partner.

If nothing else was proof of the contemptible nature of the Stalin régime and its rôle in this war (we repeat it: as junior partner in one of the imperialist camps), Stalin's speech would be sufficient indication. The utter absence of a single socialist pronouncement in The Leader's speech, taken in the context of imperialist war now raging, is significant evidence. But the behavior of the Stalinist parties is doubly conclusive. Acting on the orders of their Kremlin master, they have established an all-time record for quick changes. In England and in the United States, for example, they have become so vociferous in their championship of the imperialist war that their jingo shouts come louder than all others. Hailing Stalin's "battle program" against fascism, the Daily Worker, in a long front page editorial, concludes that the "historic duty" of the American people is to throw the "POWER AND STRENGTH OF THE UNITED STATES . . . INTO THE SCALES AGAINST HITLER" (their emphasis—Ed.) In other words, and concretely, the "historic duty" of the American people is to urge the imperialist government to be swifter in entering the imperialist war!

Stalin spoke in Moscow, the Daily Worker in New York. Both statements were dictated by the same reactionary voice—the voice of the Stalin gangster régime.

O. K., But . . .

We don't often find ourselves agreeing with the ultra-reactionary Hearst press. We have to admit, however that it hit on a good and worthy scheme when it raised the demand for franking privileges for conscripts; that is, free postage. It looks as though the suggestion may be accepted by Congress (which would have a hard time explaining how it is that the congressmen, with their ample salaries, get free postage while \$21 a month draftees have to buy postage). Good and well! BUT . . .

The proposal is only the lightest drop in the bucket compared to the many needs of the draftees. Cost-free mail is a good idea and a necessity; but CENSOR-FREE MAIL is an even greater necessity. Censorship is unofficial. Nevertheless, draftees have been heard to complain that their mail looks suspiciously as though it were tampered with. Why and by whose authority? Draftees should have the same opportunities to write freely to their friends, and to the press—if they wish, without fear of brass-hat censorship as are LEGALLY (if not actually) given any other person in the United States.

That then is one demand. But there are still greater ones. Twenty-one dollars a month is no wage; it isn't even a pretense at a wage when you consider that out of it must come a multitude of expenses—laundry, extra food, some money for those at home who need it, etc. They are entitled to some approximation of a union wage, which, in the circumstances, would be DOUBLE WHAT THEY ARE GETTING NOW, PLUS ALL EXPENSES.

Further: the men now have no instrument through which they can make their demands known, or, if known, effective. They are completely under the thumb of the brass-hat autocracy. We therefore propose that the draftees be given full workers' rights—particularly the right to organize and to select grievance committees of their own choosing.

We don't expect the Hearst press or Congress to fight for these demands. They'll concede a sop or two, but as for the many VITAL needs of the draftees—these is only one force which can be depended upon: organized labor. Organized labor, acting through its unions, won recognition of labor's rights: the right to organize, the right to strike. These rights today are under attack from boss and government. And just as they will only be defended and extended by the militant action of organized labor, so too will they be won for those members of the working class who are now compelled to serve in the bosses' army only if the unions take up the demands and fight for them.

The United States Closes Its Gates to Victims of Nazism

Almost daily we see "democratic" American papers, associations, politicians and statesmen shedding bitter tears over the fate of the poor victims of the Nazi terror.

"The awful destiny of the oppressed Poles, Czechs, Norwegians, Dutch and the horrible hounding of German anti-fascist fighters are painted for us in lurid colors. Not a little compassion and sympathy are spent on those members of the Jewish race who are being hounded from country to country. One is made to believe that government circles in America are doing their utmost to help the victims of Nazism.

But in reality things are quite different. In the concentration camps of France, in the few European ports still not under Nazi occupation, there are thousands and thousands of refugees. These refugees have lost everything they called their own—their homes, their possessions, their country. Many of them are actually starving. They have been driven from one country to another and each day now the threat of German occupation or of being handed over to the Gestapo hangs over them. For them there is one single hope to save their lives—the American visa.

For long months and years, with the tenacity of despair, they have been fighting for the possibility of emigration. They have travelled great distances, they have spent hundreds of hours in waiting rooms, they have filled out dozens of application blanks, they have with difficulty procured dozens of necessary documents, they have spent weeks and weeks chasing after possibilities of emigration, of transit, of transportation. Thousands of obstacles had to be surmounted, time and again their plans seemed to come to a dead end.

All this took place in an atmosphere of feverish suspense, where every new newspaper report raised once again the fearful question: Won't it be too late? American consuls subjected all documents, passports, recommendations, moral and material affidavits to the strictest of examinations. Thousands of refugees were turned away, new and stricter conditions were posed daily, yet many refugees still had a last hope of being able to escape from the Nazis.

And just at this moment the government of the United States sets up new regulations which make immigration impossible for almost all of these poor unfortunates!

A naive person could ask: But the issuance of visas has not been categorically prohibited? No, of course not. A "clever" method has been found for keeping out all refugees without arousing liberal public opinion in America by an unequivocal prohibition. The brutality of this measure is surpassed only by its hypocrisy.

Valtin Gives Clue

The clue for this act was given by that wonderful Mr. Valtin, who cut out a career for himself as spy and man-hunter first in the service of the GPU, then in the Gestapo, then simultaneously in the service of both of these humanitarian organizations and now, with equal fidelity, in the service of the FBI and the Dies Committee. According to this new shining light of democracy, every refugee is a potential spy. But especially those who have relatives in Germany or in occupied countries. For it so happened that Mr. Valtin, who was sent into the GPU apparatus by the Gestapo (and simultaneously by the GPU into the Gestapo), had his wife

held as hostage by the German police, in order to keep him from working for the other side.

Each gypsy prophesies according to his own character. Because attempts were made to keep in control a professional spy who is capable of working for both sides, by using his relatives, Mr. Valtin draws the conclusion that every anti-fascist fighter will let himself be misused for spy services when his family is threatened. And the government has made use of this opportunity to decree that no one may enter the United States who has a wife, children, parents, sisters or brothers over there. Except—for we are a humanitarian country—if he takes all his close relatives along with him.

Now, most refugees escaped illegally from Germany and occupied countries, through woods, across mountains, by night and foggy weather. Not all of them were able to take along their wives; only a few their children and parents. And certainly no one thought of taking along all their sisters and brothers, who were perhaps not at all politically active or threatened. Jewish families are often blessed with numerous children; in order to do justice to the new regulations, they would have to be emigrated whole battalions at a time.

To sum up, there is hardly a refugee in European ports who has not at least one close relative (father, mother, sister, brother, wife or child) in Hitler Europe. Well and good, the consul will say, you will get your visa if you also bring out your wife. The wife, however, cannot get her visa, not to mention all the other difficulties, because she also has parents, brothers and sisters who in turn are married and have still more close relatives. . . . In order to comply with these wonderful regulations, consul, would have to take along this poor man, who is talking to the perhaps twenty people to America and support them here. . . .

Who Will Get Busy?

On further reflection we will see that, according to this ruling, neither the Czech President Benes nor the Polish General Sikorski could be given entry, since both have left close relatives at home. Princess Juliana of Holland fortunately took along her Prince Consort; the case stands worse for the Norwegian Crown Princess Martha, at present a guest of the Roosevelts. If the Germans march into Sweden, her parents will be in occupied territory.

However, we need have no fears for these illustrious heads: the State Department has announced that there will also be exceptions. But it will no longer be the consuls but the State Department itself that will decide each and every case. That is to say, soon there will be an accumulation of tens of thousands of petitions in Washington. And if you don't happen to have the luck of being an heir apparent, you will have to wait months and years for the decision. In the meantime, most "cases" will certainly "solve" themselves by the petitioners' either committing suicide or their being beaten to death by the Nazis.

Had the government simply prohibited the immigration of refugees, this would surely have occasioned a storm of protest on the part of labor and liberal public opinion. That is why it sought and found a way out that would pass unnoticed. But this cannot and must not put a brake on protests. Every honest opponent of fascism must raise his voice against the measures that close all doors to the victims of fascism and thus deliver them into the very hands of the Nazi executioners.

We Called The Turn--

Last December, LABOR ACTION took up the British Communist Party's slogan for a "People Government" in England. The Stalinists were then rooting for the Berlin-Moscow axis, and this was their leading slogan of opposition to the British government.

In this article by Joseph Carter, LABOR ACTION once again called the turn on the Stalinist flip-flop. We wrote:

"What does this 'People's Government' mean? Why, of course, ANY British government which forms a military alliance with Russia! All the rest is mere verbiage. So long as the Churchill government, either because of its own interests or because of Stalin's does not have such a military alliance the Communist Party will be against British imperialism in the war. However, if the Churchill government or its imperialist successor does take this step then the Stalinists will forget all about freedom for the colonies, democratic rights for the workers, and particularly for the anti-war fighters; in a word, will once again be ardent defenders of Union Jack imperialism. The interests of the British workers play no role whatever in determining Communist Party policy."

CIO Leader Condemns Attack On Local 544 and the SWP

A federal grand jury, sitting in St. Paul, last week moved, on instructions from the United States Department of Justice and Acting Attorney General Francis Biddle, to indict leaders of the Socialist Workers Party and prominent Minneapolis union militants on charges of "seditious conspiracy to advocate overthrow of the government of the United States by force and violence."

Seeing the prosecution for what it is, an attempted blow at militant and anti-war unionism instigated by Dan Tobin, who has found goon terror insufficient in cracking the ranks of Local 544, Frank Barnhart, regional director of the United Construction Workers Organizing Committee (with which Local 544 is now affiliated), condemned the federal indictments and the raid on SWP headquarters in the Twin Cities.

"Not long ago," said Barnhart, "Tobin issued an ultimatum to the officers and members of the AFL Teamsters Union ordering them to give unequivocal support to Roosevelt's war policies under threat of reprisals against them by Tobin if they failed to comply. Tobin devised this policy both as a service to Roosevelt and as a protective screen under which he hoped to maintain his arbitrary and dictatorial rule over the rank and file of his antiquated organization." Barnhart went on to defend the right of unionists to oppose the war. He also defended the excellent record of the Local 544 leadership.

The American Civil Liberties has also come to the defense of the SWP and the Local 544 leadership by telegraphing its protest to Biddle. It branded

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed—That whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."—From the Declaration of Independence, adopted in Congress, July 4, 1776.

the prosecution as "obviously dangerous to the preservation of democracy" and described the statutes under which the prosecution was brought as "hostile to constitutional guarantees and in our judgment the statutes could not withstand a court test."

Legally, the Department of Justice, the attorney general and the grand jury haven't a leg to stand on. But that will count for little if they can get away with it. By distorting the evidence, by resort to shady and viciously undemocratic statutes, they will seek to break the hold of Local 544's splendid leadership. As we said in last week's LABOR ACTION, the Roosevelt government is out to break any union that won't bend to its war will.

The union leaders under charge deny that they are members of the Socialist Workers Party, but that makes little difference to the reactionaries. But it should make infinitely less difference to labor. Any union man has the right to join any working class party he chooses. In this case, the SWP is merely a "handy" pretext for getting at the union militants.

Something more than legal grounds for a defense is therefore needed. These grounds exist and are plain. But the constitution and the law will mean nothing to the grand jury—unless the union movement speaks up for the SWP and Local 544 leaders in the way Barnhart did. That is the way to militant unionism, that is the way to keep Minneapolis a union town, that is the way to defend labor's rights.

In the meantime we recommend to Attorney General Biddle and the grand jury that they consult the Declaration of Independence. The most they can charge the SWP with is taking the Declaration of Independence seriously.

SPECIAL INTRODUCTORY OFFER! 25¢ For Three Months

LABOR ACTION
114 West 14th Street
New York City

Enclosed find 25 cents for which please send LABOR ACTION for three months to:

NAME _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____ STATE _____

THE NEGRO'S FIGHT Negroes, We Can Depend Only On Ourselves!

By J. R. JOHNSON

The worst traitors and enemies are always the traitors and enemies inside the camp. Today, at the head of the traitors is Philip Randolph with his two assistants, Walter White of the NAACP and Frank Crosswaith of the Socialist Party. But Randolph and White are the chiefs. They are responsible for the calling off of the March on Washington. They did Roosevelt's dirty work. They did what Roosevelt could not have done himself.

Randolph bears the responsibility, but White of the NAACP is smeared all over with evidence of his partnership in the crime. Let us therefore have a few words about White. He is a big shot in the NAACP and for years we have pointed out that the leadership of the NAACP is rotten, that though it may investigate lynchings, etc., and carry on a certain amount of public agitation, yet it is not an organization which depends upon the action of the masses but begs for favors and carries on intrigues with Roosevelt and Eleanor Roosevelt. It is far more concerned with its backstairs connections with the White House than with mobilizing mass action. It will go a little way with the masses of Negroes when the masses move, but as soon as the mass movement begins to look as if it means business, the NAACP begins to think of what Roosevelt will say. And in any serious clash between the masses of Negro people and the government, the NAACP is with the government. Now all through the negotiations Walter White was Randolph's chief friend and adviser.

Yet Randolph was the man in front. Why? Chiefly because Randolph had a great reputation as a labor leader. Randolph had organized the Pullman porters, the best labor organization that Negroes have today. The struggles of Negroes are first and foremost labor struggles, particularly the struggle for jobs in the war industries. So everybody looked to Randolph.

WHY THEY STARTED THE MOVEMENT

Why did they start the movement at all? The Negroes were clamoring for action. All over the country there was the usual unrest and dissatisfaction, but this time linked with the desire for action. White and Randolph saw that if they did not take the leadership of the movement, the Stalinists, using their stooge organization, the National Negro Congress, would take it over. At that time (not today any longer) the Stalinists were calling the war an imperialist war and were doing all they could to confuse and embarrass the Roosevelt government. So that if they let the Stalinists get away with the leadership, White and Randolph would be discredited, a mass Negro movement would get under way and leave them behind; and Negroes would be under Stalinist influence. White and Randolph therefore came out as leaders.

Roosevelt, however, didn't want any March on Washington. What the ruling class hates above all is independent mass action. Above all, the workers must always be told what to do. They must never do anything themselves. And particularly Negroes. This march would have meant a tremendous awakening of Negroes all over the country. It would have shown the hypocrisy of the American capitalist class, pretending that it was fighting for democracy abroad, when it was stamping as usual upon the democratic rights of the poor at home. Roosevelt set out to break the march.

On June 10 Eleanor Roosevelt wrote a letter to Randolph. She called the march a "very grave mistake." Following this, Eleanor Roosevelt, La Guardia, Randolph and White had a conference at City Hall in New York. White and Randolph were now in a mess.

Stimson, Secretary of War, and Knox, Secretary of the Navy, sent a telegram to Randolph asking him to come to Washington for a conference. There was a lot of going and coming and in the end Roosevelt issued his executive order, which does not mean one damn thing because there are no penalties to be imposed upon those who continue to discriminate against Negroes. But White and Randolph have done their work. They have killed the greatest independent action the Negroes have undertaken for a generation.

STORY NOT YET FINISHED

The story isn't finished yet, however, and it isn't going to be finished for a long time. Here are two new chapters, very short but very significant: Randolph got on the radio a few days ago and said that soon the President would issue another executive order abolishing discrimination in the Army and Navy for all time. This can mean only one thing. Somebody has promised Randolph a job in the government, for no man in his senses would talk such nonsense, except he was doing it for a purpose.

At the same time Glenn L. Martin, whose airplane plant at Middle River, Md., has half a billion dollars worth of war contracts, was asked what his would be if the President tried to enforce the executive order. He replied: "Immediate stoppage of work." In other words, "To hell with the President."

Negroes, that is what we have to deal with. Negro-hating capitalists, sly politicians like Roosevelt and treacherous stooges like White and Randolph. We must organize ourselves, with our own elected committees and depend only upon ourselves!

LABOR ACTION
Official Organ of the Workers Party
Published weekly by the
Labor Action Publishing Company
Vol. 5, No. 28 July 14, 1941
114 WEST 14TH STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.
(3rd Floor)
Editor: JOSEPH CARTER
Managing Editor: EMANUEL GARRETT
Business Manager: JOHN BILLINGS
Subscription Rate: \$1.50 per year
\$1.00 for six months
(\$2.00 per year or \$1.50 for six months
for Canada and Foreign)
Re-entered as second class matter May 24, 1940,
at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1879.