

CIO WARNS AGAINST HOME GUARD BILL

Cafeteria Workers' United Front Makes Clean Sweep In Elections

Red-Baiters Fail To Win A Single Post In Local 302; Winners Are Pledged To Carry Out A Militant Union Program

The United Union Ticket, united front slate of the militant workers of New York's Cafeteria Local 302, Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union (AFL), has just scored a decisive election victory over the United Right Ticket, candidates of the reactionaries and the remnants of the racketeers who at one time dominated the food workers union. The elections were held December 17 and 18.

The final tabulation of the vote gave a three-to-two majority to the united front candidates. The total vote cast was 5,098. The union has 10,000 members.

All posts in the "A" and "B" branches of the local, as well as all general offices of the entire local, were won by the militants, as an aroused union membership finally cleaned house of the boss-minded, super-patriotic jingoists and gangsters who have been attempting to throttle the local. During the campaign, the United Right crew had the open support of the bosses and the backing of the reactionary bureaucrats heading the international union.

The successful United Union candidates for the leading posts were Costas Dritsas, of the United Rank and File Club, President; Sam Kramberg, of the same group, Secretary-Treasurer; Larry Phillips, of the United Progressive Group, General Organizer; and Juan Aviles, of the United Spanish Workers Club, Labor Chief.

This election campaign has held the attention of the entire New York labor movement. The victory of the united front ticket is regarded as a blow to the whole right-wing sector of the union movement here.

The victory takes on double significance in the light of the terrific pressure exerted on the union members, not only by the right-wing clique—whose sole program was red-baiting and patriotic appeals in the interest of "national defense"—but by the bosses in



LARRY PHILLIPS

the food industry and by the general anti-labor pro-war drive of the government and the boss press. It demonstrates once again the capacity of the workers to fight in their own interests and to resist the propaganda of the employers.

UNITED FRONT DID IT

The decisive factor leading to this victory was the united front established by all the groups in the union which were opposed to red-baiting. What is more, the

Flint Auto Workers Hear Grace Carlson Tuesday, Jan. 7

FLINT, Mich.—Grace Carlson's national tour brings her here on Tuesday, January 7, 8, p.m. at Carpenters Hall, Pengeley Building.

She's going to give a talk on a subject which the workers of this auto city are certainly interested in: "The Right To Life," a graphic picture of what the auto bosses and their kind do to the lives of the workers in their grip. Comrade Carlson knows what she's talking about. She's worked with and talked with thousands of workers during her years of connection with the famous Glen Lake Sanatorium, the Minnesota Department of Education and its subdivisions which handled workers who fell victim to disease or industrial accidents.

Flint auto workers! Come out and hear this Minnesota trade unionist and spokesman for our party!

Negro Sailors Defended By Boston Meeting

BOSTON, Dec. 20—A mass meeting of Negro and white workers was held here this evening under the auspices of the Socialist Workers Party to protest the mistreatment of the Negro sailors on the U.S.S. Philadelphia and to demand the discontinuation of the government's policy of Jim-Crow in the Navy and other armed forces.

By unanimous vote, the meeting adopted a telegram to be sent to Secretary of the Navy Knox and Admiral Nimitz calling for release of the two imprisoned Negro messmen on the U.S.S. Philadelphia, and revocation of the "undesirable discharges" of 13 other Negro sailors.

The meeting also voted to send letters of commendation to each of the 15 men involved in this case, which arose when they wrote a letter exposing the maltreatment and Jim-Crow against Negroes in the Navy. The telegram adopted by the meeting informs these courageous sailors that workers back home, Negro and white, are backing them up.

A committee was established at the meeting to continue the work of organizing protest in this case and to carry on the fight against all Jim-Crow practices in the armed forces.

Attention Chicago! Grace Carlson Speaks On Friday

Grace Carlson, U. S. Senatorial candidate of our party in Minnesota, now opening a national tour, speaks in Chicago this coming week.

Her first lecture will be Friday, January 3, at 8 p.m., at the Hamilton Hotel, 18 South Dearborn Street. The subject will be: "Roosevelt vs. Hitler—The Struggle for Empire in Latin America."

(For Comrade Carlson's other lectures and conferences in Chicago, ask for information at the Chicago headquarters of the SWP: 160 N. Wells Street, Room 200.)

united front was based on a genuine fighting program in the interests of all the food workers against the bosses.

Such a united front has been unprecedented in the labor movement here. It included workers of many different nationalities—Spanish, Greek, Slavic, etc. It included adherents of various working class political parties—the Rights were yelling "Trotskyite" and "Stalinist" at any worker who even looked militant. It included different crafts—chefs, cooks, countermen and unskilled categories. All combined on the one supreme immediate task confronting the union membership: smashing the menace of the racketeers and boss-controlled labor fakers. The chief obstruction in the path of the union membership has been blasted away. With the program sponsored by the united front, the rank and file at last have the opportunity of concentrating on the job of winning decent conditions in one of the most extensive and exploited industries in New York City, where over 100,000 food workers are employed.

The groups officially forming the United Union Committee were the United Rank and File Club, the United Progressive Group, United Spanish Workers Club, and (Continued on Page 2)

Bad Housing Spreads Illness In Army Camps

With thousands of soldiers housed in totally inadequate tents and living in conditions unfit for human beings, while storms sweep through them, a full-fledged influenza epidemic threatens to sweep the army camps.

Dr. James A. Dolce, in charge of sanitary reports for the Public Health Service, last week reported the following conditions in the army camps:

Camp Murray, Washington, where 12,000 soldiers are stationed, topped all army camps in influenza cases, with a total of 682 cases on Dec. 2.

There were 1,328 cases of respiratory illness in Camp Murray, according to the Army Surgeon General's office.

Camp Clapsop, Oregon, had 251 influenza cases among its 875 soldiers.

Camp Beauregard, where most of the Michigan men are stationed, had 480 respiratory cases out of 10,000 soldiers in camp.

At Alexandria, La., there were 30,000 cases of colds, influenza and fever. This is a city where 35,000 army camp workers and defense project laborers are stationed.

And the comment of the health service on all this was...

"There is no cause for alarm."

It is a fortunate accident that the current epidemic is influenza of a mild form. Nevertheless, it reflects the fact that the men are subjected to dangerously unsanitary living standards.

Strict army censorship has succeeded in keeping out of the public eye any protests against these conditions which the draftees may be making.

"Sabotage" Bill Also Denounced

Only Military Law Could Touch Guards, Murray Points Out; But He Fails To Indict Their Purely Anti-Labor Role

WASHINGTON, Dec. 23—The CIO has taken a stand against the "model" Home Guard and "Sabotage" bills, proposed by the bosses for adoption by state legislatures as "national defense" measures.

Scoring the Home Guard bill, which would replace the National Guard units taken into the regular army by military bodies under complete military direction, Philip Murray, newly-elected CIO president, today called on all members and affiliates of the CIO to oppose this bill on the grounds that "it leaves these state guard units completely free from any civil responsibility for their acts by making them responsible to military law only."

Murray did not, unfortunately, oppose the establishment of a Home Guard altogether, but merely the provision of this particular bill fixing the control of the Home Guard. "This section of the bill should be stricken," declared Murray. "In its place, there should be provisions protecting the rights of workers and the community at large against any lawless acts by the State guard units."

A STRIKEBREAKING FORCE

Murray fails to point out the fact that the proposed Home Guard as such, whether under military or civilian law, is intended solely as a strike-breaking armed force, similar to the National Guard, and which will be controlled by the bosses in any event, whether under military or civil law.

Just as eighty percent of National Guard duty has been in "enforcing the right to work" during strikes, so the Home Guards will be employed.

The action of Murray and the CIO, nevertheless sharply focuses the attention of the organized labor movement on two of the most menacing bills ever proposed against labor.

WHAT LABOR NEEDS

This Home Guard bill, and the concern it has evoked even in conservative labor circles, underlines the need for the trade unions to press for the counter-measures long advocated by the Socialist Worker Party.

Labor needs its own organized and trained defenses, Workers Defense Guards, against the growing danger of employer-inspired vigilantes, fascist gangs, professional strike-breakers, and similar outfits which are taking advantage of the anti-labor pro-war

drive of the bosses and the government.

The model "sabotage" bill comes in for even stronger criticism by President Murray. "This bill," says Murray, "would make it a felony 'for any person intentionally to interfere with the production of national defense articles in private plants and intentionally to fail to note defects in products.' It would also authorize local officials to close streets and public highways adjoining private plants engaged in 'national defense' production."

Murray charged: "The sabotage provisions of the bill are of such a nature that they could be readily used to suppress strikes or other union activity to improve wages, hours and working conditions." Reactionary local authorities would try to invoke the penalties of this bill upon the ground that labor union action resulted in interference with national defense production.

The bill contains a so-called exemption in the case of acts within the "rights guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act." But, states Murray, "... nevertheless the enforcement of the law would be in the hands of a thousand different local prosecutors and judges, and the exemption could easily be rendered meaningless by word juggling."

Here again, however, Murray backwaters, and says "some" sabotage laws are needed, but enforcement should be federal. The conduct of the government officials in the Vultee strike and the Bethlehem Steel situation, as well as in its policy of granting war orders to labor law violators, shows clearly enough how little labor's interests would be regarded in the enforcement of such a law under federal jurisdiction.

Waller Gets Stay Of Execution

Labor And Negro Protests Win Delay Of Sharecropper's Death Sentence

Odell Waller, Negro sharecropper of Virginia, who was condemned to execution by an all-white jury including ten landlords, for the self-defense slaying of his white landlord, has won a stay of execution until March 14, 1941. The stay was granted by Governor James A. Price, after many protests from progressive Negro and labor organizations throughout the country.

Waller shot his white planter-boss, Oscar Davis, after the latter threatened him when he came for his wages and those of his wife and aged mother, who had also worked for Davis.

Outstanding attorneys, such as John F. Finerty and Thomas H. Stone, are acting as defense counsel for Waller, testifying to the vital importance of this case as typifying the miserable servitude to which the Negro masses in the southern Bourbon states are subjected.

Mr. Finerty was defense counsel for Tom Mooney and in the Sacco-Vanzetti case. He served as legal advisor for the International Commission of Inquiry, headed by John Dewey, which investigated the charges against Leon Trotsky, made in the Moscow Trials and acquitted him.

The stay of Waller's execution was granted on the plea of unfairness in the selection of the jury and prejudicial pressure on it from the outside.

This stay does not end the menace to Waller's life, but merely delays his execution until the Virginia Supreme Court reviews the case. The fight to save Waller must be continued, as in all likelihood the white ruling class courts in further hearings will endeavor to convict Waller more "legally."

The Workers Defense League, which is in charge of Waller's defense, has asked for urgently needed funds to carry on the fight. Funds may be sent to the League in care of its secretary, David L. Clendenin, 112 E. 19th Street, New York City.

ON THE WAR FRONTS

by GEORGE STERN

The fateful year of 1940 draws to a close. Amid all the bleating about Xmas goodwill and peace on earth, the carnage goes on. The coming year can only witness its extension to even broader fronts, a deepening of the horrors, an unimaginable increase of the tension, the suffering, the mass privation engendered by the world war of the bosses.

The past twelve months have witnessed volcanic changes in the political map of Europe. Moribund bourgeois democracy went down in Norway, Holland, Belgium, and finally in proud France, where it was cradled. Totalitarian Germany became master of the continent and came to grips with England for mastery of the world. England itself shed its democratic fig-leaf and is girding all its strength for the test that the coming year must bring. And even England's leaders admit that afterward, win or lose, things can never return to their old grooves.

The capitalist system has long been incapable of providing adequately for society's needs. The first world war of 25 years ago first exposed the cancers that were already then destroying it. That conflict brought the crisis of society to a time of great decision: this society would either be permitted to live on—to rot from within and to kill in its agony all the myriad organisms dependent upon it—or else it would be thrust away once and for all and a new society created better fitted to the means of production and the human needs of the modern world.

The great movement of proletarian insurrection that rose out of the ruins of 1914-18 represented the tremendous effort made by the submerged masses of the world to make the change

cleanly and swiftly. Everywhere but in Russia, they failed. The workers lacked the revolutionary parties capable of leading to victory. The socialists and other fakers who led them were concerned not with building a new power of the workers but with preserving the power of the bosses. For these crimes and failures, isolated workers' Russia had to pay by passing into the control of the Bonapartist clique of Stalin. The capitalist world retched and writhed on into a new world conflict.

This war is encompassing the destruction of the old political system of capitalism as we have known it for three centuries. The new totalitarianism is the harbinger of a new political system for the capitalist order, a system based upon contracted production and reduction of the masses to unrelieved slavery. And in this process, millions must die and suffer and starve.

The old way is gone. The great question is still before us: Who shall usher it out? Who shall build the new world and what kind of a world should that be? We say there is still time for the workers of the world to take into THEIR hands the business of re-making the world. We say there is still time to check the onward rush toward a new form of capitalist barbarism. We say there is still time to put the world on the rails toward a new socialist order, an order of new realization for all men and women.

The Fourth International stands for this future and none other. In lands already engulfed by war or about to be, its partisans fight on toward this goal. To them, this end of the year of 1940, we send our fraternal salute.

Special National Convention Of SWP Acts On International Relations

A special national convention of the Socialist Workers Party was held at Irving Plaza Hall in New York City on Sunday, Dec. 21, convened at the call of the National Committee to consider possible problems which may arise under reactionary federal legislation recently adopted.

The main report was made by James P. Cannon, National Secretary.

Two resolutions were adopted by the convention. One, on "International Relations," reads as follows: "Whereas, federal legislation (the Voorhis Act, etc.) has been adopted by Congress which imposes burdensome requirements on political organizations affiliated to international bodies, including the formal periodic registration of lists of individual members; and "Whereas, such regulations could be of service only to the enemies of the workers, the Fourth (Special) National Convention of the Socialist

Workers Party hereby resolves:

"1. To formally discontinue its affiliation to the Fourth International as of this date.

"2. To continue its struggle for socialism as a completely autonomous party.

"3. While complying with the provisions of the aforesaid legislation, we affirm our opposition to this and any similar measures designed to disrupt the international solidarity of the workers. We assure our co-thinkers in other lands that nothing in this decision of compliance with arbitrary discriminatory legislation alters in any way our ardent sympathy with their own struggles for socialism."

The text of the second resolution adopted was:

"The Declaration of Principles of the Socialist Workers Party—adopted by the Foundation Convention, (Dec. 31, 1937 to Jan. 3, 1938)—requires some changes and additions to bring

it up to date and correspond with new developments which have transpired since the Foundation Convention.

"This task can be performed satisfactorily only after adequate time has been provided for consideration of proposed changes and their discussion in the ranks of the party. As a step towards the preparation of this task, the Fourth (Special) National Convention resolves: "1. To suspend and withdraw the Declaration of Principles adopted at the Foundation Convention;

"2. To authorize and instruct the National Committee to prepare the draft of an amended Declaration of Principles for submission to the party for discussion and eventual decision by party convention or referendum."

A series of motions were also adopted, amending the party constitution so that it now conforms to the sense of the two resolutions adopted.

Imprisoned By British Police

Pierre Frank, a French revolutionist, has been sentenced to six months at hard labor by a London police tribunal.

Frank explained to the authorities that he had been condemned in his absence, to several months' imprisonment in France. Had he registered with the British police in the normal way, he would have run the risk of being delivered into the hands of the French authorities.

Frank is a member of the Molinier group, which has been outside the Fourth International for several years.

Protests against the vicious punishment vented on Pierre should be directed to the British Embassy in Washington.

"Equality" Before The Draft Boards---Oh Yeah

The First Businessman Is Called Up In Flint—And The Board Asks New Ruling

FLINT, Mich.—Flint business men are regarded by local draft boards as a special group entitled to extraordinary considerations. What applies for an ordinary working stiff just doesn't apply for a "respectable" business man who has many, many responsibilities, mainly looking after his profits.

A case in point came up recently when, to the great embarrassment of Flint draft board No. 4, the manager of a large store in Flint drew a number which required his immediate examination for service. Still more embarrassing for the draft board flunkies—all

of them middle class citizens with proper respect for business managers—this particular business man passed the physical examination and was ready for immediate induction.

Now it was all right to send young workers into the army as soon as they passed the physical. No one had to pay any attention to their "affairs" or to their need to readjust their lives.

But with a business man it's different. No sooner had the store manager, Herbert J. Wineman of the Federal Stores, successfully passed the physical examination, than draft board No. 4 made a request of the State Selective Service board in Lansing for a special ruling in cases involving business men.

"Can a selectee be given 60 days in which to wind up his business affairs?" asked draft board No. 4. Amplifying its question, the local board further stated that it feels that a 60-day period should be allowed between the final examination and induction to allow business men to straighten out business affairs, and eliminate "possible financial loss or embarrassment."

Workingclass draftees will, however, continue to be jerked out of their accustomed lives, and plunked straight into the army without further ado.

The only reason this question has come up so late in the game here, is that Mr. Wineman happens to be the first and only business man thus far called up.

WORKERS' FORUM

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

Some Southern Negroes Learn What Stalinist "Discussions" Mean

Editor:

About two months ago, a Negro friend of mine came to me and asked for information concerning the Communist Party, and after a brief discussion, he informed me that he had been invited to a meeting which was to be held by the C.P. and asked me if I would not like to attend with him. Of course, I immediately accepted the invitation for it just so happened that this meeting was to be held in a district where we had previously been doing some work. It was decided that we would also ask some of our contacts to attend with us.

When we arrived at the hall where the meeting was to be, we found a small group of Negroes and one white fellow. On our arrival, the white fellow, who appeared to be one of the hotshots of the local C.P., was standing on the steps of the hall and his immediate suspicion of us caused his face to become as blank and cold as a statue of Stalin, and after about two minutes of staring back and forth, we turned away from him and started a conversation with the Negro workers, and after about fifteen minutes conversation, I noticed that this fellow with a poker face was still standing on the steps staring.

It was so evident that this fellow was in a terrific strain that I finally decided to put him at ease, so I informed him of the fact that we had not met before. He then introduced himself and asked how we had heard that there was to be a meeting and he wanted to know what we thought of the C.P. I answered that I believed in the teaching of Marx and Lenin, but that I didn't believe that the C.P. was following this revolutionary course, whereupon he began to assure us that the C. P. was still revolutionary and pointed in proof that only recently there had been revolutions in Latvia and Lithuania.

Another comrade then asked him why it was that we had never heard of these revolutions. He answered that the boss press wouldn't carry a story such as that. The comrade then informed him that the boss press was not able to keep the news from us when the workers took arms in Russia in 1917 and neither were

they able to withhold the news of the Spanish workers taking arms, so therefore, it wasn't possible that there could have been revolutions in these countries, as the news had never reached workers of other countries. I then asked him if he considered a change of system in those countries to be revolutionary when said change had been brought about under the rifles of Soviet troops and not by the workers of said countries. I told him that I couldn't believe that Lenin would ever have sanctioned such action, and of course, he never answered my question.

He then informed us that it would be better if we didn't attend the meeting, explaining that he thought that our purpose was to disrupt the meeting by asking questions, and that he was trying to organize a Ford club among workers who were not advanced. Therefore he could not afford to be disrupted by political questions. We then asked him why he could not answer questions and what was he trying to hide. We assured him that we were not trying to obstruct any progressive action, but that there were workers at this meeting who wanted us present, and that there were many who would never attend his meeting when they knew that he had been refused admittance. He then told us that we were members of the S.W.P., and he just couldn't agree to our presence. One of the Negro workers, who had been present at one of our meetings when we had answered questions of a Stalinist and extended him an invitation to attend following meetings and ask all the questions that he wished, told this fellow that he could not see any reason why we should not be allowed to attend and said he had never been turned away from any meeting before. He also told him that we were holding meetings in his house and extended an invitation to attend these meetings.

After leaving the meeting place, we met a group of people on their way to the meeting. After a few minutes discussion with them, they decided that if we couldn't attend the meeting, neither would they. They said that they would pass the word around through the district as to what had happened, and they did.

The results were: A miserable failure for the Stalinists in the organization of a Ford club, and also their awakening to the fact that the Trotskyists have moved in.

Texas BILL GREEN

"T.B.", Scourge Of The Poor, Kills 9 Workers For 1 Businessman

You Can Kill A Man With A Tenement As Well As You Can With An Axe

By GRACE CARLSON
(The author of this authoritative article on the ravages of tuberculosis among the workers is now starting a cross-country speaking tour. Among the subjects on which she will speak in 35 cities will be "The Right To Life," the workers' struggle for health and happiness. Watch the APPEAL for news of when Comrade Carlson will speak in your city.)



GRACE CARLSON

In their fight against low wages and bad working conditions, the trade unions are also fighting disease. Take, as one example, tuberculosis which kills 64,000 people in the United States annually. Three-fifths of these deaths occur among individuals from 15 to 45 years of age. Tuberculosis is caused by germs which are passed from sick to healthy people who in turn become sick from tuberculosis and infect others. Nevertheless, the individual who is in a run-down condition is more likely to break down from tuberculosis than the individual who has strong resistance.

Strong bodily resistance is produced by good food, warm clothing, decent living conditions, adequate rest and freedom from worry. No trade union can feel that its wage scales are high enough so that its members can purchase all of these requisites for strong bodily resistance to disease. A good start has been made, however, and the fight must go on.

Evidence that poverty breeds tuberculosis has been accumulated by the National Tuberculosis Association. In a recent study, it was shown that nine unskilled workers died from tuberculosis to every professional or business man who died of this disease. The death rate from tuberculosis among skilled workers as well as office workers is three times as high as the rate for professional and business men. Tuberculosis is more common among poorly paid workers than among those who are well paid. Although a few occupations like mining, stone-cutting and grinding are a definite hazard for tuberculosis, the chief influence of occupation on tuberculosis is the wage level and the standard of living that goes with it.

Another study shows that the

death rate from tuberculosis is five times as high among families paying \$10 to \$20 per month rent than among families paying \$55 and more per month. Poverty itself does not cause tuberculosis (only the tuberculosis germ can do that), but poor housing and the subsequent crowding make it easier for the germ to spread from person to person.

NEGROES PAY THIS PRICE OF POVERTY

Because the Negroes are the most poorly paid, poorly housed and altogether most exploited section of the population, they suffer greatly from this terrible scourge of the poor. Deaths from tuberculosis among Negroes are about three times as many as among whites. As a matter of fact, the death rate from tuberculosis among Negroes today is the same as it was among whites in 1910. It is clearly apparent that the progress of medical science, in cutting down the death rate from tuberculosis, has not aided the Negroes as it has the whites. This in a land of "equality!"

Tuberculosis, could be wiped out if the conditions of poverty which breed tuberculosis could be eliminated and if every person with an active case of tuberculosis could be placed in a sanatorium for the "cure". The germs that cause tuberculosis grow in

the lung of the person who has the disease. These germs are very small so that thousands may be present in a tiny drop of sputum. They are passed from individual to individual by direct or indirect contact.

When tuberculosis germs attack the body, certain natural forces of the body fight back. These forces are called "resistance." Strong resistance withstands the attack of a few tuberculosis germs and the body may remain well. However, even strong resistance will not withstand the attack of many tuberculosis germs. Weak resistance, on the other hand, will give way to the attack of even a few tuberculosis germs and if many tuberculosis germs attack the body, a complete breakdown from tuberculosis is almost sure to follow.

WHY WORKERS DON'T GET CURED

Because so many workers do break down with tuberculosis because of the conditions of poverty under which workers live, the individual worker should realize that he has probably been exposed to the disease from his many contacts with fellow workers. If a case of tuberculosis is discovered in an early stage, it is not difficult to cure the patient and restore him to productive life. It is very tragic that over 90 per cent of the patients admitted to the sanatoria of the country are in far advanced stages of the disease.

Anyone who is familiar with the problems of the working man can understand why a man continues at work for weeks and months after he shows signs of illness before he seeks medical advice and is sent to a sanatorium. Even where he is in a union, there is little sick leave allowed to the worker by his boss. Long periods of illness for the breadwinner of the family mean hunger, cold, worry, and undernourishment for the wife and children of the worker. Small wonder, then, that workers struggle along at their heavy jobs for long periods with the burden of coughing, indigestion, pain in the chest and other symptoms of tuberculosis rather than risk unemployment.

Tuberculosis will not be conquered until poverty is abolished from the face of the earth. Even

medical science cannot keep patients well if they must return to the terrible conditions of hunger, cold and over-crowding which prevail among large sections of the workers in the population.

WAR PROGRAM EATS UP HEALTH FUNDS

In many parts of the country, especially in the south, the conditions for the treatment of the tuberculous are extremely bad. The sanatoria are crowded to the doors, the technical equipment for the modern treatment of tuberculosis (collapse therapy) is lacking, out-patient clinics do not exist. However, even when tuberculous patients are treated in well-equipped, modern sanatoria they must be discharged into a world of poverty and unemployment. The meager rations of relief budgets are not adequate to keep them in good physical condition.

Many patients become disgusted with the terrible life on relief and return to jobs which are too heavy for the person with an "arrested" case of tuberculosis. Large numbers of patients break down again because of these conditions and must return to the sanatorium—many times to die.

American capitalism pays lip service to the fight against tuberculosis in the yearly Christmas seal campaign. Throughout the rest of the year the "one-third of the nation" continues its losing fight against tuberculosis, in the great scourge of the poor. Moreover, American capitalism is finding it necessary to withdraw benefits from the workers rather than to add to a social security program. Public health officials will be instructed to concern themselves primarily with the health of the prospective conscripts. Thus money allotted for public health work will be turned over to the armament program.

Today the fight for health, for decent living conditions, for even a minimum of social security becomes a fight against the basic structure of American capitalism itself. There is no longer a "middle way". The worker must take a stand either for the preservation of capitalism which denies workers and their families the necessities of life, or he must accept the revolutionary socialist position and work for the establishment of a society of peace and plenty.

TRADE UNION NOTES

by Farrell Dobbs

ATT. GEN. ARNOLD SHOWS HIS HAND

Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, who has been prosecuting the so-called "anti-trust" cases against the trade unions, arguing before the United States Supreme Court, stated that "labor . . . should not be permitted to destroy itself by factional war." This statement was made in connection with Arnold's attempt to prosecute the officials of the AFL Carpenters Union as the result of a jurisdictional strike against the AFL Machinists in the Anheuser-Busch brewery at St. Louis.

When asked by Justice Frankfurter whether his argument would apply to a similar dispute between the AFL and the CIO, Arnold replied that it would. If the UAW-CIO were to strike Ford and the Ford company-union claimed that the CIO was striking against its "jurisdiction," which it probably would, then, according to Arnold's "logic," this too would be a jurisdictional strike in which he, the great crusader, would step in to save labor from "destroying itself by factional war."

"The power to suppress competition," says Arnold, "is far more dangerous than the power to fix prices." Arnold refers here not to the competition between business establishments, but to the competition among the workers for jobs. When he attacks the "power to suppress competition" in this case, what he is referring to is the right of the legitimate trade unions to act as the exclusive bargaining agency for the workers.

Having camouflaged his real aim during the early stages of his anti-labor campaign by confining himself mainly to the jurisdictional disputes in the AFL, Arnold is now preparing his second and more brazen line of attack—"anti-trust" prosecution in disputes between the AFL and CIO. The final stage will be a direct assault upon the established principles of union recognition.

Arnold is fighting to maintain

the anti-union "open shop" in industry. It is well to remind the workers and the "labor statesmen" that he is a subordinate of a member of Roosevelt's cabinet.

ANTI-LABOR BILLS SECRETLY PREPARED

A Washington correspondent of the New York Post reports that bills giving state and local authorities unprecedented powers in anti-labor activity have been secretly prepared in Washington. They are designed for submission next month to nearly all state legislatures.

One bill provides a ten year jail sentence and \$10,000 fine for anyone who "intentionally . . . interferes" with property to "hinder, delay or interfere with national defense." Another section provides a similar punishment for anyone who "intentionally" is responsible for any defect in an article which is "intended to be used in connection with national defense."

Virtually everything from common pins to cannon can be construed as "used in national defense." Therefore, this bill could and would in almost every instance be applied against the trade unions. The word "intentionally" would be used as a convenient pretext in preparing frame-ups against the workers.

A second bill would provide each state with what amounts to an official vigilante organization, the members of which would be free from arrest for almost anything except "treason or felony." In the business of strike-breaking it is considered neither treason nor a felony to club down the striking workers on a picket line. This becomes a matter of "civic duty."

These bills will be introduced in the state legislatures behind a smoke-screen of hysterical agitation against "subversive activities," "sabotage," and "espionage."



Cafeteria Workers' United Front Makes Clean Sweep In Elections

(Continued from Page 1)
dependent Hellenic Club, Chefs and Cooks Committee, Polish-Ukrainian Committee, Committee of Miscellaneous Workers, and Women's Committee.

OUTSTANDING CONTEST

Most significant individual contest of the election was the race of Larry Phillips, for six years a bitter and outspoken opponent of the reactionaries and racketeers, against William Kincheloe, chief spokesman for the United Rights, or "Crashshooters" as they are known to the food workers.

The election of Phillips marks the first time that a present member of the United Progressive Club, for years the most consistent opposition to the reactionary machine, and the initiators of the united front election proposal, has been named to one of the four key posts of Local 302.

Kincheloe, who had been attached formerly to the United Progressive Club and was expelled some time ago for pursuing reactionary policies in the union, made a bloc in this election, together with his followers, with William Mesevich, leader of the racketeers. His attacks on Phillips and the United Progressives went the limit in slanderous red-baiting.

Phillips' election was undoubtedly the bitterest dose which the United Rights had to swallow. It was he who single-handed at the AFL state convention in August challenged the program of collaboration with the boss political machines advocated by the AFL chiefs and who proposed the initiation of an independent labor political party. He met combined assault of Willkieites and Rooseveltians alike. Although a number of Stalinists were delegates at that convention, none took the floor in defense of Phillips' proposal. Phillips' AFL convention speech led to the split between Kincheloe and the United Progressives.

Phillips has been a member of the union six years. He came in with the organization of the Foltis-Fisher cafeteria chain in 1934. From the first he distinguished himself as a militant unionist and a particularly aggressive fighter against the racketeers. He was elected to the executive board in December, 1935, and served a year and a half term. In August, 1936, he was a delegate to the international convention of his union. He has also served on two contract negotiation committees.

In the local's elections of 1938 and 1939, Phillips ran unsuccessfully against Kramberg for the secretary-treasurerhip. Kramberg at that time had formed a joint slate with Mesevich.

Among the United Progressive members elected to office are John Bilsbury, Branch "A" organizer; Joseph Fox, Branch "A" business agent; Sidney Moraski, Harry Feller and Martha Ballan, Branch "A" executive board members; Sam Roth, vice-president of Branch "A"; Gus Sosa and Christ Cordista, general council members; Victor Gregorson, Branch "B" executive board member; James Gordon, delegate to the Central Trades and Labor Assembly. These, together with Phillips, have been the special targets of the reactionaries for years.

Fox was a leader of the Square-Deal group, the first to challenge the rule of the racketeers. The racketeers expelled him for this in 1935; but he was reinstated by the membership in 1937.

Sam Roth is the editor of *The Spotlight*, publication of the United Progressives which has been mercilessly pillorying the right-wing.

GORDON BEGAN THE JOB
The election of James Gordon marks the first real recognition by Local 302 of the worker who has borne the blows of the racketeers longest. Gordon is undoubtedly more hated and feared by the reactionaries than any other man. They had openly vowed

never to permit him at any cost to win office in the union. As a leader of the New York Amalgamated Hotel Strike in 1934, James Gordon emerged as an outstanding union fighter. He was General Organizer of Local 110 before its merger with Local 302 in 1936. As the original organizer of the United Progressive Club, Gordon has the satisfaction at last of witnessing the program for which he has fought so long become realizable.

During the campaign, it became apparent that there were no more active and vigorous groups than the United Progressives and United Spanish Workers Club. A great deal of credit goes to these groups for their indefatigable labors in rallying the membership to the United Union ticket.

This program of the United Union Committee, which was published in full in the December 21 issue of the *Socialist Appeal*, includes a general organization drive in which the entire membership will participate; the abolition of separate branches and the elimination of wage differentials; a vigorous fight for the miscellaneous and women workers, whose conditions are the worst in the industry; general wage increases and the improvement of working conditions throughout the industry; against any form of discrimination on the job or in the union on the grounds of race, creed, color, nationality or political belief; protection of the jobs and seniority rights of conscripted members; full measures to safeguard the unemployed members and to secure more jobs; democratic administration of the union, with the right of full and free discussion on all issues, and no appointments to union posts from above.

Representatives of the United Progressive Club and the United Spanish Workers have declared that the task ahead for the new officers is to prove to the membership that they really intend to carry out the program which the membership endorsed in the election. As one leader of the Progressive declared, "Our job has just begun! This will be a real victory for the union members only when the program for which they voted is carried out. Every officer is now on the spot. The members are saying 'Produce, or else . . .'"

The test will come this spring, when the contracts run out. A big fight with the bosses is in the offing. Only militant labor action will get results, as most of the members realize. They have put their hopes in the new leadership to be the fighting spearhead of such action. And they will be satisfied only with results.

THE FAMOUS FLINT BATTALION . . .
No words of ours need be added to the following inspiring letter, received last week from a leading Flint comrade:

"It's quite a commentary on all other so-called radical parties that none of them dare to distribute their papers at the plants, or in any way to individual workers except through the mails. By means of regular week-in and week-out plant distribution the Appeal has been made 'THE' labor paper here. No other paper is so well known as ours. The workers have come to expect us at the plant gates; if we miss a week they wonder why, where were we . . . we are a sort of institution. With every crisis in events, the Appeal is looked for with

We've been forced to the conclusion that we threw overboard a good thing when we dropped the heading "APPEAL ARMY" for this department. Today the title "APPEAL ARMY" describes, better than anything we can think of, the well-organized bodies of comrades who cover the nation's important industrial areas each week with increasing larger bundles of the "SOCIALIST APPEAL". So we revive the title "APPEAL ARMY."

FRONT RANKS FOR CHICAGO!!

Stepping into ranks previously monopolized by Minneapolis and Newark—and exceeded only by New York—Chicago has leaped into the front ranks of the Appeal Army with a doubling of its bundle order. For a full month now, the Chicago branch has been taking 1,000 copies of the APPEAL each week—and getting to new layers of the working-class with them.

Comrade H. J., now serving as Chicago literature agent writes: "Our work is going forward full speed. We are covering two unions, a portion of the Negro area, and house-to-house work on Sundays. Our comrades here are taking a very serious attitude toward regular work with the press."

"Rain or shine our papers are going out at the regular time, and we will double our order every time there is the slightest excuse."

"In Flint we have had all extremes in the reception of the Appeal at the plants. There have been times when we had to face not merely indifference, but actual physical assault from mistaken workers. On one occasion I remember I had a regular picket squad of unionists surround me and forbid me to sell the papers. On the other hand, I have had them stand in line and wait to get a paper . . . this is only a process of political development which always seethes in workers' minds."

"Other parties don't risk going to the workers in periods of reaction. We find our way to them at all times. We understand them, and we 'patiently explain.' We are stubborn people. The workers will learn to respect us for that quality. They know we mean business, and that we are not merely 'fair weather friends.'"

Join the Socialist Workers Party

TROTSKY MEMORIAL FUND

The following payments were made this week:

Newark	\$23.00		
New York	96.00		
Portland	10.50		
Pittsburgh	3.00		
Flint	20.00		
San Francisco	30.00		
New Haven	2.75		
St. Louis	5.00		
Allentown	7.00		
Toledo	1.00		
Quakertown	2.50		
Rochester	10.00		
Los Angeles	30.00		
Philadelphia	5.00		
Chicago	25.00		
Buffalo	5.00		
Hutchinson	10.00		
Boston	14.00		
TOTAL	\$299.75		
Branch	Quota	Amount paid	%
Boston	\$ 100.00	\$ 131.00	131%
Portland	10.00	10.50	105
Toledo	50.00	51.00	102
Milwaukee	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.10	102%
Baltimore	10.00	10.00	100
Detroit	200.00	200.00	100
Rockville	7.00	7.00	100
Hutchinson	10.00	10.00	100
St. Louis	5.00	5.00	100
Pittsburgh	10.00	9.00	90
Allentown	15.00	13.00	87
San Francisco	100.00	85.00	85
Lynn	100.00	85.00	85
Newark	150.00	123.50	82
Los Angeles	150.00	123.70	82
Chicago & Indiana Harbor	200.00	160.07	80
New Haven	20.00	14.00	70
Rochester	15.00	10.00	67
Flint	150.00	99.00	66
Buffalo	25.00	16.15	65
Philadelphia	30.00	19.00	63
New York	1000.00	531.00	53.1
Minneapolis and St. Paul	1000.00	530.00	53
Quakertown	7.00	2.50	36
Akron	10.00	3.00	30
Youngstown	50.00	6.00	12
Individual Contributions		2.30	
TOTALS	\$3509.10	\$2261.82	64%

The Negro Struggle
By ALBERT PARKER

The Courier Conference
The Pittsburgh Courier recognized, before the Hampton Institute conference was over, that nothing was going to come out of it that would be worth two beans in the struggle against Jim Crow in the army.

Evidently, then, at the last minute, the Courier, trying to salvage something out of the mess and to utilize the wide publicity the Hampton meeting got, decided to hold its own conference on the same subject, and there presumably take the steps rejected by Hampton. That was why this second conference, "called and sponsored" by the Courier, was called to order in Washington three days after the Hampton conference.

The overwhelming majority at Hampton seemed to be government job-holders and teachers or professors—what George Schuyler described as "soft-handed, well-groomed, cultured, income-tax-paying, pillars-of-society." This was a very fitting description—but it fits the composition of the Courier conference just as well.

The Who's Who in the Courier lists 41 names, and gives information about 31. Of these 31, 19 are either government job-holders, or teachers or professors. All "soft-handed," that is, not a worker in the crowd. In addition, most of them had also been at the Hampton conference.

Nor is the resolution of the second conference much better than that of the first. True, its language is sharper, more vigorous, more direct. Its position is less ambiguous, although it too does not name names or place the responsibility for the present state of things where it belongs. It also fails to take up the question of Roosevelt's "separate regiment" policy by name, only hinting at it.

It certainly is not a revolutionary solution. And yet there is signed to it the name of George Schuyler who, in criticizing the Hampton Conference, said that only a revolutionary approach can solve the Negro's problems. Instead of being revolutionary, as a matter of fact, it contains a section just as harmful to the Negro as anything pulled off at Hampton.

Not a Pro-Labor Resolution

That is the section dealing with labor, which calls on the government to investigate labor unions which by constitutional or ritualistic provisions bar Negroes from getting jobs. The Courier makes still clearer what is meant when it says, "we call upon the Attorney-General of the United States to prosecute these racketeering unions under the provisions of that (Sherman Anti-Trust) law."

That is, the conference called on the government to end Jim Crowism in the unions, the very same government that shows its approval of Jim Crowism as a principle by its handling of the Negro in the armed forces!

Let us see what the Courier's proposal would accomplish:

1. It will give the government (which dislikes both the unions and the Negroes) a handle to enter and break up the unions. Will this be in the interests of the Negro people—or in the interests of the ruling capitalist class ("the very people who keep race prejudice alive", as Schuyler put it)?

2. It will give reactionary, lily white trade union leaders a handle to incite white workers against the Negroes, for they will be able to say, "Do you see now why we want to keep Negroes out of our unions? Because they are our enemies and are calling on the government to prosecute us and break us up." Will this be in the interests of the Negro people—or in the interests of the reactionaries who want to keep Negroes out of the trade unions?

The one point that distinguished the Courier resolution at Hampton was the following:

"That Negroes in each community immediately proceed to the organization of a Defense Committee, composed of representatives of local organizations... to cooperate with the central committee in Washington, D.C., and with the local authorities." Said the Courier: "Once these organizations have united it is proposed that they hold huge defense mass meetings... Representatives from these united organizations would be selected to attend" another conference planned for Washington in January shortly after the next Congress opens.

This means that the Courier recognizes that action is necessary against the Jim Crow system in the army, and that action by the local organizations, that is, by the masses, is necessary. Insofar as the resolution draws attention to these things, it serves the interests of the Negro people.

But just because real action is necessary, the section of the resolution on the trade unions must be condemned, because it weakened it if it didn't destroy, the possibility of including the trade unions in the united front.

The main objection to be made against both the Courier and Hampton conferences, is that, while both ask for the correction of certain Jim Crow evils, they propose to leave the control of military training in the hands of the lily-white officer caste.

It is already a law that there shall be no discrimination in the armed forces—but since control of military training is in the hands of a military and governmental caste that wants to perpetuate Jim Crowism, discrimination goes on.

The National Defense Commission has already laid down the ruling that there must be no discrimination because of race or color in the factories getting war contracts, but because the bosses, who profit from racial division, control both the factories and the Defense Commission, discrimination goes on.

What is needed therefore is a system of trade union control of military training, to put control of it in the hands of the workers who have nothing to gain from discrimination. What is needed in addition is expropriation of the war industries and their operation under workers' control to put an end to discrimination in industry.

Stalin Calls "Party" Conference
Will, Like All Previous Ones, Be Preceded By Mass Purge

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

Stalin has summoned a Party Conference to convene on February 15, 1941 according to an Associated Press dispatch dated Moscow, December 20. The curtly worded dispatch states that the agenda of this, the Eighteenth Party Conference, will be limited to two points: 1) Discussion of the Party's "work in transport and industry"; 2) "Organizational questions."

The mere calling of a Party Conference would in and of itself constitute news of primary importance, and denote a major move on Stalin's part. It is the first Party Conference called in nine years. The preceding Conference—the Seventeenth—took place in January 1932. Coming as it does on the heels of recent Soviet developments, the significance of this call cannot be exaggerated.

If under Lenin the Party Conferences were milestones in the revolutionary history of the Bolshevik movement, then under Stalin every single one of the five Conferences already held was filled with a counter-revolutionary content.

In Lenin's lifetime twelve Party Conferences were convened—the Twelfth and last in August, 1922 when he was gravely ill. The most famous of them is the April Conference at which Lenin presented his "April Theses." Since Lenin died, five Conferences were called and held prior to the one scheduled for February, 1941. Each of them marked a new stage in the degeneration of the Russian Communist Party; each one of them served Stalin to consolidate power more and more firmly in his hands.

In the first four years after Lenin's death—1924-1927—three Party Conferences took place—the

against *Trotskyism* on an international scale. In February of the same year, Trotsky was officially deprived of Soviet citizenship. "A logical consummation of the Seventeenth Party Conference" (Trotsky).

Although in the interim two party Congresses have been held, Stalin has refrained from using the edged weapon of "Conferences." That he has exhumed it from his arsenal, coupled with the content of the agenda for the coming Conference, is ominously telling.

Since the passage of the June 26 laws lengthening the work week and prohibiting the workers from leaving their places of employment, the party organizations have been under constant fire for their failure to enforce this or that ukase in the interminable series of ukases issued by the Kremlin in the last seven months. A silent purge of the party ranks has been going on for some time now, but has obviously proved inadequate. Hence a "discussion" is on the agenda of the Conference on the question of the party's role in the economic life of the country. The second point on the agenda, *The Organization Question*, implies that there are shortcomings in the existing organizational set-up which obstruct the party's "work in transport and industry"—and therefore the party must be most certainly "renovated" organizationally.

Never has a Conference been held under Stalin not preceded by savage repressions and a large

scale purge. Stalin will not break this precedent in the eight weeks assigned for the "preparation" of the 1941 Conference. A major surgical operation is now in progress.

VITAL SECTION OF INDUSTRY MILITARIZED
The Conference call was issued on the same day that Marshall Timoshenko, head of the Red Army and Voroshilov's successor, promulgated a sensational decree: The Red Army itself will run factories "which will produce articles needed by the soldiers and in this way ease the burden on industry as a whole. The soldiers themselves will manufacture the articles" (*Jewish Day*, December 20, 1940).

If this report is true—and there is no ground for impugning its veracity, although the news was apparently ignored by the big metropolitan dailies—it implies far more than an extension of the compulsory labor legislation to the soldiers in the Red Army.

Timoshenko's decree—by order of the Kremlin—militarizes a vital section of Soviet industry—the defense industry which has operated for years under a special Commissariat, and which produces all the "articles needed by soldiers" from boots to bombers.

Whatever factories are taken over by the Army, these will then operate under military discipline, which in its turn has been recast under Timoshenko to conform with the discipline in bourgeois armies, Fascist or "democratic." There are millions of skilled and unskilled workers in the Ar-

December 20, 1940

A Midwesterner Is Flabbergasted By The New New York

By ART PREIS

I've just sat through most of a two-day convention of the New York District of the Socialist Workers Party. I've come away with the impression that maybe I've had an attack of amnesia and accidentally wandered off to my old bailiwick out in the mid-west, where a party gathering has always meant a gathering of workers.

When I first entered the convention hall, I was struck by a flaring banner, "Beat Minneapolis in The Fund Drive: Quota \$1000 Each."

Now, I know the New York local from the old days, when a sign like that would have wound me up with taped ribs from laughing so hard. The idea of New York's dilettantes challenging Minneapolis teamsters to anything! But things have changed.

From start to finish this was a workers' convention. In its composition and in its serious concentration upon the problems of the working class this convention reflected the fact that the New York section of the party has at last overcome the poison of its petty-bourgeois past and is spreading deep roots into fertile proletarian soil.

Almost the entire two days were devoted to reports and discussion on trade union problems; to the recital of experiences in the organized labor movement; to planning the party's program for advancing the principles of militant class-struggle.

Active union fighters in the food, maritime, ship-building, electrical and radio, garment and other industries spoke. Their reports painted a graphic and living picture of the workers' struggles in the New York area, a picture made real because these delegates are a vital part of these struggles.

Gone are the phrase-mongers, bohemians, and fake intellectuals. Gone with the wind-bags—the petty-bourgeois splitters of last April. In their place are loyal and serious-minded workers striving to plunge themselves deeper and deeper into the task of organizing and leading the working class to the conquest of power.

Who's Who Now In New York

Over 50 percent of the New York party members are active trade unionists. 35 percent of the New York party members are concentrated in the three huge and vital industries, food, electrical manufacturing and marine transport.

An additional sizeable sector of the party are workers in trades and industries as yet unorganized. These, taken together with those in organized trades, make a party membership that is decisively proletarian in character. A complete reversal of the condition that existed just eight months ago under the domination of the petty-bourgeois play-boys!

A day and a half of listening to reports distilled from the daily experiences of the class struggle has convinced me that the old days of phoney gab-fests that passed for an SWP convention in New York are ended—but definitely!

One incident which occurred during the convention deserves special mention. Two former SWP members from Gloversville, N. Y., workers who had been misled temporarily into the ranks of the petty-bourgeois opposition at the time of the split, paid a visit to the convention. They had just come from a call on the so-called Workers Party.

"But we couldn't find any workers there," they explained. "So we've quit them."

A few hours in attendance at our convention revealed enough real live workers. They asked for re-admittance into the SWP and were immediately welcomed by vote of the convention.

Watch Their Smoke, Minneapolis!

Every phase of party activity came in for thorough discussion. A vigorous drive was made on the question of building the mass circulation of the party press. Real plans were outlined; and they won't be pigeon-holed either, like in the old days.

I might not have believed it, if I hadn't seen it with my own eyes. But I'm here to tell the Minneapolis comrades not to take lightly the New York challenge about beating them in the Trotsky Memorial Fund Drive. Stop reading last year's newspapers, Minneapolis. You're not confronting Bronx hill-billies. You're up against proletarian fighters. And they're not kidding!

War Against Fascism

Winston Churchill's broadcast to Italy on Monday shows exactly to what extent this is a "war against fascism." The fascist regime of Italy is in difficulties as a result of the defeats in Greece and Egypt; the masses do not want the war; they are beginning to resist the regime. Whereupon Churchill seizes the opportunity to... whitewash the Italian royal house, the Pope, the army officialdom, i.e., Mussolini's collaborators and accomplices during these last eighteen years.

Churchill blames Italian participation in the war on "one man," Mussolini. That has as much truth as saying that Churchill alone is responsible for British participation. If only Mussolini wanted the war, why didn't the royal house and the army general staff prevent it? If they can stop the war now, they could have prevented its beginning. Churchill appears to be talking nonsense.

But he isn't. He is saying: "Boys, if you'll leave Mussolini in the lurch and come over to my side, I'll help you maintain your rule—of which Mussolini was only the front man—and as a token of my help in keeping you in power, I am making this speech whitewashing you." And this is the war against fascism!

Martinique: Two Negro Newspapers' Views
They Differ Only In Their Choice Of Slavemasters For This Negro Colony

By ALBERT PARKER

The ruling class of this country is preparing to seize Martinique, the French-owned colony with a population of a quarter-million colored people.

The fate of Martinique should be of vital interest to every Negro and white worker, for the question of Negro freedom in the United States is very much connected with what happens to the Negro people everywhere—in Africa, the West Indies, etc.

That was why the Negroes here and everywhere were and are so concerned about the independence of Ethiopia. We knew that the successful defeat of the Fascist invasion of Ethiopia would have been a blow at the bosses, the oppressors of the Negroes of all countries; that's why we of the Socialist Workers Party supported Ethiopia's fight for independence.

From this point of view, let us examine the editorials on Martinique which have been recently carried by two of the leading Negro newspapers of this country.

The Baltimore *Afro-American* editorial is entitled, "Let's Take Martinique." When the writer says let us, he means let the United States government take it. The arguments of the editorial are almost the same ones made by the American capitalists, who have had experience "taking" other colonial countries in the past:

"As long as France is tied to Hitler's apron-strings, it seems to us that the United States ought to step in and take over the island for the duration of the war.

"France couldn't object. It lies prostrate under Hitler's heel. After the war is over, it can have its island back.

"There is another reason why we should take Martinique. Its 250,000 people are poor and hungry. The British blockade has ruined the trade. Uncle Sam can do them a favor and get rid of a likely headache if he adopts these few French-speaking colored folks until peace comes."

In other words, says the *Afro-American*, Washington should take the island because it would be the best thing for its natives.

They are poor and hungry, says the *Afro-American*. But so are the people of the other countries Washington has "taken." Just look at Porto Rico! Its people were starved by Spain. Now they've been "taken" by the United States for more than 40 years and—the *Afro-American* would scarcely deny it—the people of Porto Rico have been poor and hungry throughout these years, and remain so.

And so far as "adopting" the island "until peace comes" is concerned, that is a childish joke. If that happened, it would be the first time in its history that Washington or London or Paris took over a small country and then willingly let it go. The bosses of this country don't take over col-

onies out of good nature or concern for their people's welfare—they take them to be able to exploit them, and Martinique is a rich prize which they will no more give up after the war than they gave up the Philippines 40 years ago.

The capitalists and their press say that the colored people in the colonies are not fit to rule themselves; that is why the imperialists must run things for them. This is the same vicious lie that they use in this country to perpetuate segregation and discrimination against the Negro people.

What have the *Courier* and the *Afro* to say about this? Why do they reject this theory for the Negroes in the United States and accept it for the Negroes in the colonies? How can they accept "white supremacy" for the colonies and logically answer the advocates of "white supremacy" in this country? Why did they demand the independence of Ethiopia and why don't they demand the independence of Martinique? How can they logically demand it for one, and not for the other?

It seems to us that these papers which claim leadership in the fight for equal rights for the Negro people "in all spheres of life" have some explaining to do to their readers.

As for us of the Socialist Workers Party, we take a view entirely different from those of the *Courier* and the *Afro-American* on this question.

We are against the "white supremacy" theory everywhere, in this country and in the colonies.

We are against the "lesser evil" theory, we are against all kinds of slavery and discrimination, in this country and in the colonies.

We don't want France to get back "its island," as the *Afro-American* calls it, because they would keep the people in slavery and oppression.

We don't want the Nazis to get it, because they would keep its people in slavery and oppression.

We don't want the United States to "take" it, because they would keep its people in slavery and oppression.

Martinique should belong to the people of Martinique.

A Crude Lie About France In The Saturday Evening Post

The chief feature in the Dec. 7 issue of the *Saturday Evening Post* is the diary of a British staff officer during the Battle of France. The details he gives constitute an annihilating indictment of the French bourgeoisie and its general staff. Blind, fatuous, complacent, stupid, lacking intelligence and imagination, cowardly—the bourgeois "democracy" of France emerges from this officer's diary shorn of every claim to any stature.

But the picture is too damning. The bourgeois "democracy" of France was exactly the same kind of ruling class which still rules in Britain and the United States. Therefore the author—perhaps at the suggestion of his publisher—casts about to find a striking detail which will enable him to make the situation of the French rulers different from that in Britain and the United States. He cannot find it because it does not exist.

Whereupon he invents it. It appears out of a clear sky at the end of his article:

"General Georges was asked point-blank why the promised counterattack had not been delivered. His liaison officer spoke for him and answered that the general could not give orders so far in advance of the inclinations of the division. This was an eye-opener, and it is only now that it is brought home to me that the formation of soldiers' committees, regularized in the French army in 1936 by Blum's regime, have

so far undermined discipline."

This is a lie made of whole cloth. Blum did not "regularize" soldiers' committees in 1936, or any other time. Not only Blum, but every party in the Popular Front—including the Stalinists—denounced the Trotskyists, who were the only party that demanded the formation of soldiers' committees. Still less were there soldiers' committees in May, 1940, when even the modest gains of the workers in the factories had been completely wiped out by the French government.

Soldiers' committees would mean the beginning of real democracy. France was not a democratic regime but a military dictatorship in 1940. Precisely because there was no real democracy, the morale of the French armies was soon shattered.

Gentlemen of the *Saturday Evening Post*: We brand you as publishers (and perhaps direct instigators) of a crude fabrication. You did it deliberately, in order to obscure the real lesson of France. You did it in order to blame the French working class for the fall of France, when everything else in that very diary which you publish shows conclusively that France fell because its rotten, degenerate bourgeois democracy was too impotent to defend France.

Had soldiers' committees existed in the French army, they would never have permitted the capitulation to Hitler. It was precisely in order to prevent the appearance of soldiers' committees and all

that they signify, that General Weygand insisted that the French government surrender. The government still had great resources at its disposal for military purposes. Paris could have been defended, as well as the south of France. And even if that fell, the armies could have retreated to North Africa and continued the war.

But Weygand and the rest of the general staff understood what continuation of the war under those conditions meant. After the terrible defeats in the North of France, the masses could see just what stuff their ruling class was made of. But at that point the ruling class would have to appeal to these masses. To continue the struggle required mobilizing these masses to build barricades and trenches on the outskirts of Paris, turn every house into a fortress, defend every street.

"It must not come to that," said General Weygand—as was authoritatively reported at the time, and has never been denied. Weygand likened the situation to that of Russia in 1917, and feared the coming of a workers' revolution if the war continued. "It must not come to that." Rather than that, he and the French "democracy" preferred to turn France over to Hitler.

Such are the indisputable facts. The crude bit of forgery in the *Saturday Evening Post* is deliberately designed to blur over these facts, which damn bourgeois democracy not only in France but wherever it exists.

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. IV—No. 52 Saturday, December 28, 1940

Published Weekly by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASSN.
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-3447

Editorial Board:
FELIX MORROW ALBERT GOLDMAN
General Manager:
RUTH JEFFREY

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
orders: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents
per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

"Reentered as second class matter December 4,
1939, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1879."

FIGHT WITH THE
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

ON THE WAR FRONT:

For:

1. Military training of workers, financed by the government, under control of the trade unions.
2. The establishment of special officers' training camps, financed by the government and controlled by the trade unions, to train workers to become officers.
3. Confiscation of all war profits—all company books to be open for trade union inspection.
4. Expropriation of all war industries and their operation under workers' control.
5. Trade union wages for all workers drafted into the army.
6. Full equality for Negroes in the armed forces—Down with Jim Crowism.
7. An end to secret diplomacy.
8. A peoples' referendum on any and all wars.

AT HOME:

For:

1. A job and decent living for every worker.
2. Thirty-thirty—\$30 weekly minimum wage—30 hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
3. \$30 weekly old age and disability pension.
4. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.
5. Workers Defense Guards against vigilante and fascist attacks.
6. A twenty-billion dollar Federal public works and housing program to provide jobs for the unemployed.
7. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
8. An Independent Labor Party based on the Trade Unions.
9. A Workers' and Farmers' Government.

Murray's Program

President Phillip Murray of the CIO has sent to Roosevelt a proposal for "maintaining continuous production" on war orders. The essence of the plan is labor-employer boards in each industry.

We are quite well aware of such differences as exist between the outlook of Murray and John L. Lewis on the one hand, and William Green and Sidney Hillman on the other. The main difference is on the question of industrial unionism and on that question, as we have often pointed out, we stand with Murray and Lewis against Green and Hillman. But on the question of "national defense" we find that all these four gentlemen see eye to eye with each other.

What does Green say? Addressing the quadrennial convention of the Carpenters recently he declared: "We maintain that labor should be represented on every board created by this government for the promotion of our defense program."

What does Hillman say? At the CIO national convention Murray declared that there should be a labor-employer board in every industry—substantially the same proposal that Murray now has made officially to Roosevelt. Hillman answered him: "We are starting on the course suggested by Murray... If it is the suggestion we set up defense industries commissions, we are on the way. We are right now setting it up in the shipbuilding industry and there will be an equal representation of labor and industry on that particular commission... We expect to do that in the aircraft industry as soon as we set it up in shipbuilding, and there will be representatives of labor."

And on November 30, Hillman announced the setting up of a "shipbuilding stabilization committee" along that line. And there's no reason to doubt that before he, Knudsen and Roosevelt are finished, they will have such committees in every industry. Why not? It's all to the advantage of the employers and their government.

So what's the difference in views among Hill-

man, Green, Murray and Lewis on this basic question? None that's visible to the naked eye.

Their proposal is as false as would be the proposal to give half the seats on a union executive board to the bosses. It's as false as would be a proposal for setting up compulsory arbitration boards. As a matter of fact, Hillman's actual boards—first in shipbuilding, then elsewhere—constitute a major step in the direction of compulsory arbitration.

We know that Murray and Lewis don't like the anti-labor consequences of such boards. Yet, reluctantly, without enthusiasm, Lewis and Murray ended up by proposing to Roosevelt the formation of such boards. That was inevitable, given the present political outlook of Murray and Lewis. They had to take some stand on the questions arising out of war production. Only two main positions were possible. Either they could, like Hillman and Green, agree to class-collaboration with the bosses and their government. Or they could declare themselves firmly as the defenders of the interests of the working class against the bosses and their government. One or the other! The issue is now posed on a razor edge and can't be evaded.

So Murray and Lewis have taken the same stand as Hillman and Green. Because to take the opposite stand means to launch the labor movement on the road of independent political action, on the road of a Labor Party. Because it would mean that the working class should itself become the power and the government of the country. That's the only real alternative to the Judas role of Hillman and Green. Everything in their past and present, however, keeps Murray and Lewis from adopting that alternative.

But the workers of the CIO don't have that kind of past and present. Their catastrophic experiences with the Hillman-Green-Murray-Lewis position will inevitably drive these workers, for their very salvation, to the road of independent labor action.

AFL Bourbons

The AFL bureaucracy, like the Bourbons, learns nothing and forgets nothing. Its conception of a good union man still is a fellow in one of the sheltered and well-paying crafts who has worked at the same trade for forty years in the same town. This stupid conception remains untouched by the 11-year catastrophic crisis which drove millions upon millions from their trades and their towns. It remains impervious to the inspiring fact that the trade union movement has more than doubled its membership in the last few years, and that the new members are the most militant and now constitute the backbone of the labor movement.

How all this passes by the dull mind of an AFL bureaucrat is shown in the Dec. 17 issue of the AFL *Weekly News Service*, in the column of its editor, Philip Pearl. He brazenly undertakes to defend the \$300 initiation fee charged by the Washington, D. C. local of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, against the complaint of a worker:

"In the first place, the only reason this migrant worker sought to join the union was because he couldn't get the (army construction) job otherwise." Note that smug, contemptuous reference to a "migrant" worker. Workers who have to migrate are just scum to Mr. Pearl. "If he had enough skill to qualify him to become a member, the probabilities are that he acquired his skill working in scab shops as a non-union man." So what, Mr. Pearl? Five million good union men were non-union men five years ago—and today they're better union men than you are.

But then Mr. Pearl gets down to the meat of the thing. "The chief reason for initiation fees is to keep new members out when there are not enough jobs to go around for the members already in." His idea of a union is a job trust. Keep all the jobs for "our" boys, and to hell with everybody else. To add insult to injury, after keeping the others out Mr. Pearl calls them men who "acquired their skill working in scab shops."

Mr. Pearl's policy meant, concretely, during the years of mass unemployment, to drive out of the unions the unemployed who couldn't keep up their dues, and to keep the unemployed out of the union. It meant to set up an impassable barrier between the employed and the unemployed, pitting one against the other.

Precisely such a policy, pursued by the the Social Democratic leaders of the German trade unions, served to drive the desperate unemployed into the arms of Hitler.

Fortunately, the CIO industrial union movement has grasped the importance of uniting employed and unemployed and bringing all into the unions. Fortunately, too, some AFL unions don't set up impassable barriers against interested workers. But this Bourbon outlook of the AFL bureaucracy can still do great damage to the American labor movement.

Anaconda Copper Trust
Hits The Jackpot AgainIt's Just Like It Was In 1917—The Sky's The
Limit—It's Nice To Have Friends In Washington

The Anaconda Copper Mining Company, and its subsidiaries, which has a virtually complete monopoly on the ownership and production of all copper in the United States, and controls no less than 60 percent of the world supply, announced a consolidated net profit of \$24,241,675 for the first nine months of 1940. This is more than a 100 percent gain in profits over the 1939 corresponding period.

It is obvious that the Copper Trust is continuing and even bettering its profiteering record of the last war. Anaconda Copper in nine months of 1940 made \$3,438,805 more profit than it did for the whole of 1918. The net take for 1918 was \$20,802,870. By the end of the present year, the total copper profits will far surpass the 1917 total of \$25,203,751.

What this monumental profiteering really means in terms of the influence of the Copper Trust over the present Administration can only be realized when we consider how Anaconda Copper garnered its lesser profits during World War No. 1.

TOOL OF TRUSTS
HEADS WAR BOARD

Heading the War Industries Board, which had dictatorial control over all industry and government purchasing during the last war, was Bernard M. Baruch. Baruch was a speculator in copper stocks who was given his start in the brokerage business by James Keene, a confidential broker for J. P. Morgan and

Company. Baruch made his first big pile in the Amalgamated Copper manipulations of the Morgan-controlled National City Bank out of which came the Anaconda Copper trust. In 1904, Baruch became a confidential broker for the Guggenheim interests which had control of Anaconda Copper. As chairman of the War Industries Board, this tool of Morgan and Guggenheim spent government funds at the rate of \$10,000,000 annually.

Baruch was ably assisted in cleaning up for the copper trust by John D. Ryan, president of the Anaconda Copper Corporation, who was Assistant Secretary of War under Woodrow Wilson, and head of the copper buying committee of the War Industries Board.

After the war the House of Representatives set up a special committee, headed by William J. Graham of Illinois, to investigate the war-profits scandals. The evidence of this committee fills 21 massive volumes, and includes overwhelming proof of the graft, corruption and gigantic thievery of Anaconda Copper in conjunction with the government.

HOW THEY SQUEEZED
THE GOVERNMENT

Among the findings of the Graham committee was the fact that just two weeks before Wilson sent his war message to Congress on April 2, 1917, Ryan and Baruch had arranged a monopoly combination of all copper producers to sell to the government 45,000,000 pounds of copper, an indispensable

war material, for 16 2-3 cents a pound. The combine was known as United Metals Selling Company, with Ryan as president. From this combine, the government during the war bought 523,338,735 pounds of copper at a total of 592,258,674 pounds purchased.

The average cost of producing copper, according to the Graham committee's findings, was 8 to 12 cents per pound. But by October 15, 1917, when the government made its second great copper purchase of the war, the price charged was 23½ cents, and advanced to 26 cents by June 15, 1918. Copper profits ranged from 33 to more than 200 percent.

From 1916 to 1920, the Navy Department did tremendous purchasing, including a great deal of copper. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who had continuous important dealings with Baruch and Ryan, was a young fellow named Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The press on Tuesday, November 26 of this year gives front page notice to the fact that Roosevelt had "lunch" with Baruch just prior to an important special secret conference of the President with the heads of the War and Navy departments and the National Defense Commission. Although the present incredible profits of Anaconda Copper are evidence enough, this luncheon tête-à-tête tops off the proof that Roosevelt is not forgetting his old-time friends like Barney Baruch.

So much for Anaconda, the same story can be told about all the other big trusts. War—it's wonderful—for the fat cats.

Latin-American Masses
Fear Uncle Sam's "Aid"

By QUEBRACHO

BUENOS AIRES (By Mail)—The announcement in New York that the Uruguayan government was preparing to consider construction of air and naval bases at the mouth of the Rio de la Plata, in connivance with the United States, produced a sensation in this part of the continent.

In a recent interpellation in the Uruguayan Senate, Foreign Minister Guani said that already in June a U. S. military commission had visited Uruguay to survey favorable sites for bases. Yet nobody here knew of the existence of this commission; only now has the Uruguayan government said a word about it. What is more: every rumor concerning this possibility of such bases—rumors which always came from the United States—have been categorically denied by Cordell Hull and the South American governments. The game is now clear: these rumors were launched as trial balloons in order to accustom the people of our countries to the idea of having Yankee imperialism installed in a series of Gibralters in South America.

Despite this preparation the announcement now made about projected bases at the mouth of the Rio de la Plata, a few miles from Buenos Aires and Montevideo and controlling the most vital zone of the South Atlantic, has deeply moved our people. The innumerable organs of publicity controlled by Yankee imperialism—which are operated here in truly amazing number, increasing all the time—have exhausted all methods to convince the masses of the necessity of installing such bases against the "Nazi danger," and that the bases will be built "without affecting in any way the sovereignty of the countries involved." In spite of all this propaganda, the uneasiness of the public cannot be soothed away, even though this uneasiness often fears to express itself because it doesn't

want to appear as a partisan of Nazi-fascism.

The press and organizations here which serve the Axis powers have of course hastened to raise a banner in their "anti-imperialist" banner, filling this city with posters against the cession of these bases, accusing the Uruguayan government of "treason," and pointing to the danger of permitting Yankee imperialism to control the mouth of the Rio de la Plata.

The Chilean government has felt it necessary to declare that it is not considering the possibility of ceding bases to the United States, while a representative of official circles has declared himself flatly opposed to such cessations.

For its part, the Uruguayan Senate, after interpellating Minister Guani, made a declaration similar to that of Chile, although in this case the action loses much of its weight since it was inspired by the "Herrerista" party, which is linked to Nazi-fascism. (Since this article was written, the three Herrerista ministers have resigned from the Uruguayan cabinet in protest against the negotiations for bases.—Editor.)

The Argentine government has as yet said nothing, although it is known here that acceptance of the plans for "continental defense"—i.e., cession of bases on the southern coast, in Patagonia—is the condition demanded for granting the \$100,000,000 loans and arrangements for commerce, now being negotiated in Washington by our Prebisch mission. If that condition is agreed to, there will be a great public outcry, especially in the army and navy, which may well be taken advantage of by the Nazi-fascists.

However, everything indicates that Wall Street is going to move with extreme caution and advance only little by little its plan for economic and military domination of South America. Cordell Hull has declared for the hundredth time that the proposed bases will not affect the sov-

ereignty of the South American countries. The bases would be under the control of the South American countries which would construct them, and which would, only in case of external aggression, put them at the disposition of the other nations of the continent, including, forsooth, the United States. In return, the South American warships would be able to utilize the bases of the United States—I needn't underline the comical aspect of this "in return."

When all factors are taken into consideration, it is easy to see that, in spite of the great uneasiness shown by the people at the announcement about the bases, the project will go forward. That is already stated by General Baldomir, President of Uruguay, in spite of the contrary vote in the Senate.

The ever-greater campaign of the "democratic" press of this continent, in the service of Yankee imperialism, will make inroads in convincing public opinion that opposition to these plans is the exclusive work of totalitarian propaganda and that all those who don't support it are members of the "fifth column." In this way they will be able to castrate, for the present, the patriotic impulse of the South American people. In this way they will stifle the voice of the revolutionary workers by identifying them with Nazi-fascism and discredited Stalinism. And the South American people will accept with clenched teeth, as a "lesser evil," the open or covert installation of Yankee imperialism on our coasts.

Until they awake to the realization that, through the treason of their governing classes, this step means the chaining of our peoples to the war machine of the United States and our enslavement by that which will be the most brutal imperialism of all times, Wall Street imperialism-

November 25, 1940

Shachtman Takes
Chair Vacated By
Professor Burnham

By JOSEPH HANSEN

The announcement of Max Shachtman in the December issue of his *New Internationalist* that he has been led "to abandon the position that Russia is a workers' state," will come as a surprise to no one who has followed the development of the petty bourgeois group to which he belongs. Shachtman has only moved over to the position occupied by his ex-client, Professor Burnham, before the latter abandoned the camp of the working class for the camp of the bourgeoisie.

It will be recalled that Burnham for some years held the view that the Soviet Union is not a workers' state. Nevertheless so long as the Franco-Soviet pact endured he found it possible to defend the Soviet Union unconditionally against imperialist attack. With the switch of Stalin into the orbit of Hitler, marked by the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact, Burnham found he could no longer defend the Soviet Union.

Like Burnham, Shachtman now finds that "developments in the world situation occasioned by the Second World War raises to the forefront once more, the Russian Question." That is, in response to the pressure of the war-mongering imperialist bourgeoisie, he has decided that this is the time to revise all the carefully worked out analyses of the Soviet Union accomplished by the Fourth International in peacetime.

Like Burnham, Shachtman finds that "Russia's role in the war on the side of German Imperialism only emphasizes fundamental trends inherent under Stalin's Regime," trends which Shachtman, however, unlike the more perspicacious Burnham, did not discover until after the war broke out. In this delay Shachtman again demonstrates his dependence upon Burnham as theoretician and underlines what was pointed out by Trotsky during the faction struggle with the petty bourgeois opposition, that Burnham was its ideological leader, Shachtman his attorney.

In promulgating his views on the class nature of the Soviet Union, Burnham was extremely cautious: "The ruling stratum of the Soviet Union does not constitute a crystallized bourgeois class in the traditional sense, nor can it be predicted with assurance whether its evolution in the future—even if unchecked—will be toward such crystallization." Now that Burnham is no longer present to indicate to Shachtman some of the implications of his views, Shachtman finds it possible to plunge head over heels down the logical course of Burnham's position, i.e., that there is an entirely new ruling class in the Soviet Union. "The old crap was revived—in a new, unprecedented, hitherto-unknown form, the rule of a new bureaucratic class."

In arriving at Burnham's position on the class nature of the USSR—"a new attempt at revising the class theory of the state" as Trotsky remarked of precisely this position in 1937—Shachtman bases himself almost exclusively on Trotsky's analyses of the Soviet Union. Just as J. R. Johnson considers Trotsky "one of the most powerful agents of social dynamics who has lived in this or any other time" only to conclude that Trotsky was a political idiot, so Shachtman says of Trotsky that "Nobody has even approached him in the scope and depth of his contribution to understanding of the Soviet Union" only to conclude: "The traditional view of the (Fourth) International on the class character of the USSR rests upon a grievous theoretical error." Trotsky, a Marxist on the level of Marx, Engels, Lenin, was unable to arrive at a correct determination of the class nature of the Soviet Union! Apparently Shachtman considers Trotsky a theoretical idiot.

Shachtman bolsters his arguments with numerous quotations from Trotsky's works. It is only necessary to put these quotations back into their context however to see that each one of them refutes Shachtman at every turn. Even more damaging to Shachtman is the fact that Trotsky answered long ago every one of the arguments that are now brought out as something new by Shachtman. If one merely listed the points which Shachtman attempts to establish, a completely crushing answer could be given him simply by counterposing Trotsky's previous answers to the revisionists who stood a few years ago where Shachtman stands now. Two articles alone of Trotsky's written in 1937: "Once Again: The USSR and its Defense," and "Not a Workers' and Not a Bourgeois State?" published in *Internal Bulletins* Nos. 2 and 3 of the SWP answer every one of the essential arguments now raised in 1940 by Shachtman.

"The touchstone of a revolutionary political leader is the question of the state," Trotsky remarked in his *History of the Russian Revolution*. Belatedly Shachtman has provided another remarkable demonstration of the importance of this dictum in working class politics.

In the January 1938 issue of *The New Internationalist*, Shachtman himself aptly characterized the stale dish he now serves up as an innovation: "At bottom, the ultra-leftist position on the Soviet Union which denies it any claim whatsoever to being a workers' state, reflects the vacillations of the petty-bourgeoisie, their inability to make a firm choice between the camps of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, of revolution and imperialism."

The next logical step of Shachtman's development in the wake of Burnham is, like his former client, to make a firm choice.

NEW YEAR'S EVE CELEBRATIONS

Dec. 31—9 p.m. Until All Hours

IN NEW YORK CITY

GERMANIA HALL

3rd Avenue and 16th Street

Subscription: 91 Cents

DANCES AND GAMES

REAL BLOWOUTS

EATS AND DRINKS

Auspices: SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

IN CHICAGO

1114 PRATT BOULEVARD

Subscription: One Dollar