

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. II—No. 36 Saturday, September 3, 1938
Published every week by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six
months. Foreign: \$2.50 per year. Bundle order
3 cents per copy. Single copies 5 cents.

Entered as second-class matter September 1,
1937, at the post office at New York, New York,
under the Act of March 3, 1879.

MAX SHACHTMAN
Editor
HAROLD ROBERTS GEORGE CLARKE
Associate Editors
S. STANLEY
Business Manager

Cordell Hull's Philosophy

A new note of Secretary Hull's, addressed to
the Mexican Ambassador, and released to the
press last Friday, brings to a turning point the
current dispute between the Mexican and U. S.
governments.

Hull, rejecting bluntly and rudely Cardenas'
just, amply motivated and sufficiently modest
reply to his earlier note, in effect denies the
independent sovereignty of Mexico insofar as
its relations with imperialist powers are concerned.

Hull's correspondence on this issue of the
Mexican expropriation is, in fact, achieving the
status of a general defense of the foundations of
imperialism. The latest note is a condensed essay
on the "philosophy of property," and includes
extended reflections on the eternity of property
rights, tracing their alleged ancestry far back
beyond the world of modern civilized nations.

Let us hope that Cardenas will see fit to show
up the hypocrisy of the good Secretary by manipulating
his own philosophy. Hull might well
be asked what happens to these profound philosophical
considerations when they concern, say,
relations to other major imperialist powers—for
example, those engaged in the late War, which
have somehow been rather lax about "just compensation"
in the Hull manner.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the issue
which is now raised between the Mexican and
the U.S. governments, an issue which is brought
to a head by Hull's new note. Squarely and
openly imperialism is drawn up against the
claims and rights of exploited peoples and
nations.

It is high time to demand an answer from
Roosevelt's cohorts in the American labor movement.
The line is marked clearly: on which
side do they stand? It is impossible to fight for
the freedom of the people at home when we
participate in the oppression of the people of
another country.

"Peace" Means War

The "democratic" imperialist governments of
the United States, England and France have
good reason to congratulate themselves on the
results of the proceedings of the Second World
Youth Congress which held its sessions at
Poughkeepsie, New York. For the middle-class
youth who were delegates to the Congress clearly
indicated that they will support these governments
through thick and thin in case they are
involved in a war against Germany, Italy and
Japan.

There is no other conclusion that can be
drawn from the "peace pact" in which the approximately
500 delegates present at the Congress
pledged to do all in their power "to give
assistance to victims of treaty violations" and
"to take necessary concerted action to prevent
aggression and to bring it to an end."

Is there any one who does not see the implication
of these fine-sounding words? The youthful
delegates of Bulgaria and Hungary grasped
their meaning without difficulty. They refused
to sign the "peace pact" because they were for
a revision of the unjust Versailles Treaty, and
they protested against guaranteeing existing
boundaries.

The Bulgarian and Hungarian delegates struck
the nail on the head. The policy of concerted
action (a new formula for collective security)
against aggressors signifies, at the present time,
nothing more than guaranteeing France and
England in their spoils of victory. If we accept
the basic approach of the Congress, the delegates
of Hungary and Bulgaria were perfectly justified
in their reasoning. Why should the winners of
the World War keep their booty if the delegates
coming from the satisfied imperialist powers are
willing to go to war to keep the boundaries as
they are, what blame can attach to the youthful
delegates of the defeated countries if they favor
support of their governments in an attempt to

revise those boundaries? What is sauce for the
goose is sauce for the gander.

Is there anything else necessary to prove the
correctness of the revolutionary Socialist position
that for the workers to support their "democratic
governments" during a war will play into the
hands of the fascist governments? Here are
delegates of Hungary and Bulgaria reacting in
a chauvinistic manner to the chauvinism of the
delegates of the democratic capitalist countries.
Nothing else could be expected. If there is anything
that will arouse the German and Italian
workers to struggle against their fascist governments
during a war, it will be the example of
their brothers in France and England.

"There can be no peace without justice,"
grandiloquently proclaims the "peace pact." Justice
to whom? Did the delegates consider the
subjugation of millions of colonial slaves by
France, England, Belgium, the United States as
something that falls within the realms of justice?
Does their struggle against aggression include a
struggle against these imperialist countries for
the liberation of the exploited colonial masses?

How noble it is to be for justice when it does
not involve taking up the cudgels on behalf of
the exploited of one's own country!

Had the Congress been composed of middle-
class pacifist youth, one could be more tolerant
in estimating its work. For while pacifism is
helpless in the struggle against war and capitulates
completely to the ruling class when war
is actually declared, it is nevertheless an expression
of a genuine hatred of war and all that it
involves, especially when it is embraced by young
people. But those who gave the tone to the
Congress were not naive pacifists; they were
young Stalinist bureaucrats who used the tremendous
prestige and influence of the Stalinist
apparatus to confuse the youthful innocents and
make them enthusiastic propagandists for the
imperialist war mongers.

As these delegates will scatter far and wide
to preach the gospel of concerted action against
aggressors, trying to fool themselves and others
that this means peace, they will be confronted by
the advanced youth of the working class, who
will also preach peace but a peace that can be
achieved only through the class struggle, through
the overthrow of all imperialist governments,
fascist and "democratic" alike.

While the Stalinist and their innocents will
prattle about justice and righteousness, the
class-conscious youth of the working class will
demand the right of the people to decide the
question of war and peace in a referendum, will
demand the expropriation of all war industries,
the transfer of all armament funds for public
improvements. The working-class youth will
strive for peace by participating in the class-war.

Wages and Hours

According to estimates just released by officials
of the Labor Department as many as four
million workers might obtain shorter working
hours ultimately under the new Wage-Hour
Law. The law provides that after the first year
the work-week will be reduced to forty-two
hours, and after the second year to forty hours.
That means that the estimated four million
workers will have to wait two years before their
hours of work will be reduced. That is not anything
to make a worker shout for joy.

The purpose of a reduction in the number of
hours should be two-fold. For the worker who
is employed it will mean more leisure, and for
the unemployed worker it will mean a greater
opportunity to find work. If the capitalist system
is unable to furnish work for all workers
on the basis of a forty-hour week, then the
work-week should be reduced to thirty or even
less in order to make room for all the unemployed.
And there should be no reduction in
wages.

What the workers want is a job at their own
trade with a wage that will give them a chance
to live decently. The only productive class in
society is not willing to remain idle because
industry under capitalism cannot function.

Permanent unemployment, even under conditions
where some relief is granted, is not in
the least satisfactory to the American worker or
any other worker. The workers do not want to
be thrown out of industry, to lose their skill and
to become members of a new class of permanent
unemployed. That is the threat confronting millions
of workers.

The present Wages-and-Hours Law has almost
nothing to offer either to the employed or
unemployed. Not only are its provisions meager,
but they apply only to those industries operating
in inter-state commerce. Domestic workers, agricultural
workers and many other categories of
workers are excluded from the operation of the
law.

A really drastic reduction of hours will offer
a partial solution to the problem of unemployment.
A six-hour day and five-day week will
put some millions of workers back at their jobs.
And if a reduction to thirty hours a week will
not suffice, then a further reduction must be
made. Whatever work there is should be divided
amongst all workers with a guaranteed minimum
wage.

A job with a decent minimum wage for every
worker! Let the workers organize a struggle for
this necessary and reasonable demand.

Attacks on NLRB Reflects
Blows Suffered by Labor

William Green Joins
With Employers
Against Board

By JAMES BURNHAM

During the past month, the
long sniping from many quarters
at the Wagner Act and its creation,
the National Labor Relations
Board, has broken out into
a sustained and rounded attack.
As in the past, we discover in the
vanguard spokesmen for the Re-
publican Party and for the Na-
tional Association of Manufactur-
ers.

On this occasion, however, the
American Federation of Labor is
taking more conspicuous part,
and indeed is currently the chief
public critic. Hardly a day goes
by without a new denunciation
from Bill Green.

For the first time, moreover,
President Roosevelt has entered
the controversy. Green last week
held a long conference with the
President. Following it, Green
told the press that he had dis-
cussed possible amendments to
the Wagner Act, and that Roose-
velt was in favor of (unspecified)
changes in order to clear up cer-
tain "ambiguities." By failing to
issue a denial, Roosevelt has tacitly
admitted the correctness of
Green's report.

Want Courts Supreme
The bosses have long since
made clear the nature of their
attack, and the amendments
which they demand. They wish
to give employers the right to
petition the N.L.R.B. directly, at
present excluded by the wording
of the law. They wish to subordi-
nate more completely the actions
of the Board to the regular
Courts, in which they have full
confidence. And they wish espe-
cially to write into the law certain
requirements of union "responsi-
bility" which would enable them
to utilize faked-up or even gen-
uine contracts as a means of
smashing militant union activi-
ties.

The A. F. of L. charges that
through its power to designate
the bargaining unit, the N.L.R.B.
has favored industrial unionism
and the C.I.O., and that the law
should be amended so as to "pro-
tect" the right of employees to
bargain in craft unions. Green
objects also to the personnel of
the N.L.R.B. and tried unsuccessfully
to block the re-appointment
of Board member Smith. Green
joins hands with the bosses in
wanting the Board to be com-
pelled to give increased recogni-
tion to contracts: that is, Green
wants to be able to negotiate,
over the heads of the workers,
a contract which the Board can-
not upset.

The Act was thus in one sense
a concession to the workers, a
concession for the sake of the
more general aim of preserving
capitalism and renewing profits.
At its inception it was opposed
by many (though by no means
all) employers, who were short-
sightedly against making such
concessions. Interestingly enough,
there is no longer any explicit
employer objection to the Act as
a whole; the demand now is only
for "amendments" or "modifica-
tions."

The Act is "Ambiguous"
The Act, called into being by
the incipient movement of the
workers, became itself a factor
stimulating union organization.
The "ambiguity" mentioned by
Roosevelt is a fact, and no accident.
The Act is sufficiently flexi-
ble to be utilized on one occasion
as a factor in the growth and



BILL GREEN

It would be a delusion to im-
agine that the present attack is
a merely legalistic one. Like the
passing of the Wagner Act, the
present attack must be under-
stood in terms of the actual re-
lationship of the social forces
involved.

Aims of Wagner Act
The Wagner Act, sequel to Sec-
tion 7A of the N.R.A., came into
being as a class collaborationist
device designed: (1) to swing the
workers behind the New Deal's
method of salvaging U. S. capi-
talism; and (2) to keep the grow-
ing mass movement of the work-
ers from getting out of capitalist
bounds, to restrain it firmly with-
in the frame-work of the bour-
geois state.

The Act was thus in one sense
a concession to the workers, a
concession for the sake of the
more general aim of preserving
capitalism and renewing profits.
At its inception it was opposed
by many (though by no means
all) employers, who were short-
sightedly against making such
concessions. Interestingly enough,
there is no longer any explicit
employer objection to the Act as
a whole; the demand now is only
for "amendments" or "modifica-
tions."

The Act is "Ambiguous"
The Act, called into being by
the incipient movement of the
workers, became itself a factor
stimulating union organization.
The "ambiguity" mentioned by
Roosevelt is a fact, and no accident.
The Act is sufficiently flexi-
ble to be utilized on one occasion
as a factor in the growth and

Militancy Alone Will
Save Gains Under
Wagner Act

Attacks N.L.R.B.

strengthening of workers' organi-
zation; on another—as it has sev-
eral times already been—as a
factor weakening the workers
and their unions.

There is no doubt that the
N.L.R.B. has made many deci-
sions in general favorable to the
unions, and specifically favorable
to the C.I.O.

This is not, however, a tribute
to the beneficence of the Wagner
Act and the N.L.R.B. In reality,
it is a reflection in the juridical
sphere of the strength, during
the period recently ended, of the
upsurge of the labor movement in
general and of the C.I.O. in par-
ticular. The problem of the
N.L.R.B. was to adjust class con-
flicts; and this meant above all
to meet the challenge of the C.I.O.

Strength Shifts to A. F. of L.
Today's drive to amend the
Wagner Act in a reactionary di-
rection, and the prominence of
the A. F. of L. in this drive, sim-
ilarly reflects the weakening of
the organized labor movement be-
fore the new slump and more
specifically the terrific set-backs
which the C.I.O. has received
during the past year. These set-
backs are altering sharply the
relative positions of C.I.O. and
A. F. of L. A year and a half ago
no one would have dreamed of
disputing the dominance of the
C.I.O. in the American labor
movement. Today the A. F. of L.
is shifting again toward the as-
cendant.

As in all important cases, the
parliamentary questions, though
having a secondary relative au-
tonomy, are in the last analysis
subordinated to the relationship
of social forces. The fate of uni-
onism in this country will be de-
cided neither by preservation nor
by amendment of the Wagner
Act, but by the class strength and
militancy of the workers them-
selves, outside of the courts and
the halls of Congress.

This does not, of course, mean
that workers should be indiffer-
ent to the fate of the Wagner
Act. On the contrary, all proposed
amendments designed to aid
craft against industrial unionism,
to bolster faked contracts, to les-
sen employer responsibility, or to
limit and bind trade union activi-
ties should be vigorously resisted.
But the best way of putting up
this resistance also is not by par-
liamentary jockeying but by
extending and deepening the
mass organization of the workers
and by combating militantly the
direct offensive of the bosses on
the economic front.

FATE OF POLITICAL REFUGEES
RESTS WITH LABOR

By V. R. DUNNE

The American Fund for Politi-
cal Prisoners and Refugees, spon-
sored by an active committee of
militants, places before the Amer-
ican labor movement a task de-
manding immediate action.

In Europe, brave working-class
fighters are today facing torture
and death at the hands of Fascist
agents of reaction. Where yester-
day magnificent trade unions and
workers' political movements
flourished, and promoted the in-
terests of the working class, today,
bloody, totalitarian regimes herd
all working-class militants into
concentration camps and ruth-
lessly crush every workers' or-
ganization.

Crumbs from Evian Table
Refugees from Fascist terror
clamor for help from the "demo-
cratic" nations of Europe but re-
ceive only the meager crumbs of
assistance which the Intergovern-
mental Refugee Committee feels
forced to give them. This Com-
mittee, now continuing in Lon-
don the work begun last month
by the Evian Conference, at-
tempts to hide its imperialistic
aims behind a mask of humani-
tarianism and high idealism.
However, when the Committee
discusses the practical aspects of
providing new homes and livings
in democratic countries for the
thousands of helpless victims of
Fascist reaction, it reveals the
decadent nationalism of demo-
cratic capitalism.

Delegates to the Conference
speak of unemployment in their
own countries; the necessity for
restrictions on immigration, etc.,
etc. The Prime Minister of South-
ern Rhodesia objects to the Con-
ference's proposal to send 500
Jewish families there since "it
would appear to cut across the
policy of keeping South and Cen-
tral Africa under British influ-
ence." Democratic capitalism
neither can nor desires to offer
real assistance to all of the per-
secuted victims of Fascism. Each
democratic country participating
in the Conference is itself being
driven into a position of extreme
nationalism by a dying-capitalist
order.

If it is decided by the Confer-
ence to evacuate 600,000 refugees
from Germany and Austria in the
next five years (no persons over
fifty are to be included, since they
cannot be deported upon to earn
their own livings in the new
country) how many of these will
be working-class refugees from
Fascism? Myron Taylor, the
spokesman for the United States
Government at the Conference,
formerly spokesman for United
States Steel, can be depended
upon to guarantee that no revo-
lutionary victims of Fascism be-
come the beneficiaries of "demo-
cratic humanitarianism."

"Democracy" Mocks Refugees
The humanitarianism of the
democracies is a mockery. In
most of the so-called democratic
countries the right of asylum is
today a meaningless phrase.
Workers who have escaped the
nets of Fascist police spies in
their homelands are now being
terrorized by other capitalist po-
lice spies in the democratic
countries to which they have fled.
Even France, the liberal nation,
the democratic ally of the U.S.S.R.,
for whose favor, Stalin sacri-
fices the welfare of the French
workers has passed laws imposing
severe penalties upon any French
citizen aiding an exile. Its Popu-
lar Front Government under Da-
ladier makes it impossible for
political refugees to obtain citizen-
ship status and thus earn a liv-
ing. Nor is France more reaction-
ary than other European democ-
racies.

A thousand examples of perse-
cution of political refugees by all
of these democratic countries
could be given. Foremost in our
minds, however, is the story of
that most heroic political exile
of our times, Leon Trotsky. Who
can forget the cruel persecution
of Trotsky by the governmental
agents of almost every European
democracy during the past ten
years? Above all, what excuse
can be made for the brutal depor-
tation of Trotsky from the Nor-
wegian democracy in 1936, ex-
cept that it was dictated more
by its tangible capitalist interests,
namely its trade with the Soviet

Union, than by its abstract
democracy.
No Safety in Stalinland
Equally opposed to the entrance
of revolutionary refugees from
Fascism is Stalin's "Fatherland."
Serge, Cilla, Tarov, Beal and
many others have borne witness
to the fact that no revolution-
aries are safe in the U.S.S.R. Even
the corrupt Comintern bureau-
crats from foreign countries, who
long ago left the line of revolu-
tionary Marxism are not always
safe there.
In fact, the Soviet Union has
its own political refugees. They
have fewer living refugees
probably than do Germany and
Italy, since the G.P.U. agents are
more expert at ferreting out revo-
lutionists; more successful in
staging frame-up trials against
them; and more ruthless about
delivering them to the firing-
squad.
G.P.U. Allied With Police
Directly related to this is the
program upon which Stalin's
G.P.U. agents in capitalist de-
mocracies have now embarked,
that is, a program of co-operation
with capitalist police spies to
persecute and deport to Fascist
prisons the revolutionary refu-
gees who have found a temporary
shelter in these countries. Demo-
cratic capitalism, so-called, now
preparing a new war for the re-
division of the world among the
big capitalist powers, Fascist and
Democrat, welcomes the assis-
tance of the G.P.U. in crushing
the revolutionary elements in the
ranks of the workers. The clear-
est thinkers in the ranks of
American labor, who, themselves,
resist being pushed into the in-
ferno of war, owe it to their
own movement as well as to the
European labor movement to
come to the rescue of the hounded
political refugees who most con-
sciously oppose the war-makers
of Europe.
The fate of the new trade union
movement in this country will be
tragic indeed if it fails to under-
stand the meaning of this cruel
persecution. These brave mili-
tants who have seen the great
trade union movements of Ger-

Pinning 'em Down
By JAMES CASEY

SURPLUS BUT NO BREAD

New York City administration figures show that during
the last seven months relief cases have increased by 41,115. There is no ap-
parent reason to believe that other cities have fared better.

Autumn is almost upon us and then the dreaded winter for the
jobless and destitute. The most conservative estimates place the
number of unemployed at ten to twelve millions and, adding their
dependents, at least twenty-five million men, women and children
will face the coming months with lack of food, shelter and clothing.

Almost simultaneously with the issuance of the relief case re-
port came the statistics relevant to the bread problem from the
United States Department of Agriculture. These reveal that the coun-
try has too much wheat. To be exact, the United States has a wheat
surplus of 517 million bushels. In other words, there is in the country
enough surplus wheat to feed all the hungry millions for four full
years.

Yet the jobless and their dependents can expect no more than
25 millions bushels to be set aside for relief. What will be done with
the other 482 million bushels? The farmers don't know. The gov-
ernment doesn't know. Nobody knows!

The wheat may be held in grain elevators to keep up prices. It
may be exported to South America through a government subsidy
plan. It may be destroyed, as in other years of the New Deal ad-
ministration.

So, although the nation's granaries are stocked to overflowing,
millions of workers will be forced to skimp on bread crumbs and
walk the streets hungry in search for jobs.

And the Washington administration will go on singing about
the blessings of the New Deal!

THE PRESIDENT'S MORALS

Stop your kidding, Mr. Roosevelt!
The President has set up a cry that the Republicans are po-
litically immoral.

Mr. Roosevelt is an astute politician, in fact the cleverest of
any of those representing the rival wings of the Wall Street oligarchy.
Accordingly, when he starts to shed tears in the open, it is in order
to take inventory.

It seems that the Idaho Republicans entered the Democratic
primaries to help in the defeat of Roosevelt's Senatorial "yes man."
One way for the Democrats to "get even" would be to enter all the
Republican primaries and, by means of their vastly superior number,
nominate all the stooges hand-picked by Mr. Roosevelt. That would
silence the G.O.P. for a while. But far it be from us to advise the
President in his forays with his immoral brethren.

What does interest us are the implications that are likely to
be drawn by many workers from Mr. Roosevelt's lamentations. True
enough, the Republicans are politically immoral, if one wishes to
be charitable in thus describing them.

But since when, Mr. Roosevelt, has morality been considered a
trait or requisite among capitalist parties and politicians?
Having himself invoked the morality issue, does the President
remember his strange silence when the vice-president of his National
Committee had a gang of strong-armed men pelt Norman Thomas
with eggs and then kidnap him, because the latter attempted to ex-
ercise his constitutional right of free speech in New Jersey?

Does Mr. Roosevelt recall how the State Democratic boss ruth-
lessly suppressed meetings of the C.I.O., while appeals to the White
House for intercession and some action were met with a shameful
display of buck-passing or went entirely unheeded?

Does Mr. Roosevelt have any recollection at all of how Mayor
Hague, representative of Standard Oil, boasted in the newspapers
that the President was behind him in his fascistic depredations, with
not a word of denial forthcoming from the White House?

What had happened in those days prior to the election campaign
to the President's sense of political morality? Why had he waited for
weeks (after the storm had blown over) before making a lukewarm
criticism of attacks on free speech, without even then daring to
mention the name of Boss Hague? We repeat where were Mr. Roose-
velt's virginal political morals at a time when they should have been
given the widest exhibition.

We might also point out that the Great Moralist has remained
silent all these years in the face of the black crime of California's
big banking and utility interests against Tom Mooney.

Or does the President believe it is more moralistic politically
to woo the resources and votes of the California's reactionaries than
to try to right one of the gravest class injustices in America's history?
No worker can have any brief for the Republican bambosozers
or their immorality, to use the President's characterization. However,
they are, in no respect, either better or worse than the political mor-
alists in Mr. Roosevelt's own camp.

So far as America's workers are concerned, they can give answer
to the President's moralistic cry with that apt phrase which he not
so long ago used on a less appropriate occasion:
"A plague on both your houses."

Timely Articles On War
Features September N.I.

The September issue of the
New Internationalist is off the press.
Although emphasis is laid on the
dangers of a world war, the con-
tents are varied. Albert Gates
writes on the "Myth of Isolation"
and Hal Draper reviews the
course of Franklin D. Roosevelt
in an article entitled "Roosevelt,
the War Monger." The "World
War by Stages" is discussed in a
book review by B. J. Widick in
which books by Major R. Ernest
Dupuy and George Fielding Elliot,
by Hanson W. Baldwin, Liddell
Hart, Sutherland Denlinger and
Charles B. Gary are covered. The
three articles sum up compactly,
yet fully, the course of American
imperialism toward war.

The role of Canada in relation
to world politics is described in
detail in an article by E. Robert-
son. Robertson's views have since
received ample vindication in the
speech of President Roosevelt
and the attitude of the United
States toward Canada.

Saviours of Capitalism
The soothsayers or saviours of
capitalism, as represented by its
outstanding schools and schools
of thought—Harvard University,
Brookings Institute and Jerome
Frank—are dissected and their in-
adequacies exposed in a lengthy

review by Dwight Macdonald.
A favorite of New Internationalist
readers, George Novack, con-
cludes the second part of his re-
view on "The Politicos" in an ar-
ticle entitled, "The Two-Party
System in the United States."

Political Survey
The editor's comments are con-
cerned mainly with the develop-
ments in New York politics, pri-
marily the course of the Amer-
ican Labor Party; the Roosevelt
purges and the various pension
schemes which have arisen.

Continuing the public discus-
sion of issues now being dis-
cussed in the Socialist Workers
Party and the Y.P.S.L. (4th In-
ternationalists), Albert Goldman
writes on the question of the la-
bor party.

"In Memoriam" is a review by
Elsa Reiss on the life of her
husband, Ignace Reiss, murdered
by the Stalinist G.P.U. S. Stanley
writes once again on contemporary
India.

Various other features complete
the September number, which can
be purchased at 20 cents per copy
or a subscription entered for one
year for the price of \$2 by ad-
dressing:
NEW INTERNATIONALIST
113 University Place
New York, N.Y.

COPS SURROUND
N. Y. RELIEF SIT-IN

(Continued from page 1)
locked although the bureau is
regularly open until 5 P. M.
Immediately a patrol of police,
uniformed and in plain clothes,

was established about the build-
ing and no one was permitted to
enter. Even the rear was guarded
to make sure that no food was
given to the demonstrators.
Messages of support came from
all the neighboring W.A. locals
and even the New York office of
the Alliance, controlled by Stalin-
ists who hate the militancy of Lo-
cal 15, sent a message of support

signed by Jerome Benton. With
the national convention of the
Alliance near, the bureaucrats
who support LaGuardia and his
relief-slashing program are forced
to give lip service to militant
demonstrations.
ASK FOR THE APPEAL
AT YOUR NEWSSTAND