volved in this progressive force.

"First, with regard to the in-

tellectuals, Bertrand Russell is

far the most distinguished in-

tellectual we have on the Com-

mittee, but in joining it he

made it quite clear that he was

prepared to give "neither time

nor money," a condition of

which we were rather rudely

reminded when we asked him if

he would sit on the Commis-

Russell apparently was too

The "LABOR WITH A WHITE SKIN CANNOT EMANCIPATE ITSELF WHERE LABOR WITH A BLACK SKIN IS BRANDED" — KARL MARX.

Negro Question

≡ Robert L. Birchman ≡

West Indian Negroes' Jobs in Canal Zone Defended by Minneapolis Labor

by CARL O'SHEA MINNEAPOLIS, Minn.-The attempt of William Green to gain labor's endorsement for his move to bar West Indians from jobs as skilled workers in the Panama Canal zone received a set-back when the Minneapolis Central Labor Union voted to disregard any distinction as to race and citizenship of workers in the Panama zone,

and simply approved that efforts be made to as-

sure that every worker received union wages,

hours and conditions. William Green is asking all AFL bodies to support a congressional amendment to appropriation bills for the Canal Zone, which amendments would eliminate 12,000 West Indian Negroes from

skilled occupations. Mr. Green doesn't mind the

Questions Use of Term "Negro"

Negroes working at unskilled jobs.

I question very much the correctness of your column-heading-"The Negro Question."

The word Negro is a legitimate one and found in the dictionary (so is the word "slave"). And the Greenwich Villager, the successful singer, etc., may be very proud of it. Even while they lick the boots of the white bourgeoisie, they trade on their "solidarity" with their race. And the "race" men often take a strong and almost masochistic delight in speaking of the "Negro."

YET-they all know that a great portion of the colored working class resent the word second only to the word "nigger." Not from any inferiority complex, as the "race" newspapers continually suggest, but rather because of their genuine militancy and their still inarticulate class-conscious-

Colored people would rather be called such. They are not seeking to escape their color, (they are not Greenwich Villagers), but to escape its accompanying indignities. And to call them "colored people" as they wish, instead of "Negroes" is not catering to prejudice, etc., but just the opposite, and is in fact, gettng off the high horse of a

kind of condescension. It is only when you are already familiar with a colored man that you speak about the "Negro." Don't forget that when we take the Appeal to our colored brothers on the WPA, in the factories, or in their homes, we show them page 3 firstand your column. And their eyes fall on "The Negro Question." It make me feel like a social

worker or something The title sounds like something meant to appeal to white people alone, just as the phrase "servant problem" is loved most by the masters.

Let's remember we are talking to people—as well as about them. We are talking to perhaps the most revolutionary group in the United States. It is not a "question" what to "do" with them-or even entirely a question of what they are to do. They have no "question." They have no choice but to struggle. They are already angry. They merely lack the "piston box" to hold and put to work the steam of their wrath. They lack the socialist revolution. They lack-so far-the leadership. And believe me, it will be a great leadership, great in more than just theory, that can guide the unleashed fury of the colored race.

So please put me down for one, who would rather hear about the "Revolt of the Black Man" or the "Colored Peoples Struggle" or any other such thing rather than the "Negro Question." Titles in a mass paper are rather important. Buffalo, New York

[Lets hear from other readers if they feel the way V. C. does about this.]

THE RUSSELL FIGHT ---A STUDY ON LIBERALS Launches Red Purge

By WALTER O'ROURKE

been in the headlines of the bour- sity for a militant, working class certaining of the truth which sell wrote books in which he ex- their government. pressed opinions of sex relations

Bishop Manning himself sent a search of more professorships? Leon Trotsky. However he was protest to the school board which No, these liberal professors pre- not at all anxious to become in-

aining what democratic rights very eyes-if they would only we still possess.

BUT THE LIBERALS CAN'T LEAD THAT FIGHT

But the liberals who protest so the unhesitant support of the ONLY THE WORKERS vehemently against this reaction- progressive forces in American WILL BRING FREEDOM

sity faculty members pledge the self against still more reactionary "impartial." sum of five dollars apiece to fight philosophies. this "serious menace to academic But we defend this right befreedom." (We might ask of the cause academic freedom is in-liberty and progress in general Committee for Cultural Freedom volved and not the freedom of a will have to be dealt by the workif they were at all disturbed by man who is "deserving" of sup- ers. The uninspiring figure of a LaGuardia's attempt to destroy port. On the contrary, Russell's Russell, afraid to open his mouth, the Transport Workers Union a record as a fighter for democratic can never be the leader in the few weeks ago.)

other "shocking" events. The Rus- It is difficult to find in the as part of the struggle for all sell case is just one more incident, period of the last few years a democratic rights can and will and a minor one at that, in the greater injustice done to a single be led by a militant, revolutionorganized campaign to prepare man, a more reactionary blow at any working class which by the country for war. The attempts the progressive force in society- dauntlessly throwing its force to force the unemployed into the he revolutionary working class- against those of its class enemy army and navy, the WPA prose- than was carried through at the can inspire and gain the support and exploit you in peacetime cutions in Minneapolis, the frame- Moscow frame-up trials. The of all the oppressed strata of up of the Teamster Union officials Commission to investigate these society.

in Sioux City, LaGuardia's at-The appointment of Bertrand tempts to smash the TWU and trials and defend Leon Trotsky Russell, English mathematician many other incidents have been had as its mission not merely the and philosopher, to the faculty of more than "shocking" to work- defence of an individual or even the City College of New York has ers; they have shown the neces- a group. Its mission was the as-

And these liberals—these white group of traitors and assassins or that did not please the bourgeois knights fighting for academic reveal them as the true representmoralists. Because of his ideas freedom-Russell himself-have atives of the only progressive about free love, the family and they shown their readiness to join force in society-the revolutionreligion, there arose a storm of the working class in its struggle ary proletariat. protest from religious and other against the bosses and thereby reactionary sections of New York | the cause of reaction? Or do they |lend his support to the British continue to humble themselves in Committee for the Defense of

appointed Russell. As a result a fer to exercise on a comparably aw suit was started by Mrs. Jean safe issue like the Russell case In a letter to L. Trotsky on May Kay, a Brooklyn taxpayer; she rather than to challenge directly 7th, 1937, Charles Sumner, secrecontested the legality of the ap- the real reactionary force in our tary of the British Committee Russell was not a citizen of the war and the governments, demo- trials writes as follows: United States and that he would cratic or dictatorial. They prefer have an immoral influence on the to ask favors of the boss class children of New York attending rather than to cross the barri-City College. Judge McGeehan cades and throw their lot in with made a decision cancelling the ap- the working class. The governpointment because "The conten- ment campaign directed against tion of the petitioner (Mrs. Kay) the very existence of workers' orthat Mr. Russell has taught in ganizations receives scant attenhis books immoral and salacious tion from our professors and their doctrines is amply sustained by friends. They are too busy safely the books conceded to be the defending the academic freedom writings of Bertrand Russell." of Bertrand Russell, while the There is no doubt but that this power of the working class, which decision is a blow at academic is the foundation of academic reedom and that it must be op- freedom as of all our liberties, is posed by all interested in main- being eaten away before their

> open them. The Call (Mr. Norman Thomas' paper) of April 13th declares that in society. ". . . Professor Russell deserves

ary example of captialist demo-life." Now, as was stated above, freedom, is the sorriest of the this cause should never be placed than the woods. For the trees are Communists want it only for and the like, have been met with lot—not even having the courage on a personal plane as The Call such figures as Judge McGeehan themselves, not for anyone else, rank and file action in plant after to issue a fighting statement. He does when it says that Russell is and the woods are the democrat- especially not for the Trotsky- plant. These widely separated acpreferred to leave all of this to personally "deserving" of the sup- ic or dictatorial oppression of the ites." the Civil Liberties Union and took port of progressive forces. Some entire working class by the powhis whipping docilely in the hope perspicacious people have said erful state machine of the cap- is just the beginning. All too soon as proof of the irresponsibility of that the bone would be tossed that we have not supported Rus- italist class. When it comes time every real labor militant, every the union. back to him if he submitted sell because we disagree with his to fight the violent and decisive progressive, every war-opposiastounded," Dr. Boas of Colum- is true that we oppose his philo- to give "neither time nor money," bia, "deeply shocked"—the Com- sophy which will be dealt with are "too old and too preoccupied fighters will be crushed side by mittee for Cultural Freedom peti-shortly in our press. However, with other matters" or have an- side with the spurious Stalinists. tions Mayor LaGuardia to urge although Russell's philosophy is other Russell case to peck at. And without these real elements,

rights has hardly earned him the fight for academic freedom. This But the past year has seen defense of which The Call speaks. worthy and important struggle

purges had resulted in the complete emasculation of labor unions. On the other side of the fence the most vicious and regeois press for many weeks. Rus- policy against the bosses and would either condemn Trotsky actionary attacks were made against all who opposed the and the Fourth International as a American Legion type of "Americanism." One delegate introduced a resolution which would have required every delegate to sign a pledge stating that he was neither a Communist or a Nazi. Bertrand Russell was asked to

The official vote of expulsion ment with the vote standing 52 over the union's end of the negofor, 37 against. Five CIO locals tiations; from all reports they are ly shown in the pamphlet. have already concurred in the ac- purely on the defensive and Murtion of the central body.

His Own Medicine Ironically enough, Osthimer is pointment on the grounds that society - capitalism, imperialist for an inquiry into the Moscow a delegate representing a white collar workers union (Local 29, U.O.P.W.U.) from which, a little

> last night by Joseph Ditzel, pres- the UAW-CIO in Detroit last One of the major issues raised by the finks' atbusy elaborating his "advanced opinions on fundamental social questions" to put either time or money in investigating the greatest frame-up in history directed against the only progressive force my house during the strike, after week at 40-hours pay. they had been run off the picket line, begging me to let them march." The Stalinists, Ditzel The case of Bertrand Russell

ment will be a huge, sprawling, The decisive blows in defense grotesque thing, devoid of all deof academic freedom as well as mocracy and all militancy.

> Workers of America! Stand against the purge of radicals and militants in the labor movement! Stand against the weakkneed leaders who capitulate so cravenly before the pressure of the war-mongers! Stand against every opponent of full and complete democracy in the union! Stand for the mighty force of organized labor which constitutes your only weapon for defeating those who would despoil and send you to your deaths in time of war!

General Motors has shown little or no inclination to make any concessions whatever to the UAWnize the shop steward system, and has generally behaved as though he felt that the corporaunion to go to hell.

stewards system.

Militants Propose Strategy

This was thrown in his face meeting of the GM sub-council of government.

Company Provokes Men

heard from Hillman or Murray or the GM Bargaining Committee.

The fight for the 30-hour week of the entire booklet. with the 40-hour pay is only beginning. It is yet to be seen what the effect will be of an avalanche of demands from local unions everywhere that the leadership seriously take up this slogan.

Any attempt to pass off a poor agreement on the membership, which many believe that Reuther, Thomas and Co. may attempt to do, will very probably meet a stern rebuff.

Toledo CIO Council Launches Red Purge (Continued from Page 1) (Continued from Page 1)

Our readers will be glad to know that they can CIO. President Knudsen, accord- now obtain all information and background maing to reports, has emphatically terial on the fink suit against the Minneapolis stated that he will grant no wage General Drivers Union Local 544, in a pamphlet increases, that he will not recog- published by the Northwest Organizer-"Behind the 544 Suit."

The fink suit against this militant Drivers Union began in 1938 and has aroused national intertion was in a position to tell the est in the labor movement. The flagrant, open attempt to blacken the name of the Driver's Un-Sidney Hillman and Phillip ion, the methods used by the bosses to break this was taken shortly before adjourn- Murray, CIO moguls, have taken union which has been and continues to be the backbone of the Minneapolis movement, are clear-

The history of the union itself, since its rebirth ray is beginning to spread the in 1933-34, the organizational and economic gains opinion that the union will have to the workers of the city in that period, the to give up demands for the shop workings of the gigantic bookkeeping system used by Local 544, are all written into the pamph-

The preface, written by Miles Dunne, editor of Negotiations have begun at the the Northwest Organizer and secretary-treasurer over a year ago several Trotsky- beginning of the slack season in of the Teamsters Joint Council, parent body of ites were expelled "for being an- the industry when the company Local 544, is a splendid analysis of the rise of the ti-Roosevelt," at the instigation can afford a struggle with the unof Osthimer and other Stalinists ion much better than during the shows clearly the connection between the rising in the union. Now the official par- fall upswing. This fact is recog- working class, the gains forced out of the emty line has swerved and poor Os- nized by the militant membership ploying class, and the present frantic drive thimer is behind the eight ball. of the union, as was shown at a against organized labor by the boss class and the

ident of the Chevrolet local. Os- week, where a motion was passed torneys in the trial was the disbursement of funds thimer stated, during his defense requestion that negotiations be by the union. Charges that the treasury of the speech, that during the Chevrolet postponed until the production union was a "huge iron safe from which the offistrike he had visited the home of pick-up, and at that time to begin cials dipped at will," have been ably refuted by Ditzel "nearly every night." Dit- a real fight not only for the shop one chapter, written by the union bookkeeper zel-who was opposed to the ex- steward system, wage increases, herself, outlining in detail the process of keeping pulsion—said not only Osthimer, abolition of the D. list, seniority, books for the union. Even people who knew some "but a lot of Communists came to etc., but also for the 30-hour of the intricacies of that system were amazed at the painstaking details when they read this section. Every three months, in addition to the regular audit by the auditor from the International The GM Corporation, well Brotherhood of Teamsters, the union hires a pubcontinued, said they wanted to be aware of its temporary advan- lic certified accountant firm to go over the books. able to claim some credit for win- tage, has been provoking dozens C. Ward Clarke, who is the accountant regularly cracy really present a sorry pic- the defense of academic freedom and the excited liberals is just ning the strike. "I said I am for of minor incidents in the plants. assigned by his firm to audit 544's books, stated ture. Bertrand Russell, their is an important cause, worthy of another illustration of how they freedom of speech, I'm for it for These provocations, speed ups, before the Central Labor Union that "544's books standard bearer in the fight for the support of the workers. But choose to see the trees rather everyone, even Communists. The the taking away of rest periods are the best set of books I have ever seen."

The history of the union's fight against opening its books to the enemies of labor is ably traced. tions have been thrown up during that it will open its books to any bona-fide labor From the very beginning, Local 544 has insisted committee, and that the books and financial reports are open to any member of the union, at any time. But the five "members" of the union philosophy. This is stupid and we battles against this reactionary tionist and every revolutionary tinue, the union leadership thus are and have been avowed organizers for the Professor Speer of N.Y.U. is can only shrug our shoulders. It class, they are always prepared worker will feel the Iron Heel of far has found no answer except "Associated Independent Unions, Local 1," a child the war lords. The real worker- to advise the membership to use of the boss organization which is now known as caution, to be respectable and to the Associated Industries. They have tried retrust in the top committee. No peatedly to draw members away from Local 544 the appeal of the McGeehan deciin some respects reactionary, we They either remain on the side the core and soul of the working to the corporation's offensive, to held membership within Local 544 they repeatedthe membership's problems of insecurity of employment and tech- of them even boasted that "a bunch of business nological displacement, has been men are financing the suit against the union."

Miles Dunne ends his preface very fittingly with the following words-and they set the tone

"Labor has no champion but Labor. No one can defend labor but labor. The interests of a labor union in a hamlet and in a metropolis are precisely and exactly the same. . . . Labor must fight for its rights with understanding, with clarity, with honesty. . . . But labor must fight."

We heartily recommend that they send immediately and get this very worthwhile pamphlet.

They can obtain copies of "Behind the 544 Suit" by sending 5c to the Northwest Organizer, 257 Plymouth Ave. N., Minneapolis. The sale of the pamphlet has exceeded all expectations and it is well to get your order in early.

The Struggle for a Proletarian Party

By JAMES P. CANNON

National Secretary, S.W.P.

(This is the fifth of a series of articles by Comrade Cannon, to acquaint our readers with the party's estimate of the dispute which arose in the party, was debated in a sevenmonths' discussion, and was settled by a decisive majority at the Third National Convention, April 5-9.)

The Case of Burnham

In the manner of all unreconstructed petty-bourgeois, for whom personal considerations, and especially personal grievances, real or imaginary, weigh heavier than the problems of the party and the class, our oppositionists industriously circulate the accusation that we have been "persecuting" Burnham. It is told around that Cannon especially, who is the "embodiment" of all things evil in the party, cannot tolerate any smart people in the leadership and wanted to "drive Burnham out of the party." There is no doubt that this cry gained some sympathy from the humanitarians in the party and netted some votes for the opposition. Others, unappreciated aspirants for leadership, saw in the "persecuted" Burnham a symbol of their own heartbreaking tragedy. All the insulted and injured rallied to his defense with instinctive solidarity.

Nevertheless, this grievance is entirely imaginary. Burnham never encountered any personal hostility from the proletarian wing of the party. On the contrary, as the record amply demonstrates, he has always been handled with silk gloves and given all kinds of liberties that were denied to others. His qualities and abilities were appreciated in the highest degree and every step that he made in our direction, that is, toward Bolshevism and complete integration into the party, was welcomed and encouraged. Far from trying to "drive Burnham out," extraordinary efforts were made to draw him more completely into the party life. At the same time, the more experienced and discerning comrades understood very well that he was standing in an untenable position; that sooner or later he would have to make up his mind to come all the way with us or go back to the bourgeois world. The unavoidable decision, when it finally came, was of his own

In looking through my personal files the other day I ran across a letter from Comrade Dunne, addressed to me in California, November 21st, 1936. This letter is convincing evidence of good will toward Burnham. Vincent wrote: "I have received from Comrade Burnham quite a long letter of very good criticism about The Organizer and the election campaign I think that Iim d

a very good job and it is especially gratifying to know that he follows so closely and is able to speak in terms that indicate he is developing very swiftly. I will send you a copy of his remarks, most of which I believe are quite valid. I think that his estimation of the effects of my candidacy and its relation to the tasks of the union in the election is not very well thought out, but one could not expect this of him, having had little or no experience in the mass movement."

This letter strikingly-illustrates the friendly attitude of the proletarian elements toward Burnham and the hopes entertained for his future development. At the same time it puts the finger very deftly on his weak spot-"no experience in the mass movement"- which, unfortunately, Burnham made no effort to remedy and which undoubtedly contributed very heavily toward his failure to assimilate himself into our movement. This letter shows that Dunne was willing to learn from the intellectual. Too bad it never occurred to Burnham that he might learn something from the leader of workers. Had he but known it, there was much he might have learned.

Comrade Dunne might have added another and even equally serious weakness in Burnham's position: his lack of experience in the party. One cannot learn all that needs to be known about a party and its inner life and functioning on weekly visits to the meetings of the Political Committee; and one cannot be a serious leader of the party in his spare time. The pre-war Social Democracy was a sprawling, slow-moving reformist organization which proceeded on the theory that it had unlimited time to advance to socialism at a snail's pace in a completely normal evolutionary process, uninterrupted by wars and revolutions. The leadership in the main corresponded to the character of the party. Lawyers, doctors, teachers, preachers, writers, professors-people of this kind who lived their real lives in another world and gave an evening, or at most two evenings, a week of their time to the socialist movement for the good of their souls-they were the outstanding leaders of the pre-war socialist party.

They decided things. They laid down the law. They were the speakers on ceremonial occasions; they posed for their photographs and gave interviews to the newspapers. Between them and the proletarian Jimmy Higgins' in the ranks there was an enormous gulf. As for the party functionaries, the people who devoted all their time to the daily work and routine of the party, they were simply regarded as flunkeys to be loaded with the disagreeable tasks, poorly paid and blamed if anything went wrong. A prejudice against the professional party workers. The real

honors and the decisive influence went to the leaders who had professional occupations outside the party and who, for the most part, lived typical petty-bourgeois lives which were far removed from the lives of the workers they were presumably "leading."

When we organized the Communist Party in this country in 1919, under the inspiration of the Russian revolution, we put a stop to all this nonsense. We had the opinion that leadership of the revolutionary movement was a serious matter, a profession in itself, and the highest and most honorable of all professions. We deemed it unworthy of the dignity of a revolutionary leader to waste his time on some piddling occupation in the bourgeois world and wrong for the party to permit it. We decreed that no one could be a member of the Central Committee of the party unless he was a full time professional party worker, or willing to become such at the call of the party. I think we had the right idea in 1919. It is all the more right at the present hour of the historic clock when the organization of the proletarian party on the highest

possible basis of efficiency is the supreme problem of the revolution. By and large there is no excuse for any exception to this rule unless the party itself, for reasons of its own, finds it advisable to have a prominent leader in this or that position outside the party to serve party ends. Naturally there are and have been and will be cases where the personal responsibilities of the individual cannot be provided for by the party, and he may have to seek an external occupation for economic reasons. That is the case right now with a great many party comrades who ought by right to be devoting their entire time to the party. But such situations have to be regarded as temporary expedients, to be cut short when the financial resources of the party improve.

It is only natural that a man of the outstanding talents and equipment of Burnham should play a leading role in the party. This was universally recognized. At the same time, it seems to me, it placed upon Burnham the obligation to put himself completely at the service of the party and make party work his profession. In the early days of our acquaintance with him I took it for granted that he had this end in view. Far from barring this road to him, I personally made numerous attempts to open it. I first broached the question to him in the summer of 1935. Even then he was highly critical of the administrative inefficiency of the Trotskyists; he even propounded the theory that this was an inherent weakness of Trotskyism. He was inclined to the opinion that our "regime"—which was then "embodied" by Shachtman and Cannon -was so pre-occupied with political ideas and with the conviction that they would prevail in spite of everything, that the organizational and administrative machinery for realizing the ideas was not given sufficient attention. (That was before Burnham discovered that Cannon has no political ideas and no interest in

I proposed to him at that time, in the most friendly spirit. that he help us remedy the undoubted weakness. I proposed concretely that he make an end of the two-for-a-nickel business of instructing college students who have no intention of connecting

talents entirely to the party. After "thinking it over" for a day or so he rejected the proposal. The reason he gave was somewhat astounding: He said he was not fully convinced of the wisdom of devoting his life entirely to a cause which might not be victorious in his lifetime! Naturally, I could not give him any guarantees. . . .

After my return from California in the summer of 1937, when we were proceeding to form our party again after our expulsion from the S.P., I again raised with Burnham the question of his taking the post of National Secretary. Again I received a negative reply. In the pre-convention discussion which preceded our foundation convention in Chicago a little more than two years ago, Burnham began to develop his revisionist theory on the Russian question. In addition he began to raise the "organization question" in a manner that suggested a difference with us that was something far more profound than disagreement over this or that detail of our current work. In reality, his criticisms were directed not so much at the party regime as at the organization conceptions and traditions of Bolshevism.

He began to express a great deal of concern over "democracy" after the revolution, somewhat in the manner of those democrats who identify Stalinism with Bolshevism. We were greatly disturbed by these manifestations. They seemed to indicate quite clearly that Burnham was moving not toward us, but in an opposite direction. Comrade Shachtman and I, who were working very closely together at that time, had jointly elaborated the organizational resolution against the resolution of Burnham. He and I had several personal conversations about these alarming symptoms of Burnham's defection from the line of our movement. We had followed a deliberate course of minimizing personal friction. This was not so easy in view of the haughty and provocative attitude of Burnham, but we did succeed in keeping personal antagonisms down to a minimum. In one conversation which we had with Burnham during this period, he made it quite clear that his apprenensions were directed at our orthodox Bolshevism on the organization question, or at any rate at our interpretation of it. He expressed the opinion that we, as leaders of a future Soviet, would be too ruthless in our suppression of opposition.

However, he was by no means sure of himself on these points. He was obviously going through a difficult period of skepticism and internal conflict which was undoubtedly aggravated, if not inspired, by a hopeless contradiction between his personal life and his position as a party leader. However, it appeared to us that his Souvarinist views about Bolshevism and Stalinism were not by any means fully formed. His revisionist views on the Russian question had not yet led to counter-revolutionary conclusions with regard to defensism or defeatism. We hoped that he would surivive his personal crisis and find his way to Bolshevism. To facilitate that, as I said before, we did everything to maintain friendly personal relations, without making any concessions whatever in principle, either on the Russian question or the organiza-