

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. III, No. 51 July 18, 1939

Published twice a week by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N.
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months. Foreign: \$2.50 per year; \$1.50 for six months. Bundle orders: 2 cents per copy in the United States; 3 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 2 cents.
Bronx and Manhattan subscriptions are: \$1.50 for six months; \$2.00 for one year.
"Reentered as second class matter February 16, 1939, at the post office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879."

Editor: MAX SHACHTMAN
Associate Editors: HAROLD ROBERTS, FELIX MORROW
Staff Members: EMANUEL GARRETT, JOSEPH HANSEN
Business Manager: SHERMAN STANLEY

FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY FOR:

1. A Job and a decent living for every worker.
2. Open the idle factories—operate them under workers' control.
3. A Twenty-Billion dollar Federal public works and housing program.
4. Thirty-thirty! \$30-weekly minimum wage—30-hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
5. Thirty dollar weekly old-age and disability pension.
6. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
7. All war funds to the unemployed.
8. A people's referendum on any and all wars.
9. No secret diplomacy.
10. An Independent Labor Party.
11. Workers' Defense Guards against vigilante and Fascist attacks.

Atty. Gen. Murphy Invents Some Law

On the afternoon of Thursday, July 13, United States Attorney General Murphy called the Washington newspaper correspondents to his office and gave them a statement which was headlined throughout the nation as "U. S. Outlaws W.P.A. Strikers."

"There must be no strike against the government of the United States by any one, anywhere, at any time," said Murphy.

Then he showed his New Deal teeth: "Those leaders who have moved to exploit the protests of W.P.A. workers in violation of the federal statutes will be prosecuted."

Federal District Attorneys have been instructed to keep a close watch on activities of W.P.A. strike leaders, said Murphy. He singled out Minneapolis and East St. Louis as two spots where "evidence of labor racketeering or criminal conspiracy against the nation's relief program" may "result in indictments."

We don't have to formulate an answer to Murphy and his chief, President Roosevelt, for whom, of course, Murphy was speaking. (On Tuesday, July 11, Roosevelt showed his colors when he pointedly reminded newspaper reporters that "he had made no objection to the new wage provision when he signed the Relief bill."—N. Y. Times, July 12).

The answer to these gentlemen has already been made, and made by an authoritative spokesman for organized labor. We refer to Thomas Murray, President of the New York Building Trades Council of the A.F.L., and to his biting reply to the threat now repeated by Murphy, but first made last Friday by the W.P.A. administrator of New York, Colonel Somervell. President Murray then said:

"The demand of Colonel Somervell for the arrest and confinement in prison of these men is at once a long step away from our cherished American democracy and a running broad jump in the direction of a dictatorship of the Nazi-fascist type.

"It is the most unspeakably shameful and vicious attack ever made on American workers in the entire history of our country. The workers will not be intimidated one iota by his monstrous and utterly contemptible threat."

Mr. Murray is one hundred percent correct. These gentlemen who make these threats are—

'Utterly Contemptible'

Murphy, as U. S. Attorney General, passes for something of an expert on the law. And presumably he pretends that he got his "principles" about this W.P.A. strike from the law. If so, we would like to know:

Where did Murphy and Roosevelt get the idea that no one can strike against the government?

Where did Murphy and Roosevelt get the idea that militant organizing of the W.P.A. strike is "evidence of labor racketeering or criminal conspiracy against the nation's relief program"?

While we're at it, we can ask some other pertinent questions:

What law gave Roosevelt, Murphy and Harrington the authority to dismiss striking W.P.A. workers after the fifth day they were out on strike—not the fourth, sixth or first, but the fifth—is that in the law too?

What law gave Roosevelt & Co. the authority to refuse direct relief to W.P.A. strikers?

What law gave Roosevelt and his crowd the authority to send secret servicemen into Minneapolis and East St. Louis—and for all we know, into every other strike area—where they act, of course, as strikebreakers?

The answer to all these questions is one and the same: **THERE IS NO LAW THAT GIVES ROOSEVELT - MURPHY - HARRINGTON THE AUTHORITY TO DO THESE THINGS.**

Attorney General Murphy has no more authority to call the W.P.A. strike illegal than he has to call any other strike illegal. He just did it in the hope of getting away with it. That is, he and Roosevelt hope that the strikers and their leaders will get scared and quit.

There's no law that says that the most skilled craftsmen of the nation must work for any wage the government chooses to give them. And if there were such a law, it would be a law not deserving of obedience, for to obey such a law would mean to surrender ourselves to slavery.

These weren't the only threats Murphy made. In the same press interview, Murphy announced—maybe it was just a coincidence—that he was conducting an investigation of the "unhealthy and scandalous" conditions in the building trades, on a national scale, "not by isolated indictments." He is going to clean up all conspirators, "whether they are contractors or labor leaders."

How does Murphy know, before the investigation is concluded, that "labor leaders" are among the conspirators he is going to indict? The answer is that he doesn't know, he is just making it up in an attempt to scare the building trades workers.

Pretty crude stuff! But it shows that the strikers have Roosevelt and Murphy plenty worried. It shows that the strike is effective. It shows that all the strikers have to do is to hold on, keep the strike going and spread it, and they will win their demands.

We think the most significant thing about Murphy's threats is the way he singled out Minneapolis and East St. Louis for special mention.

Why did he single these two places out? Because in those places, more than any other places, the strike is also an—

Unskilled Workers' Strike

In Minneapolis the Building Trades Council made a direct appeal to the unskilled workers to join the building trades workers in the strike, and joined with the unskilled workers' organizations in a Joint Action Committee to make the strike 100% effective.

In Minneapolis the famous teamsters union, General Drivers Union Local 544, has for years sponsored a Federal Workers Section for W.P.A. workers and relief clients, and the rest of the trade unions help finance the Federal Workers Section of Local 544 and send their unemployed members to it for aid. As a result of this close link between the unions and the unemployed, the Minneapolis W.P.A. workers and relief clients have had the power to wrest from the administration wages and relief budgets which constitute a beacon-light for the unemployed throughout the country.

The loud howls of rage from Murphy are eloquent testimony to the effectiveness of the Minneapolis system of uniting the employed and unemployed, the skilled and the unskilled. The W.P.A. strike is more effective there than anywhere else in the country.

What makes Murphy howl ought to be taken up by the unions everywhere.

Everywhere the unions ought to seek the unity of employed and unemployed which has been achieved in Minneapolis and which has made the W.P.A. strike there so successful.

If every building trades union in the country followed the example of the Minneapolis Building Trades Council—the St. Paul building trades unions followed that example too—and directly appealed to the unskilled W.P.A. workers to join them in the strike, and helped to organize the unskilled and the relief clients as Local 544 has done in Minneapolis, this strike would be absolutely assured of success.

We repeat what we said in our issue of July 11:

The unskilled laborers are hungry for organization, and the striking building trades unions have a responsibility toward them. The support of the unskilled laborers is needed, not so much to tie up the projects, perhaps, but certainly in order to win the widespread sympathy without which the strike cannot win. If Congress can be forced to amend the W.P.A. laws so as to provide the prevailing wage rate, it can also be forced to amend the laws so as to provide better wages for the unskilled workers.

If the building trades unions understand the strategic needs of a political strike, we are sure that they will come to understand the pressing need of linking their demands with those of the unskilled workers.

Meanwhile, more power to the strike!

Tightening the Belt!



New Deal Strikebreaking Moves Fail to Crack W.P.A. Strike Lines

Akron

By PAUL FIELDING
(Special to the Socialist Appeal)
AKRON, O., July 11—Thousands of fighting W.P.A. workers closed down 95 percent of all projects in Summit County today, and demonstrated in front of the courthouse against the wage cuts.

They responded to the call for a half-day "holiday" issued by the C.I.O., using this only means they were given to protest. But they interpreted it in their own way, with militant strike action.

Defying urgent pleas of the Stalinist-controlled Workers Alliance to refrain from direct action, roving picket squads closed down practically all projects.

Over three thousand massed in front of the courthouse. They were told there by several Stalinist and C.I.O. officials to "go back to work tomorrow and forget all about the strike, we've had our protest."

The few timid references to the strike in the speeches were greeted with thunderous applause, and a chorus of boos went up at every mention of Congress. When Arnold Johnson, state president of the Workers Alliance, paused for applause after praising Roosevelt and the New Deal, he was met with a stony silence.

The W.P.A. strike called on July 10 by the A.F.L. Tri-County Building and Construction Trades Council, to last "until Congress passes some emergency legislation to correct the situation," was scarcely mentioned in the speeches, although it is going strong, involving about 15,000. Instead the workers were told to go to their dentists and doctors (as if they can afford them) and to the Elks and Moose clubs, etc. for signatures to resolutions to be sent to Congress.

But the militants on the projects drew another lesson, after they saw the widespread response to their strike action among W.P.A. workers. Not by writing letters to their Congressmen, they realized, will they force the government to change the Starvation Law.

The Stalinist leaders of the Workers Alliance were overwhelmed with the response to the demonstration call, they admitted at the courthouse meeting. And they spared no words of warning against further militant action.

"Go back to work. We've had our protest. Now it's up to the Tory Democrats and Republicans. Remain on the job. Support the New Deal," they shouted desperately.

Following the demonstration, the cry went up to form a mass picket line in front of the Akron Dry Goods store where a strike has been in progress for more than three months. Almost 500 formed a giant chain picket line in front of the store. Police started flailing their clubs to

break the line and finally got it dispersed. This is not the last you'll be hearing from the mass of the Akron W.P.A. workers!

Detroit

(Special to the Socialist Appeal)
DETROIT, July 11—According to official estimates 28,000 of the 35,000 W.P.A. workers in this city quit their jobs today in a one-day strike against the Woodrum-Roosevelt starvation, wage-cutting bill. The strike was called by the W.P.A. auxiliary of the U.A.W.-C.I.O. and endorsed by the building trades council of the A.F.L. who pulled their members off the construction jobs. The teamsters union joined forces by refusing to deliver material to the struck projects.

10,000 W.P.A. workers, Negro and white, marched from their project in demonstration through Woodward Avenue, main thoroughfare of Detroit to the City Hall. It was a militant demonstration. The men on the line were prepared to keep the projects at a standstill until Congress could be forced to change its reactionary mind. But the union officials had ordered the strike to be limited to one day.

Cheer Militant Speeches
On the lawn of the City Hall and on the steps of the Hall and flowing over onto the streets of Cadillac Square, the thousands gathered and cheered wildly the speeches calling for a fight to the finish against the coolie conditions Congress is seeking to impose upon them. The very mention of the name of scabber Mayor Reading brought lusty and prolonged jeers from the workers. Reading had declared that those workers striking on W.P.A. would be denied relief.

10,000 demonstrators roared their determination to battle to the end against this starvation program and to see Reading sweeping up the leaves on the City Hall lawn after the next election before they would submit.

It remained for the belly-crawling representative of the Workers Alliance to throw the damp post-card blanket on this militant assemblage. His entire speech was devoted to a tirade against those who would direct the opposition where it really belongs, against Roosevelt and his Congress.

Opening Gun
The one-day protest strike can only be conceived as the opening gun of the battle in Michigan against the wage-cut and lay-off. Within one-month, if congressional plans are carried through to their bitter end, more than 27,000 W.P.A. workers in this state are slated for the breadline.

Meanwhile, it is revealed in the local press that while wages of skilled and common laborers are being reduced by the 130 hour provision that out of a

total of 581 administrators, supervisors and plum pickers in top W.P.A. classifications receiving yearly earnings over \$1,200, 85 of them are receiving over \$2,600 annually. Abner Larned, State Administrator, rakes in an annual salary of \$7,000 and Lee E. Fisher, his deputy, \$5,200 per annum.

Flint

(Continued from Page 1)
protest strike against the Woodrum-Roosevelt starvation law.

Official figures estimate that 3,600 out of 4,000 W.P.A. workers quit the ditches and the street projects in answer to the strike call of the C.I.O. Heated resentment to he wage-cuts and the layoffs reached a fever pitch and it is to be expected that unless the White House and Capital Hill gang change their tune, W.P.A. workers in Flint will take more decisive and drastic action in the future.

The strike was climaxed in a demonstration numbering more than 500 at the old post office. Charles Lewis, representative of Fisher Body Local U.A.W., Claude Workman, International Representative for W.P.A. department of the U.A.W. in Flint and Kermit Johnson, outstanding strike and unemployed leader were the speakers. Wayne Adams of the Workers Alliance was graciously extended a few minutes in which he extolled the virtues of Roosevelt and the New Deal to an assemblage of workers whose necks were still raw after the New Deal's axe blow.

The tone of the meeting was set, however, by the militant speeches of Johnson and Workman who told the men the real score on the Washington raw deal. The audience rang with applause when Kermit Johnson declared: "If private industry cannot operate the factories and make work for the unemployed, the workers can and will operate the factories themselves."

The auxiliary is now launching a drive to enroll all W.P.A. workers into its ranks.

Philadelphia

(Continued from Page 1)
the New Deal Administration is acting as a strike-breaker and should be treated as such.

The Stalinized Pennsylvania Workers Alliance were completely caught off their guard. It took them two days before they could issue a statement saying they supported this "demonstration."

The strategy of the Alliance is to get the workers to turn the strike into a one-day demonstration, and then—go back to work.

The Philadelphia C.I.O. Council is unreservedly supporting the strike, announced Carl Bering, president. "We are 100% behind the walkout," he said.

IN THIS CORNER

By Max Shachtman

If ever President Roosevelt starts an economy regime in his own household and finds himself forced to do without his valet, he won't have to worry even about having his pants pressed, and above all, his boots licked into a high polish. Whoever has been following the Daily Worker's treatment of the building trades workers' strike on W.P.A. must by now be convinced that Roosevelt can get free flunkie service from the editors of the Communist party sheet even when he doesn't ask for it.

We do not want to deny that the Stalinists on the Daily Worker are considerably embarrassed and in an unenviable position. On the contrary, we grant it readily. Here they have been trying to sell an increasingly discredited Roosevelt to an increasingly disillusioned working class, painting up the President as a stout friend of labor, and first crack out of the box, their Third-Term Candidate comes out as a strike-breaking boss, no different at bottom from Tom Girdler.

For their embarrassment, a spirit of tolerance, pity and understanding would normally be indicated. But such feelings just naturally turn sour even in a merciful man when he reads how the Daily Worker impudently seeks to extricate itself from its own predicament by shouting Stop Thief!

Playing Down the Reality

First, the Daily Worker has been systematically playing down the strike, which everybody else in the country recognizes as one of the most important labor struggles in recent times: a strike led by conservative A.F.L. officials "against the government" which is supposed to be "friendly to labor."

The Wednesday, July 12, issue of the Daily Worker is typical. While every other paper of that date gave the W.P.A. strike first position, you had to look all over the front page before you could find, in obscure position at the bottom, a colorless story entitled "A.F.L. Group Visits Capital on W.P.A. Talks." The Stalinists refuse to accept the idea of workers striking against a wage-cutting Roosevelt Government, and they hope to dispel the idea by playing down the reality.

Second, the Stalinists have tried their damndest to convey the impression that good old Roosevelt and the New Dealers are friends of the strikers, enemies of the Woodrum Starvation Bill, and conversely, that the strike is in no sense directed against Roosevelt—only against the "Tories."

In its Thursday issue, it prints a characteristically foul story about the distribution of the last issue of the Socialist Appeal and leaflets of the independent Unemployed and Project Workers Union to the striking workers at the North Beach Airport.

"Ugly words came from groups of project workers as they filed out of the airport gates and copes of the Trotskyite sheet, Socialist Appeal, were handed them. The paper carried a story boldly headed 'President Roosevelt—strike-breaker.'

"The paper was being distributed by the same disruptive groups who arranged the flopped meeting.

"Remarks were heard such as:
"Who are these rats?"
"This ain't what the strikers are saying, is it?"
"They talk like the people who passed the bill."

Now, apart from the fact that the Socialist Appeal was exceptionally well received by the workers involved, the important thing in the Daily Worker story is the obvious attempt to clear Roosevelt from all responsibility. It is "the people who passed the (Woodrum) bill" who are alone responsible, in the words it invents for the mythical airport worker whom the reporter never heard, Roosevelt, however, is O.K.

Keeping Silent on Roosevelt

But if the President is the savior and benefactor of the W.P.A. workers, it seems to us that the least the Daily Worker can do is to quote him. Yet that is precisely what the Daily Worker is stone silent about. The statement from the White House on the W.P.A. strike was printed in every New York paper we were able to get hold of, prominently displayed by New Deal as well as anti-New Deal organs—but not one single syllable of even remote reference to it was contained in the Stalinist paper.

Since it is theoretically possible that it was omitted from the Daily Worker because its space was too occupied by Columnists Amter, Begun and Cacione, let us refer to the Roosevelt statement here:

From a special Washington dispatch to the New York Times of July 12:

"President Roosevelt insisted today that the Administration would attempt to carry out the security provision of the new relief law despite the work stoppages in various parts of the country. . . .

"Mr. Roosevelt refused to indicate whether he would support the Congressional move to abandon the security wage in the new bill in favor of restoration of the prevailing rate of wages, but he recalled that he had made no objection to the new wage provision when he signed the Relief bill." (Our emphasis.)

Strikebreaker! Scab!

From page 1 of the same issue of the Times:
"The requirement that all W.P.A. employees work 130 hours a month for their security wage, even though previously many had worked less than fifty hours for the same pay, was written into the new Federal Relief Act at the suggestion of Colonel F. C. Harrington, National Works Projects Commissioner" (a Roosevelt appointee, of course!).

In spite of the Daily Worker's indignation at our irreverence to the President, we are therefore constrained to repeat what we wrote last week—in a whisper of course, and timidly:

President Roosevelt—Strike-breaker!
And: the Communist Party—Scab!

P.S.—Our last issue referred to the Stalinist-controlled Workers Alliance call for a "one-day stoppage," and labelled it, properly, a basically scabby measure. The Daily Worker now informs us that the Alliance is calling its "stoppage" for July 20—that is, more than two weeks after the strike was called! Why July 20? Why not Christmas or New Year's Eve? By that time the Stalinists could be absolutely sure that the strike is over.