

SENATE UPHOLDS POLL TAX!

Post-Office Department Dictators Bar Mailing of Labor Newspaper

By HENRY JUDD

NEW YORK CITY, Nov. 24.—At the time of this writing, for the third time within three weeks, The Militant, a weekly labor and socialist newspaper, has been banned from the mails by the postal authorities in New York City and Washington.

The most astounding and reactionary aspect of this blow against the democratic rights of American labor and American labor publications has been the absolute refusal and failure on the part of the officials to give an explanation for their actions! Apparently, under the terms of the military dictatorship which the postal authorities seem to have set up for themselves, they can

just ban a paper from the mails AND THEN REFUSE TO GIVE AN EXPLANATION.

W.P. Sends Letter of Solidarity To Militant

The following letter, sent by Max Shachtman, national secretary of the Workers Party, to the editor of The Militant was released to LABOR ACTION for publication:

George Breitman,
Editor, The Militant,
116 University Place,
New York City.

Dear Comrade:

We have learned with indignation of the refusal of the post office authorities to permit the November 7 and 14 issues of The Militant to go through the mails. The failure of the authorities to notify you of their decision, or to offer any explanation, for it only makes their conduct more outrageous.

To allow this action to go unchallenged would mean to condone the usurpation of bureaucratic powers which the post office authorities have been arrogating to themselves to an increasing extent, especially since the outbreak of the war. It is worth noting that ultra-reactionary capitalist papers which carry on an unbridled campaign of denunciation of the government and of the conduct of the war in such a manner that they have been openly accused, by responsible public figures, of aiding and abetting fascism, continue to publish without let or hindrance. Obviously the post office respects their democratic rights only because big capitalist interests stand behind them, and because their criticisms are made from the standpoint of extreme reaction. It is just as obvious that the authorities presume to take their arbitrary action against The Militant only because they know it is a working class newspaper and because they think that it does not have powerful enough support to resist successfully this clear-cut attempt at suppression and persecution.

Organized Protest Needed!

In is in the interest of every workingman and every labor organization in the country, to teach these insolent bureaucrats a resounding lesson. If they can get away with the hounding and suppressing of The Militant, in the dark of the night, and without a thunderous and organized protest of the whole labor movement, then no labor paper in the country is safe, whatever its political or economic views may be. If these bureaucrats, and the Roosevelt Administration, which presumably stands behind them, are not immediately compelled to reverse themselves, the whole labor movement is in for a repetition of that infamous period of the suppression of the labor press during the last World War, under the Postmaster Generalship of the odious Burleson. The time to stop Burlesonism is the minute it shows its ugly head, and before it gets well under way.

The Workers Party salutes The Militant for its firm and courageous stand and assures it of its complete solidarity and unreserved support in any counter-action that may be planned.

With best fraternal greetings,
Max Shachtman,
National Secretary.

November 20, 1942.

25 Cents Will Bring

LABOR ACTION to your home for six months. Send your subscription to LABOR ACTION, 114 West 14th Street, New York City.

action, of an anti-democratic blow against the American labor movement?

Defend the Militant!

These steps against The Militant are a blow against every American labor paper, including LABOR ACTION. The right of political criticism, the right of a free labor press, the rights of labor organizations themselves are deeply involved. Everyone understands that this action is but the beginning! The next blow of the post office reactionaries may

well be directed against LABOR ACTION which has also, as everyone knows, taken its stand for labor and against the capitalist war.

Then, if these totalitarians are not halted in their tracks right now, there will be additional measures taken against labor publications, not excluding the trade union papers of the AFL and the CIO. Defense of labor's rights to enjoy a free press demands complete solidarity and support to The

(Continued on page 4)

Our Hearts Continue to Bleed for the Rich

On How Corporation Taxes Work

In its issue of November 16, LABOR ACTION listed a few of the companies which have grinded their teeth, determined to bear with fortitude the "sacrifices" they are called upon to make—WHILE GRASPING IN THEIR GREEDY FISTS REGULAR AND EXTRA DIVIDENDS, IN MANY CASES AMOUNTING TO MORE THAN LAST YEAR.

Yes, indeed. To the stalwarts of industry the new taxes are like water on a duck's back. Here is a little more proof.

After making deductions for depreciation, obsolescence, contingencies and ALL TAXES, American Tel. & Tel., Aluminum Co. of America, Mack Truck, among many other companies, CAN STILL PAY IN 1942 THE SAME HIGH DIVIDENDS AS IN 1941. Some sacrifice!

Kennecott Copper does its bit by declaring a 25 cents regular dividend—PLUS \$1.00 EXTRA.

Bohn Aluminum & Brass "earns" \$4.60 on each share of its outstanding stock for the first nine months of 1942—which is \$1.34 more than last year, when there was no "equality of sacrifice" tax law.

American Shipbuilding Co. can pay a dividend of \$3.00 in 1942—which is \$1.00 more than in 1941. J. P. Morgan & Co. is so "burdened" by the new taxes that it pays out \$6.00 in 1942 against only \$4.00 in 1941. And Pacific Finance Co. of California has paid out \$8.20 a share this year compared with \$1.10 in 1941. Definitely, our hearts bleed for the rich.

After deducting everything deducti-

ble, including ALL TAXES, Anaconda Copper still reports profits of \$27,514,668 for the first nine months of 1942. And Baltimore & Ohio for 1942 has \$34,065,000 to the good—IN SPITE OF THOSE VERY NAUGHTY TAXES.

On the basis of these fat figures, Eric Johnston, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has expressed the opinion that "profit margins on war contracts are narrow and only a small percentage of earnings are retained after taxes."

We are very sorry indeed for Mr. Johnston and for his class. Why don't we workers do something about it? Maybe we ought to demand wage decreases and more taxes—anything to widen the margin of profits and enlarge the percentages!

Arizona's Big Cotton Kings Strike Against Paying 30c-an-Hour Wage

By R. CRAINE

There is a strike on in Arizona. Involved is the long staple cotton crop used in the production of parachutes for the Army and Navy—yet there is hardly a word of denunciation in the press, no cries of sabotage and no demands for immediate government action to "shoot the organizers" or to draft the strikers into the Army. For this is a strike of big cotton growers who are refusing to pay the government minimum of 30 cents an hour for cotton pickers.

For years the large cotton growers in Arizona have recruited laborers from Mexico or from among the dust bowl victims, the "Okies," and have paid them miserably low wages. The workers were completely at the mercy of their employers; because they lacked organization they had to accept whatever was offered them. The Senate Civil Liberties Committee has disclosed that the cotton growers spent in one year some \$125,

000 for this method of securing cheap labor, that this expenditure was more than compensated for by the extremely low wages paid.

This low wage policy was maintained through the Farm Labor Service, which is financed by Western Cotton Products Co., a subsidiary of Anderson, Clayton & Co., one of the biggest cotton firms in the world. Will Clayton, head of this outfit, is an assistant to Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce.

Because of the current labor shortage, the cotton growers have found it extremely difficult to get men to work their plantations. They have turned for assistance to the government, which has stipulated that while it is willing to get Mexican and other labor necessary for the cotton picking, and to pay their transportation to Arizona, the growers would have to pay a minimum of 30 cents an hour for this work, and supply men with decent living conditions.

The answer to this requirement,

in itself more than modest, has been, first, a "slowdown" and then a strike organized and supported by the Farm Bureau Federation. The FBF president, himself a rich Alabama plantation owner, Edward A. O'Neal, has stated that these wages were "outrageous" and that the 30 cent minimum would "socialize agriculture."

The government has made a number of overtures to the cotton growers, one of which was to raise the price of cotton. In spite of the fact that the increase in wages would thus be covered, the Federation is holding out against the principle of decent wages for 3,000,000 farm workers, stating further that the requirements of the government for decent living conditions, including toilets, baths, cold and hot water, was just a lot of "red tape stuff."

A telegram sent by McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, and Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, calls upon the Arizona cotton grow-

ers to accept the terms of the government contracts, or else the government will hold the growers responsible for saving the current crop of long staple cotton in that state.

That is how the government gets tough when it deals with big business. There is no indication here of the Army or Navy stepping in and running the plantations, no threat of "work or fight" to the rich cotton growers, as would be the case had the cotton pickers struck for higher wages and decent living conditions.

The farm lobby in Washington has many powerful friends in Congress and in the Senate who are demanding that farm labor be frozen at whatever wages the employers want to pay. What is needed is not a counter-lobby, such as the National Farmers Union, composed of smaller farmers, is trying to establish, but an organization of farm workers, which will enforce its own minimum wage scales and decent living conditions through union strength and control.

the President had the unbounded nerve to plead ignorance of the whole thing.

This historic press conference at which the President of the USA used the flagrantly flimsy alibi of not knowing what had been going on in the Senate for a full week, was reported in the New York Times of November 21 as follows:

"The President said, at his press conference, that he knew nothing about the filibuster. Asked whether he thought the poll-tax repeal bill should pass, he reiterated that he knew nothing about it, had talked to no one about it, and therefore could not express an opinion."

Read that again—and again! Millions of American boys are and will be fighting for the capitalist brand of "democracy" in the four corners of the earth, while the President sees fit to express no opinion on whether the prohibitive poll-tax disfranchising 10,000,000 citizens should be repealed!

The President knew only too well what was going on in the Senate. You may be sure he knew without the direct appeal to him of the Committee to Abolish the Poll-Tax which represents seventy-five national organizations of labor, Negroes, women, etc. Yes, he knew without the direct protest to him by leaders of the CIO, AFL and Railroad Brotherhoods. But—

The filibustering poll-tax senators are all fellow Democrats. They are of the warp and woof of the President's own political party. That would very well explain his lack of opinion. Besides the President shares with this political oligarchy of the South the fear of the voting power of the millions of disfranchised poor Negroes and whites. What a political overturn they could make! They could even vote for a party of their own class instead of for the reactionary politicians of one or the other of the capitalist parties.

It is true that Senator Barkley, also a Democrat and leader of the supporters of the bill—if you can call them that—declared, in the course of the shouting, that "if the only way the Democratic Party could survive was to tax the right of poor people to vote for federal officials, then the Democratic Party is built on sand." He also said that the poll-tax is a "hangover from feudalism," which means that the Democratic Party is built on political serfdom in the South. WORDS—ONLY WORDS!

For neither Barkley nor his chief in the White House nor anybody else was willing to fight to free the political serfs. Barkley and the other "champions" of the poor in the South made a deal with Bilbo, Connally, O'Daniel, McKellar and the other feudal lords of the South—as dirty a deal as was ever made. That deal has not only thrown the anti-poll-tax bill out of this session of Congress, Barkley also consented not to bring the bill before the NEW Senate. The arrogant anti-poll-tax bloc boasted that they expected to discourage "future congressional moves to outlaw the poll-tax." Very obviously they succeeded.

Every one of the ardent "democrats" capitulated. Senator Norris, old-time "liberal," assured the poll-taxers, "I'm not going to annoy you by bringing the bill up again." Senator Pepper, Democrat, who introduced the bill, agreed to the sell-

Shipyard Union GEB Seeks to Suspend Local 9

Membership Faces Serious Threat in Undemocratic Move to Injure Union by Putting It in the Hands of a Dictator

SAN PEDRO—By the time this article reaches the members of Local 9, the membership will be faced with such an all-out and vicious attack upon its democratic rights that the very existence of the union is threatened.

It seems that it is not enough that the companies have gotten away with one slice into union conditions after another, that the hiring hall is destroyed and that shady, undemocratic deals have been put over on the membership. The national office of the Shipyard Workers Union is evidently not satisfied with the speed with which the union is losing ground.

The GEB has now acted to suspend, altogether the autonomy of Local 9. And they have seen fit to appoint as dictator over the local

none other than the very phony who, as representative of the government, crammed the rotten Los Angeles yard contract down the throats of the membership—that bird by the name of "Phony Promises" Pollard.

When Pollard was here before he showed his contempt for the democratic rights of the membership and his disregard for such details as the union constitution and by-laws. This time he appears as proposed dictator over the local in a completely unconstitutional move by the General Executive Board of the union. It is reported that President John Green, who delights in making long-winded speeches about democracy, is the very one who recommended setting up the dictatorship.

Coming right in the midst of nominations and elections of officers for the coming year, when the present incompetent officials were due to be turned out by a membership sick of sell-outs and misrepresentation, the action of Pollard and the gang behind him is clear. They seek to prevent the election of progressives to office—progressives who would build and strengthen Local 9 by democracy and education within the local and by fighting for union conditions.

If Pollard and the national officers get away with their proposed "blitzkrieg" against Local 9 is a typical AFL method of preventing the rank and file from exercising its own democratic rule. It is a method that AFL bureaucrats have used to keep themselves in office

ballots. If he wants to he'll put in a "provisional" government. He'll have his "Quislings" or get them by intimidation.

But every member can rest assured that just as under any dictator, whoever is given the appearance of power, it will be Pollard who keeps real control. And Pollard will use that control to reverse any decision he disagrees with. He'll "discipline" or expel any man he doesn't like, or who doesn't like him—and, brother, that's considerable!

The action of putting a dictator-receiver in charge of Local 9 is a typical AFL method of preventing the rank and file from exercising its own democratic rule. It is a method that AFL bureaucrats have used to keep themselves in office

for twenty to thirty years, but a practice from which CIO unions have kept themselves pretty well clean in the past.

If Green and Van Gelder of seven or eight years ago could have looked ahead to see the Green and Van Gelder of today, they would have blushed with shame. Eight years ago these men, as enthusiastic radicals, set out to organize the most democratic and most progressive union in the United States. That they succeeded to a considerable degree in the first years is testified to in the democratic nature and progressive principles then written into the union constitution.

Under the test of the great pressure of the imperialist war, Green

Europe in Revolt

News from the Socialist Camp

A HAPSBURG AS A PILLAR OF THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

This column is hardly able to keep pace with events. Nearly every day another monarchist or fascist climbs aboard the "fighters for democracy" bandwagon.

It was officially announced in Washington that a military committee for the liberation of Austria has been formed under the presidency of the Archduke and that "a special battalion of Austrians" will be formed to fight to free Austria from Axis domination.

Among democrats and liberals in Europe, the Austrian monarchy was considered to be the stronghold of the most reactionary oppression.

The revolution of 1918 and the collapse of the monarchy chased the Hapsburgs out.

ON THE LOOKOUT FOR QUISLINGS

Germany's chances seem to be gradually diminishing and "post-war reconstruction" is beginning to be less a preoccupation of well-meaning "liberal" college professors.

It is getting to be the affair of hard-boiled military experts and diplomats. So, for example, it is being discovered that "the former French collaborationists no matter what their expressed policy during the German occupation was, actually were hoping fervently for an Allied victory."

And further, the Nazi General von Thoma, recently captured, has been brought under special honors to London, and the New York Times this week carries a strange article passed by the British censors.

And last, but not least, an influential British Catholic paper recently printed a sensational article in which it was stated that the Vatican would envisage some sort of "Mediterranean settlement involving Spain and Italy."

The article says that the Vatican "would be concerned about the maintenance in Italy, no less than in Spain, of a political and social order that reflects the Catholic tradi-

Seek Local 9 Suspension--

(Continued from page 1)

and Van Gelder have forgotten their ideals and their loyalty to the working class and its struggle against boss oppression. But the rank and file of shipyard workers throughout the country must still go to work at the same jobs and under the same conditions, war or no war.

Stand by the Union!

In the struggle facing Local 9 today, the real union men will stand by the principles of democracy and progress on which the Shipyard Workers Union was founded, and resist to the end the betrayal of those principles.

In this fight, as in all other recent battles, it is easy to predict the role of the Stalinist clique of Alexander, Lopez, Gandall & Co. A thousand times over they have shown

Otto von Hapsburg, intriguing with Schuschnigg and Dollfuss against the Austrian socialists, one of those chiefly responsible behind the scenes for the bloody crushing of the workers of Vienna in 1934, could not succeed, in spite of all his efforts, to persuade French and English imperialists that he was the best safeguard against revolutions in Central Europe.

To be sure, Otto will not yet be recognized officially. But the first step has been taken. A special battalion which will be completely made up of monarchists—because not even liberal democrats or social-democrats will ever join—is at hand.

Yesterday, Darlan, the fascist; de Gaulle, the "democratic" monarchist, and Sikorski, the anti-Semite; and now today, the Hapsburgs. We are indeed moving at a bewildering pace.

And these are only the opening moves. At what is going on behind the scenes we can only guess.

tions of these countries... A satisfactory Mediterranean peace could be negotiated with the good will and even the mediation of the Vatican so long as the United Nations are prepared to allow the best elements in Spain and Italy to remain in or to raise them to power."

Who these "best elements" are is only too clear: Franco in Spain, and those particularly around Crown Prince Umberto who are disillusioned by Mussolini's failures. There are even persistent rumors that negotiations with Umberto are being carried on....

The deal with Darlan was the first to come into the open. We may expect many more to be known in the near future. American imperialism seems to be on the winning side. That's why all the reactionaries in Europe who had been going along with Hitler are now suddenly changing camps. They all aspire now to be American Gauleiter in Europe.

Now more than ever is it of the utmost importance that American workers realize what is happening. This war is an imperialist war fought for the domination of the world. It will depend in no small measure on the American workers as to whether the sordid schemes of the imperialists will succeed in crushing the coming European revolution.

Europaeus.

how little they care for anything in the line of union principles or union conditions. They will care not one whit more for the democracy and autonomy of the local than they did for the hiring hall. If they think that ultimately Pollard will let them get their grasping fingers on Local 9, they will support his dictatorship in the meantime with gusto. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that they had some hand in bringing about the bureaucratic intervention of the national office.

But none of these baby Hitlers will have the last word. If they win the battle now—which they will not if the rank and file rises up and fights—but even if they do win at the moment, the day of reckoning will come. Daily the injustices of boss oppression and the fakery of the sell-out artists will become more apparent to the awakening rank and file. And this aroused rank and file will toss this variety of parasites and political pygmies into the garbage heap where they belong. For that day we do our best TODAY and TOMORROW—defending the union, fighting to preserve the democracy of the working class, building our strength for the future.

Of Special Interest to Women

By Susan Green

On November 14 James F. Byrnes, economic stabilization director, had published in all the newspapers "a positive program that will guarantee our people the basic living essentials that they must have at prices they can pay."

By this time the housewife has learned to give such programs an I'm-from-Missouri reception. So she probably was not surprised—though plenty alarmed—to read on November 15 that, so good are the economic stabilizers at making and carrying out "positive programs," that THERE WILL BE A SHORTAGE OF BUTTER, CHEESE AND EVEN MILK.

To add insult to injury, it is predicted that the OPA will be asked to RAISE CEILING PRICES on dairy products—as if they now function honestly! And do you know why this "modest" request will be made to the OPA? To allow the rich dairy companies "FAIR" PROFITS!

There is something very positive indeed about all these programs. Working class housewives can always be positive that while they get it in the NECK, the bosses who own production get it in PROFITS.

Dr. Clive M. McCay, professor of nutrition, State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., recently declared that "the housewife should be as particular about what she feeds her family as the farmer is concerning the feed for his LIVESTOCK."

The similarity between your family and the farmer's livestock may be taken for granted by such pillars of capitalist society as professors of nutrition. Just as they take for granted that—while human beings are reduced to cattle—profits must go on as usual, only a little more so.

The working class housewife can afford to take neither for granted. She wants a society free from war and does not want to raise a family of cattle. Also she could be more particular about what she feeds her family if the bosses and the government agencies were less particular about that item of profit-as-usual—PLUS.

When she wakes up to her own interests, the working class housewife is going to be an ardent socialist. SHE HAS NO OTHER CHOICE.

Dr. Victor G. Heiser, medical consultant of the National Association of Manufacturers, reported "eleven thousand war workers killed or injured on and off the job every day since December 7, 1941." SOME CASUALTY LIST!

He said that "fatigue and malnutrition" are the causes of this amazing slaughter of industrial workers. It was to provide some protection against just such a situation that labor fought to have labor laws passed.

If any group of workers need protection today it is certainly the inexperienced women who are entering production in droves. Yet the laws passed for the protection of working women have as much effect today as a feather in the wind.

For instance, night work is limited by law, but state Governors have taken it upon themselves to extend the limit from 10 p.m. to midnight to all the way around the clock. This means that women will be working day and night—during the day in their homes and during the night in factories. Of fatigue and malnutrition they will have plenty.

Another instance is the lowering of the age limit for girls employed in industry from 18 to 16 years. This

was arbitrarily done by a ruling of the U.S. Labor Department. Kids of 16 will be thrown into the industrial cauldron where 11,000 workers are killed or injured each day!

MEN AND WOMEN WORKERS MUST PUT UP A FIGHT TO HAVE THE LABOR LAWS OBSERVED BY THE GOVERNMENT ITSELF.

Magistrate Jeanette G. Brill of Brooklyn is thoroughly convinced that "We have got to stop bringing unwarranted war babies into the world."

Speaking on the subject of juvenile delinquency, she said that while she was on the bench in Children's Court in Brooklyn in one week—even before Pearl Harbor—eight girls between the ages of 12 and 15 were brought into court—about to become mothers.

She said that the situation is due to the fact that a "changed psychology exists among younger girls today. They label themselves the Victory Girls. They think that the boys are here today but may be dead tomorrow and they reason: 'We'll give them all they want.'"

She said further that "War always brings about an increase in juvenile delinquency" and cited England's increased rate of 46 per cent. Nobody can find fault with Magistrate Brill's understanding of her subject. It is quite complete—EXCEPT AS TO WHAT'S TO BE DONE. She made an earnest plea to schools and parents to "correct the situation," but no serious correction is possible without removing the cause itself—WAR.

The millions of boys who "are here today and may be dead tomorrow," the ignorant deluded kinds of 12 to 15, their unfortunate war babies—all are inevitable war casualties.

This human waste can be ended by the world-wide brotherhood of all nations in lasting peace under INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM. That's the answer.

In one of her columns in the New York World-Telegram, written from England, Mrs. Roosevelt said of the children evacuated from the city to the country:

"The children are all very good. The poor little things, I suppose so much has happened to them that nothing surprises them any more. Usually these children are placed in some private house with large gardens, where the children thrive. But I fear the complication of returning to London's slums afterward will be great for both mother and child, for the latter will undoubtedly be very unhappy."

You've heard it said that this war is being fought for the "Four Freedoms"—the most important of which is "Freedom from Want"? Would you, expect that in a society free from want, SLUMS WOULD STILL THRIVE? Or does Mrs. Roosevelt conceive of a society in which the "Four Freedoms" will flourish right in the slums?

What really happened is that she was so carried away by sympathy for the children that she forgot all about "Four Freedoms" propaganda and came out with the naked truth: RIGHT BACK TO THE SAME OLD SLUMS THE CHILDREN WILL GO—if they are not bombed into powder, in which case the children will have nowhere to go.

Children in rotten slums in peacetime, bombed out in wartime, only to be sent back again in peacetime—that's what socialists want to put an end to!

The American Legion

It Was Organized to Preserve Capitalism

By H. ALLEN

When Roane Waring, national commander of the American Legion, declared at the recent American Federation of Labor convention that, if he had the power, he "would shoot" a worker who goes on strike now, his statement doubtless surprised and shocked many people.

"President Roosevelt signed legislation today making members of the armed forces serving in the present World War eligible for membership in the American Legion. American citizens serving with any country allied with the United States also would be eligible."

Quite conceivably there are today many workmen who do not know about the anti-labor role that the American Legion has performed through the years, and in whom such an endorsement by President Roosevelt ("labor's friend") of the American Legion may occasion no surprise. Recent events and utterances by Legion spokesmen may have helped to awaken them.

Why? Let Lieut.-Col. D'Olier explain: "After the armistice, bolshevism was the bogey. Disgruntled soldiers had provided the manpower for the cataclysm in Russia."

The purpose of that ex-service-men's organization, its leaders have made clear, was to fight bolshevism and the newly formed republic of workers, peasants and soldiers of Soviet Russia. The task and aim of the American Legion today are essentially the same: to fight all progressive labor and radical movements on the ground that they are "subversive."

A petition of the Private Soldiers and Sailors Legion of the United States, presented to Congress on August 15, 1921, demanded that Congress repeal the Legion's charter because it had been formed with "unlimited funds" received "from sources which have never been revealed."

Why? Let Lieut.-Col. D'Olier explain: "After the armistice, bolshevism was the bogey. Disgruntled soldiers had provided the manpower for the cataclysm in Russia."

The purpose of that ex-service-men's organization, its leaders have made clear, was to fight bolshevism and the newly formed republic of workers, peasants and soldiers of Soviet Russia. The task and aim of the American Legion today are essentially the same: to fight all progressive labor and radical movements on the ground that they are "subversive."

To the Legion, "subversive" means any form of radicalism or labor militancy; bolshevism, communism, socialism, pacifism, liberals, aliens, labor organizers, militant labor unions, and even the American Civil Liberties Union. It has red-baiting and anti-labor propaganda down to a fine art, conducting it today under the cover of "national unity" for the imperialist war.

The American Legion is controlled and directed by a handful of men at the top: by the national commander and national committee. Conservative, middle-aged men with a military background, plus business interests—firm believers in and beneficiaries of capitalism (for instance, Waring, the national commander, is president of the Memphis, Tenn., Street Railway Co.)—being anti-union is second nature to these Legionnaires. Fully 80 per cent of the rank and file of the veterans of the

Sparks in the News

By Everett Weston

"Since Pearl Harbor the nation's annual incidence of 200,000 juvenile delinquencies has boomed 15 to 20 per cent."—Newsweek.

This is a national average, which hardly reflects a rise of 100 per cent or more in large cities where war activity is centered.

One of the really amusing angles of the new front in Africa is the distance Wendell (Windbag) Willkie had climbed out on the well known limb. Definite preparation for the "sneak attack" were in the making for months. When FDR sent Willkie around the world, I imagine he had a good notion he would blast Stalin's second front line back to the front pages. For the refinements of capitalist politics, you can't beat our Franklin.

"A scandal in the tin drive which is likely to knock the WPB to its foundations may explode any moment... In recognition of the brewers' 'sacrifice' in collecting tin cans in most of the big cities, (WPB) issued Order M-72-A, which authorizes brewers and bottlers to retain 50 per cent of the large-sized cans collected... The brewers had already had the astonishing amount of 60,000 tons of virgin metal allocated to their uses... A tin scrap section chief who protested was demoted."—Christian Century.

Get in the scrap—for caps!

"Of course the local boards need not pay any attention to 99 per cent of the things which we send out. It is a good thing they do not have to."—General Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service chief.

"The problem of a 'shortage' of U.S. manpower... is partly a shortage of U.S. brainpower in using the available manpower."—Time.

When the full story of MacArthur and the Pacific command comes out, it will make most interesting reading. Correspondent Harsch's story that "political Washington was largely responsible for setting up two separate commands in the Far Pacific" because of fear of MacArthur's political ambitions was not complete-

ly answered by MacArthur's apparently forthright "I started as a soldier and I shall finish as one. For part of the press continues to boom him. Pro-Roosevelt papers, for example, head dispatches from the Pacific 'United Nations Headquarters,' but the anti-Administration press, e.g., the New York Daily News, heads them 'General MacArthur's Headquarters.'" There has been increasing recognition that a division of command down the middle of the Solomons makes little sense, and since MacArthur's statement that he has no political ambitions, there has been a large sentiment for a unified command under him. The Army & Navy Journal, for instance, lists apparently typical editorials from all over the country. The following quotation is from John Gunther's "Inside Asia," page 301:

"The flamboyant MacArthur... believes firmly that the Filipinos, even if absolutely cut off from America, could defend themselves. General MacArthur has a battery of tactical reasons to support his claim... For one thing they say that air power would not be effective against the islands and that an infantry invasion is hardly possible... To assert that they could ALONE withstand a major war seems childish. A war would be a disaster."

"An officer at Fort Des Moines, Ia., wrote to the War Department to find out which side of his wife he should walk on. His wife is an officer in the WAACS. The answer: The mate with the higher rank walks on the right, even if the male must shove his wife onto the curb."—Yank.

And what about Eagle Scouts?

The African invasion was a boom to Armistice Day speechmakers. The only phrase we did not hear was that victory was just around the corner.

Leon Henderson pointed out that normal consumption of coffee is thirteen pounds a year, as compared with a ration of one pound every five weeks.

Correction: the figure thirteen pounds a year is based on the total population, including non-drinkers of coffee and children, who don't want and can't get ration cards.

Liked Sperry Article, Says Brewster Worker

Dear Editor: Congratulations on your Sperry article. We here at Brewster are glad to see that at least one paper gives us the news about the victorious labor gets out of real action.

I hope that you people answer the leaflet given out by the Communist Party on the War Labor Board (I am enclosing one). I would like you to know that no one has yet been so foolish as to give those one-sided facts in front of a union meeting.

The way we feel now, after one run-around after another, that guy would certainly get a merry reception. You know, some of us live in the Bronx.

Brewster Worker.

Episode in Camden Shipyard Union

Dear Editor: A member of Local 1 (IUMSWA-CIO) arose at a general membership meeting and moved to have the local donate \$200 to an airplane observation post in the Camden, N. J., area sponsored by the American Legion.

Certain members spoke in support of the motion when a known militant shop steward took the floor. "What's the matter with you guys?" he asked. "Remember the strikes in '35 when we got our union. The American Legion were the scabs and strikebreakers and you want to give them money? To hell with them!"

President William Pommereh of Local 1 seemed to recall that in the 1935 affair a couple of "smart lawyers" in the Legion had instigated the scabbing, but that "our boys in the Legion" had "straightened them out."

The motion was decisively defeated.

Pass this paper on. Give it to your fellow worker. He'll like it.

The Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

Brewster Worker Hits Stalinist Attack on LA

Dear Editor: I've been receiving your paper, LABOR ACTION, for the past several months now. I have found that I agree with many of the policies you advocate and disagree with some of them.

I'm in 100 per cent agreement with the policy you advocate for the unions, a policy of fighting back against those people who would wreck the trade union movement.

Last week a leaflet attacking your paper as Trotskyite-Hitler seditious propaganda was distributed by the Communist Party. The fact that at

mentioned in this leaflet. The leaflet argues against any militant action by the workers, except they call it "wildcat" actions, and mentions cases where the War Labor Board has handed down what they consider favorable decisions. (I should mention here that right now our union, Local 365, UAW-CIO, has a case before one of the panels of the War Labor Board.) Maybe the Communist Party doesn't know it, but in most cases the decisions of the War Labor Board have not been in favor of the workers and their unions.

Two of our shop stewards were fired recently. As a result of a two-hour "walkout," a demonstration of solidarity by the men and women in the shop, these two brothers were

I suppose if the members of the Communist Party in the shop, or those people who advocate their policies, had been in the leadership of our local union these men would still be out of work waiting for the decisions of some board of one kind or another. It seems to me that the action we took to defend our brother members is the kind of action that the Communist Party considers "wildcat."

I believe that Stalin's boys would wreck the unions here, regardless of the effect of such action on the lives of millions of workers of this country, if by so doing they could guarantee victory for Russia.

Enclosed find a donation to help you keep distributing your paper

its own fight on the home front, defending itself from attacks by people inside and outside the labor movement.

Brewster Worker.

Soldiers Called Out In Cleveland Strike

Dear Editor: Thirty-two members of District 50 of the United Mine Workers had a grievance. They also had courage and were sick and tired of the boss' lies and stalling. Thirty-two men—and it took a detachment of soldiers with bayoneted rifles to break their strike!

It happened near Cleveland last week when the soldiers, perhaps

three and one-half mile Fairport, Painesville & Eastern Railroad in Lake County. This was the first (but not the last!) time since Pearl Harbor that troops were used as strikebreakers in a Cleveland area labor dispute.

William Ullé, District 50 local union president, said the walkout was called in support of the union's demand for reinstatement of twenty-seven employees who were fired during a strike on the road in 1935.

The troops, from Fort Hayes, Columbus, were under command of Colonel J. C. Daly of the Fifth Service Command. He said he was acting on orders of the War Department in Washington.

The line on which the men were striking serves three large war

Max Shachtman Discusses:

Nine Lessons of North African Invasion

In the last issue of LABOR ACTION, Comrade Shachtman discussed six of the Nine Lessons of the North African Invasion. These were: 1. The Question of Who Fires the First Shot Is Not Important in Judging a War or the Participants in a War; 2. Diplomacy Is Hypocrisy and Deceit Practiced with Equal Cynicism by the Imperialists of All Countries; 3. Middle Class Liberals and Intellectuals Are Not to Be Taken Seriously When Serious Matters Are Involved; 4. This War Is an Imperialist War, That Is, a War

Fought for the Preservation or Acquisition of Empires and Imperial Power; 5. This Is Not a War for Democracy and Against Fascism, for Progress and Against Reaction. Those Watchwords Are Only Covers for the Real War; 6. The End Justifies the Means Only if the Means Are in Harmony with the End, and if the End Itself Is Just.

Readers who missed the first section of Comrade Shachtman's article are urged to write to LABOR ACTION for a copy. We continue and conclude the article in this issue with—

do it, and no people is free that helps, in any way whatsoever, keep other people enslaved. The vast majority of the enslaved peoples of the world today are the people of the colonies and half-colonies.

But imperialism, the democratic variety included, is not at all interested in emancipating these peoples. Just the contrary. It is in the business of keeping them under its arbitrary thumb. The latest experience in North Africa proves it.

The United States and England announced that they came to North Africa in order to free it. That is absolutely right—if you understand by that promise the idea of freeing North Africa of German and Italian domination. But just who is it that is to be freed in Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia? The Moroccans, the Algerians, the Tunisians? Not on your life! It is French imperialism that is to be freed, and the Moroccan and Algerian and Tunisian people who are to exchange the rule of Berlin-OmelVichy for the "good old" tyranny of French imperialism.

That is why the secret agents of America who went to North Africa before the invasion approached the civil and military representatives of old French imperialism, and held before them the bait: If you support us, you can have your African empire back without Axis supervision or control.

That is why these agents did not approach the workers and peasants and tribesmen of North Africa with the honest proposition: If you support us, you will be free of ALL foreign domination, you will enjoy national sovereignty, as any civilized people should, you will not have your destiny and your resources ruled by others, you will genuinely enjoy that basic democratic

right, the right of national self-determination. They didn't approach the natives with such a proposition because it is not in the nature of imperialism to make, much less to keep, such a pledge. And every intelligent colonial knows it.

The colonial people therefore do not join either imperialist camp of their own free volition. We do not mean native colonial tyrants, reactionary feudal lords, beys and shahs and generalissimos, because they readily join the imperialists who are their best protection from the democratic aspirations of their own people. We do mean the people, the colonial masses.

The best that democratic imperialism can do to obtain the "support" of the colonies is to ape the Nazis and their methods. They do not (they cannot!) win the genuine support of the colonial people by saying, and proving in action, that their fight is really a fight for the freeing of all oppressed peoples, nations and persecuted national minorities. So they say instead: "Don't go with the Axis. Don't be impressed by its words and deeds. Just look! We are just as tough as the Axis. We can conduct blitz-war just as well as the Axis can. We can be just as ruthless and hard-boiled. If you're smart, you'll join us." In other words, the colonial peoples are to be won by a species of intimidation.

You can dragon people into supporting you by such methods, but you cannot win their genuine, heartfelt support and solidarity. Yet, such methods are not the special peculiarities of General Eisenhower, or President Roosevelt, or Prime Minister Churchill. They are the methods that are inherent in imperialism of all varieties, as inseparable from it as a salty taste is from salt.

7. THE FATHERLAND OF ALL CAPITALISTS IS CAPITAL.

A good deal of bunk and stupidity has been written in the past two years about Quislings and Quislingism, and the North African events are a good occasion for introducing some clarity into the subject.

The newspaper propaganda about the Quislings aims to show that there are good capitalists and capitalist politicians, and bad ones. The former are first-rate patriots who love their fatherland above all else and are ready to make any sacrifice they can for it; under no circumstances will they cooperate with reactionary fascism. The latter, however, are not real patriots; they do not really love their fatherland; their only aim in life is to sell it out to Hitler and then go to work for him as office-boys.

Stuff and nonsense, from beginning to end.

There is not a single capitalist or capitalist politician worth mentioning who will not cooperate with Hitler or any other fascist, or even directly create or promote a fascist movement, if such an action suits his main aim—the protection of his capital. And for that matter there is not one of them who will not fight Hitler if that will serve the same aim.

The capitalists of the United Nations are not fighting Hitler because he represents fascism, which threatens democracy. They don't give a hoot in hell about democracy. They are fighting Hitler because he represents aggressive German imperialism, which threatens their own imperialist power. They capitulate to Hitler only when they find the Germans overwhelmingly superior, only when they consider it impossible to continue the war with any prospect of victory, or if they believe that to continue the war means a working class revolution. It is only then that they become "Quislings," that is, they subordinate themselves to a victorious Hitler, they cooperate with him in the hope of getting the best possible terms. But they never really give up their hostility toward him—not as the representative of a political system called fascism (they are never hostile toward that) but as the representative of a rival national imperialism. While "cooperating" with the victor, they bide their time. They wait for a better day, a more favorable day, when they can turn against the victor and inflict upon him the same "peace" terms that he inflicted upon them when he had the upper hand.

That's the way things really are with the so-called Quislings. The French capitalists "cooperate" with Hitler not because they want to serve German capitalism but because they think "cooperation" is the best way to serve their own class interests in the long run. In exchange for their "cooperation," they may get some relief, some concessions, from Hitler. They may get a breathing spell until the tide turns. That is how the German

capitalist class and capitalist politicians "cooperated" with the victorious Allies in the last war. They waited for the turn in the tide, for the time when their representative, Hitler, could do to the others what the others tried to do to them.

Of course, there are non-cooperator, "non-Quislings," among the French and Belgian and Dutch and Norwegian capitalists. But between them and the Vichy type there is no difference in principle of any kind. There is only a difference in judgment. In their estimation, Hitler has no chance of a durable victory. The United Nations are sure to win. Therefore, they string along with the latter. No difference in principle, we repeat; only a difference in judgment. It's like investing in one stock instead of another. The only reason you choose one against the other is that you expect more returns on your capital.

That's why, for example, the minute some of the Vichy rats concluded that the tide was turning, that the United Nations were getting the upper hand, they suddenly became "anti-Hitlerite," jumped across the Mediterranean, and announced themselves again as great French patriots. That's all that Darlan's turning of the coat means, or Nogues's, or Juin, or Flamin, or Pucheu or all the rest of them.

Naturally, there are some genuine Quislings, as the term is popularly understood. They include such vermin as Quisling himself, Ante Pavelich, Jacques Doriot, Anton Mussert and the like. But they are small-time political muscle-men, adventurers for hire, and they do not seriously represent the serious interests of the capitalist class. With hardly an exception, they are concerned mainly with their petty political fortunes, with a modest amount of subaltern power.

With the capitalist class itself, with its authentic political representatives, things are different. They aren't really Quislings, in the sense of avidly obedient tools of Hitler and Hitlerite Germany. Fundamentally, they were and they remain true and loyal to their religion—the religion of capital—the Norwegian capitalists to Norwegian capital, Dutch capitalists to Dutch capital, French capitalists to French capital, just as German capitalists are true only to German capital and Japanese capitalists to Japanese capital.

Defense of the nation? Defense of the fatherland? Do not be absurd! Capitalists are interested in defending the borders of their country only when their capital is at stake. If their capital is better protected by cooperation with the foreign invader and violator of their frontiers, they choose cooperation. If it is better protected by war, they send us off to war! That's all there is, at bottom, to the problem of Quislingism.

The religion of all capitalists is capital. The fatherland of all capitalists is capital.

8. DEMOCRATIC IMPERIALISM CANNOT WIN THE GENUINE SUPPORT OF THE COLONIAL MASSES IN ITS "WAR AGAINST FASCISM."

Every thinking worker, and enlightened people generally, hate fascism. It isn't Germany he wants crushed, or the German people, for what can he possibly have against those suffer-

ing victims of fascism? But he does want to see fascism crushed, no matter where it raises its head, no matter what language it speaks. It can and will be crushed. But only free people can

9. NO PEOPLE CAN REALLY ACQUIRE ITS FREEDOM AS A GIFT FROM IMPERIALISM. THEY MUST FIGHT FOR IT THEMSELVES.

There are many who support democratic imperialism because they say that whatever the criticism that can and should be made of it, it is nevertheless much preferable to Hitlerism, and it will at least bring freedom to many oppressed nations and peoples.

They are fooling themselves, if not others. Freedom is not a gift within the power of imperialism to give, not because it "doesn't want to" but because it just isn't in its nature to give it. You might as well ask a leper to bring you good, robust health.

Oh, well, that's just a theory. Yes, but a theory based on a vast accumulation of facts, of living experience, and added to every day.

Are the Moroccans, the Tunisians, Algerians, or the Libyans or Egyptians to be liberated, or gain full national sovereignty (the only possible basis for liberation), as a result of the victory of either imperialist camp? You have to be a first-class dope, or a political blind man, to believe that if one of the imperialisms emerges from the war, flushed with the power of victory, it will turn around to the colonies and say: All right, we quit; we withdraw; the country is yours. If British imperialism will not even make a serious concession to India now, at a time when it is in a bad jam and needs as much popular Indian support against its Japanese rival as it can get, do you think it will make India any gifts if it wins the war in Asia?

It is precisely in order to prevent the genuine freedom of the colonies that the imperialists find it so easy to come to terms with people like Darlan, Chatel, Esteve and Boisson. They need these scoundrels in order, as Professor Jean Boorsch of Yale University said the other day, "to keep the natives in line."

David Coolidge Reports on CIO Convention

Discussion on Wages Reveals Basic Error in the CIO's Orientation

(Continued from last week)

The presence of high government officials at the recent CIO convention helped to decide the tone of the convention, give it its real meaning, and make clear the real reason why the convention was being held. Last week we commented on the speeches of Bard and Pepper. It should be reported also that on the first day Under Secretary of War Patterson addressed the convention. All that was necessary to have the three branches of the government represented was to have some Justice of the Supreme Court present and making a speech.

This convention, probably to a greater degree than preceding ones, was devoted almost wholly to support of the imperialist war and devising suggestions as to how the government might more efficiently and effectively prosecute its war. All was not clear sailing for the leadership, however. Although the delegates were not from the rank and file, they were people in close contact with the rank and file, and people faced with serious questions arising in the shops.

Furthermore, the leadership itself knew that its policy of retreat and capitulation had not succeeded in accomplishing those for such a policy. For instance, it

things which had been claimed was clear even to the most obtuse of the bureaucrats that their famous slogan of "Victory Through Equality of Sacrifice" had been made applicable only to the workers and had not touched in any appreciable way the profits and income of the bosses.

Wages and the War

The longest discussion in the convention revolved around the resolutions on manpower, total war mobilization, and stabilization of national economy. These were the chief resolutions relating to the conduct of the war with which the convention was concerned.

The resolution on stabilization pointed out that (a) wages had been stabilized; (b) cost has not been controlled; (c) over-all and democratic rationing has not been accomplished; (d) the 1942 tax legislation actually takes away from the low income groups money which they need to buy the bare necessities of life.

Then this resolution resolves that "labor does not seek any special privileges...we merely seek the adoption of policies which will assure the maximum utilization of all our manpower and all our resources in a manner that will guarantee an early victory in this war." After

which it calls for a "win-the-war tax program."

The resolution closes with the contention that "wages should continue to be stabilized but not frozen. The wage program should be measured in terms of what will best assure the most efficient workers for production...wage freezing must be condemned as a blow against the fullest prosecution of our war effort."

A Feebly Distinction

It is very difficult for anybody to discover and understand what exactly is the distinction that the CIO leadership makes between what is called "wage stabilization" and "wage freezing." The resolution and the leading speakers in the convention ignored completely the fact that the policy of the War Labor Board, which was laid down in the Little Steel decision, is a policy which ties the workers to their standard of living as of January 1, 1941.

LABOR ACTION has already pointed out that this decision and procedure simply mean the stabilization and freezing of a low standard of living. It provides no opportunity for an improved standard of living and for increased real economic benefits. Furthermore, the vague language of the resolution about paying wages that will cre-

ate the highest production is really nonsense. It is significant that nothing is said in this resolution about a demand for higher wages to limit the tremendous profits of the bosses. All these bureaucrats are concerned with is wages high enough to guarantee maximum production. This for the reason that they are concerned primarily with support of the imperialist war.

The resolution on total war mobilization says in part that "total war mobilization cannot operate or be organized except through the direct and fullest participation of labor—not through any advisory committee, but with labor given the highest responsibility in the formulation and execution of all the policies and activities. This full and equal representation of labor has not been achieved...the CIO therefore demands the participation of labor in all the administrative agencies which make and execute our war policies—and at every level."

Source of Difficulty

This is really a demand not only for the placing of labor representatives in the administrative agencies, but also a demand for the placing of labor in responsible cabinet positions. This must be true because the formulation and execution of policies and activities is a political func-

tion. The tragic and naive incompetence of the CIO leadership to think clearly on this question is really the source of the difficulties that the CIO and its membership face today.

This was further illustrated in the discussion of the resolution on the recent elections. This resolution said that "with the forces of labor and other supporters of the leadership of our Commander-in-Chief not always united, and with the finger not accurately pointed to the conveyors of confusion and of internal opposition, the candidates qualified for membership in a true win-the-war Congress went down to defeat."

In the discussion of the resolution, one delegate said that in Michigan from 25 to 35 per cent of "our people were not even registered to vote. They don't even think that it is important to register, and then when election day comes around they do not get out and cast their ballots... Although we haven't got any form of socialism or technocracy or anything else, collective bargaining as we have come to know it has probably been taken over by the government."

In the discussion of this resolution there were many things said about the necessity of labor being represented in the government. Comparison was made with the situation in England, but nobody seemed to be aware of the fact that in England it is not the trade unions as such that are represented in the government, but the British Labor Party. They talked in this convention as though the problems of labor can be solved simply by placing a dozen or so trade union leaders, as trade union leaders, on the administrative board.

There was a great deal of shooting at the mark, but everybody missed. The real question that was posed before the convention was independent political action, a break from the Democratic and Republican Parties, and the establishment of an Independent Labor Party, national in extent. But the convention and its leadership steered clear of that logical conclusion.

The resolution on manpower called for the full utilization of all workers, Negro, alien and women, and a demand that every restriction on their use be broken down and eliminated.

drafting of labor. It was urged that a national mobilization plan be adopted "with full participation of all elements in our population" in order to "bring about the integration of our war machinery."

Reuther Approaches Genuine Point

At the request of Murray, Reuther made a long speech during the discussion on the total war mobilization resolution. In the course of his speech he remarked that "Mr. Nelson is not a New Dealer, and if you check the people who make up the War Production Board you will find for every New Dealer there are two hundred rock-ribbed reactionary Republicans. They are making the policy in Washington... I came back from Washington about three weeks ago in a plane. There were two representatives of the War Production Board in front of me... They were reading the news about Stalingrad. One fellow said: 'All we have to do is just give the Russians enough so they can hang on, and they will destroy each other.'"

Reuther also told the convention about a document being circulated in Washington by one of Nelson's closest advisers "which proves beyond doubt that Mr. Weinberg is using material put out by a notorious strike-breaker, labor-baiter and Jew-baiter in the city of Chicago, one Harry Jung, who has been carrying on a vicious campaign against labor. Mr. Weinberg is using material from this fellow's agency in his fight inside the War Production Board against organized labor."

It is interesting that in the course of this speech Reuther approached the heart of the difficulties that the workers in the shops face today; that is the problem of getting their grievances settled. He said: "We go to management and they say take it to Washington. We say take it to Washington. Reuther's solution for this difficulty, how-

ever is not to make a demand for the restoration of genuine collective bargaining between the workers and the bosses. Instead he suggested that the regional offices of the War Labor Board appoint arbitrators to handle grievances.

The whole discussion revealed that the entire course of the CIO during the past year has been one which has and could only lead to defeat for the membership. Time and again leading speakers emphasized the point that the course pursued during past months has not produced the results that the leadership evidently expected.

What we want to emphasize is the fact, known to every militant member of the CIO, that defeat was guaranteed when the right to strike was surrendered. It is known in every shop and factory that when the threat of strike was removed the whole management, from plant owner down to the smallest foreman, began a planned policy of riding the workers and refusing to discuss grievances. It is also known by every worker that there is one way and only one way to correct this situation and that is to go back to the time-honored methods that have proved effective in forcing management to settle grievances. All the talk about supporting "our Commander-in-Chief" will have absolutely no influence on hard-headed corporation executives.

Next week we will resume this report, dealing with the Stalinists, the United Mine Workers, unity, and the resolution on discrimination.

Buy LA and NI
In Buffalo:

Main and Mohawk.
Main and Huron, next
to Gamlers.

Detroit Workers, Attention

For further information about LABOR ACTION, write to
PO Box, 1805, Detroit

New York Workers Attention!

THE NEW CRISIS IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT

JOHN L. LEWIS—THE CIO—TRADE UNION UNITY

WILL BE THE SUBJECT OF A LECTURE BY

DAVID COOLIDGE

(National Labor Secretary of the Workers Party)

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 6, at 8:00 P. M.

IRVING PLAZA—IRVING PLACE AND 15th STREET

Auspices: LABOR ACTION

Questions and Discussion

