

VULTEE STRIKE VITAL TEST FOR LABOR

First Days Of CIO Meet Bring Heated Discussion

By DAVID COOLIDGE

ATLANTIC CITY, Nov. 19—The "Third Constitutional Convention" of the Congress of Industrial Organizations opened here Monday morning with the usual ceremonial prayer and address of welcome by the mayor. After this and a few other routine matters the temporary chairman worked up to the event that the convention was waiting for: the introduction of John L. Lewis. The forty-five minute ovation had been well prepared and organized by the Stalinists. I do not mean by this that the ovation was purely a Stalinist affair. This would be far from the truth. There were many delegates and other members and friends of the CIO who were sincere in their rapturous reception of Lewis. These were old associates, friends and members of the organization who are convinced that Lewis stands for something important, vital and necessary in the labor movement in this country. They look upon Lewis as the living symbol and chief protagonist of the idea of industrial unionism. These workers are convinced that industrial unionism has given them something that they never had before and that the CIO holds great promise for the workers in the mass production industries. They attribute the results obtained during the past five years to the leadership of John L. Lewis. That is why they applauded him so vigorously.

Inflated By Stalinists

There is no doubt however that the ovation was pumped up and inflated by the Stalinists. They arrived here on Sunday, and by Monday were as thick as flies. They were organized to put over the re-election of Lewis. When you entered the lobby of the Hotel Chelsea, where the convention is being held, delegates and visitors were handed lapel buttons two inches in diameter bearing the legend, "Forward With Lewis and CIO." It was evident to any of us who have seen the Stalinists in action that these buttons were a part of their "draft Lewis" campaign.

During the forty-five minute ovation the Stalinist cheering sections in the gallery and among the delegates were busy with confetti, streamers and various types of noise makers. There were cries of "we want Lewis," and the singing of "Lewis is our leader, we shall not be moved." The band attempted the ruse of playing the Star Spangled Banner on the assumption that at the end of the "national anthem" the delegates and gallery cheering section would, with due reverence, become silent. But nothing of the sort happened: the din continued. Finally, I suppose with fatigue approaching, and with the efforts of Lewis, order was restored and Lewis began his

(Continued on page 4)

Michigan U. Prexy Expels Thirteen Anti-War Students

Michigan University has two memorable personalities walking about its well-groomed campus grounds these November days. One is half-back Tommy Harmon—whose hip-dipper exploits on the gridiron field are so amply publicized for the greater glory of Alma Mater and amateur sports. The other is prexy Alex Ruthven—whose pile-driving knock-em-down drag-em-out game against academic freedom is not so well reported for America's sporting multitudes. And prexy Ruthven has just given us a foretaste of war-time "democracy."

Last June, for example, Ruthven addressed letters to thirteen students denying them re-admission to the University for the fall term. In October, Ruthven followed through by withdrawing a teaching fellowship from a graduate student for protesting the expulsion of the students. Ruthven is keeping mum about the expulsions. Thus far he has failed to make public to anyone the reasons for the expulsions and has rejected out of hand any proposal for an open hearing. Ruthven may be silent, but the record of the expelled students as leaders of the campus anti-war movement, and as fighters against Negro discrimination in Ann Arbor, speaks eloquently as to why Ruthven considers them undesirable characters.

The Michigan Committee for Academic Freedom, organized out of the

Thaelmann Wasn't Present-- He's in a Concentration Camp

"In the forenoon Mr. Molotoff had a two-hour talk with Reich Marshal Goering, who, it is surmised, gave his visitor an extensive picture of the results of the air war against Britain. Mr. Molotoff was accompanied by members of the Soviet Air Commissariat, who were among his delegation.

"FOLLOWING THAT EXCHANGE WITH GOERING THE SOVIET PREMIER CALLED ON HERR HESS, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE NATIONAL SOCIALIST PARTY, TO WHOM HE CONVEYED THE GREETINGS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY."

—Dispatch from Berlin to the New York Times, Nov. 14, 1940

THE WORLD AT WAR

"Big Doings" Seen Coming As Result of Hitler Talks-- U. S. Keeps Eyes on Far East

By MAX STERLING

Before taking leave of Hitler, Molotov committed an act of debasement and treachery that has no parallel in the long history of the labor movement. He presented greetings from the Communist Party of Russia to the Nazi Party of Germany! We leave it to the Stalinists to explain this infamous act of political solidarity between what was once the party of Lenin and the organized murderers of the German working class. Perhaps they will say that this too is a "matter of taste."

The first result of the Molotov-Hitler meeting was the publication in Pravda of the text of the German-Slovak treaty consummated two years ago which made Slovakia a protectorate of Germany. Diplomatic circles believe that this is preliminary to Russian recognition of Germany's conquest of Czecho-Slovakia. Closer ties with the Nazis are also indicated by the establishment of German consulates at Leningrad, Vladivostok and Batum.

GERMAN PLANS

We shall no doubt soon see further evidence of the agreement reached by Molotov in Berlin. In the meantime, the Nazi press is hinting that big political doings will come off this week. Hitler is being kept busy with new talks with King Boris of Bulgaria, Ramon Suner of Spain, Count Ciano of Italy and General Ionescu of Rumania.

All this points to another Nazi blitzkrieg attempt. After Mussolini's fiascos in Greece and Africa no one can any longer speak of an Italian blitzkrieg unless we speak of a blitzkrieg in reverse.

However, the German threats are another thing. The visit of Ramon Suner to Berlin may mean that the Nazis are ready for their assault on Gibraltar. Consideration of loans and food shipments to Spain by England and the United States are obviously an attempt to swing Spain out of the Nazi orbit. It appears more likely that Hitler will have his way with

Franco, especially since disguised German troops are already reported to be on Spanish soil.

The pending Nazi campaign in the Mediterranean may take the form of a series of simultaneous or even independent blows which would include not only an assault on Gibraltar but a drive against the Greeks and a reinforcement of the Italian campaign in Africa. Now that Mussolini has disgraced himself in Greece, the Nazis may think it time to show the Italians how a real blitzkrieg is made. This may explain King Boris' visit to Hitler; the best way for the Nazis to get to Greece is through Bulgaria.

(Continued on page 3)

Bosses Open Attack on 40-Hour Week

On Nov. 13, Mr. Alfred P. Sloan Jr., chairman of the board of directors of the General Motors Corporation, fired the first big gun in the drive against the 40 hour week at a dinner meeting of the Academy of Political Science. Before a notable gathering of the representatives of big business and their professional economists, Mr. Sloan declared: "America today is working a shorter number of hours per week than any other nation—certainly any other involved in war or defense. Output can be increased 20 per cent by working six days a week in place of five days. It seems clear this should be the first step, if the point is reached when the slack of unemployment has been taken up and the increasing speed of industry has been utilized to the fullest practical extent."

These gentlemen certainly work fast. The final provision of the wage and hour law, providing for maximum working hours of 40 a week and minimum pay of 40 cents an hour, only went into effect on Oct. 24. There are still 9 to 10 million unemployed in

Challenge Poll Tax In Appeal for Negro Cropper

A dollar and a half may be the difference between life and death for Odell Waller, Negro sharecropper who is scheduled to die on Dec. 27 at Chatham, Virginia, for the alleged murder of his cheating landlord, Oscar Davis.

A dollar and a half is the Virginia Poll Tax. Most sharecroppers cannot pay this poll tax; they were consequently excluded from the all-white jury which convicted him.

With his "peers" excluded from the jury, Waller didn't have a ghost of a chance. At the very moment that the prejudiced jury was sitting in judgment on this poor sharecropper, lynch mobs were forming outside the court in the event the jury "slipped."

Waller killed Davis in a dispute over crop shares; and there is substantial evidence to prove that Davis was trying to cheat Waller out of his entire season's crop—after he had already evicted Waller's family from their home. In the dispute, Davis reached for his gun pocket. Waller, who had already been threatened with violence, acted in self-defense and shot Davis.

Armed planters went after Waller. Though the atmosphere in the county made a fair trial impossible, the judge refused to entertain a defense motion to move the trial to another city.

Thus, Waller was not tried for the murder of Davis. He was condemned to death because he, a Negroes and a sharecropper, defended himself against a white landlord.

The Workers Defense League, with the cooperation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, is pressing Waller's appeal. At least \$2,000 is needed to carry the appeal to the Supreme Court. He can be saved from the chair only if \$350 is raised by Nov. 26 for appeals in Virginia's courts.

Waller's case is labor's case. Readers are urged to contribute to the \$2,000 needed for the appeal. Address funds to Workers Defense League, 112 E. 19th Street, New York City.

Carlo

"A Matter of Taste" --- Molotov



Army Chiefs, Bosses Use "Defense" Lie Against Strike

By JACK WILSON

LOS ANGELES, Calif., Nov. 16—Terrific pressure by the war department, the federal conciliation service, and Sidney Hillman was put on the 3,800 production workers at the Vultee aircraft plant here to end their strike for a half way decent wage scale.

Called by the aircraft division of the United Automobile Workers of America (CIO), the Vultee strike, involving a total of 5,000 employees, constituted the major showdown between aircraft manufacturers and the CIO in its effort to organize the 225,000 workers in this industry.

Nearly 65,000 aircraft workers in this area alone, most of them unorganized, are watching with keen interest the outcome of this battle on which the future of the CIO in aircraft hinges.

Want More Pay

Burning issue of the strike, and among all aircraft workers in this district, is wages. Most plants pay a minimum of .50 cents an hour, much too low for any kind of decent living standard. The Vultee strikers are demanding a minimum of .65 cents an hour, and a five cent an hour wage increase for higher paid workers.

Seven weeks of fruitless negotiation, combined with a growing impatience on the part of the workers, forced the calling of the strike, despite repeated efforts of Hillman, and federal conciliators to settle the issues by "arbitration."

The strike was neatly timed also to put Hillman on the spot at the CIO convention at Atlantic City, since it gives an excellent opportunity to expose him as Roosevelt's hatchman in the labor movement against the workers' interests.

Men Enthusiastic

Approved by the international executive board of the auto workers union, the strike is under the direction of Walter J. Smethurst, director of the CIO aircraft organizing committee, and former executive assistant to John L. Lewis. L.H. Michener, international representative of the autoworkers, and Wyndham Mortimer, aircraft organizer for the UAWA, complete the trio handling this strike.

Since the strike is well organized, the workers full of pep and enthusiasm, great responsibility rests on these individuals to prevent a phoney "arbitration" agreement. They are obviously acting under guidance of their respective political factions within the CIO who are out to embarrass Hillman and expose Roosevelt's pre-election demagoguery about safeguarding labor's gains.

In view of the heat against any strike action whatsoever, especially in aircraft, the mere calling of this strike represents a forward stride for aircraft workers since it emphasized that the aircraft workers not only have the right to strike but can strike successfully.

Of course, the filthy newspapers and gutter sheets here are filled with howls about a "calamity" against national "defense."

Fantastic Profits

However, the aircraft companies are making such huge war profits and are so dizzy from prosperity that the general reaction is in favor of the strikers obtaining a substantial wage increase.

Vultee has a backlog of \$80,000,000 in British and U.S. government orders, on which a profit of between 10 to 18 per cent is guaranteed. Everyone knows this, so the old baloney about "we can't afford to pay more," hasn't been attempted much by the company.

Rather, the company is trying to make "national defense" the issue, and cleverly hides behind the skirts of the war department, the federal conciliators, and the notorious Mr. Hillman.

Martin Dies, notorious labor bather, issued another violent statement about "1,200 spies and saboteurs" in the airplanes around here, as part of the preparation to raise a phoney red and spy scare to force the strikers back to work without obtaining their demands.

Army Against Strike

A special delegation of U.S. Army officers made their appearance today at the plant, headed by Colonel Lowell Smith, army procurement chief, in a crude attempt to impress the strikers and terrorize them.

The tremendous national significance of this strike has not escaped a single one of the various forces clashing here. The U.S. Army is

(Continued on page 2)

And Still They Complain

The financial and industrial interests of this country are doing a lot of croaking these days about the perilous condition of business and the low profits they are making. Every day one or another of the leading financiers or industrialists makes the press by announcing that business is endangered and cannot prosper unless the work week is lengthened and wages remain stationary or are reduced. Behind this public attack on labor conditions and standards is a grand scheme to increase even more the present enormous profits made by the American capitalists.

Information can be obtained from the little-read financial periodicals or banking reports where figures on business and profits are contained for the information of the few who read them. Of especial interest is the economic bulletin of the National City Bank of New York, for the month of November.

Speaking of general business conditions, the bulletin states: "The industries and the commodity markets have had another busy month in October. For the most part manufacturers have continued to sell more than they are shipping, and their unfilled orders have piled up further. . . . Manufacturers can see a high rate of operations ahead for some time." The bulletin goes on to state: "An index of new orders compiled by the National Industrial Conference Board, which is based on reports from about 700 manufacturers, in September climbed above the peak reached during the rush last Fall, following the outbreak of war. This was the sixth consecutive monthly rise, and the increase was the greatest in any month of the six." Poor manufacturers!

The bulletin continues: "Most questions as to the near-future business outlook disappear when the industries have order books as well filled as now. . . . Steel mill output is larger than ever before in the country's history. . . . The automobile industry is giving strong support to business."

So much for the business outlook. And what about profits? We are informed that: "Sharp gains in profits were reported in numerous of the capital goods industries (large heavy industry-Ed.) having a continued recovery in volume of business, partly due to the war and the national defense program. . . . A tabulation of the statements of 350 industrial corporations for the third quarter gives combined net profits, less deficits, of approximately \$257,000,000, after taxes. . . . For the first nine months, these companies had combined net profits of \$869,000,000, which compares with \$611,000,000 in the last year and represents an increase of 42 per cent."

Here is what the tabulated reports show (in thousands of dollars):

	Net Profits 9 months	Per Cent Change	Annual Return % (Profits)	Rate of Return % (Profits)	
	1939	1940	1939	1940	
291 Manufacturing Groups	\$575,581	\$819,053	plus 42.3	7.8	10.8
59 Mining, Trade, Service, etc. Groups	35,439	50,316			
250 Groups	\$611,020	\$869,369	42.3	7.4	10.4

Remember these figures well: an increase in net profits for the first nine months of 1940 in the amount of \$257,000,000! An increase of 42.3%! And the RATE of profit increased from 7.4% to 10.4%, a growth of three percent.

(Continued on page 2)

Fascism and the Imperialist War by Max Shachtman

ARTICLE THREE

The already voluminous literature of discussion in and around the radical movement is concerned with the question of the day: What should be the working-class or socialist attitude towards the war? And well it might be concerned with this question, for on the answer to it hinges nothing less than the future of humanity.

Nine-tenths of yesterday's radicals or near-radicals have already foresworn their old allegiances. We said this, that, or the other thing yesterday? No matter. We say the opposite today. Fascism has changed everything. The Austrian house-painter has, you see, wiped out capitalism, his Blitzkrieg threatens to wipe out the world and our way of

A Changing World—Hook Proves It

As a teacher, not only of university students but also of the radical movement, you would expect that he has something definite to say. And so he has. Only, what he says today differs from, and more often than not contradicts, what he said the day before. His outstanding distinction is the fact that in about a decade of public political activity he has not held a single important political view for more than a twelfth-month. If there were any doubt that this is a changing world, the hospital chart of Hook's political fevers would speedily dispel it.

He first acquired political prominence by active intellectual sponsorship of the presidential ticket of the Stalinists in 1932, when "Third Period" idiocy was gathering full speed. We find him next as the theoretician of the strange combine that was founded under the name of the American Workers Party. After a few months of its existence, he helped bring about its fusion with the Trotskyist organization, out of which came the Workers Party of the United States. Exhausted by this progressive but brief effort, he dropped out of the organized movement entirely. Since then, he has shifted steadily to

A Re-Hash of Social-Patriotism

Hook is for supporting England against Germany, and for the U.S. government sending aid to England. If that means U.S. entry into the war, he cannot for the life of him understand "why should socialists oppose a war against Hitlerism?" The arguments against his position—and substantially his article is directed against us of the Workers Party—divides into four parts, which we will list and number:

ONE: It is wrong "to assume that what was a valid position in respect to the first world war must still be valid in respect to this one."

TWO: It is wrong "to substitute the question: 'Who is responsible for the present war?' for the question: 'What are the consequences to democracy and socialism of victory by one side or the other?'" and to conclude from the fact of equal responsibility that the consequences of the victory of either side will be the same."

THREE: It is wrong "to wax eloquent about the dangers of one course of action so as to ignore the greater dangers of any practical alternative."

FOUR: "Only one serious argument has ever been advanced against socialist support of a war against fascism. It is asserted that such a war will bring totalitarianism to the democracies which engage in it. . . . The possibility cannot be gainsaid. But the probability of such an outcome is much less

The Character of the Present War

Is it a reactionary war? Is it an imperialist war? of capitalism and imperialism, war and fascism, is what we used to ask, and answer affirmatively, about the war to come, the war now being fought. So did Hook. But he does it no longer. On the question of the character of the war—not one word. In place of an answer, we get the profoundly smug platitude which ought to go over big in Hook's freshman classes: It is wrong "to assume that what was a valid position in respect to the first world war must still be valid in respect to this one." We do not assume that it must be valid. We set out to prove that it is valid, and no-one, least of all Hook, proves the contrary.

The last world war was a struggle between imperialist powers, each seeking either to preserve old plunder or acquire new plunder; it was not a struggle between Republicanism (France) and Monarchism (Germany) or between Culture (Germany) and Czarism (Russia); neither side played a progressive role and the war was reactionary on both sides. The present world war is likewise a struggle between two imperialist bandit camps, one seeking to preserve its plunder, the other seeking to take it away; it is not a struggle between Democracy (England) and Fascism (Germany); neither side is playing a progressive role and the war is reactionary on both sides.

That is how a socialist, Professor Hook, approaches the question. And that is why your first point is spurious.

Hook's second point is no improvement, and that on both questions, the one he considers legitimate

The Consequences of a Position

But what about the famous "consequences to democracy and socialism of victory by one side or the other?" To deal with this point requires dealing also with Hook's third and fourth points.

Our "socialist" has completely abandoned the idea that the working class can raise itself, by its own independent action, out of the slime and horror in our own "archaic" and "hyper-thyroid" way, that the world has gone to the dogs, and the working class along with it. Only one of the two imperialist gangsters can emerge triumphant. And we, poor impotent souls? Our only hope is to carry liberty to Germany on the points of those imperialist bayonets which are a "lesser evil" as compared with the other imperialist bayonets. "A defeat of Hitler in all likelihood will lead to a socialist revolution in the Fascist countries," writes Hook. Is it not our turn to say: It is wrong "to assume that what was a valid position in respect to the first world war must still be valid in respect to this one?" It wasn't valid in the last world war either, to be sure, but it was the Kaiser-socialists in Germany who argued that "a defeat of the Czar in all likelihood will lead to a socialist revolution in Russia"; and the Anglo-French social-imperialists who argued that "a defeat of the Kaiser in all likelihood will lead to a socialist revolution in Germany." No, Professor Hook, when you snitch the arguments of Scheidemann and Cachen, you should give credit where credit is due. It is bad manners to plagiarize.

Let us look further into the quite relevant question of consequences.

Does Hook know how Hitler has succeeded, to a great extent, in breaking down the socialist spirit and morale of the German working class? Not by

life, and we?—we proceed immediately to wipe out the class struggle and our principles. In different accents, in different forms, our ex-radicals are all saying one thing. Support the war against Hitler!

Yet, no matter where they came from originally, no matter what specific set of principles they are abandoning, no matter what form they couch their pleas in, the ex-radical gentlemen have one thing in common. They and their arguments tend to gravitate in one direction: the superannuated patriots of the right wing of the social democrats in this country, the New Leader crowd. A case in point is the versatile Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy in one of our illustrious universities, ace-Marxologist, part-time politician, advisor of the people, and now, expert in matters-of-war.

the right. His attacks on Bolshevism increased in volume, malice, and distortion, but still he insisted that he was a revolutionary socialist. Finally, he took to writing for the New Leader, organ of as corrupt and shoddy a gang of right-wing "socialists" as you want to find. It was a bad symptom. When Hook was taxed with it, he protested that he had nothing whatsoever in common with the gang, that, though he despised them, he was utilizing their invitation to write in order to put forward "his own" ideas. We thought differently, and we said so.

Finally, in the New Leader of August 31, 1940, Hook, having absorbed the surrounding atmosphere like a sponge, comes forward as a full-fledged social-patriot, singing the praises of the holy war against fascism. He, the "radical," the "Marxist," is triumphantly presented by Abe Cahan's editors to demolish the revolutionary socialists whose views, as one of them says, "are drawn from archaic traditions, or a hyper-thyroid and garrulous revolutionism."

Let us see from the job he does whether the laborer is worthy of his hire.

than that a triumphant Hitlerism will result in totalitarianism everywhere. . . . But in a war between the democracies and Hitlerism, there are only two practical courses of action open for socialists: either to devote their energies to help the democracies win, or to oppose them and thus weaken their struggle against fascism. The first may lead to totalitarianism; the second will lead to totalitarianism."

Now if this wretched re-hash of social-patriotic apologies were written by a contemporary of those "socialists" who dragooned the workers into the war of 1914, it might be passed over in silence just as one passes in pitying silence an incurable drunkard who is found lying in the gutter for the fiftieth time. But this is written by Sidney Hook, the eminent "Marxist," that is, by a man who knows better.

There is a horrible world war going on now. It was not unexpected. It was not unforetold. We Marxists saw it coming; we predicted it; we analyzed it in advance. So did Hook. Our self-styled socialist undertakes in his article to analyze the war and recommend the attitude that should be taken towards it. But although he covers almost a whole newspaper page with ink, he does not—this Marxist of ours—spend one word to ask and answer the first, elementary, indispensable question:

and the one he says is illegitimately substituted for it. The question of "responsibility" is not arbitrary, beside the point, or merely a matter of moral judgment. It relates directly to the question of the character of the war and the socialist attitude towards it. To be sure, we understand why Hook considers the question of "responsibility" illegitimate; it is most embarrassing to all the "democratic" war-mongers. But above all, it is pertinent.

The present war is, except for minor shifts, a direct continuation of the war of 1914-1918. The "peace" of 1918-1939 was nothing but a long interval between battles. It was an armed truce during which the belligerents, the principal imperialist rivals, re-assembled their forces, re-armed, jockeyed to occupy the most favorable fighting positions for the resumption of the war. The last war was not caused by the fact that the Kaiser's left arm was shriveled; the present war is not caused by the fact that Hitler's soul is shriveled. Both wars were caused by the clash of imperialist interests and appetites. The real stakes in the war, then and now, are not Kaiserism or Democracy or Fascism, but which imperialist gang is to dominate the colonies of the world, the commercial lanes, the sources of raw materials, the fields of investment, the spheres of influence, the sources of cheap labor. In the last war, the imperialist lusts of Germany were strangled by the noose of Versailles. In this war, Hitler wants to strangle Britain with a German Versailles. And Britain, the citadel of Democracy? Her aim is to fasten upon resurgent German imperialism a super-Versailles! Let Hook deny it.

force alone. The whole Fascist ideology is based upon the notion of the identity of interests of all classes. There is no class struggle, say the Nazis, there is only the nation, and the nation is the race. How do the Fascists dispel the internationalist "doubts" of the socialist masses in the country? By pointing to the class-collaboration and social-imperialism of their "comrades" in the "democratic" countries. "Do you see how they unite with their governments in war time? Do you see how they defend the ill-gotten colonial gains of their masters?" By these far from stupid arguments, the Nazis tear up the fabric of socialist spirit in the heart of the German workers.

Hook has either forgotten the Saar plebiscite and the experience in Sudeten land or else he never understood them. Why did the Sudeten-German socialist and communist masses move over by the thousands to the banner of Henlein-Hitlerism? Their nationalism, their capitulation, were fed powerfully by the nationalism and capitulation of the Czech social democrats and Stalinists to the Czech bourgeoisie.

The first consequence of labor and socialist support to the imperialist democracies in the war is a consolidation of Hitler's ideological stranglehold over the German masses. Hook can dispose of the Versailles of 1919 and Churchill's super-Versailles plan of today by pretending he never even heard of it, or if he did, it is not important; the German masses are not so nimble.

But there are other consequences, just as bad or worse. Hook tries to scare the old maids editing the New Leader—who are scared enough as it is—by warning against the policy of civil war against

the democratic capitalist government while it is at war with a Fascist power." Good. In order that the old maids may get at least one night's sleep, we promise on our word of honor not to start a civil war the minute the Roosevelt-Cahan-Hook Holy War Against Fascism is launched. In return, let us see what Hook will have to promise, that is, what

From It Flows a Program of Action

Now, unless this is all a literary exercise, certain consequences, that is, a certain program of action, among other things, must follow from this position. You cannot "drive the successful conclusion of the war against Fascism" by bombarding Berlin with copies of Hook's philosophical works. With due deference to them, something more potent is needed nowadays. The first objective of the "drive" must logically be: a tremendous armaments program that will enable the U.S.A. to catch up with and outstrip not only Germany, but Germany plus Italy plus Japan plus any other allies they can muster. More than that. Modern war requires the replenishment of used material at a greater speed and in greater volume than ever before. And remember. This war is not a week-end excursion. Both Churchill and Hitler envisage a duration of at least five years.

All this will require a bit of doing. It will mean imposing an economic burden on the country—heavier every day—such as it has never known. Who will bear this burden? The population as a whole? All classes of the population (surely Hook has heard that there are classes in the United States)? And how will this burden be divided among the classes? What share will be allotted to the workers and the farmers, and what share to the capitalists? Will it be equally distributed? And above all, who will decide on the distribution?

The government will decide, yes, the good, democratic, anti-fascist government. What is this government? Is it above all the classes, impartially administering justice to all? Is it the government of the capitalists and of the workers? Is it the government of the capitalist class—or is it this, too, one of those ideas of Marxism that must be declared ob-

On the Side of Which Class?

We promised Hook not to launch a civil war as soon as Roosevelt declares war. But what is civil war? It is only the culminating point of class war, of class struggle in modern society. In defense of their class interests, which becomes more and not less urgent during war, the workers carry on a class struggle. In the course of that struggle, they seek to win and finally do win the support of the masses of the people. The question is thereupon posed: Who is to be master at home? The militant, democratically-organized masses reach out for the power that is properly theirs. The ruling class stands in the way, seeking to crush the people by force. A civil war, of greater or lesser scope, of greater or lesser duration, of greater or lesser violence, then ensues.

Hook is not really aiming at "civil war" threats, which come from nowhere. (He knows, of course, how ridiculous it is to speak of that.) He is aiming at the class struggle. That is how all turncoats from Marxism, from revolutionary socialism, end up: by renouncing the class struggle, by preaching class peace, reconciliation, collaboration. That is another of the consequences of Hook's policy. There are still others.

Hook would have us support the American capitalist government in the war, as the British Labor Party is supporting its government. He wants to "drive" for a speedy victory over fascism, because of the "consequences" of a victory of the other side. He is against "civil war" (in reality, against working class independent action) at home because it weakens the dear old government in its fight against Hitler.

What, then, would Hook, as emissary to India of His Majesty's Ever So Democratic Government, tell the Indian masses to do now? (Surely Hook has heard somewhere that England is an imperialist

The Class Struggle Must Go On!

Yes, yes—it will be said—but with all that, you still cannot deny that Rooseveltian democracy is "better" than Hitlerite fascism. Quite true. We do not deny it and we never have. What we have insisted on is this:

The only way in which to preserve and extend those democratic rights which we have conquered under democratic capitalism is, in the present period, to carry on an independent class struggle against fascistified-infected or fascistified-corrupted bourgeois democracy. How can any intelligent person think otherwise, especially after the experiences of the past few years? The masses entrusted the bourgeois democrats with the struggle against Hitler, and they got Hitlerism in 1933. They did the same in the struggle against Franco—and Franco was handed the victory by the same "democrats." They did the same in Czechoslovakia—and before Benes fled to teach Chicago students how to preserve democracy, he turned the government over to the Svyov military dictatorship, which turned it over to Hitler. They did the same in France—and they got Vichy totalitarianism plus Hitler.

Does the lesson of all these tragedies merely mean that . . . we must repeat them? Hook can dismiss all this airily with the sporting reference to the necessity of taking "risks." Support of the war may lead to totalitarianism, says he. And you see, say his blunter colleagues, in England there is not yet a totalitarian regime. To be sure, there is not. Why not? Because countries like the U.S.A. and England, the former especially, still have great economic resources. France had less. Germany, in 1931-1933, still less. In England, the war pressure has only begun to make itself felt. Hook, in common with all the war-mongers, drags the workers, shuts their eyes to reality, instead of opening them, showing them where developments are leading, and warning

His Is the Voice of Despair

Having in mind the banner of the Third Camp which we have raised in this war, Hook declares that his views might be invalid if we could prove that "there exists a third feasible alternative." Like the Cannonites, Hook does not see a Third Camp. But, he implies, if it did exist, and was really powerful force, a "feasible alternative," he would forego supporting imperialism and support the Third Camp of the proletariat and the colonial peoples instead. Whether Hook knows it or not, there is the nub of the matter!

Hook speaks with the voice of despair, the voice of the philistine. There are only two courses open to labor, says our "socialist": one way you surely get totalitarianism, the other way you may get

are the consequences of his pro-war policy.

Hook ridicules the fears that some capitalists here will not fight Hitler. "Rather should such a fear lead us to a drive for the successful conclusion of the war against Fascism, in the course of which Hitler's allies (in England or the United States, M.S.) can be exposed."

solete, "archaic" and "hyper-thyroid"?

What will be the general line of the decision made by this government? Hook's colleagues on the New Leader, at least, are under no illusions on this score. One of them, the infamous Willi Schlamm, writes: "Is there any word of contempt strong enough to characterize the intellectual and moral state of people who, witnessing France's ordeal, will dare to tell their naive audience that you can have both, peace AND growing welfare for the masses?" And the editors themselves write: "France fell because of too much ease and comfort and the good things of life, which the people were not willing to exchange for 'regimentation'." In their way, they are right, and Hook is wrong. The Holy War of the Democracies means an end to the "growing welfare" of the masses, or any welfare whatsoever. It means exchanging "ease and comfort and the good things of life" for "regimentation." That is, it means the accelerated decay of the Democracies into Totalitarianism!

But labor must resist all that, while supporting the war, says Hook. It must pursue "independent action" and preserve its "organizational integrity." Presumably, it must resist having the stupendous economic burden of the war thrown upon its shoulders, while the bourgeoisie coins its blood-money profits. Presumably, it must resist encroachments upon its democratic rights. How? By preserving its "independent labor action" and "organizational integrity." Independent labor action is a hollow phrase unless it is identical with independent class action. Against what class is this action to be directed? Against the bourgeoisie and (begging your forgiveness!) against its government. At any rate, not against the working class, let us ardently hope.

power, where a few million Englishmen democratically exploit and oppress a few hundred million Indians. Would he tell them that this is no time to fight England, that this is no time to fight for such an unimportant aim of democracy as national independence? That such a fight would weaken the "democracies" and help Hitler? In other words, would he tell them what every rogue and helpmeet of British imperialism is telling them?

Now, suppose the Indian revolutionists were very forbearing and didn't kick Hook down the stairs, but at the same time refused to take his advice. Suppose they adopted the maxim known to every intelligent Irishman: England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity. Suppose they launched a real fight for national independence, as the Irish did in the last war. And suppose further (fantastic assumption, is it not) that Democratic England (which Can Take It, but which Won't Let It Go) orders its troops to suppress the Indian democratic (truly democratic!) uprising. On whose side of the fight will Hook be?

Or a case closer to home. Suppose, in one or another Latin-American country, the masses begin resisting the—not imperialist, oh no! just the "democratic" economic and military encroachments of the U.S. government. On whose side of the fight will Hook be? In both cases, the "independent action" of the masses would be directed against imperialism. In one case, it would be weakening the British Empire; in the other, the American Empire.

The consequences of Hook's position lead straight to the suppression of revolutionary national struggles for independence in the realms of Democratic Imperialism. Hook is already speaking the language of the slave-consoling priest working for the slaveholder: Your master is bad, but it could be worse.

them in time. He is not a teacher of labor; he runs a hasheesh joint for democratic imperialism. He does not point out that tomorrow, when the going gets rougher, as the question of "distributing" the war burden in light of diminishing reserves and resources becomes intensely acute for all classes in England, the present government or its successor will be as little able to afford its present "democratic luxuries" as was France (even before the war began), and later, as was Germany when Hitler took power. He does not point out that as the war proceeds, the British bourgeois regime will have to centralize increasingly all economic and political power, will have to call for increasingly unbearable "sacrifices" by the masses, will have to take rigorous measures to suppress (and then forcibly to prevent, in advance) all expressions of dissatisfaction, economic or political, both at home and in the colonies.

Hook tries to reduce the problem to the academic dispute over whether the democracies will surely become totalitarian, or only probably, or only possibly! The real problem is: What policy is best calculated to prevent the evolution to totalitarianism in the bourgeois democracies? Hook says, by subjecting labor to the imperialists, by supporting the imperialist war, by a "drive" for victory—and all that entails. That policy is precisely what paralyzes labor, what smooths the road towards fascism by removing from that road the only important obstacle, an independent and militant labor movement. We say, labor must take no responsibility for the war either before or after it is declared. It must defend its class interests at all times, its economic position and its democratic rights. It can do this only if it maintains complete independence of the imperialist government and its war. Unless it does this, its goose is cooked.

totalitarianism. In our own "archaic" way, we always thought the task of the socialist was to point out to labor how it could get freedom.

The workers are not organized yet, not prepared yet, not conscious yet. Therefore, the philistine has always said, it must not be organized, prepared or made conscious of its power, its goal, its invincibility. Therefore, the traitor to labor has always said, it must support the bourgeoisie—oh, of course, the good bourgeoisie and not the wicked ones.

The workers are not yet ready for revolution and socialism. Therefore, the masters of logic and philosophy, have always said, they must support capitalism and join with it to suppress revolution. If, however, in spite of us, the revolution does tri-

umph, they added later on, we shall "recognize" it once it is consolidated. Meanwhile, however, we shall follow a policy guaranteed to prevent or at the very least, to delay the revolution and socialism.

Does Hook know that here, as elsewhere, he is merely plagiarizing from the social-patriots of the first world war? That is exactly how they argued. Where is your practical alternative? Where is this revolution you babble about? In Russia, the "babblers" prepared and brought about the revolution and put an end to capitalism and war, because during the war they taught that neither capitalism nor its war should be supported. In Germany, the "practical" friends of labor did all they could to prevent the revolution from breaking out, suppressed it in blood when it did break out, perpetuated capitalism, and got fascism plus another, more ghastly war.

Hook writes scornfully. "We will defeat Hitler, cries the revolutionary Mad Hatter, only by first defeating the enemy within our own country, those who are ready to fight Fascism although not yet ready to fight for socialism." Churchill, you see, is "ready to fight Fascism" but he is "not yet" ready to fight for socialism. So is J.P. Morgan. So is Henry Ford. So is Getulio Vargas. Such a beautiful formula! So an honest formula! And how plausible it sounds! The country is not yet ready for socialism; it is ready for an imperialist war under guise of a struggle "against Fascism." Therefore, support the imperialist war. That's a few shades worse than the position of Karl Kautsky in 1914. We cannot answer Hook better than by quoting Lenin's reply to Kautsky:

"Kautsky's old sophism, here again repeated, namely, that 'at the beginning of the war' the Left Wing looked upon the situation as presenting the alternative of either imperialism or Socialism, has already been analyzed. This is a shameful sleight of hand, since Kautsky knows very well that the Left Wing put forth another alternative: either the party joins imperialist plunder and deception, or it preaches and prepares for revolutionary action." (My emphasis. M.S.)

We Preach the Victory of Socialism

That is precisely what is involved today. Hook wants labor to support the war for imperialist plunder and deception, and, just in passing, contributes to that deception. We preach and prepare for the victory of socialism. We seek to organize (not disorganize!) the mighty forces of the Third Camp. We tell them the truth (not lies) about the war. We urge them to act independently of the imperialist war-mongers, not to become their willing slaves. We tell them to pursue the class struggle in order to protect their elementary interests, not to suspend the struggle. We tell them to rely on their own strength, initiative, program and leadership, not to rely on the salvation that will be brought them by their class enemy and its apologists, Professors included.

We tell them to utilize their manifold opportunities to smash a rotten social order, its fascist spawn, its wars, its misery and sufferings. Hook tells them: Not now. Let us first help England keep her slaves in Somaliland instead of turning them over to Italy; let us first help Wall Street establish its economic and political enslavement of Latin America, lest Germany and Italy get there first; let us first help Wall Street bring the slaves of the Dutch East Indies under its imperialist sway, lest they fall under the sway of Japan. After that is done and a super-Versailles is imposed on the fascist powers, you have my permission to talk about socialism, but not before.

If we follow Hook, however, we will probably find, as Trotsky once pointed out, that five or ten years later, capitalism will spawn a super-fascism somewhere. Hook will then teach us that we must support Hitler-fascism as a lesser evil in its war against the super-fascism.

Like Max Eastman, Hook began a few years ago to take "orthodox Marxism" to task for its "mystic faith" in the inevitability of socialism. Oh no, said Hook sagely, socialism is not automatically produced; it is the product of conscious, organized and directed mass activity. Not bad, eh? Thereupon, again like Eastman, he proceeded to suspend his conscious, organized and directed activity for socialism. Now he's developed to a "higher" stage: he wants the rest of us to suspend our activity—we must win the war for democracy, at all costs. Tomorrow? Tomorrow he will adopt Eastman's latest conclusion: socialism in general is not so desirable, after all. We can only hope that he will not develop to the "highest" stage, where the ex-socialists join actively with the bourgeoisie in preventing the unrepentant socialists from carrying on their revolutionary activity. We can only hope. But not with much confidence.

Sylvia Ageloff

In the last issue of LABOR ACTION we joyfully published the news that Sylvia Ageloff was at last ordered released by Judge Trujillo. This joy must now give way to the disappointment caused by the Mexican District Attorney Garcia's order rescinding the release.

According to the Napoleonic Code a district attorney may set aside a judge's order pending trial. The defense attorneys may now subpoena the district attorney to show cause. This, we understand, is now being done, but the decision will not be known for several weeks.

It is our hope that Sylvia, against whom there has never been suspicion will be quickly released, just as it is our hope that every strand of evidence leading from Jackson, the murderer of Trotsky, and the GPU will be thoroughly investigated and exposed.

We shall endeavor to have additional news for our readers by next week.

SAN FRANCISCO READERS —
 YOU
 Are Invited to Join In A
 ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION OF
 CURRENT EVENTS
 Each Tuesday Evening, at 8 p.m.
 Room 223, 628 Montgomery Street
 What are YOUR problems in connection with the WAR, the DRAFT, the ELECTIONS, the whole swiftly moving tide of current WORLD PROBLEMS?
 JOIN IN WORKING THEM OUT!
 Auspices: Workers Party

To See or Not To See

by Susan Green

You Almost Smell The Salt

"The Long Voyage Home"

It is an old woman's tale that sailors go to sea to find peace for their souls on the briny deep. Yet the tale persists, and even a usually clear-sighted reviewer like Bosley Crowther of the New York Times falls into the fallacy of referring to this entirely unsentimental saga of the sea as "the never-ending story of man's wanderings over the waters of the world in search of peace for his soul".

This film version of four of Eugene O'Neill's one-act plays, knit together to make one fascinating story, leaves no illusions as to why Drisc, Yank, Axel and the other land-loving seafarers on the old tub of a freighter, the S.S. Glencairn, added sequel after sequel to that never-ending story of man's wanderings over the waters of the world. They were caught in a vicious circle, only one of whose arcs is the lure of the sea itself. After a long lonely voyage fraught with danger, they are easy prey for the first brothel-keeper they meet—and then go away with empty pockets. What is there to do but go back to sea? But in this story the old-timers at least have the satisfaction of rescuing young Ole Olson from their own fate. He returns—with his money—to his mother on a Swedish farm.

Thanks to the good sense of director John Ford, who knows when he has the stuff out of which a realistic film can be made, there isn't even a smell of make-believe about the S.S. Glencairn and her tough crew. It's all there. The dreaminess of a moonlight night in the Carribean. First fighting over the daughters of the devil who come aboard to smuggle rum and sell their favors. The merciless fury of a storm, out of which Yank comes with a fatally punctured lung—and no doctor on board. The filthy system of shanghaiing sailors. The cruelty of the men, matching that of the sea, when they suspect the reticent Smitty of being a German spy. Also the healing balm of a calm sea and a sun-drenched deck. It is all there.

On the S.S. Glencairn of 1940 the fore-castle is not as wretched a hole as the one I remember in the O'Neill play. Also, it seems to me that in the play the men were much more rebellious when they learned that the ship had loaded a cargo of explosives for England. But these points, however interesting, are still only minor criticisms of a film in which the story, the directing, the acting, the photography, are tops.

Give Me Too!

Or Hollywood Pulls Out a Plum

A recent item from that cultural centre of America brought the glad tidings that the motion picture industry has turned over its entire facilities to the army for the production of films to be used in the training of the conscripts called under the Selective Service Act. A nice, big-hearted, altruistic thing for Hollywood to do, no?

Yes—until you get down to the end of the item, where it says that—

Gordon Mitchell, manager of the research council of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts, who will be in active charge, has just come back from conferences in Washington with a government allotment of \$250,000 of the \$5,000,000 Hollywood is to get in connection with the first group of conscripts. The implication is that

more millions are to go Holly-ward as more conscripts go camp-ward.

Unless you are a conscript, you will not have the pleasure of seeing any of these pictures to be produced solely to meet the "national emergency". They will not be released for the general public, but will be used only as a visual "educational" course for new soldiers. Of course, the army will be working hand in glove with the motion picture industry.

Needless to say, this lucrative plum is being shared by all the Hollywood big shot pay-riots: Paramount, Twentieth Century-Fox, Columbia, Warner.

Definitely, To See

Walt Disney's "Fantasia"

You have probably some time or other yawned through a movie short which attempted to visualize music for you. Don't let that prejudice you against going to see Disney's Fantasia which has been described as "seeing music and hearing pictures". It is a work of great beauty and imagination, and accomplishes its purpose of bringing to an audience fine music together with the color, movement, characters or what-have-you that might be imagined to fit that music.

Our good fortune, of course, is that we get here not the color, movement, characters, etc., that might occur to anybody, but those that occurred to Disney and his co-artists. So Fantasia is made of the Disney sense of humor, his sense of the drama of color and movement, of rhythm and synchronization. We have here his clever use of the similarities between entirely dissimilar things, his affectionate attention to minutiae, his exploitation of the unexpected.

The show begins as a concert does. The orchestra tunes up. Leopold Stokowski appears, and under his music-molding hands the orchestra gets to work. First comes a Bach selection and with it fascinating patterns of color and motion that catch every nuance of the music as well as its spirit. Then Tchaikovsky's Nutcracker Suite, in which the Chinese Dance is done by mushrooms, the Russian dance by thistles and orchids. Mickey Mouse later appears as the best Sorcerer's Apprentice in the world, and never in all my experiences at dance recitals, have I seen better dance rhythms than in Disney's Sorcerer's Apprentice or in his Dance of the Hours—that old-time ballet, which Disney burlesques by using ostriches, hippopotami, elephants and alligators as his corp de ballet. To Stravinsky's Rite of Spring, with its exploding discords and its weighty, thumping rhythms, Disney gives us the convulsions and upheavals of the earth as it moulded itself into land, mountain and sea, millions and millions of years ago, together with the evolution and demise of the formidable dinosaur. The effects are as awesome as the music.

Beethoven, Moussorgsky and Schubert are the others on the program of eight selections, all beautifully complemented by Disney's imagery. There is unfortunately no space here for more detail.

The one thing I regret is that Fantasia can, as yet, be seen only by a very limited audience. It is being shown at few theatres throughout the country. The evening prices of admission in New York range from 75¢ to \$2.20, with very few seats at 75¢. Whether it will ever get to the local theatres at regular prices is a matter of doubt, because its showing requires special theatre equipment.

Vultee—

(Continued from page 1)

bitter about the shut-down. They want the strikers forced back to work and would like to make strikes considered treason.

The aircraft manufacturers know that if the Vultee strike is won, the minimum wage of .65 cents an hour will soon prevail in all other plants and cut in on their bloody profits. That's why they have a solid united front against the strikers, and are putting pressure on all government agencies to assist them save their profits.

Vital for CIO

For the CIO it is a make or break proposition. The last attempt of the CIO in aircraft ended with the failure of the Douglas sit-down strike in 1937. Its loss caused a great decline in CIO prestige in this area to the advantage of the AFL.

The AFL machinists union is a strong competitor for organization with the CIO in aircraft. The AFL has contracts covering 14,000 employees of the Lockheed Corp. here, the Consolidated Aircraft in San Diego, the Vega plant in Burbank, and the Boeing aircraft plant in Seattle, Washington. Very important is the fact that the AFL was able, despite Hillman's maneuvers, to obtain a 62½ cent an hour minimum at the Boeing plant recently.

Aircraft workers are not primarily concerned with the question of what section of the union movement they

The Cio

and AFL conventions will be completely reported and analyzed in the next issue of LABOR ACTION. Both conventions are of extreme importance for the American labor movement. No worker should miss the next issue of LABOR ACTION.

are affiliated with. They want to support the union which does the most for them.

The CIO strike leaders realize this fact very well. They must obtain some real concessions for the Vultee men or the CIO is on the down grade again in aircraft.

Since each action of the top leadership was taken in closest cooperation with the shop stewards and the rank and file of the union, it is clear that the union leadership understood thoroughly the need for the most powerful kind of solidarity in view of the great forces working against the strikers. There is no question but that the rank and file is ready for any kind of struggle to obtain its demands.

Since the John L. Lewis wing of the CIO is in full charge of this strike, its future depends largely on the course of the struggle between Hillman, representing Roosevelt and his war plans, and the Lewis forces at the CIO convention.

Effect on Aircraft

Developments in the next few days are bound to open the eyes not only of many of the strikers but of sections of the labor movement that "national defense" means defense of profits against the just demands of the workers.

The Vultee strike has created ferment among all other aircraft workers in this area, judging by many reports, and the workers are solidly behind the Vultee strikers because they know a victory there means an immediate gain for themselves.

Barring a complete sell-out, all the way down the line, much more is going to be heard in the next period from the aircraft workers. Even the forcing of a retreat on the part of the strikers by the acceptance of an "arbitration board," with its inevitable chiseling down of the union's demands, will only dampen, but not stop the aircraft workers struggle to better their miserable conditions.

World at War

(Continued from page 1)

Hitler is probably putting pressure on the Vichy government to root out the DeGaulle movement from Africa. The capture of Gabon in French Equatorial Africa by the forces of General DeGaulle and his further advances into African territory controlled by the Vichy government, represent a threat to Hitler's and Mussolini's strategy in the Mediterranean.

JAPAN'S PART

Now that Japan is a part of the Axis they too may be called upon to do their part in the event of a big push in the Balkans, the Near East and Africa. That may be the explanation for the continued withdrawals of Japanese troops from China to Japanese bases in the south which are within closer range of Hong-Kong, the Philippines, Singapore, the Dutch East Indies and southern Indo-China.

An Axis campaign in the Mediterranean plus the extensive raids on British ocean shipping is certain to keep the British fleet with more than its hands full and will certainly immobilize it for any action in the Far East. It is more than likely that the United States will have to assume the full burden against any

Lenin on Conscription in 1917

"... America's real object in entering this war is to prepare for war against Japan. The American people enjoy considerable freedom, and it is difficult to believe that they will tolerate conscription, the creation of an army for aims of conquest, for a struggle against Japan, for example. The Americans can see from the example of Europe what this leads to. And so the American capitalists were obliged to intervene in this war in order to find a pretext to create a powerful standing army under cover of the lofty ideal of fighting for the rights of small nationalities."

— From a speech delivered by Lenin in Petrograd on May 27, 1917, one month after his return from exile and published for the first time in English in 1940 under the title "War and the Workers" (International Publishers, N.Y.)

Big Business Opens Attack on 40-Hour Week

(Continued from page 1)

problem until 1942 at the earliest. The phrase, however, can very easily lead to differences of opinion should we admit that a lengthening of the working week is valid if there is no longer any unemployment.

Mr. Sloan's co-worker from the General Motors Corporation, Mr. Knudsen, as head member of the Defense Council in charge of production, may very well decide that "the slack of unemployment" has already been taken up. For these gentlemen require the existence of a huge number of unemployed in order to keep wages down. Throughout the history of capitalism, the bosses have found it very profitable to keep millions unemployed. They know that when a worker sees that there are dozens of unemployed workers ready to take his job at starvation wages, he won't be very apt to go on strike or ask for an increase in wages. Since big business is working at high capacity today, they seek to extend their profits by increasing the length of the working week.

Obviously, it would be a bit too crude for the capitalists and their apologists to come right out and say that hours of work have to be lengthened so that the present high levels of profits can be maintained and exceeded. So the reactionary attack against the wage and hour law is dressed up. Above all, it is cloaked under an attack on inflation. Every worker, of course, is against inflation, because it undermines his standard of living. Says Mr. Sloan: "The greatest source of inflationary danger at the moment is in the increase in wage rates and its impact on costs. It deserves the most profound consideration."

About the only thing that we can agree on with Mr. Sloan is that this whole question (of wages, hours, costs, prices and profits) deserves "the most profound consideration." Our conclusions, however, are quite different and, we think, would make for a genuine defense of labor's democratic rights and standard of living.

To begin with, prices, according to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, have already gone up 17½% in this country since the outbreak of World War II. That, it seems to us, justifies labor in asking for at least a 17½% increase in wages. Even Mr. Sloan would be forced to agree with that according to his own reasoning. Then, big-business profits have gone up at least 200% on the average since the outbreak of the war. Just let labor ask for a 200% increase in wages, and what a howl would be set up by these gentlemen who measure their patriotism by the size of their pocketbooks!

We are not interested in increasing or protecting the profits of the capitalists, but solely in defending and extending workers' living standards. To defend these standards, steps must be taken to resist Sloan's proposals. In effect Sloan is calling on Roosevelt to do what Daladier did in France—whittle away the gains of labor, beginning with the 40-hour week.

Should unemployment be completely eliminated, we are still, in principle against increasing the length of the working week in order to increase production. How would we increase production in order to cope with Hitler's slave economy? Very simple. By eliminating profits. That way you place at the disposal of society greater wealth. With production planned in the interests of the workers, production could be increased many times above the present levels without lengthening the working week by so much as one second. Hours of work could probably be reduced. Standards of living could certainly be raised. And that would mean the end of capitalism.

Inflation

Every argument of Mr. Sloan and his brother capitalists is a fraud. The real danger of inflation at the pres-

Masterpieces of Understatement:

"The Socialist Appeal this week covers the Molotov-Hitler discussions in a five inch item. We quote the caption: 'MOLOTOV PAYS COURTESY CALL ON HITLERITES.'"

Japanese offensive. For this purpose American imperialism undoubtedly has an agreement with Great Britain which would enable her to use British bases in the Far East. It is reported also that the United States is negotiating with the Thai government and is offering her a loan and other concessions in order to assure her support against any attempted Japanese offensive.

Our Readers Take the Floor...

The Handwriting on The Wall

Dear Editor:

Al Sloan of General Motors fame let the cat out of the bag when he advocated before the Academy of Political Science on November 14 that two steps be taken by industry, to wit:

- 1—A six-day working week—
- 2—Elimination of penalty payments for overtime work—

Al was careful not to specify the length of the working day, but I'll bet you a subscription to LABOR ACTION against a membership in the Junior Chamber of Commerce that his mind was not toying with a six-hour day nor even an eight-hour day. That he was roundly applauded by his audience goes without saying.

The important aspect of Sloan's proposals is that they follow, step-by-step, the actions of the ruling class in France. If we compare the Blum government to the Roosevelt administration, we can find a great many correlations in the concessions won by the French and American workers under the Blum and Roosevelt governments, respectively. Precisely in the same manner can we now witness the onslaught by the American ruling class on the gains made by labor, even as the French ruling class attacked the shorter hours and better pay won by the French workers under Blum. The French ruling class was victorious in nullifying these gains. The French working class, having nothing left to fight for, refused to sacrifice its life for a continuation of exploitation by its ruling class. If we must be exploited, so they reasoned, what difference whether it is done by Hitler or the 200 families? The French owning class, fearing revolt, welcomed Hitler within their borders "to keep order."

The greatest mistake the American working class can make is to depend on Roosevelt to maintain their gains for them. Under the guise of "defense" the concessions won by labor will be whittled down until they become non-existent. No new laws are needed to accomplish these anti-labor aims. Mere sabotage, such as refusal by the government to enforce the Wages-and-Hours Law, the Social Security Act, the Labor Relations Act, will be sufficient to deprive the American workman of even these inadequate concessions.

In the next period the American worker will learn that concessions paternally handed down from above, can also be taken away from above. The concessions gained by struggle on the picket line, through union organization, are the only gains that can be counted as permanent, if vigilantly watched over.

But no matter how vigilant a union and its membership may be, it has no control over enforcing the laws that were handed down by a reluctant Congress in the face of sit-down strikes and other militant actions.

Any reactionary move made against labor will be rationalized by "defense" needs. If workers kick about it, they will be held up to condemnation for their lack of "patriotism."

But not a single concession need be relinquished. On the other hand—now is the time for labor to make further gains. The enormous expenditures for the tools of wholesale murder will undoubtedly stimulate the demands for the services of American workers. That's the time to insist on higher pay and shorter hours. If the working class will rely on collective action, through their unions, to make further economic advances, they will be mad. If they rely on "paternal" government for such advances, they will get fooled, even as the French workers were fooled.

and other reforms were not given to them by Roosevelt. On the contrary, the workers of this country won the 40 hour week and collective bargaining by their own fighting power and the strength of their own organizations. The workers can keep the 40 hour week and their unions and a chance for a decent standard of living only if they are willing to fight for them. And this fight can be won if the workers rely on their own organized strength—on the power that lies in huge numbers organized for a common goal. It cannot be won if the workers depend on "their friend in the White House," who is already sending the army through picket lines, to fight their battles for them.

Alfred Sloan of General Motors has sounded the warning.

WORKINGMEN TAKE HEED Use every concession as a stepping stone to further demands. St. Louis Worker

WAY OFF ON THE WRONG TRACK

Editor: Philip Marsh considers the intellectuals very hypocritical because they do not maintain an anti-war stand as true socialists should. The answer of such accused intellectuals is very short and effective. They ask where are the intellectuals of the conquered lands in Europe? These intellectuals are certainly not functioning in their native lands. They are exiles, or dead or defeated.

The fighting intellectuals are smart enough to have learned that if they do not fight, there will be nothing left for them to do at all. Obviously the European intellectual who stayed at home and hoped to continue the struggle now has no chance whatever. His only hope is a foreign military victory—which will be undertaken by quite ordinary fellows—regular tradesmen, plumbers and so on. They will win the fight for intellectual liberty although they may not know much about the subject.

The world is composed of more than just one piece and more than one event and happening can take place at the same time. Thus an intellectual may see that there will be no hope for socialism at all if fascists gain their complete sway over the world. So he has to be anti-fascist first and before all other things. This is rightly so. It is placing important matters where they belong. He can still have his socialism for further reference and use—when the time is opportune. It won't be if Hitler comes.

It has been forever impossible to do over everything in the world as to make all things perfect for each person. There are bound to be sad tragedies in life. Rabid socialists set up the most perfect standards for everyone and then shout if some poor ordinary thinker does not meet their exacting standards.

Yours truly, Chicago Carl Peterson (See Shachtman Article—Ed.)

SEES EFFECT OF WAR HYSTERIA

Comrade Editor: Halloween was celebrated with amazing violence this year. After several years of relatively quiet Halloweens, it had seemed that Halloween was on the way to become a harmless evening of children's apple-bobbing parties. Presto!—the year 1940—and Halloween arrives upon the scene with renewed fury.

Streets are barricaded, trolley wires are pulled down, autos are overturned, parked cars are riddled with buckshot, bonfires are built in the middle of streets. But these events pale in comparison to the real explanation, and that is—War.

Why should Youth fear to risk its life, when soon it will be drafted and sent to the imperialist slaughter? Why not be contemptuous of property rights? Are we not to be maimed and butchered to defend these very same rights? The rights of others can have but little meaning to those who are about to die.

Thus war, the greatest crime of capitalism, has claimed another victim. Theodore Beidler, you were slain by a system that cannot let youth live. Your seemingly insane act is but a reflection of a greater insanity, a whole economic system gone mad—capitalism in senile dementia.

Fraternally, Cleveland, Ohio Richard Swift

As the Vultee Men Struck

LOS ANGELES, Calif., Nov. 15—The boys had been raring to go all week long. Now it was here.

At 5 o'clock this morning the 1,200 grave yard shift workers formed picket lines at the Vultee gates. Good-natured, spirited, and orderly, the men walked out after having participated in two brief sit-downs during the week.

It was time for action. Seven weeks of stalling was enough. Long overtime and extra days combined with the never-ending rush for speed had exhausted the workers, and their patience.

"It's like a vacation for a change," one picket remarked. He had been averaging 12 hours a day for over two months, he said.

Soon the 2,000 morning shift workers arrived. They joined in the picket lines or else hung around across the street. The company shut down completely.

It was a glorious day to strike. Clear blue sky overhead and a warm sun beaming down on the youthful looking pickets just added the right touch. Besides, all the boys knew the company had rush orders, \$80,000,000 worth, the papers said. It was a good time to strike.

Among the strikers were a few hundred ex-Douglas aircraft workers, victims of a blacklist following the sit-down strike defeat in 1937. It was a pleasure to get back at the bosses.

It was a source of strength to know this strike was prepared, the workers were solid, and the chances good for a real victory. The Aircraft Organizer, official strike paper, reflects the feelings which the ex-Douglas boys have. It takes the whole thing calmly.

Feel Confidence

Confidence could be felt everywhere. The strikers were sure they were right. "Everyone knows the big profits the aircraft companies are making. We just want a decent wage. That isn't asking too much," another picket explained.

Absolute immediate minimum (retroactive to Oct. 11) of 65 cents an hour—that was the main demand for the 50 cent an hour boys. For others, an immediate wage increase of 5 cents an hour. "If we fight for something for everyone, we'll stick together better," a striker said.

"Many of our men go to work at Vultee for 50 cents an hour and they are promised five-cent raises at the end of three months. When that time comes, these men are transferred to another department," a shop committee explained.

That's the way the boys see it. The strike is a question of getting what they deserve. All this newspaper talk about national defense, Sidney Hillman's role, etc., isn't what's concerning them mainly today.

There is much worry, however, about being ordered back to work

before a contract is signed. It's this arbitration business. Telegrams coming from Hillman in Washington and stuff like that.

These are some of the things the strikers talk about as they parade back and forth, overseas caps worn jauntily on their head, and union banners carried high. "They Can't Beat Us," one sign says. "They Shall Not Pass," says another.

Most of the men are new union recruits. "I signed over 30 in my department last week," an experienced unionist declared. They are frisky like young colts.

Union headquarters is the proverbial beehive of activity. The Women's Auxiliaries is all set with the soup kitchens. Telegrams of support come pouring in, even from unorganized aircraft plants. The strikers' own chief of police directed the disciplinary committee. The clean-up committee is rushing around.

Wyndham Mortimer, CIO auto-workers' sub-regional director, is talking to reporters. "We will have about 50 men at each gate and will keep several hundred others in reserve," he explains.

He was critical of the National Defense Advisory Commission. "They would not force the company to raise wages. I can't see how they can force us to work for lower wages," Mortimer declared.

A couple of the pickets were talking about the radio speech, delivered last night before the strike was called, by L.H. Michener, international representative of the aircraft division

Dear Mary—

Glad to get your last letter and hear that Joe is back at work. It must take a lot of worries off your mind. Guess you'll be able to get the winter clothes for the kids now. You haven't written yet how Joe made out in the draft, was his number high, or low?

There's lots of fun around here now with the coming CIO Convention. Most of the boys were so sore after John L's speech that they wanted to kick him bodily out of the CIO. And some of them are going to the convention to see that it is done! So they'll put in Phil Murray! I can't see that he will be any better. The main point today is still to see that our wages are kept up and when the Defense Board, Roosevelt's Defense Board, doesn't care whether the boss lives up to minimum wage agreements, it seems to me they are taking the leadership in cutting wages. The little shops will say—well Bethlehem doesn't pay union wages, how can you expect us to? And Murray was one thousand percent behind Roosevelt—he seconded Wallace's nomination at the democratic convention. That means he is behind Roosevelt and his Defense Board.

Not that Willie would have been any better—the same thing to us. The elections only go to show how much labor needs its own party—its own political program and candidates. Seeinging between democrats and republicans forever will never get us anywhere. If Murray thinks he can get more from Roosevelt after the election than before, he's nuts. Roosevelt didn't have to promise us a thing to get the enthusiastic endorsement of 75% of labor unions. Afterward he can tell us to pound sand and what can we do about it? Trust Hillman? His main job up to now has been to say "no strikes". No wonder I get hot about it. If you can't strike how can you win?—you've given up your final and best weapon—your trump card, so to speak.

Well don't complain because this letter is all about unions! Of course it is, that's all I think about. Sis and the family are fine. Let's hear from you.

Fraternally, Sally

Editorials

OUR PROGRAM AGAINST THE WAR

1. Not a man, not a cent for Wall Street's war. All war funds to the unemployed.
2. For a rising scale of wages to meet increasing cost of living. Thirty Thirty—\$30 weekly minimum wage—30-hour weekly maximum for all workers.
3. Expropriate the Sixty Families. For Government ownership and workers control of all war industries—aviation, steel, chemicals, railroads, public utilities, etc.
4. Against both imperialist war camps. For the Third Camp of World Labor and the Colonial Peoples.
5. Let the people vote on war. For the right of youth to vote at the age of 18.
6. Abolish secret diplomacy. Open the files of the State Department.
7. Withdraw all armed forces from territory outside the United States. Free the colonies. Hands off Latin America.
8. Against compulsory military training and conscription.
9. For the defense of civil liberties and workers' rights. Stop the persecution of aliens. Against the M-Day Plans and war-time dictatorship.
10. For full social, economic and political equality for Negroes. End discrimination against Negroes in industry and trade unions.
11. For an independent Labor Party.
12. For Workers' Defense Guards against Fascist and vigilante attacks.
13. No confidence in the Roosevelt government. For a workers' government and a people's army.
14. For Peace through Socialism. For the Socialist United States of the Americas, for the Socialist United States of Europe, and for the World Socialist Federation.

From All Sides

Elsewhere in this issue a worker-correspondent sees "the handwriting on the wall" in the current drive to raise the work-week. This is indeed a warning to labor, and labor must pay it careful heed. The attack has come not only from the outright spokesmen of the capitalist class, such as Sloan of General Motors, but from the government spokesmen of the bosses as well. Thus, the week which witnessed the huge publicity given to Sloan, also witnessed significant statements by two government officials: Secretary of War Stimson, and Labor Board chairman Millis.

Speaking before the AFL convention, Stimson assured his audience that "I know that labor will contribute its fair share of the sacrifices needed for defense. . . . I come to assure you that if, as the danger approaches, further efforts and further sacrifices are required, as they probably shall be, we shall call upon all groups in fair and equal proportion to make these sacrifices and not upon labor alone."

Speaking before the Academy of Political Science, Sloan delivered his widely publicized plea against the 40-hour week, and tempted his listeners with the guarantee that "Output can be increased 20 percent by working six days a week in place of five days."

And, speaking in his capacity as newly appointed member of the Labor Board, Harry A. Millis committed himself to the philosophy that "When an emergency arises it is up to everyone to buckle down and work as many hours as needed."

Now, take these three statements and add them up. The result you get is an . . .

Organized Drive

—to destroy those gains won by labor in bitter and hardfought battle.

Oh no, they don't come out openly and state their aims and purposes. That would arouse so much protest and indignation that these profit-loving gentlemen would be compelled to run for cover. They therefore cloak their vicious schemes in the vaguest of words, and justify them in the "loftiest" of sentiments: "sacrifice" in which all will join equally for the "public good."

Sacrifice there will be a-plenty. But it will not come from the bosses and their idle off-spring. The workers will sacrifice their lives and their toil—so that the bosses may indulge in the equal "sacrifice" of sweating with the labor of toting away ponderous packets of profit.

Do we misinterpret the honorable Mr. Stimson, or the pay-triotic Mr. Sloan? Sloan, an unsentimental business-man left small grounds for misinterpretation despite his talk about taking up unemployment slack. He wasn't talking to a trade union convention the way Stimson was (and why was there no outburst of protest among the delegates when Stimson made his speech?). Stimson had to sugar-coat his plea.

He "knows" that labor "will contri-

bute its fair share of "sacrifices." How does he "know" it? He knows only that the army brass-hats who are under his jurisdiction, and every other instrument of government, will be used to terrorize, to compel labor to "sacrifice." He knows that in California where the Vultee workers have gone out on strike, the bosses and army big-wigs are working hand in glove. He knows that certain of the labor leaders are as pawns in the hands of his capitalist class. He hopes that all together—army, state, boss and Hillman type of labor leader—they will be able to force this sacrifice out of the working class.

These are not isolated instances ripped out of context and distorted in their meaning. Their meaning is abundantly clear. The very appointment of Millis to the Labor Board is proof.

The elections were hardly over before Roosevelt manifested the reactionary trend of his third-term by appointing Millis. Millis is a professor of economics known for his conservative views. No, he is not against trade unions. He is against them only when they are militant. Unions that don't cause "trouble," that don't strike, such unions will find an earnest friend in Millis. Union-leaders that do their best to stamp out labor militancy will always find a ready listener in Millis.

Labor must "buckle down and work as many hours as are needed." Does he mean buckle-down so that no man need go hungry? so that no child need go without shoes? No, that kind of "buckling down" is not needed. This country with its vast resources and industries could provide plenty and security for all—were it not for the capitalist monsters who feast on the system of insecurity and impoverishment.

"Buckle down, working-man," cry the bosses and their stooges. "Our national defense, the defense of our bloody investments, our profits need your sacrifice. Go back to the sweatshop. Work until you fall dead on your feet. Work double hard. Work day and night. We want to grasp a world for exploitation. We want bigger banks to house bigger profits. Sacrifice, working-man, it's for the greater glory of our empire!"

No, fellow-workers, . . .

We Can't Yield

—that easily. We fought for decades to win the eight-hour day. Many of our brothers died in this fight. Unions fought sacrificing and bitter battles to gain it. Shall we now give up what is ours, we who with the sinew and bone of proletarian strength built the factories and houses that are rightfully ours? Shall we descend to the level of working-beasts because our enemies, the bosses, see greater profits to be made in war and the preparation for war?

Our answer must be a resounding NO! Rather than yield an inch on our living standards, we demand instead that these be raised. We will yield the forty hour week only for a shorter week.

That is our answer: Take the offensive against the boss campaign.

Demand a Thirty-Hour Week with Thirty Dollars minimum pay, and no reductions where the pay is higher.

Demand Workers' Control of the War Industries so that no cent of profit will be coined out of workers' blood.

Stand solid in union-organization. Meet the thrust of big-business head-on. Send it reeling under the impact of proletarian might and solidarity!

They Know

"As for war, bear in mind that campaign promises on both sides were against participation in 'foreign war.' But they don't mean much. If war comes, it will start with incidents which can easily be construed as 'foreign' attack on United States interest. Thereupon it will become not a 'foreign war,' but 'defense of the United States.'"

Two and two put together suggest that our course is toward war.

As for timing and the precipitating incidents, no one knows, but many informed persons talk about the possibility by next spring.

A common note in many solemn conversations about war is this: We shall not burst into war all of a sudden. We shall creep into it. A little bit here, a little bit there, advancing toward participation. In this sense we are already in it, but the public doesn't recognize it."

(From the Nov. 9 issue of the Kiplinger Letter, which is "circulated privately to business men.")

Heated Discussion on "News" Marks Opening of CIO Meet

(Continued from page 1)—speech: began what he called an accounting for his stewardship for the past five year period.

The Speech

This first speech of Lewis wasn't long. It was concerned with a discussion of matters pertaining to his leadership of the CIO and some of the controversial questions that have arisen since his pro-Willkie campaign speech. He said that what he had done was his considered judgment and that if he had it to do over he would not change his position.

"There were those," he said, "who hoped that the Democratic Party would do something about the fifty-two million empty bellies in the country. Well go ahead and hope. I take my stand with the fifty-two million empty bellies." This drew tremendous applause. Lewis then told the convention that he was leaving the post of CIO president and that he would be their leader only a few days longer. He attacked those who would bring discord into the organization and cause it to be weakened by internal conflict in the face of the big job to be done. (This was interpreted to mean the Hillman group). He said that those who say that the CIO is controlled by subversive groups lie. Continuing his attack on his critics Lewis said, "I was something of a man before I became president of this organization and I will be something of a man when I leave. That's what I think." His answer, at least to some of the handclappers was, "your applause does not enthrone me overmuch, your attacks move me not at all."

At the close of the speech there was another ovation. The Stalinist cheering sections however had been a little weakened and discouraged by

the categorical declaration of Lewis that he would not retain his post of president. With some of them it was as though they had been ducked in the cold waters of the Atlantic just a few hundred yards away.

The Stalinists were not finished however, for all during Monday and Tuesday telegrams were pouring in from locals all over the country demanding that Lewis stay on. The overwhelming majority of these telegrams were from unions and locals either dominated by the Stalinists or where they have an appreciable influence. The dulllest part of the convention was sitting and listening to the reading of these "canned" telegrams. There was one telegram from a steel local demanding that Lewis resign. One from a Jewish local of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, asking the convention to accept Lewis' resignation. This telegram also condemned the draft Lewis movement. One came from the American Catholic Trade Union Association of Detroit calling for the unity of the AFL and CIO. There were a few telegrams praising the work of the CIO and promising continued support, but omitting the demand for Lewis to continue in office.

Credentials Report

The credentials committee reported on Monday that 548 delegates had been seated in the convention. The final report on the number of delegates to the convention has not been made. There are delegates from every section of the country and of every race and creed of the national population. There are miners, smelter workers, packing house workers, cereal workers, textile, steel, agricultural, marine, radio, office, automobiles, glass, clothing, furniture, forest, cannery, oil, quarry, paper,

shoe, transport, distillery, construction, utility, etc., etc.

There are men and women delegates present who know what it is to fight on the picket line from long experience and many a hard fought battle. There are Negro delegates. I saw a gnarled Negro woman from the sharecroppers union—here to get something to take back to the most exploited workers in the whole country. All of them are here because they believe in the CIO. They appreciate the fact that they are better off than they were five years ago and they are determined to go out from the convention to complete the job.

Heated Discussion

The second day of the convention opened with the reading of more dreary telegrams demanding that Lewis stay in office. I suppose that they will continue as long as the convention is in session. The first important business was the report of the Committee on Officers Reports. This is a committee that discusses and reports to the convention on its findings in connection with the annual reports made by CIO officers. The content of these reports will be discussed later. The section of the report dealing with the CIO press brought the first heated discussion in the convention from the floor.

Baldanzi, formerly of the Dyers Federation, which has been merged with the Textile Workers Union took the floor to disagree with the evaluation of the CIO News given by the report. Baldanzi said that the News was the only paper in the United States that did not carry a picture of President Roosevelt after the election. He mentioned Len De Caux, editor of the News, whom he accused of bias in withholding items sent to the News by some sections of the organization.

De Caux was given the floor to defend his administration of the News. I thought his "defense" very weak. He didn't seem to be very sure of himself. He contended that he had edited the paper in conformity with the decisions of the executive council and that the only position taken was laid down by that body. But we knew that DeCaux was leaving his defense to Lewis.

A Little Rough

Blumberg, of the Laundry Workers Joint Board (ACW) also took issue with the report on the News. Blumberg objected to the printing of the Lewis speech endorsing Willkie. Then Lewis took the floor to answer Blumberg. Sensing the situation, the convention and the galleries drew up to strict attention. They expected something and they were not to be disappointed. Lewis said that his speech was printed in the News by De Caux because he (Lewis) had requested it. He said that thousands of telegrams had come in asking for copies of the speech. And then, despite the fact that Lewis had announced at the time of the speech, that he spoke only as a private citizen and not as the representative of the CIO; he decided later that the thousands of copies of the speech that were asked for should not go out privately printed, but in the official organ of the CIO.

This was strange reasoning and I was surprised that no delegate called this to the attention of Lewis. But John L. had not shot his bolt yet. He said that he fully endorsed the way the News had been conducted under De Caux and that De Caux had carried out the policies of the executive council. While Lewis was speaking there was some boing. At this point Lewis did an inexcusable and impermissible thing. He suggested that if the "gentlemen who did the boing will come to the platform we will put on an audition for them." One of the boers sitting beside me stood to let Lewis know that he was one of them but was not observed by Lewis. Lewis then remarked that he would appoint a committee to bring the boers up and remarked: "the committee that I will appoint will bring them up." This sounded to me like the John L. Lewis of an earlier day, the day of intimidation and rough tactics toward workers who were demanding simple democratic rights in the miners' union.

The next part of the report of the Committee on Officers Reports was the section dealing with unity. This discussion will be reported in LABOR ACTION next week along with a full report on the convention. The convention was scheduled to last two days but it looks no was if it will run through Thanksgiving.

There is one thing that I forgot to mention. That is the plan to have Phil Murray replace Lewis. This plan hit a snag in the negotiations of the executive council last night where Murray took the position that he would not accept unless he could get a resolution from the convention authorizing him to eliminate all communists, fascists and nazis from official posts in the CIO.

The State of the Nation
WOKR WANTED
5 hard working, efficient maids (scrubbing, polishing, washing) 10¢ hr. P.D., B.J., B.K., B.S., L.Z. WLA-37547

—an ad in a Los Angeles paper.

We Say That This Country Belongs To The Workers

By PAUL TEMPLE

"I saw the movie *Foreign Correspondent* last night," said Johnny. "I know you think it's just propaganda, but when that reporter made the speech at the end about arming to defend American democracy and they began playing the Star Spangled Banner, well—"

BILL: Well what?

JOHNNY: I could feel it in my blood. It makes you think.

BILL: You mean it STOPS you from thinking. Since when do you think with your blood?

JOHNNY: Aw hell, you know what I mean. It appeals to something deep down inside of you.

BILL: So does a juicy steak. What does it appeal to—your brain or your glands?

What Kind of Patriotism?

JOHNNY: There you go joking again. I'm dead serious. It seems to me, if you're an American, you've got to feel that sorta thing with your heart. There IS such a thing as loving your own country and wanting to see it get ahead, even though a lot of fakers talk that way too. And there's such a thing as standing by your country, just because you're an American.

BILL: All right then, let's love our country and make it get ahead and stand by. That goes for all Americans, huh?

JOHNNY: Certainly.

BILL: And all Englishmen—

JOHNNY: I should say so.

BILL: And, of course, all Germans—

JOHNNY: Of course—Wait a minute! A real patriotic German'd be against Hitler and that bunch of lice that runs the German government.

BILL: So it all depends on whether you like your government!—But look, Hitler is making Germany get ahead, he's made it powerful. Shouldn't a German patriot be glad about that?

JOHNNY: Say, you're not justifying Hitler, are you?

BILL: Not a chance. BUT YOU ARE. If thinking with your patriotic blood is all right for Americans, then what's wrong with it for Germans? This propaganda is drugging you the same way as Hitler drugged the German people. Hitler tells the Germans: "Stand by! England and France have kept us down since the last war and took away our colonies and tried to make us a second-class nation. Now, we even up. Don't be a traitor to your country just because you don't like the government!" Then the band plays and everybody feels it in their blood. . . .

JOHNNY: I know there's something wrong with what you're saying. . . . Here's the way I'll put it: I'm a patriot for democracy. That's why I'm for America, because it's democratic.

BILL: Then the Star-Spangled Banner and your blood has nothing to do with it. If what you say is so, it ought to be the same to you if you were born on a desert island.—The propaganda gets you both ways. If your brain works a bit, they tell you: Fight for democracy. If it doesn't, they wave the flag and tell you: Fight for your country and the Red, White and Blue.

JOHNNY: So what? It comes out the same both ways.

BILL: Not exactly. It didn't in France. They've got the Red, White and Blue there too, and they waved it at the beginning of the war. Now the lice who ran the government are doing what? KOWTOWING TO HITLER. But they're still waving the flag. Patriots, aren't they?

JOHNNY: No sir, they're traitors. And anybody who supports them is scabbing on the fight against Hitler.

BILL: I'll go you one better: same goes for anybody who supported these same lice last year too. I told you then that they weren't interested in democracy OR patriotism but only in defending their PROFITS against Hitler. That's why they can make a deal with Hitler. THAT'S WHY THE "PATRIOTIC" MANUFACTURERS IN THE U.S.A. GO ON A SIT-DOWN STRIKE WHENEVER THE GOVERNMENT MAKES A MOVE TO LIMIT THEIR PROFITS. And you haven't heard Roosevelt making any speeches denouncing them, have you?

JOHNNY: Damn it, you always get me all mixed up. But I STILL think my kind of patriotism is all right. And if the bosses try any double-dealing I'll say, Down with 'em.

Be a Patriot of Your Own Class!

BILL: Trouble is, it's too late AFTER the double-dealing, when you're all shuffled up.—Well, you've been two kinds of patriot so far. First you were patriotic about the Star Spangled Banner. Then you were patriotic about democracy. The bosses are patriotic about their profits. OK, I'M A PATRIOT TOO.

JOHNNY: About number one?

BILL: No, ABOUT MY CLASS. I'm against Hitler because he crushes the workers, not because he's a German. That's why I'm against the American bosses and their stooges in Washington too.—And what's more, I love this country more than they do.

JOHNNY: Now you're talking.

BILL: Sure—I love this country so much I want to take it away from these Wall Street parasites and give it back to the people.

LABOR ACTION

Official Organ of Workers Party

Published weekly by the

Labor Action Publishing Company

Vol. 4, No. 33

NOVEMBER 25, 1940

114 WEST 14th STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y.

(3rd Floor)

Editor: JOSEPH CARTER

Managing Editor: EMANUEL GARRETT

Business Manager: JOHN BILLINGS

Subscription Rate: \$1.50 per year,

\$1.00 six months

(\$2.00 per year or \$1.50 six months for Canada and Foreign)

Re-entered as second class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.