

U. S. SEEKS HEMISPHERE CONTROL

Auto Union Convention Opening in St. Louis

An Honest Account of Leadership's Record During the Last Year Would Be a Tale of Do-Nothing Policies

DETROIT, Mich.—The top leadership of the United Automobile Workers of America will submit a detailed report on its activities and the progress of the organization to the national convention of the union, which opens July 29 at the New Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis, Missouri.

An honest and forthright report would have to admit that the union has made absolutely no progress in its organizational work; that the organization drives on Ford's, the aircraft industry and the competitive parts plants were total flops. It would have to admit that the leadership sabotaged and side-tracked the necessary fight for the 30 hour week at 40 hours pay; that the two major strike battles engaged in by the union since the Cleveland convention—the GM Tool and Die strike of last summer and the 55-day Chrysler strike—gained the membership virtually no important concessions and it would record that the top leaders today have jumped on the bandwagon of the Morgan-Dupont National Defense Council and are conducting themselves as recruiting sergeants for the Wall Street war machine.

"STABILIZATION" — AND WHAT IT MEANS

In one respect and only one respect the leadership actually has achieved its program. This achievement goes under the heading of "stabilization of the union." In what does the stabilization of the union consist? Not primarily that the dues are coming in more regularly or that the members have become more consistent union men. No! The stabilization of the union as far as the leadership is concerned consists of the fact that a great amount of the enthusiasm, the spirit of daring and of fighting is gone from the membership. Attendance at meetings is smaller than at any time in the past three years, interest in the union is at a low point.

Is this anything to be proud of and to record as an achievement? As far as the union leadership is concerned, yes! With the present set-up there isn't so much kicking on the part of the membership, oppositionists do not feel so free to attack the union leadership, kickers are more easily eliminated, the leadership breathes more easily about its jobs and its pay.

The leadership does not dare reveal its real program which amounts to this: we've got enough membership right now, dues and per capita are coming in pretty good, our salaries are being paid regularly: Let's leave well-enough alone! This conservative do-nothing attitude of the leadership is dishd out under the high-faluting terms of "preserving our union gains."

This constitutes the actual program of all the International officers and executive board members without exception. True, the executive board is not one hundred per cent homogeneous. While the majority of the board and the officers follow very strictly the leadership of John L. Lewis, several of the board members still play ball with what remains of the Stalinist machine in the U.A.W. But this division between Stalinist machine men and the John L. Lewis men is purely a clique division, a fight for posts, honors and jobs.

Behind the Lines

STALIN FLIP-FLOP AWAITS BATTLE OF BRITAIN

by GEORGE STERN

Despite the multiplying signs of a coming shift in the policies of the Kremlin, it would now seem that this shift is to wait upon the conclusion of the Battle of Britain, now about to open. This is due primarily to the development of the American position in the war. Had there been any possibility of immediate American intervention on an effective scale, the chances are Stalin would have already effected his latest flip-flop. But this possibility has not existed. Neither the Roosevelt administration nor its Republican "opponents" has dared in the last few months to take an openly interventive stand.

At the same time the advisability of attempting such a stampede was materially reduced by the unexpectedly swift victories of Germany in the battles on the European continent. It has been sufficiently apparent in the past few months that effective intervention by the U.S. in Europe may no longer be feasible. It became clear instead that the clash between the U.S. and Germany would more likely take place on broader battlefields following the German conquest of Europe.

This caution dictates a like policy in the Kremlin. Without American intervention, Stalin could not hope by himself to change the course of the Battle of Britain. He might succeed

On every major union question—and political question for that matter—the whole board votes and acts as one man. Examples: the unanimous approval of the GM agreement, unanimous position on the handling of the 55-day Chrysler strike fiasco, unanimous shelving of the 30 hour week at 40 hours pay, unanimous support of a third term for Roosevelt.

Things stand considerably different with the membership of the UAW. They are not satisfied and cannot be satisfied with the status quo, because in spite of all of the big talk and ballyhoo they still remain the victims of insecurity, low annual wages, unemployment, and the murderous speed-up.

Because of the despicable program of the UAW and CIO leadership in dampening the enthusiasm and militancy of the men for the past years, in signing phony contracts, and making phony deals with the manufacturers and capitalist politicians, the auto workers are temporarily tired out. They have no perspective at the moment of what to fight for and how to do the fighting. The present leadership has done a pretty good job of spreading confusion in the ranks.

MILITANTS HAVE FAITH IN UNION

Militants all over the union, however, men who have gone through the baptism of fire of the union strike struggles, are not despairing at all. They know the UAW will lead the strike struggles in America in the coming period as they did in 1937. They are preparing at the coming St. Louis convention to lay the ground-work for a real program of action that will build and shove forward the UAW once again, and the job of building a leadership that will honestly adhere and act upon a program of this kind.

A militant program necessarily envisages consistent opposition to the war preparations of the Roosevelt government and deadly hostility to the Wall Street National Defense Council.

A militant program will defend by aggressive union action and strikes and demonstrations all of the rights of the union and will not tolerate the laws that seek to establish a dictatorship over the labor movement.

Such a program will launch a militant fight for the 30 hour week at 40 hours pay, and aggressive organization campaigns to organize the unorganized at Ford's, the key aircraft industry, the competitive parts and accessory plants.

MEMBERSHIP WILL ANSWER BLOWS!

The militants know that the present leadership is working with might and main to hogtie the UAW to the war machine and hamstring its abilities to strike and to fight for the rights of its membership. They know that in the coming period prices are bound to rise sky high and that the present union policy will at best keep wages stationary. On the pretext of national defense necessity the 40 hour week and all other major union achievements will be attacked.

The UAW membership will not take these blows lying down. The next stage will inevitably witness the fight of broad sections of the UAW membership for a fighting program and for a leadership adhering to that program.

only in bringing upon the Soviet Union a full German attack earlier by months than he had any reason to expect. Stalin, in effect, is already pegging his policy on American policy, just as in the dim days before the war European currencies were being pegged to the dollar.

Meanwhile the pot goes on boiling. Walter Duranty, who still has an eye for such things, reported from Bucharest the same day that Hitler spoke (NY Times, July 20) that Rumanians expect Germany before long to resume its drive to the East.

In Bucharest itself, Duranty said, the Germans were intriguing furiously to keep Rumania and the Soviet Union and Turkey and the Soviet Union as embroiled as possible without actual conflict. Most important of all, Duranty cites as authentic reports that both Red Army and German troops were being moved westward and eastward respectively in steadily growing numbers.

Militant Strike Of Die Casters Lost by Leaders

Workers Wanted To Fight On, But Not Stalinist Leaders

CLEVELAND, July 21—Panic-stricken CIO leaders, largely Stalinist, threw the Die Casting Workers into rout and defeat after the workers had thrown repeated militant mass picket lines against the union-hating Precision Die Casting Co. Stevenson, Balint, Cheyfitz, and company took four hours to hammer the union membership into calling off the strike and returning humbly to work.

The membership was told that the NLRB would protect them from discrimination when they re-employed for work, and Mayor Kaufman of Lakewood, where the plant is, would intercede for them with the company.

The company has now refused to rehire the majority of the 85 strikers, and the union officials are even postponing their appeals to the NLRB in order to give the company "every chance to play fair."

The break in the strike came after unusually severe sentences had been passed out against a dozen workers charged with breaking the anti-picketing injunction. A significant aspect of this court attack upon the union was that Judge Gilbert, who passed out the sentences, had been supported by the Stalinist-dominated Labor's Non-Partisan League for election.

The loss of the Precision strike has hurt the union movement in Cleveland, and it can be laid entirely at the door of the Stalinist leadership who prepared for it very poorly, and whose trembling knees contrasted sharply with the real fighting militancy of the workers.

Among other stupidities, these officials used the argument that the company was holding up national defense by refusing to settle, an argument which the workers here understand is a boss argument through and through.

A new critical spirit is beginning to arise in the CIO rank and file here as a result of seeing such leadership in action.

Nazi and U. S. Groups Near Civil War in Argentina

British Lackeys Turn to U. S. Master, While Native and German Fascists Seek Rapprochement with Germany

By QUEBRACHO (Special to the Socialist Appeal)

BUENOS AIRES, July 11 (by airmail)—Moved to their depths by the events in Europe, the Latin American countries are preparing to take part in the Havana Conference which Roosevelt has just convoked. But if for all of the Latin American countries—as semi-colonial lands—this moment is particularly grave, for Argentina, it is a moment of fundamental crisis. We are faced with imminent civil war between the two sections of the bourgeoisie corresponding to the contending imperialist camps in the war.

Argentina, economically the most advanced and the principal market of South America, has been, together with Uruguay, the only one that has resisted the influence of the United States, maintaining close relations with England. This is due, in the first place, to the fact that the cattle-owners who dominate this country have had their principal market in Great Britain and that British imperialism controls a great part of Argentine economy, particularly since the signing of the Roca-Runciman pact in 1933, through which, in order to conserve the English market—menaced by the Ottawa agreement—the Argentine government assured "preferential treatment" to British capital invested here, which amounts to 450 million pounds sterling and is mainly in railroads.

If the voice of Argentina was raised harshly, against the United States, more than once, at the Pan-American Conferences, it was simply because through her British imperialism was speaking. But now Britain's domination is declining and, unless she demonstrates herself capable of victoriously resisting Hitler's assault, her influence is destined to disappear in all the South American continent.

Confronted by this perspective, the Argentine bourgeoisie, which has been losing its markets for meat and cereals in the European countries which were its principal customers, and is menaced with losing England also if it is subdued by the German army, is profoundly divided on the question of new perspectives.

On one side are those who remain loyal to England and who form a veritable British "fifth column". This group is attempting to draw Argentina directly into the conflict behind Britain under the slogan of the "struggle for democracy against fascism." On the other side are those groups who call themselves "nationalists", and the Nazi-fascists, who form the Nazi "fifth column," which is strengthened by the German successes; they conduct a demagogic "anti-imperialist" campaign and say they fight for Ar-

gentine "neutrality". In reality, however, they are attempting to prepare a purely fascist seizure of power and then to effect a rapprochement of the country with Germany. To the first group the "socialists" of the Second International adhere; to the second, the Stalinists.

The struggle between the two groups is extremely intense and is complicated by the fact that President Ortiz maintains good relations with the Anglophile "fifth column" while vice-president Castillo is similarly aligned with the Nazi-fascist "fifth column." Through the illness of Ortiz, Castillo will probably remain at the head of the government, and this intensifies the situation still more.

It is in this atmosphere that the Havana Conference takes place. Each group of the Argentine bourgeoisie takes its own stand toward it. The "nationalists" and Nazi-fascists, of course, combat "Yankee imperialism" and conduct an intense campaign against U. S. penetration. The Anglophiles, who are the most numerous and the stronger group, incline favorably toward the "great democracy of the North" and are ready to deliver themselves to Wall Street as quickly as the City of London collapses.

In the face of this state of things, the working class is extremely disquieted—and confused. Through the voice of a great part of its unions, the working class has manifested its desire for the maintenance of Argentine neutrality and for the repudiation of those who try to drag them as cannon fodder into the imperialist slaughter. But each day one sees them more drawn into the control of those who speak of "defense of civilization," "defense of democracy", etc. For they instinctively hate Nazism; moreover the press, outside the Nazi and Stalinist dailies, is controlled by the Anglo-U.S. group.

The United States is far from here and has had little contact with Argentina; hence the working class here does not begin to comprehend yet the magnitude of the plans of Yankee imperialism for establishing its exclusive control over the Latin American countries. In the coming struggle between the two sectors of the bourgeoisie that correspond to the contending imperialist camps, the Argentine working class will line up with the Anglo-U.S. sector in order to fight against Nazism. This augments the possibilities of U.S. penetration here.

But, assuredly, before that will be completed, the working class here will begin to realize that it is confronted by a new master—a fact which it has some glimmerings of now, but not sufficiently to prevent that master from moving in here.

What Will John L. Lewis Do About His Proven Charges Against FDR?

A letter by John L. Lewis to members of the CIO executive board, made public last Sunday, constituted an indictment of the Roosevelt administration's anti-labor policies in connection with "national defense" contracts.

The very least the government could do under the circumstances is not to issue contracts to corporations violating the labor laws. That's what Lewis asked Roosevelt in a letter dated January 18, 1939—over a year and a half ago—in which he pointed out that Douglas Aircraft Corporation, the Electric Boat Company and Bethlehem Steel Corporation were three corporations—he could name others—which were violating the labor laws.

Roosevelt's reply to that letter was an insult to the intelligence of John L. Lewis and the labor movement. For Roosevelt denied that the government could require government contractors "to adhere to the letter of the Labor Law". Instead, no doubt with a sly grin, he advised Lewis to seek "remedial legislation" from Congress. But the president didn't send Lewis away altogether empty-handed: he generously offered to provide Lewis with technical assistance in drafting such legislation.

Needless to say, technical assistance wasn't what was needed. Lewis, or his attorney, Lee Pressman, or for that matter anybody, could write down what was needed. The point is, as Lewis told Roosevelt in a second letter, Roosevelt's own Army and Navy Departments were working hand in glove with the National Association of Manufacturers to prevent passage by Congress of a specific clause directing government departments not to issue contracts to corporations which violate the labor laws. Three times in the last three years the House Rules Committee and the House majority organization—i. e., Roosevelt's party—have killed proposed legislation to so direct government departments.

As a matter of fact, however, Lewis pointed out to Roosevelt, such specific legislation is not legally required. The president has the power to issue an executive order that government departments shall require contractors to observe labor laws. Lewis reminded Roosevelt that precisely this power had been used by the president back in the honeymoon days of the New Deal, when he had issued an executive order excluding from bidding on government contracts those firms which were unwilling to comply with the code of their industry set up under the National Industrial Recovery Act!

In his third and last letter of this correspondence with Roosevelt, written on March 16, 1939, Lewis explained why the CIO was getting the run-around by government officials, that "business appeasement" is essential to defense.

In other words, the government is conniving with big corporations to help them get around the few bits of protective legislation that the unions have won, because "business appeasement"—helping the corporations against the workers—is needed in order to get the corporations to cooperate with the government on "national defense".

No corporation working on government orders must be permitted to work below the conditions set by existing legislation—and that includes the Walsh-Healey provisions for payment of prevailing trade union scales on such work.

Never mind all the bunk about the "national emergency". The government's connivance with the corporations in violating these laws—that fact should be thrown into the teeth of anybody who has the gall to tell the unions not to strike for decent wages and conditions.

Trade union action! Strike! That's the only way that organized labor can enforce trade union scales and conditions! That's the plain lesson of Lewis' indictment of the administration. But will Lewis heed that lesson?

HAVANA IS FIRST MOVE IN PLAN

Economic Proposals Will Be Followed By Armed Force

By SAM MARCY

The Havana Conference is the answer of United States imperialism to a possible Hitler victory over British imperialism.

Washington has convened the conference in order to line up the Latin American countries on the side of the United States in a world conflict with German imperialism which would undoubtedly follow a Nazi victory over Britain.

At the conference the United States seeks first of all to prevent the real possibility of German economic penetration of Latin America. That is a real possibility, for a victorious Germany, organizing European production, could supply Latin America with the manufactured products it needs so badly and, in return, could take the agricultural produce and raw materials of Latin America. With low labor costs and efficient production and with a definite need for Latin American exports, Germany could compete with the United States in Latin America on better than even terms.

How prevent that? How, in other words, keep Germany altogether out of Latin America? This is the problem with which Washington is wrestling and for which it has convened the Havana Conference.

Hull-Berle Cartel

Feeling its way Washington has permitted to become public one proposal—the Hull-Berle scheme to form a gigantic cartel for the control of exports from the Western Hemisphere. An Inter-American Export Corporation would bar exports from and imports to a Nazi-dominated Europe.

But as the New York Times says very frankly in its editorial of July 22, it is economically impossible for the United States to pay the Latin American countries for its products. The authors of the cartel plan cannot but know this. How, then, do they propose to secure the obedience of the Latin American countries for the plan to cease their exports to Europe and Asia? If not by payment, there can be only one other method—armed force. The Havana Conference is, therefore, but a prelude to the military subjugation of the hemisphere by American imperialism—that is what is in store.

At Havana, therefore, the United States delegation is primarily occupied in finding those countries who are not primarily dependent on European and Asiatic exports and who will therefore consent to become junior partners of American imperialism in the subjugation of the hemisphere.

Economic Solution Impossible

The mailed fist will, however, be preceded by the silk glove of economic methods. The Hull-Berle cartel proposal cannot however be expected to work on a purely economic level. That can be demonstrated by analyzing the

(Continued on Page 2)

WORKERS' FORUM

Write to us—tell us what's going on in your part of the labor movement—what are the workers thinking about?—tell us what the bosses are up to—and the G-men and the local cops—and the Stalinists—send us that story the capitalist press didn't print and that story they buried or distorted—our pages are open to you. Letters must carry name and address, but indicate if you do not want your name printed.

Bosses Are Training, What About Us?

Editor: As a follow-up to my letter on workers' military training which you printed several weeks ago, I am enclosing the following notice clipped from a local paper which will indicate the extent of the defense activity in the small towns. Similar official and unofficial meetings are being held throughout Connecticut and, I am sure, in most of the states in the Union. It's time the workers began to wake up and realize how fast the drive for militarizing the country is proceeding, and to discuss and decide what THEY must do in this situation.

Fraternally,
W. F. W.
BRIDGEPORT, Conn.

WARNING

The Legal Voters and Taxpayers of the Town of Redding are hereby notified and warned that a Special Town Meeting will be held at the Hill School in said Town of Redding on Saturday, July 13, 1940 at 8:30 P. M., DST, for the following purpose:

- (1) For the general purpose of discussing and formulating definite, sane, sound home defense plans including but not limited to the following:
 - (a) Home Guard
 - (b) Economic Defense (including men, women, children, machines, stock and land).
 - (c) Fingerprinting
 - (d) Redding "M" Day
 - (e) And thereupon to coordinate our home defense and begin immediate cooperation with the County, The State and the United States.
- (2) And to Transact any other business right and proper to come before said meeting.

Dated at Redding, Conn., this 8th day of July, 1940.
S. HAROLD SAMUELSON
FRANK STOLLE
JOSEPH HUYBER
Selectmen of the Town of Redding.

A Letter From the Locked-Out Youth

Editor: Here is a note I received from a 24-year old boy that I know. He lost two fingers of each hand in an industrial accident, to make up for it was given some machine shop training. Somehow his note

seems to describe not only this boy, but the seven million youth who have come of age since 1930. He writes:

"I looked for work in my line all over Minneapolis and put my application in a number of the shops, but things were very slow and the relief department started sending the boys out to camp and Mr. Atkins at the relief was always asking when I was going to work. He said there was all kinds of work and there wasn't any. And then he held back my rent for the last month, and I had to keep calling up to get that. So I finally got tired of everything and started west for Seattle and I did not have a cent of money when I started. It was plenty tough going. But I finally got here. It took me seven days. I was all tired out. And now that it is all over I think I made a mistake leaving Minneapolis.

Although there is a lot of work out here, there is also a lot of men out of work that live here. I was over to the Boeing airplane factory and put in my application but they have about ten thousand of them. There is a line up every morning about two blocks long. I don't think there will be much hiring done here until this fall and it was very hard getting by without a place to sleep or eat. So just a couple days ago I was for leaving Seattle. I was all tired out from losing sleep and missing a few meals, when I walked into a cafe and asked a woman for something to eat and told her what it was all about. So she offered to help me out for my meals and a place to sleep for a few weeks and in the meantime I might find something. And after that I don't know what. So that's all the news I have for now."

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn. G. C.

Join the Socialist Workers Party

LONG ISLAND CITY BRANCH
BEER and DANCE
at
Rainbow Ball Room
10-21-47 Road
Long Island City
(in New York)
SAT., AUG. 3, 1940
CONTINUOUS DANCING
PROFESSIONAL ENTERTAINMENT

Phil Murray, Steel Bosses, All Democrats -- Whose Voice Does Their Party Listen To?

By FARRELL DOBBS

Among those to answer roll call as a delegate to the Democratic Convention was Phillip Murray, CIO vice president and Chairman of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee. His presence at the Chicago gathering is of more than passing interest to the CIO workers. Why was he there? What benefits did he hope to bring to the workers by his participation? Did he hope to find a broader solution to the problems of the steel workers whose plight he so eloquently described in his recent testimony before the Monopoly Committee of Congress?

MURRAY'S STORY OF THE STEEL TRUST

Last November and December industrial production in the nation as a whole surpassed the all-time peak in 1929, but with fewer workers. In the Pittsburgh industrial area production rose 6% from August 1929 to November 1939. But during this period men hours of work declined 19%. 24% of the working population of Pennsylvania was unemployed last December, the point when industrial production was higher than in 1929.

The cry of industry and of government for almost eight years has been "Give us greater productivity. Increase our efficiency. Lower the production costs of our commodities, and thereby create greater buying power and this will afford the cure for all the unemployment evils confronting the nation." Productivity has been increased; and labor's reward is a lower annual income, a shorter work year and more men thrown out in the streets. Corporation profits, on the other

hand, surpassed the 1929 profits in the last quarter of 1939.

Growth of Monopoly

Factual investigations reveal that the trend in American industry today is toward greater monopolistic control. Technology is building a new monopoly in the steel industry. Eighteen steel companies went out of business in the 1930's through mergers and consolidations. Eight others merged but kept separate identities. Only two new companies were formed as the result of mergers. Fourteen plants or departments are now on the steel industry's death list. 22,350 workers employed in them will lose their jobs. Control of steel production is being concentrated into the hands of fewer and larger companies. Eighteen small independent companies operating hand mills will soon go. They employ 22,350 men.

Machines Replace Men

Modern automatic hot strip mills can handle most of the demand for flat rolled products. 126 men in the automatic mills produce the same tonnage as 4,512 men in the hand mills, a 97% re-

duction in man hours. The strip mills are displacing 84,770 men. 38,470 of them have already been disconnected from the industry. They are thrown out, not one by one, but a thousand to fifteen hundred at a time. In one case 3,000 workers were told to go home and not come back.

The continuous butt-weld type mill displaces 100 workers. Where 136 men are required for an operation in the hand mills only 36 are required in the continuous mills, a reduction of 75%.

Since 1923 the number of man hours per ton of steel output has declined 36%. A little more than 6 workers can turn out as much steel now as 10 could in 1923. Almost half of the decline has occurred since 1936 when labor displacement by strip mills began. From August 1936 to September 1939 technology reduced the number of man hours per ton of ingots produced from 18.7 to 14.7 man hours per ton. This is a reduction of more than 21%.

Steel Ghost Towns

Strip mills have reduced entire communities to ruin. Events during the last three years in Newcastle, Pennsylvania, a steel town of 50,000 people, are typical. 4,500 hand mill workers have been permanently displaced in this town. A few years earlier 1,200 Bessemer workers were displaced. There have been a total of 5,700 victims of technology in Newcastle during the 1930's. 64% of the town's population is either on relief or trying to get it. As the plight of Newcastle grew worse WPA wages were reduced \$5.00 a month and the number of WPA jobs cut more than 50%.

Unemployment Cancels Raises

Between August 1936 and September 1939 hourly wage rates in steel rose more than 27%, or from 66.8 to 85.1 cents per hour. The amount of wages per ton of ingots produced in August 1936 and September 1939 was the same, \$12.50 a ton. Despite a 27% increase in average hourly wages the total wages per ton of ingot produced did not increase. This is the result of a reduction of 21% in man hours per ton of ingots produced.

The claim that increased wage rates are responsible for technological improvement is not valid. All automatic strip mills were completed, under construction or authorized to be constructed before the steel wage raise in 1936 and 1937.

An insignificant number of steel workers are employed a full five day week for 50 weeks a year. The average employed worker is idle 15 to 25 of the year. The bosses avoid hiring former hand mill workers in the strip mills. Those employed are given work as laborers or semi-skilled workers. They receive only one-half to one-third of their former daily earnings. The new steel technology is not creating new jobs elsewhere to compensate for jobs directly eliminated in the steel industry.

Workers Bear Burden

Technological improvements have been very profitable to the bosses and very costly to the workers. The same labor cost of production has been maintained despite an increase of more than one-fourth in hourly wage rates. Fourteen million dollars have been eliminated from the total monthly pay envelopes of the steel workers. Production efficiency has been raised by one-fifth. 30,000 workers have been displaced. Finished steel prices have increased 9%.

In other words, the industry produces the same amount of steel with 30,000 fewer workers. The employed workers are receiving more than 26% higher wages per hour but they are idle one-fifth to two-fifths of the year. 30,000 men have been displaced entirely and are getting no wages at all.

What Unionism Did

The SWOC Chairman supported this vivid description of conditions in the steel industry with verifiable statistics and instructive illustrations. He next turned to the role of the SWOC. If the steel workers had not organized, the situation would have been more serious. The SWOC has prevented, by increasing the hourly wage rate, a reduction of total monthly pay rolls by more than one-fourth. It has also, by reducing hours, prevented thus far the permanent elimination of 58,000 steel workers from their jobs. If it were not for the SWOC there would today be 88,000 instead of 30,000 steel workers thrown out in the street.

Murray recognizes that important as the union has been it has fallen short of a complete solution of the steel workers' problems. He goes on to say, "Having

won an increase of fourteen and one-half million dollars in total monthly payrolls, however, the SWOC has been helpless to prevent the steel industry from taking it away through technological improvements."

Congressional Action Needed

Pointing out that collective bargaining in the steel industry is on a company-wide basis, while the problems of technological improvement are industry wide and national in character, the CIO spokesman concludes: "Consequently, in the absence of universal collective bargaining, Congressional regulation of the introduction of large technological changes is necessary."

POLITICAL ACTION NEEDED — BUT AGAINST THE BOSSSES

Murray recognizes that the steel workers must supplement trade union action with political action if they are to find a solution to their problems. But why does he turn to the Democratic Party? They will give lip service but they will not act. The Democratic Party, just as the Republican Party, is a political organization of the steel bosses, not of the steel workers.

One of Murray's fellow delegates at the convention was Mayor Kelly of Chicago whose police carried out the Memorial Day massacre of the strikers in Little Steel. In the Ohio delegation the men who called out the National Guard to help the steel bosses in the same strike. Roosevelt, to whose

renomination Murray was pledged, has been in the White House during these very years in which the steel bosses were grinding the workers down under the heel of technological change.

The SWOC Chairman told the Monopoly Committee that there should be a national unemployment conference of leaders of government, industry, labor and farm groups. The Democrats put it in their platform. Platform promises, however, are taken lightly by the Democrats and the Republicans. The conference may never be held. If it is held it will wind up in a discussion of how to keep down labor trouble "in the interests of national defense," and not in any clear-cut program to aid the unemployed and underpaid workers.

The corporations are interested in only one thing: profit. As in the past so it will be in the future; the Democratic and Republican politicians will do the bidding of the corporations. Murray and all other labor leaders who support them are very popular with the Democrats and Republicans just before elections. When the election is over the bosses get the benefit of political representation and the workers get a few crumbs at best, sometimes tear gas and bullets.

"I say to the leaders of industry," Murray told the Monopoly Committee, "keep your economic theories in text books. So far as the workers of this great nation

are concerned, they want to know only one thing. When do they get jobs? When are they going to be protected from losing their jobs everytime a new contraption or a new invention is discovered. When are their children, the youth of this nation, who are roaming the streets today, going to get jobs? This is the question. This is the big problem of today."

FOR AN INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY

He is one thousand percent correct, but the workers won't get action on this vital problem from the Democrats or the Republicans. Nor will they get results through a third party of employer-loyal Senator Wheeler as John L. Lewis would have had the CIO membership believe.

The acute problems of the steel workers which Phillip Murray has so eloquently described can no longer be solved by trade union action alone. Unions the workers must have. They are an indispensable instrument. Working class political action is today equally indispensable.

The workers can depend upon no one except those of their own class. The next step toward the solution of their problems must be the election of candidates to political office—local, state and national—from the workers' own ranks by the workers' own political party. An independent labor party based on the trade unions must be formed.

Havana Is Opening Gun In U. S. Conquest of Americas

(Continued from Page 1)

economic situation of the hemisphere.

A clear understanding of the full implications of this so-called "hemisphere policy" can only be had if we begin by dismissing some of the myths which have been deliberately fostered in recent months by the capitalist press in the U. S. The first myth is that of "hemisphere unity." The western hemisphere is a geographical unit as every school boy knows. But under no circumstances can it be classified as an economic unit.

On the contrary the western hemisphere is a vast economic conglomeration of both complementary and competitive economies tied to the rest of the world by trade and commerce. Any attempt to isolate economically the Latin American countries from Europe or Asia or to impose upon them an autarchic economy can only lead to the most frightful convulsions in their economic set-up, destroy gigantic productive forces and further reduce the already battered living standards of the Latin American toilers.

Some Simple Examples

A very simple illustration of the dependency of Latin-America upon the rest of the world is supplied by the \$1,000,000,000 worth of raw materials, which Latin-America annually has sold to Europe and Asia. The aim of the Hull-Berle cartel scheme to end these exports means utter ruin for Latin-America. That this is so can be easily seen by an examination of the effects it would have on the major Latin-American countries.

A good foreign market for exporting its oil spells the difference between existing poverty and economic prosperity for the Venezuelan masses. Mexican economy in the last analysis, depends upon the export of oil, copper and silver. World prices of copper set the living standards for Chile and Peru. Petroleum export is the source of most of Colombia's income. Meats, cotton and hides are the major raw materials produced in Brazil and Argentina. Loss of the European market for her coffee would deprive Brazil of most of her foreign exchange. Wheat, corn, linseed, wool hides, and meats, produced mostly by Uruguay and Argentina, are entirely destined for foreign markets. Central America depends heavily on the export of bananas.

The so-called central marketing agency (or to put it more plainly, U. S. capitalists) would have to absorb, on the basis of 1938 statistics — 65,000,000 bushels of wheat, 10,000,000 bags of coffee, 725,000 tons of meat, 1,500,000 bales of cotton, 214,000 tons of wool, 200,000 tons of copper, about 20,000,000 tons of oil.—to mention only Latin-America's major exports!

Where, however, would the products be sold?

The natural inference which the capitalist press in the U. S. would have us draw, is that they would be sold in the United States. But this is far from the minds of the American capitalists. They know very well that a great many of the Latin American exports are in direct competition with the products made of grown in the United States. As we have said, Latin American economy is not only a complementary one, but also competitive, especially with the United States.

For example the United States competes in the world market with Argentina and Brazil in the sale of wheat, cotton and meats. The United States also competes with Latin America in the sale of cotton, oil, linseed and corn—to name only the important ones.

Crisis of Overproduction

To believe that American imperialism will purchase these products of the Latin countries at a "fair" price and dispose them upon the already overloaded American market is simply ridiculous. As matters stand now, the Roosevelt government is still paying farmers to plow under wheat and cotton, and still hands out millions to oil barons in order to control the production on oil.

The disease of over-production, especially in the field of agriculture and raw materials, arising out of the chaos created by the capitalist crisis, struck both Latin America and the United States. But owing to the fact that the Latin American countries never even temporarily recovered from the post-war crisis, the crisis of 1929 made conditions in the field of agriculture and raw materials especially severe there. The outbreak of the Second Imperialist War, unlike the last war which heavily increased Latin American exports to the Allies at high prices, has still further undermined the export trade of the Latin American countries, thereby further accentuating the already sharp crisis.

Thus Argentina is preparing to burn 6,000,000 tons of corn, which it cannot sell to Europe because of the war. Uruguay is left holding one-fourth of its wool crop, which it cannot dispose of. Brazil's stocks of coffee and cotton are cramming the warehouses. Germany, its best customer, has ceased to buy altogether on account of the blockade. Chile's exports of copper and nitrates have materially decreased, as Germany was one of its principal customers.

In the light of what has been said above it is easier to see what it will mean to these Latin American countries if U. S. imperialism succeeds in foisting upon them the Hull-Berle scheme to further reduce the already diminished export trade of these Latin countries, upon which their very existence depends.

'Worst Repressions in 20 Yrs' Says Civil Liberties Union

Repressions against working men and women in the United States have become so intensified since the war that the American Civil Liberties Union, in its yearly report just out, declares that "At no period in the twenty years of its existence have the Civil Liberties Union and other agencies engaged with protecting civil rights been confronted with such an array of threatened measures of repression. Added to the federal measures are local enactments and orders, mob violence, and hasty formation of citizens' committees dedicated to stamping out 'subversive' influences."

The latest report of the Civil Liberties Union entitled "In the Shadow of War", is in sharp contrast with the one issued last year, praising the administration to the skies.

This smug, bourgeois committee failed completely to realize that the "liberal" Roosevelt administration was systematically preparing and enacting legislation and empowering federal agencies to bound the labor movement. Today, the A. C. L. U. is ready to admit that "it is impossible to foretell in a period of such tension and change how far repression will go. But it seems certain that the drive for vast national defence with the likelihood of military conscription will weaken the defences of democracy and imperil not only the liberties of minorities but of all citizens generally."

"ON THE ONE HAND AND ON THE OTHER..."

Despite the dark outlook the Civil Liberties Union makes a rather pathetic attempt to find praise as well as blame for the government and its agencies. Its annual report contains a "Balance Sheet of Civil Liberties" which begins—to help liberal hopes spring eternal in the human breast, no doubt—with a section entitled "We commend". That contains 24 items. It is followed by "We condemn", containing 25 items. Then "We regret", four items. By this liberal mathematics the government is not so bad, after all!

Leaving aside this absurdity, the 72-page annual report is extremely useful as a picture of the developing use of repressive measures by the War Deal. It is useful, however, only in those fields in which the government quite openly assaults rights which even capitalism has traditionally conceded to be civil liberties: the right of asylum, of minority parties in elections, etc. Where, however, the assault against workers' rights is camouflaged as prosecution of violence in a strike, for example, the Civil Liberties Union does not define that as a violation of civil liberties!

Thus the most outstanding case of governmental assault on the right to strike and petition for grievance that occurred in the last year, the famous Min-

neapolis WPA prosecutions, the Civil Liberties Union report says: "The (Civil Liberties) Union did not get into the case until its later stages because of the charges of violence on the picket line. It became evident, however, that these minor charges did not justify a federal indictment for conspiracy and the Union joined with others in urging the dismissal of the remaining indictments."

In other words, "mere" indictments under trumped-up charges of violence on the picket line would not alone have been enough to have the Civil Liberties Union say a word on behalf of the WPA prisoners!

FIGURE THIS ONE OUT, IF YOU CAN

A really ludicrous example of this "civil liberties" mentality is the report's comment on the

"passport fraud" and other prosecutions directed against the Communist Party. These, says the report, were "not directly within the field of civil liberties". The Union says it found the charge that political prejudice was in back of these prosecutions to be "unsupported".

What would these gentlemen want? An affidavit from the judge swearing he was motivated by political prejudice? However, the Union does concede that it found "violations of civil rights incidental to the prosecutions—excessive bail, unfair delays in bringing cases to trial, appeals to public prejudice, and unwarranted sentences." All this, note, is incidental!

God help the labor movement if our rights in the coming period were to depend on the aid of these hair-splitters!

Soviet Ship Watched For Assaults Of Trotsky

MEXICO CITY, July 23—A strict watch is being kept by Mexican authorities over the Soviet freighter, Sevskis, now anchored in the Port of Manzanillo. It is believed that the ship arrived at that port as a means of escape for David Alfaro Siqueiros, his two brothers-in-law, Luis and Leopoldo Arenal, and other persons wanted by the police for the attempted assassination of Leon Trotsky and the murder of his secretary, Robert Sheldon Harte.

The ship ostensibly arrived to load metals for Vladivostok, but when authorities noted that there were no signs of activity aboard, they became suspicious that the ship was waiting to embark the GPU band. Siqueiros and his associates have been reported seen at various points, but have eluded all efforts to apprehend them.

Meanwhile the evidence against the assassins is continuing to accumulate. The latest of those implicated who has given a declaration to the interrogating judge is Jose Alvarez Lopez, a veteran of the Spanish civil war, who

was hired by Siqueiros as his personal chauffeur some time before the attempt to murder Trotsky.

Lopez Verifies Details

Lopez on Saturday told the judge the detailed story of Siqueiros' activities up to and including the attack on Trotsky's house. His story brought in Ana Lopez and Julia Barradas de Serrano, the two women spies assigned to corrupt the police guarding Trotsky's house; every night at eight Siqueiros met them to hear their report. Visits to the "French Jew", previously identified as the foreign agent of the GPU in charge of planning the assault; visits to the house where Harte's body was later found; and the story of the gathering of the assassins, their donning of police uniforms, the bringing of the machine guns and other weapons used, were described in detail by Lopez.

His makes the ninth declaration to the interrogating judge which names many of those who actually participated in the attack. Three other chauffeurs used that night, the two women spies, and Nestor Sanchez Hernandez who was one of the assassins disguised in police uniform, are among those who have "come clean."

Buy the APPEAL IN MINNEAPOLIS

at:
Shinders News Co.,
6th St. & Hennepin Av.
Morris Kroman,
4th St. & Nicollet Av.
Pioneer News Co.,
238 Second Av., South
A. Peterson News Stand,
Washington Av. & B'way N.
Labor Book store,
919 Marquette Av.

In AKRON, O.

the APPEAL may be obtained at:
NEWS EXCHANGE,
51 S. Main St.
PORTAGE CIGARS,
cor. Howard & West Market

SENSATIONAL SUMMER OFFER!!

- * A subscription to the Socialist Appeal
- * A valuable bound volume of back Appeals

At prices never before seen

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| 1 yr. Appeal sub, reg \$2 |) both for |
| 1938 bound volume, reg \$3 |) \$3.00 |
| 1 yr Appeal sub, reg. \$2 |) both for |
| 1st or 2nd half-year 1939 |) |
| bd volume, reg \$2 |) \$2.50 |
| 1 yr Appeal sub, reg \$2 |) all for |
| 1939 complete in two vol- |) |
| umes, reg \$4 |) \$3.50 |

(Deduct 50c for any of the above with a 6 months, instead of a 1 year, sub.)

ORDER IMMEDIATELY — SUPPLY LIMITED!
Socialist Appeal
116 University Place
New York, New York

Bill me for (check 1 in each column):

() 1 yr sub	() 1938 volume
() 6 mos sub	() 1939 (Jan-June)
	() 1939 (July-Dec.)
	() 1939 complete

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____

The Negro Struggle
by Robert L. Birchman

The New York Age in an editorial (July 20) "France Becomes a Dictatorship", comments in part as follows:

"Unless Hitler can complete his invasion of England before the winter sets in he will be faced with both famine and revolution in practically all of the conquered territory under his dominion. The French colonies in Africa, which had a measure of self rule and which had their own representatives in the Chamber of Deputies, may not like the idea of dictatorship, and may take this opportunity to declare their independence. Other French possessions in other parts of the world may do likewise.

"Hitler and Mussolini have declared their intention of making a new Europe but in imposing their will on other nations and peoples they have undertaken a job which may prove bigger than they can handle.

"Liberty, like truth, crushed to the earth will rise again, and it is our opinion that another French revolution is imminent and that once again the French people in their anger will rise and crush their oppressors and restore their most cherished possessions of liberty, equality and fraternity."

The fact is that the dictatorship that the French colonialists will experience under the Fascist regime of Marshall Petain will differ only in degree from that of "democratic" France. The French colonial peoples had but a very small measure of self-government and that represented not the masses of the exploited natives but the small "elite" of government employees and the native bourgeoisie and chiefs.

Yes, the French people will rise in a new revolution but this time it can only be the socialist revolution. That is the only road open for the masses of the French workers and the only way that will free the colonial peoples from imperialist rule.

The appointment of Henry Lemery, Senator from Martinique, as colonial minister in the new French cabinet, is an attempt to hold the loyalty of the millions of blacks in the colonies. Fascism in its own interests drops at least for the moment its color bar policy. Lemery, as is true of the other Negroes who in the past have served in high positions in the French government, is not really a representative of the colonial peoples, but only a stooge for France's 400 families. Lemery has in the past contributed next to nothing to the cause of the Negro peoples. His sympathies have always been with the rulers of France. We are sure that this move will fool but few of the millions of exploited natives in the colonies.

Margaret Sanger, president of the National Birth Control Federation, bitterly assailed the Catholic Church last week for its use of political power to force the cancellation of a birth control exhibit at the American Negro Exposition in Chicago. The exhibit had been arranged by the Federation at the invitation of an official of the Negro Exposition; but the Federation was then notified that the exhibit could not be held "because of changes in floor space"; several officials of the exposition explained, however, that it was the pressure of the Catholic Church that caused the cancellation. The Catholic Church threatened to use its influence to get the grants given by the Federal and the Illinois state government to the Exposition withdrawn if the birth control exhibit remained.

Margaret Sanger in a statement said: "The time has come to determine whether the Catholic Church or any other minority group shall be permitted to use political power to prevent the spread of knowledge which has become a recognized part of public health education and accepted medical practice."

NEGROES OPEN DOORS OF LILY-WHITE UNION

The Negro workers in Seattle, Washington have won a twelve weeks fight in an effort to force the Boeing Aircraft Co., to employ Negroes. On July 18 the Company issued a statement that it would hire qualified Negroes. The following day the company issued employment applications to two Negroes.

Boeing officials said the company would hire qualified Negroes who are members of the Aeronautical Mechanics Union No. 761, with which it has a contract. Concurrently with that announcement the Union said it would take vigorous action against a clause in the constitution of the International Union limiting membership to whites only. The Union said the matter would have to come before the International Association of Mechanics but pointed out that there is no discriminatory clause in the present agreement with the company.

BRITISH 'DEMOCRACY' AT WORK

George Padmore, secretary of the International African Service Bureau, writes us that "the editorial staff of the 'African Standard' of Sierra Leone, West Africa—George Thomas, J. D. Bailey and S. M. O'Boyle were arrested and sent to jail for sedition because they reprinted an article from the Socialist Appeal dealing with the case of their leader, Wallace Johnson." Due to the censorship imposed by the British, we have been unable to secure any further information or details regarding this action by the British authorities in West Africa.

The Appeal article referred to, appeared in this column on March 23 and quoted in part the article for which Wallace Johnson, secretary of the West African Youth League and the Sierra Leone Trade Union Congress was convicted of sedition.

Pacifist Fakery On Conscription

Bourgeois Pacifists Argue They Are Better Defenders Of Capitalism, Workers Object to Bourgeois Conscription But Should Learn Military Arts.

It is imperative for every American worker to understand what is involved in the drive toward conscription, what are the real nature of the forces engaged in the controversies around the question, and what attitude should be taken toward military training. The lives and futures of the workers and the most important political problems of our time are bound together in this issue.

Thus a movement of protest against conscription has arisen within the ranks of the capitalist class itself, especially among those conservative and middle-class elements, who, despite their whole-hearted devotion to American capitalism, cannot yet bring themselves to support all the harsh dictatorial means it needs for its defense. The position of these bourgeois pacifists has been stated in the "Declaration Against

Conscription" recently issued by 240 educators, writers, religious leaders, professional and business men and women. In an advertisement in the *New York Times* on July 12th Norman Thomas's "Keep America Out Of War Congress" repeated their arguments. The bourgeois-pacifists advance four arguments against "peacetime military conscription." They first declare that compulsory military service is anti-democratic, dictatorial, and threatens the liberties of the people. We do not dispute this fact. Capitalist conscription must be autocratic and totalitarian.

The bourgeois pacifists would have us believe, however, that our capitalist regime can preserve the old democratic forms and institutions, and yet prepare for the coming war and conduct it in a non-totalitarian manner. This is impossible. In the last war the United States enacted conscription as soon as possible after the declaration of war together with

many other oppressive measures. Now it must, like England, do the same even before war is actually under way. The bourgeois-pacifist position is based upon the illusion that American imperialism will not have to resort to conscription. They thereby deceive themselves and others.

They argue secondly, that peacetime conscription is incompatible with American democracy. Again we are not concerned to deny this. But it is not incompatible with American capitalism—and this factor is decisive. Whenever the interests of the capitalists and the institutions of democracy clash, democracy must yield.

Finding no support for their position in the future and little in the present, the pacifists then appeal to the past. This is their third argument. Military conscription in peacetime, they say, is a radical departure from American tradition. In the present emergency, however, we may be sure that American imperialism

will shatter many more such traditions, especially those connected with its pacifist past. The militarists will be only too glad to leave the past in safe-keeping of the pacifists while they control the future policies of the country. Let anyone misunderstand their loyalty to capitalism, the pacifists assure the powers that be that they are "as ardently concerned for the safety of our beloved Republic as an advocate of universal service can be." These pure patriots are simply having a family quarrel about the best methods of defending capitalism.

This is demonstrated by their final argument which abandons the lofty grounds of individual freedom and glorious tradition for a crass appeal to the material interests of American business men. They are against conscription because it is bad for business! "The military regimentation of the entire manpower of our nation will inevitably result in widespread dislocation in business, industry,

agriculture and higher education."

Here is the real reason for the anti-conscription of this pack of preachers, writers and professors. It will disturb the normal ways of doing business, including higher education, the business of the professional educators. Among the liberties endangered by the Burke-Wadsworth Bill, Norman Thomas's Committee singles out "free enterprise."

Like Liberty Leaguers, these "rugged individualists" frankly prefer the old methods of capitalist defense. "If the personnel need us for higher trained permanent forces . . . we contend that this need can best be met by voluntary enlistments under pay schedules sufficiently attractive to induce the required number to enroll." They prefer a small professional army to huge conscript armies for precisely the same reasons that business men want a small bureaucracy at Washington instead of a swollen one. It is cheaper and less burdensome.

We have saved the joker for the last. These people state that they are opposed to conscription only in peacetime! They would presumably support it in war. Opposition to conscription during wartime means treason to the capitalist state—and this they would never be guilty of.

Here the fakery and futility of the bourgeois-pacifist opposition is exposed to full view. They have only a superficial and fleeting difference of opinion with the militarists on this particular question.

The pacifists are more dangerous than the militarists whom they shield. The actions of the war-makers are easier to observe and to explain. But the pacifists spread the worst illusions among the workers, play upon their anti-war and anti-imperialist sentiments, and divert them from the real struggle against war and the capitalist system. In the end, as in England and in the last World War, the pacifists will deliver their followers to the militarists, leaving them disoriented and unprepared to defend themselves and their interest. We openly warn the workers against the bourgeois-pacifist betrayers.

WE ARE NOT PACIFISTS

Let us make clear our own position on this question. We are absolutely opposed to the measures of conscription which the Roosevelt regime intends to impose upon the American people. They are dictated by and will be used, not to defend the legitimate interests of the American people, but to abuse them in the interests of American imperialism. But our opposition to capitalist conscription has nothing in common with that of the bourgeois-pacifists.

While we are concerned with the defense of the interests of the working class, the bourgeois-pacifists are concerned with defending capitalist interests. This is demonstrated by their support of a small professional army. This means of military defense is far more anti-democratic than mass conscript armies. The officers and specially selected soldiers of the small professional armies have constituted nests of reaction and the mainstay of dictatorship in every country, including the United States.

Unlike the pacifists we do not identify bourgeois conscription with universal military training. Bourgeois conscription is one form of reactionary military service; the small professional force is another. But there is a third form of universal military training that we advocate and support: the military training of the masses under the supervision and control of their own leaders and organizations.

In this warring world nothing is so futile as pacifism. The workers must be ready to defend their homes, their lives and their jobs against enemies at home or abroad. But they cannot leave this task of self-defense to the bosses or the bosses' state any more than they can entrust the defense of their economic interest to the bosses or a company union.

The workers of the United States should demand the right to military training under their own auspices. They should have their own training camps. Worker's Plattsburghs, where they could go and learn the military arts and sciences. They should organize their own Union Guards to defend themselves against attacks from Fascist and reactionary quarters. This is a matter of life and death for the trade-unions and for every American worker.

Sovietization Of The Baltic Step Forward

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

When the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., at its next meeting, will grant the petitions of the Parliaments of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia to be incorporated into the Soviet Union (and no doubt exists but that it will), it will once more be evidence of the fact that the foundations of the October Revolution are still operative in spite of Stalin. The basic achievement of the October Revolution, the nationalization of private property in the means of production, is extended to other territories and no class-conscious worker can raise any objection to that.

The Sovietization of the Baltic states reminds us of the controversy that raged in our party before the minority, unwilling to remain a minority and coarsure of the correctness of its fantastic theories, decided to set up a little shop of its own.

When Stalin first sent the Red Army into the Baltic states and limited himself to stationing soldiers at important bases, the minority gleefully pointed out that Stalin was leaving capitalist relations in those states intact. Which would prove, according to the leaders of the minority, that Stalin was not interested in destroying capitalism, a position which we never contradicted.

What the leaders of the minority failed to see was that once Stalin for any reason whatever acquires control over territory where capitalist property relations exist, the tendency must be for him to incorporate such territory into the Soviet Union and, upon incorporation, capitalist property relations must be destroyed and displaced by nationalized property.

Stalin is not interested in extending the social revolution. He is interested primarily in the rule of the bureaucracy which he represents. But since Stalin heads a state based on nationalized property any territory acquired by that state cannot be left under capitalist property relations.

The ruling clique in the Soviet Union cannot afford to divide its power with an alien ruling class.

Should Stalin permit capitalism to function in any territory that had become part of the Soviet Union it would mean that he was actually determined to bring capitalism back to the Soviet Union.

'Theory' of Soviet Imperialism

How grotesque and senseless the "theory" of Soviet imperialism must appear to any one who thinks in Marxist terms. Every piece of territory into which Stalin sent his armed forces and which has been incorporated into the Soviet Union has been wrested from imperialism, the only kind of imperialism that Marxists know of as existing at the present time, the expansionist policy of finance capitalism.

The resources of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania are no longer open to imperialist exploitation unless they are taken away from the Soviet Union.

And superficial wisecracks will still contend that there is no difference between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany! But these people have never called the Reichstag to proclaim the nationalization of land, banking and industry in any conquered territory.

Individual capitalists, especially Jewish capitalists, run away from Hitler's rule. The capitalist class as such is expropriated under Stalin's rule.

We do not like bureaucratic socialization of industry. We would much rather prefer socialization of industry coming as a result of a social revolution than as a result of the conquest of territory by the Red Army under Stalin. And it is obvious that Stalin's bureaucratic method can only conquer small countries.

But as against capitalism even bureaucratic socialization is a step forward and we shall support it as against all people who for any pretext whatever will defend capitalism.

Baltic Masses None Too Pleased

That the working masses of the Baltic countries are as enthusiastic about their incorporation into the Soviet Union as the Stalinist press would want us to believe can be seriously doubted. They live too close to the Soviet Union and they therefore know too much about real conditions there to be enthusiastic about the happy life promised them under the leadership of the Kremlin despot.

But the lot of the workers and peasants of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia under capitalism has been a miserable one at best. Probably hundreds of thousands of them cannot picture anything worse than what they have experienced.

The class-conscious workers of the Baltic countries, however, understand that capitalism throughout the world must be destroyed, that it offers nothing but fascism and war. These workers will support the nationalization of industry. And together with their class brothers in the Soviet Union they will continue the struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy.

The corruption of Stalinism must be destroyed in order to make the Soviet Union the powerfully attractive force that it should be for the masses throughout the world.

Sidney Hook: Recruiting Sergeant

THE PROFESSOR IS A NEW, BUT TYPICAL CONVERT TO WAR

By FELIX MORROW

Sidney Hook has written an article in the July 20 *New Leader* which formally records his transition to the camp of social-chauvinism. This will surprise no one who has watched him join the intellectuals in retreat from Marxism during the last five years. Nevertheless, Hook's first open avowal of support of the "democratic" imperialists meant for me a moment of personal sadness. We had been friends for many years. It is one thing to be aware of the statistics that a good many girls become prostitutes; it is something very different to see your own sister do it.

And how easily and with what scorn the Hook of ten years ago, with his fine intellectual scapel, would have cut to shreds the shabby logical structure by which today's Hook justifies supporting the "democracies" against German imperialism!

The Hook of those days would have demanded first of all that, when a man abandons concepts he has avowedly held for some 23 years, he should give an intellectual accounting of why he has dropped them. During these years Hook avowed the internationalist position on war; with Liebknecht he said: "The main enemy is in your own country."

That wars are inevitable under capitalism; that the stakes are markets, sources of raw materials and spheres for capital investment and not the ideological fig-leaves proclaimed by either side; that the state is the executive committee of the ruling class, whatever the difference in the forms of rule of the contending classes; that the working class shall support neither side in a war between the powers but in each country the working class shall take advantage of the war conditions to overthrow its "own" rulers—all this Hook had avowed. Yet now he throws this overboard silently, without explanation! From his article it would be impossible to discover that he had ever believed these or, for that matter, that he had ever heard of these concepts!

HOOK'S THEORY FOR SUPPORTING THE "DEMOCRACIES"

Hook's present position, like that of all the more "idealistic" supporters of the one imperialist camp against the other, is based on constructing a basic difference between the two. The *New York Herald Tribune* can call for war against Germany on the basis of cold-blooded references to America's "national interests"; this base metal must be transmuted by the Hooks into holier stuff.

Here is an outline of Hook's theory:

(1). Nazism is not what "the dogma of all Leninist schools—Trotsky, Dutt, Guerin, etc." claims it is—the last phase of finance capitalism. "Functionally defined" property no longer is capitalist. "Power has been transferred from the capitalists"; therefore "the basic instruments of production are owned by the party bureaucracy," for "Finance capitalists—insofar as there are any left in Germany today—take their orders from the Nazi party and not vice versa. Nor is there any evidence that their counsel has greater weight in Nazi party

circles than that of other social groups."

(2). This new, Nazi system of property relations is fundamentally hostile to the ideals out of which capitalism arose. "Every one of the ideals of the French Revolution, with one possible exception, is anathema to the Nazi philosophy of life. . . . The one possible exception is fanatical nationalism which did not emerge with the French Revolution but with Napoleon, who arrested even as he consolidated some of its gains. . . . The Nazi critique of capitalism was, and is, that it (capitalism) abides by these ideals even in their very imperfect forms. Hitler is well aware of this. 'Democracy of the West today,' he tells us, 'is the forerunner of Marxism which would be inconceivable without it.'"

(3). "It follows at once that every democrat and socialist must be an irreconcilable opponent of Nazism. . . . Insofar, then, as Nazism wages war against the existing democracies, it is an elementary duty of socialists not merely to join the fight against it but to lead in that fight. . . . It may be true that the most effective struggle against Nazism can be conducted only by a socialist or labor government. But that is no reason for lagging in support of any government which is genuinely fighting Nazism. It is foolish when we cannot have the best to choose the worst."

It is difficult to believe that Hook cannot be aware of the gaping flaws in his logic:

(1). If his "functional" definition of property were true, Britain, like Germany is no longer capitalist. British finance capitalists today take their orders from the government as much as German finance capitalists take their orders from the Hitler government. In both cases this apparent contradiction of the supremacy of private property under capitalism arises from the same cause; the desperation of the capitalist class. The desperation was evidenced earlier in Germany: a defeated capitalist class which had to expand or die and therefore accepted fascist centralization for the task.

In Britain imminent prospect of defeat faces the British capitalists, and it accepts state centralization for the task of resistance. Hook's so-called "functional" definition of property does not really define forms of property. Both Germany and Britain remain domains of private property.

This fact is made most obvious by reference to France. Yesterday France was one of the "democracies"; today it is a fascist regime, avowing itself explicitly opposed to the "liberty, equality, fraternity" of the French revolution. Yet the same system of property continues as before, and the same class continues to rule. There is no Chinese Wall between capitalist democracy and fascism; they are different forms of capitalist rule. Hook's elaborate distinction between the two systems falls to the ground.

(2). It is true that Nazism is fundamentally hostile to the ideals of the French Revolution. But so is "democratic" capitalism. If the ideals of the French Revolution were any factor at all in the war, how explain the capita-

tion of France? It is obvious that the French ruling class could have abandoned continental France and continued the war from the French colonies. If democratic ideals were a factor, they would have done that. Instead, they preferred to remain in France, to make peace with Hitler, adapt themselves to him, turn the regime into a fascist one. Where, then, is the Chinese Wall between fascism and democracy?

Hook's reference to the introduction of "fanatical nationalism" by Napoleon exposes Hook's false method. Napoleon, let us recall, was the defender of the *new property forms* of the French Revolution; he represented progress as against his feudal and semi-feudal enemies; he *burned away much of the feudal remains* throughout France. Yet even with Napoleon, Hook is really admitting, the lovely purity of the ideals of the French Revolution were beginning to fade!

Since then a century and a quarter have passed, in which capitalism long ago reached its high point, long ago entered its decline, long ago began to drag humanity down with it. Long ago capitalism by the logic of its development and its degeneration became the enemy of every ideal of its own youth. The whole thing is summed up in the fact that the remnants of democracy now exist only in the most wealthy, the most aristocratic capitalist states, those which, by virtue of keeping hundreds of millions of peoples in slavery in their colonies can therefore still pay the overhead of some democratic forms in the metropolitan centers.

It is a vile lie that Hook perpetrates when he propounds the thesis that the American and British empires today defend against Hitler the ideals of the French Revolution. For every country in which Hitler extirpated those ideals, there is another in which the American or the British rulers extirpated them. Look at South America, Africa and Asia!

HOOK USED TO EXPOSE FALLACY OF 'LESSER EVIL'

(3). Because we are enemies of Nazism it does not at all follow that we should join the existing democracies in their war against Germany. That no more follows than that, as socialist enemies of "democratic" capitalism we should join the Nazis in their war against the "democracies." Hook once knew this well; he wrote at that time able polemics against the Stalinist "Popular Front" line and against its twin-brother, the social-democratic theory of the "lesser evil." Yet now he tells us that "It is foolish when we cannot have the best to choose the worst."

Very well, then, we should like to see him apply his mealy-mouthed aphorism to France. The workers should have supported the French government in its war against Hitler, he says. But such support—as Hook once well understood—means inevitably the weakening of the working class. The capitalist class does not cease its pressure upon the workers during the war; striking blows at their unions, cutting wages, conducting propaganda against working class-consciousness, etc. The only real response the workers

can make is to conduct the class struggle. But that means strikes, conflict with the government, that is, interference with the war. Hence if support of the war is necessary, that means no strikes, no resistance of the workers to the pressure of the bosses and the government.

Presumably when the government and the bosses capitulated to Hitler, at that point Hook would have advised the workers to resist, to take over control of France and to continue the struggle against Hitler. But the workers might then have said, to their advisor, Hook:

"When we still had strength, you told us to subordinate ourselves to the democratic government in the name of the fight against fascism. We did as you said. As a result, our organizations ceased to have any power. Today, when we are, thanks to your advice, at our lowest ebb, you tell us: 'Take power.' With what, Professor Hook? With the strength which the capitalists took away from us during the course of the war? With the morale which oozed out of us as a result of the blows we endured without answering by strikes which would have interfered with the thousands of militants who were jailed during the war and whom we could only have saved by political strikes which would have interfered with the war?"

HOOK ONCE KNEW BETTER; BUT SOMETHING CHANGED

What answer could Hook give to these accusing questions? None. Like his colleagues of the *New Leader*, he can only turn his back on the French workers, ignore and distort the plain meaning of the lessons of the French experience, and call on the American workers to repeat the mistakes of the French workers.

How can Hook be blind to these obvious facts? one may ask. The answer is that there are none so blind as those who will not see. Hook is merely the latest of that numerous strata of intellectuals who have succumbed to the pressure of the "democratic" bourgeoisie. They have succumbed because they were vulnerable to bourgeois pressure. Their mental capacities, indubitable and potentially of such enormous value to the working class, are perverted in the service of the "democratic" imperialists. And perverted because the alternative—ostracism by "public" opinion, the loss of comfortable jobs—was one they could not face.

"It won't last," Hook laughed, when he was first appointed chairman of the Department of Philosophy of Washington Square College, New University. "How long can a revolutionist hold such a job?" Then later on there was a second stage, when he grined and said: "You party men will have to take the rap, but I won't. I have no party responsibilities. I can keep quiet when the war comes." And now—oh happy accident, oh fortunate coincidence—he has evolved a political position which in no way interferes with his chairmanship. The power of the human mind is evidenced in the evolution of Sidney Hook. Or, to put it plainly, renegacy has its explanation.

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. IV, No. 30 Saturday, July 27, 1940

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

Editorial Board:

FELIX MORROW ALBERT GOLDMAN

General Manager:

GEORGE CLARKE

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
orders: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents
per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

"Reentered as second class matter December 4,
1939, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1879."

Fight with the Socialist Workers Party for:

1. A JOB AND A DECENT LIVING FOR EVERY WORKER.
2. OPEN THE IDLE FACTORIES — OPERATE THEM UNDER WORKERS' CONTROL.
3. A TWENTY-BILLION DOLLAR FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS AND HOUSING PROGRAM.
4. THIRTY-THIRTY—\$30-WEEKLY MINIMUM WAGE—30-HOUR WEEKLY MAXIMUM FOR ALL WORKERS ON ALL JOBS.
5. \$30 WEEKLY OLD-AGE AND DISABILITY PENSION.
6. EXPROPRIATE THE SIXTY FAMILIES.
7. ALL WAR FUNDS TO THE UNEMPLOYED.
8. A PEOPLE'S REFERENDUM ON ANY AND ALL WARS.
9. NO SECRET DIPLOMACY.
10. AN INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY.
11. WORKERS' DEFENSE GUARDS AGAINST VIGILANTE AND FASCIST ATTACKS.
12. FULL SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC EQUALITY FOR THE NEGRO PEOPLE.

That 'Anti-War' Plank

Promises in the platforms of the Republican or Democratic Parties are not made to be observed. They are inserted for the purpose of capturing votes before elections and are ignored or entirely forgotten after elections. It is, therefore, the rule that no exceedingly great care is taken in the formulation of those promises.

Roosevelt and his coterie of New Dealers, however, tend to follow the rule that it is best to be careful in the wording of their promises. A promise not to involve the United States in war is absolutely essential in order to get the support of large numbers of workers who are definitely opposed to the participation of this country in the European war. Their opposition is not necessarily based on a thorough understanding of the nature of the war now raging in Europe, or of the role that the United States would play in such a war. It is based on hatred and fear of suffering and death, perfectly legitimate feelings in the masses who are compelled to die for a cause that they feel is not their's.

It is interesting to observe how careful Roosevelt and his supporters have been to formulate their policy with reference to a possible entry of the United States into the war, or to a possible shipment of American troops to participate in the fighting across the Atlantic.

Last week we commented on the carefully phrased sentence by which Roosevelt wanted to impress everybody with the belief that he would under no circumstances send an army to Europe. His promise was contained in the following sentence: "We will not send men to take part in European War." As we showed in our editorial last week, this sentence, does not at all constitute a promise not to send armed forces to Europe.

Evidently the ambiguity of the sentence struck many people besides ourselves. Suspicion was aroused at the phrase and "isolationist" demagogues of Senator Wheeler's type took advantage of the ambiguity of the phraseology to demand that a more specific promise be inserted in the platform of the Democratic Party. In view of the attempt of the Republican Party to characterize the Democratic Party as a war party the politicians of the Democratic Party saw a chance to turn the tables on the Republicans. They would insert a statement in their platform which would not only satisfy the "isolationists" but confound the Republicans.

Thereupon the Democrats inserted the following in their platform: "We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our army, navy or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of an attack."

That sounds explicit enough, does it not? But please note the phrase "except in case of attack."

Now all good people know that the American capitalists have never attacked anybody and never intend to attack anybody. All good people know that the American capitalists and other capitalists never wage an offensive war, only a defensive war. No capitalists ever do any attacking. In view of that we can rest assured that whenever Roosevelt or his successor will deem it advisable to send armed forces to Europe it will be done because Germany attacked the United States, not because American capitalism has decided to attempt to destroy its imperialist rival before it got too powerful. That will be the story as the American capitalists will tell it.

Conclusive evidence that our interpretation of the foreign policy section of the Democratic plat-

form is correct can be found in the fact that Henry L. Hopkins, personal representative of the president to the Democratic convention was able to make the following comment on that section of the platform: "There is nothing in the foreign policy plank which changes by one jot or tittle the foreign policy of the president and the secretary of state. I refer not only to the present policy but future policy."

In addition, the president himself found it necessary to state in his acceptance speech that he intends to follow the same policy that he followed before the convention.

That Senator Wheeler and his "isolationist" brethren were satisfied with the plank in the platform does not mean therefore, that the plank contains any important change from the previous policy. It simply means that the "isolationists" and pacifists are ready to support the war machine of Roosevelt on condition only that he accept their phrasing. The class conscious American worker will take it for granted that American capitalism either under Roosevelt or under Willkie is preparing for war against Hitler's Germany if the British Empire should succumb to Hitler's attack. They take it for granted that war is inevitable unless the American workers can stop it by their own action.

Profitable Patriotism

An editorial entitled "The Chance of a Lifetime", in the July 6 *Business Week*, takes this month's prize for plain, unadulterated, fancy and all other kinds of sheer gall. It demands nothing less than that all corporations working on "national defense" orders for the government shall, for their patriotic services, in addition to payments for their orders, be paid TWICE the amount of capital these patriots have put up.

The government is already making arrangements to pay back to the corporations the full amount of the capital they invest. This is being done by allowing the corporations, in making annual tax returns, to charge off as a special depreciation allowance TWENTY PER CENT of the capital cost of all plant expansion. In other words, in five years, the corporations will have received in tax exemptions the full amount of the capital they have invested. They'll have the plants at the end of that time for nothing, paid for by the government.

But that's being paid only once for their patriotism. That's not enough, says *Business Week*. "By itself, a special depreciation tax allowance is insufficient reason for going ahead with construction of a plant to make munitions." (Incidentally, notice that cold-blooded tone; we always thought they wanted to make munitions because they were patriots.) *Business Week* therefore demands—not as a substitute for special depreciation tax allowances but in addition to those allowances—a system of "charging this rapid depreciation or obsolescence into the cost of the goods they produce for the government. Here again," *Business Week* continues, "the President can work wonders for new investment in plant and equipment by making it possible for the Army and Navy to include in the price they pay for their needs a prorated share of the cost of new construction."

That system would certainly work wonders. Put up a million dollars for a plant. Get "normal" profits on government orders. In addition charge off the cost of the entire plant from your tax returns in five years. In addition add to the regular profits on your bill to the government the cost of the entire plant once again. "It's the chance of a lifetime for a President", concludes *Business Week*. It certainly is!

Third Term Tripe

The Republicans were singularly unfortunate in the way their "anti-third term revolt" got under way. The lame duck Senator from Nebraska, Burke, with whose name is associated the peace-time compulsory conscription bill now before Congress, with whose name is associated the most reactionary attacks in the Senate against the labor movement, and who will never live down his warm praise of Hitler upon returning from Germany in 1938—that was scarcely the right man to make the first bolt from the Democratic party on the ground that the third term leads to dictatorship.

The third term issue is tripe. A third term for the president of the United States is no more heinous than a third term for the president of the U.S. Steel. No sensible worker, for example, ever votes against a candidate for president of his union because the man has already served two terms. If his union leaders are carrying out a progressive program he will continue them in leadership as long as they will serve.

The case against Roosevelt is his reactionary program. Those who are opposing him on the third term issue can scarcely claim to represent a less reactionary program. It is the story of Tweedle-dum and Tweedledee.

Precisely because there are no basic differences between the contending Democratic and Republican programs, they must fight each other for control of the pork barrel on such cooked-up issues as the third term. Roosevelt's "answer" to the third term issue, that he personally is indispensable, is just as fraudulent as the issue he opposes.

Had the trade union leaders of the CIO and AFL done their elementary duty and launched a Labor Party against both capitalist parties, that party would not have needed to spend a moment on the third term issue. There would have been a clear issue: capitalist parties versus a party of the workers' organizations.

Stand On War and USSR Taken By Chinese Section

Resolution Blasts Those Who Will Not Defend the USSR

Regarding the question of the war and the USSR which has been discussed in our International and particularly in the American section, the Communist League of China, following its own discussion and a careful study of the controversial documents received from other sections, places on record the following position and opinions:

1. THE QUESTION OF THE WAR: We consider that the thesis "War and the Fourth International" adopted by the International Secretariat in 1934 remains correct in principle. The actual development of the present war confirms, in its fundamental course, the analyses and predictions made in that document. Certain events, such as the actual grouping of the warring camps (e. g. Stalin's alliance with the German imperialists) were not predicted, but this does not in any way invalidate the principled position put forward in the thesis.

The character of the second world war, as correctly defined by our thesis and other important documents during the past ten years, is a war of rival imperialist powers, that is, a war for the redivision of the world in accordance with the new correlation of forces among the imperialists. But here it is essential to keep in mind the point that the USSR, occupying one-sixth of the earth's surface, is among the objects to be divided. It is one of the main objects.

The antagonism between the USSR and the imperialist powers, which in the class and sociological sense is the most fundamental in the contemporary world, has been modified to some extent by the degeneration of the USSR under the Stalin regime, and at the present time is overshadowed by the mighty conflict between the imperialists themselves. But it would be a criminal mistake to conclude from this that imperialist military intervention against the USSR has been removed from the order of the day. In our opinion the inter-relationship between the imperialist war and the coming anti-Soviet war, as formulated in Section 2 of the thesis ("USSR and the Imperialist War"), continues to correspond with reality. A statement by the Minority section of the American party, attributing to Comrade Trotsky the assertion that "the present war is an anti-Soviet war", is a gross untruth. Nowhere can we find any such statement in the recent writings of Comrade Trotsky.

For Defense of the USSR

2. THE QUESTION OF THE USSR: It is true that the war requires us to pay the closest attention to every change occurring within the USSR, so that we may check our policy from time to time. But up to now, in the opinion of the Chinese Section, no change has taken place of such significance as to warrant a modification of our policy of unconditional defense of the USSR. In support of this contention, we advance the following reasons:

(a) There is no fundamental difference between the Stalin-Hitler, alliance of today and the Stalin-Laval pact of yesterday. Stalin's invasion of small states on the western border of the USSR is motivated by the same consideration which yesterday impelled him to relinquish old territories in the Far East (Chinese Eastern Railway, Amur River Islands)—namely to avoid a major war.

(b) From the sudden adoption by Stalin of the methods of military aggression, the Minority of the American section concludes that Soviet external policy is now one of "bureaucratic expansionism" or imperialism and that Soviet economy has fallen into a dilemma which poses the alternative: "Expand or Die!" For this reason, the Minority has abandoned the policy of unconditional defense of the USSR. In our opinion their observations are utterly erroneous and superficial. The mere fact that Stalin has leapt from his formula, "We don't want an inch of others' territory," to a policy of military seizures, does not warrant a change in our attitude toward the USSR. As formerly we refused to see in Stalin's policy of conservative preservation of the status quo the triumph of socialism in a single country, so now we refuse to regard Soviet military seizures as evidence of a new policy of "bureaucratic expansionism." Both purely defensive wars and "wars of aggression" are juridical and moral categories of the bourgeoisie. They cannot replace the sociological and political definitions of the Soviet state.

The mere fact of "aggression" does not suffice to prove that the USSR has an economic need for expansion. Would it be correct to say that the Soviet attacks on Poland and Georgia in 1920, the inclusion of Outer Mongolia in the sphere of influence of the USSR in 1923, and the decision to hold the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1924 were expressions of an economic necessity to "expand or die?" Or on the contrary: Can we say that Stalin's policy coincided with the principles of "socialism in one country" when he sold the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1933 and abandoned the Amur River islands to Japan some time later?

Changes in form, when they surpass a certain degree, mean also a change in content. Quantity passes into quality. But the latest changes in the form of Kremlin policy—from one of concessions to one of aggressions—have not changed the character of the Soviet State. Nationalized property still remains. Although terribly exploited and distorted by the bureaucracy, this great gain of the October Revolution can be regenerated and become a mighty fortress of world socialism. Revolutionary militants of the IV International are therefore still bound to give unconditional defense to the USSR.

Cite Chinese Experience

3. THE SOVIET-FINNISH WAR: For the reasons given above we took the position of defense of the USSR in the Soviet-Finnish war.

Just as we are uncompromising opponents of Stalin's entire reactionary policy, so we did not support the invasion of Finland, which was part and parcel of that policy. But we are active revolutionists and it was therefore not sufficient to condemn the invasion of Finland. When the Red Army, dominated by Stalin's reactionary policy, becomes involved in a war with a bourgeois state, we can no longer confine ourselves to criticism and condemnation. We then have to weigh the question which is the most favorable outcome for the workers' state and the whole revolutionary movement: Defeat or victory for the Red Army? There is but one answer for a revolutionist. We must become real defenders of the USSR and place ourselves in the same camp with the Red Army.

It is necessary in many cases to distinguish between political confidence and support and military action. In China we fight side by side with the armies of Chiang Kai-shek and the Stalinists against the Japanese imperialists, but we have never extended an ounce of support to the Kuomintang or the Chinese Communist Party, whose policies we have never ceased criticizing. The mistake of the American Minority, it seems to us, lies in their refusal to distinguish between political confidence and military support.

Question of Progressive Wars

4. ECONOMIC SYSTEMS AND THE NATURE OF WARS: The nature of a war between two states is mainly determined by the economic and social systems which prevail in the belligerent countries. This does not mean that one should unite all historical-economic systems in a single schema, and then establish which are progressive and which reactionary according to their place in the historical sequence. In the present epoch there are only two antagonistic economic systems: dying capitalism and the embryo of socialism (USSR). So far as there are backward economic systems found in certain countries, none of them play any independent role. If a country with such a backward system conducts a war, the nature of the war must be determined by the object it fights against. If the war is directed against an imperialist power, then it is progressive (e. g., China against Japan, Abyssinia against Italy, India against Britain), for it will, if successful, clear the road for development of the productive forces in the backward country itself, and will, whether successful or not, weaken imperialism. On the contrary, a war by a backward country against a land which has abolished private property is wholly reactionary (e. g., China's war against the USSR in 1929), for the backward country acts as a tool of imperialism. On this whole question the Minority have gone wrong because of their schematism and mechanical thinking.

Anti-Soviet Minority Aids Imperialists

5. ON THE QUESTION OF THE THIRD CAMP: We are advocates of the building of the "Third Camp" only in this sense: that we take a defeatist position with regard to both the "democratic" and fascist imperialist camps in the present war. But we will never consider ourselves in a third camp with regard to the antagonism and coming war between the USSR and the imperialists. The conception of the "Third Camp" advanced by the Minority in America identifies the USSR with the Stalinist bureaucracy and Nazi imperialism with the Soviet regime. This shameful confusion of things that should not be confused can only render service to the war camp of the "democratic" imperialists.

The Fourth Internationalists cannot take a defeatist position with regard to the USSR today, when Hitler is in alliance with Stalin, nor tomorrow when Stalin may ally himself with the British and French imperialists to fight Hitler. The Minority position, carried to its logical conclusion, means that no defense of the USSR is possible unless and until the USSR is completely isolated, without any imperialist allies, and falls victim to aggression. No more ridiculous position could be imagined for one calling himself a Marxist revolutionist.

6. ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL: Having read all the documents of both factions of the SWP and having heard a verbal report by Comrade S (a visiting member of the Minority), the Communist League of China has concluded that the discussion which preceded the SWP convention, and the discussion in the convention itself, were conducted in full keeping with the principles of party democracy. Complaints of "bureaucratic methods" advanced by the Minority seem to us quite insufficient to justify the action of the Minority in splitting the party.

In view of the extraordinary circumstances brought about by the war and the split, we endorse the proposal of the American, Canadian, and Mexican sections for the convocation of a Pan-American Conference, with representation from other sections if possible, in order to elect a new executive body for the Fourth International. With the hope that the loyal elements of the Minority may be won back, we also propose that the Minority be invited to send delegates to the conference.

COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF CHINA
(Section of the IV International)

By (signed) S. S. P.

Shanghai, June 10, 1940.

Yes, the French Popular Front Was Responsible

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

In attempting to explain the miserable debacle of the French army the reactionary press in America points to the Peoples Front regime under Blum as the factor mainly responsible. Over and over again the editorials of that press attempt to show that the decrease of production during the period of the Blum regime placed France at a tremendous disadvantage in comparison with Germany as far as the production of armaments is concerned.

The increase in wages and the reduction in the number of hours of work under the Peoples Front, are, according to the capitalist press, the main factors that led to the defeat of the French army.

Naturally the capitalists and their apologists have a definite purpose in mind in their insistence that responsibility for the defeat of France be placed at the door of the Peoples Front regime. If the social gains acquired by the French workers during that regime are responsible for the defeat, then it follows that the American workers should be willing in this moment of danger to American capitalism to surrender whatever social gains they have made recently.

The Wagner Act, the Wages and Hours Law, the Walsh-Healy act must be wiped off the statute books or at least modified to an extent that they will not interfere with national defense. Higher wages and shorter hours will lead the working class right into the clutches of Hitler. So runs the refrain of those who begrudge the slightest gain made by the working class.

Quite in keeping with the patriotism of the employing class there has, as yet, not appeared any demand for capital to sacrifice or even to limit its profits. On the contrary the writing, into one of the acts of Congress, of a provision for the limitation of profits to a bare eight percent was the signal for strenuous objections on the ground that such a limitation would injure the cause of national defense. How? Because it would take away the incentive for the owners of industry to produce the maximum possible.

But why should a reduction in wages not take away the incentive of the workers to produce? That's different. The workers' incentive must be patriotism and if that is not sufficient, hunger is also an incentive and a little (or a lot) of force can be exerted as an additional incentive. One standard for the capitalists and another for the working class is perfectly logical for a government representing the interests of the capitalist class.

The Real Crime of The Peoples Front

It is quite true that the Popular Front of the Socialists, Communists and Radical Socialists (just plain liberals, representing the big capitalists) is responsible for the plight of the French workers at the present moment. Not because it made concessions to the workers by raising wages and shortening hours; but because it acted as a brake upon the movement of the masses towards taking over complete power in France.

When in 1936 the French workers seized the factories it was as clear as daylight that the social revolution was on the order of the day. The workers were ready, willing and anxious to go ahead and complete the job of doing away with the rule of the 200 families. With any kind of leadership an almost bloodless revolution could have been consummated.

This was not to be however. The Socialist party tied as it was to the capitalist order, was unwilling and unable to lead. The Communist party tied to the foreign policy of Stalin (who at that time looked to the democratic imperialists for salvation against Hitler), could not possibly furnish the necessary leadership. And both of these parties were united with the Radical Socialists openly devoted to the interests of the capitalist class. That party was led by Daladier who later took the initiative in smashing the Communist party.

The capitalists at that time were more than willing to sign the Matignon agreement granting the 40 hour week and a raise in wages. They were more than willing to lose a little in order to consolidate their forces for the inevitable counter attack.

Knaves and fools pointed to the "victory" of the workers as evidence that the Popular Front could stop fascism.

But the counter attack was not long in coming. Under the leadership of Daladier, the darling of the Popular Frontists, the gains were all taken away. The reactionary forces became bolder and ever bolder. The war and the defeat enabled them to take complete control.

What a different story we would have if the French workers had not followed the leadership of the Popular Front. A workers' revolution in France would have meant a workers' revolution in Spain followed inevitably by a revolutionary movement of the German workers. The policies of the Popular Front enabled France to gain power in Spain and enabled Hitler to conquer France.

Both from the point of view of the capitalists and of the working class the Popular Front bears the main responsibility for the victory of Hitler. From the point of view of the capitalists it meant the necessity of operating under the disadvantage of a 40 hour week as compared with the sixty hour week of the German workers. Production undoubtedly was interfered with from the capitalist point of view.

The American capitalists are heeding that lesson. They want to fight Hitler with his methods.

The American workers must also learn the lesson of France. For us the Popular Front is to blame not because it gained concessions but because it used those concessions as a means to stop the further advance of the workers. The Popular Front was the first step in saving capitalism and the victory of fascism was the second step.

The lesson for the American workers is clear: Get all the concessions you can but do not stop there. Go on to complete victory by organizing a workers' government.