

NEGROES FIGHT PHILA. POLICE TERROR

Farmers Union Meets In St. Paul

4,000 to Attend Five-State Convention; Is Most Progressive Farm Organization

ST. PAUL, Minn.—The Farmers Union will hold its annual convention for this region—Wisconsin, the Dakotas, Montana and Minnesota—in this city during the week of December 9th. Some 4,000 stockholders of the Farmers Union cooperative organizations in these five states will be in attendance.

The Farmers Union is undoubtedly the most progressive of the major farm organizations. Several encouraging developments took place at its recent annual convention in Denver, Colorado.

LABOR-FARMER ALLIANCE

The convention reiterated the organization's traditional policy of supporting the struggles of the labor movement, and exchanged telegrams of greeting with both the AFL and CIO conventions. The convention also expressed appreciation for the trade unions' legislative support in the following manner: "We organized farmers recognize that except for the faithful support of those members of Congress representing labor districts, our national farm program would have been whittled down or wiped off the law books of the nation."

However, the danger that certain elements in the Farmers Union would not continue this cooperation was indicated when the newly-elected national president of the Farmers Union said, according to report: "The Farmers Union, in order to get anywhere, has had to trade socks with everybody, including organized labor."

Both farmers and workers in this area do not agree with Patton, for they have had very concrete proof of the value of farmer-labor cooperation. This alliance was an extremely valuable aid to the famous 1934 drivers' strike in Minneapolis; in turn, the drivers union helped the market gardeners in the Twin Cities area to get their own market. Similar cooperation was recently displayed during the troubles of the Packinghouse Workers Organizing Committee with the Fargo (N. D.) packers.

Further advances by both farm-

ers and workers require an extension of this alliance, and not its abandonment. In Minnesota a real beginning has been made with the organizing, over a year ago, of the Farmer Cooperative Labor Conference, which has done much in building mutual understanding and support. The Farmers Union nationally has also pioneered in this field with the establishment of a joint committee with trade unionists.

FARMER UNION GROWS

North Dakota's Farm Union has grown during the last two years, now having approximately 16,000 members. It is also of real significance that organization work has been resumed in Minnesota, after virtual stoppage for over a decade due to a factional fight in Minnesota. The more militant farmers in Minnesota have really been without any kind of satisfactory organization since the Farm Holiday Association has become defunct.

It will be interesting to note to what extent the regional Farmers Union convention will be able to show more resistance to the Roosevelt drive for "national unity" than was shown by the national convention.

The most glaring evidence of Roosevelt's war pressure was seen at the Denver convention when it failed to endorse the proposal for a popular referendum on war, which had been for years a staple part of all Farmers Union programs. "National unity" pressure was also able to keep the Denver program down to little more than a blanket endorsement of the "New Deal" farm program—and this in spite of the fact that the masses of the farmers, discontented with that program, had voted against Roosevelt!

The major exception to this policy of submitting to Roosevelt was the reiterated endorsement of the progressive Farmers Union Debt Adjustment Bill, but unfortunately no concrete steps were taken at Denver to organize an effective drive for the bill.

(See Peter Graves' article on the farmers, on page 4 of this issue.)

AFL Convention Blocks Labor Unity

By Hostility To Industrial Unions

Anti-Labor Police Chief Is Michigan Home Guard Head

DETROIT, Nov. 30—"Heinie" Pickert, notorious former city police commissioner, who earned the well-merited hatred of the hundreds of thousands of auto workers here for his vicious strike-breaking activities, has just been given a new job fitted to his talents.

He has been named head of the Michigan eastern division of the new "Home Guards," state body replacing the National Guard. The appointment of Pickert is a substantial tip-off that the "Home Guards" will take up the strike-breaking role of the National Guard as its chief function.

The United Automobile Workers—CIO leaders are making strong protests at the appointment. They'd better get busy on a program of Workers Defense Guards and a demand for workers' military training under trade union control.

SAILORS FIRM IN WEST COAST SHIP STRIKE

Steamship Tie-up Deadlocked; Stalinists Aid Bosses

SAN FRANCISCO, Dec. 1st—The two months old steamship strike remained deadlocked today with the shipowners holding tough against vital concessions to the Sailors' Union of the Pacific.

The SUP together with the Masters, Mates and Pilots (AFL) are the only unions which have not been able to write an agreement with the steamship operators. Their efforts to organize an effective strike and win real gains for all the maritime unions have been continually frustrated by the disloyal game of the Stalinist clique in the "Maritime Federation."

The SUP negotiating committee was bluntly informed by the operators that no concessions beyond those granted the firemen (MFOFW), the cooks and stewards (MCS) and the engineers (MEBA) would be given the sailors. They were further informed that these three unions had written a clause into their agreement whereby any additional increase given the Sailors would also be given them!

A few days later the Sailors received another stab in the back from the Stalinist gang. The contents of a telegram sent by the San Francisco Industrial Union Council to Roosevelt and Madame Perkins was made public. For no apparent reason the telegram informed the national government that an agreement between the MFOFW, the MCS and the MEBA and the steamship operators had been signed; that they were ready to return to work; but that the SUP which had not been on strike at all had suddenly raised demands and was holding up a return to work.

STALINISTS AID BOSSES In a deliberate maneuver the Stalinists, by what amounts to collusion with the employers, are blocking SUP attempts to get better conditions. At the same time they are inciting the membership of the firemen and cooks and stewards against the SUP for the prolongation of the

Dubinsky Is a Sorry-Looking Figure As Craft Moguls Push Him Around

By ART PREIS The American Federation of Labor craft chiefs intend to ride to labor "unity" over the broken bones of industrial unionism. That was made clear by the just adjourned sixtieth annual convention of the AFL in New Orleans. Despite William Green's reiterated pious prayers for "peace and harmony" and his self-righteous denunciation of John L. Lewis as standing in the way of unity, the AFL head and his lieutenants failed to make the one simple declaration which might have given substance to their charges against Lewis. All Green had to say in order to clear the path to unity was: "I deny that we intend to obstruct industrial organization or to dismember the mass unions of the CIO in the interests of the craft organizations. The AFL is ready to aid in the building and extension of industrial unions in the mass production industries."

The deliberate silence of the AFL spokesmen on this one crucial point speaks more loudly than all the flowery "unity" talk unloosed on the delegates. The AFL chiefs are ready to "unite" with the CIO only around the funeral pyre of industrial unionism. A choice example of how the AFL craft moguls are setting traps for the industrial unions, in the event of unity, is the resolution passed by the convention, on the endorsement of the Executive Council, giving the Council

Vultee Victory Bolsters Union Aircraft Drive

Boss Press Lies About Union's Gains; No Compulsory Arbitration In Contract

LOS ANGELES, Nov. 27—3700 workers, members of aircrafts local 683, United Auto Workers—CIO, returned to work today at the Vultee Aircraft plant, after a twelve-day strike, with substantial gains under their belts.

Despite efforts of the boss press to minimize the extent of the gains made by the Vultee workers and to play up the agreement as "really" a company victory, the actual agreement includes basic gains: a minimum wage of 62½ cents an hour from the previous 50 cent minimum for all the 3700 Vultee production workers now employed, two-weeks' vacation with pay, pay for all principal holidays, and an annual sick leave of five days.

The reports in the local boss papers made a big fuss over an alleged "compulsory arbitration" clause contained in the agreement. The contract, however, the union declares, merely provides for the establishment of arbitration machinery for the 16 months duration of the contract. This machinery is for the purpose of arbitrating differences over the carrying out of the various conditions contained in the contract. The union has not agreed not to strike after the termination of the contract. This type of arbitration machinery is provided for in many union contracts, and the Vultee contract establishes no exceptional principle.

Compulsory arbitration, in the strictest sense, would mean an agreement by a union not to strike during the periods in between contracts. In this instance, the company was unsuccessful in securing such an agreement. In fact, the company was finally forced to reduce its demand for a two-year contract to one for 16 months.

The company statement yesterday about a rigid check-up to weed out "undesirable" elements, implying the possibility of discriminating against union militants, was for public consumption to save face for the management. The union has indicated that there will be real trouble if the company tries to discriminate against any actual employee.

Union Men Jailed In Strikes, Kept Out Of Drafted Army

Uncle Sam is trying to keep out of his new army of draftees trade union militants who might stand up to the officers and demand better conditions for the workers army. Class war prisoners and trade unionists who have been convicted as a result of participation in strikes are placed in a special category—class IV F—together with confirmed criminals, idiots and moral delinquents, and have their service deferred. Without benefit of trial, these men are not judged good enough to fight for democracy—or perhaps does it mean that they might fight too hard for democracy? It should be noted that in most cases the men involved would have had their service deferred in any case due to dependents. The reactionary army officers, however make sure that there is no possibility of these class war prisoners coming into the army and also brand them as moral delinquents in order to discredit in advance any protests that they might make.

Cops Seized 600 In Street Raids

Boss Political Machine Took This Revenge For Refusal Of Negroes To Support It In The Recent Elections

PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 30—The Negro and working-class population of this city is bitterly aroused against the mass arrest of almost 600 Negroes, whom police seized in the streets, restaurants and tap-rooms of the North Philadelphia 20th Ward last week. 128 of those arrested, who were held incommunicado in jail 24-48 hours, without warrants for their arrest or formal charges being placed against them, have already started civil suits for false arrest against 37 police officials and police who commanded or conducted the raids.

The police claimed they had instituted the raids in an alleged effort to "clean up" a series of petty crimes in the area. But the arrests were really an attempt to intimidate the Negro population of Philadelphia, because of their defiance of this city's dominant Republican political machine. Most Negroes here voted Democratic in the elections.

The Philadelphia political machine is taking advantage of the present political atmosphere—war hysteria, the government drive against striking workers as "saboteurs" and "reds," the brazen Jim-Crowing of Negroes in the army and navy, the refusal of corporations with military orders to hire Negroes—to force the Negroes by terror to support the local bosses in City Hall. Such an attempt would hardly be possible in "normal" times.

NEGRO SOLDIER HITS JIM CROW IN ARMY CAMP

Colored Troops Are Segregated In Many Phases of Camp Life NEW YORK, Nov. 29—"How can we be trained to protect America, which is called a FREE nation, when all around us rears the ugly head of segregation?" This is the question asked by a Negro volunteer now serving in a Northern army post, where his Negro regiment of some 300 men is stationed with a white army unit. He asks the question in an article entitled "Jim Crow in the Army Camps" which appears in the December issue of Crisis magazine, official organ of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Segregation is rampant in the army post, he discloses, pointing out that even in the post theatre which is run by the War Department, the Negro soldiers are forced to sit in a row of seats, "seating not more than fifteen men." "This," he adds, "is the 'Reserved-for-Colored' section. The Negro soldiers are also segregated in the Post bus, which carries the men back and forth to the nearby town. It is far from any idea I ever had of army life."

Even in library! "But this is not all," the article concludes; "Also in the library and the Post Exchange, and on the Post in general, the Negro is treated as if he is not wanted. Many of the young men enlisted in the United States Army are thoroughly disgusted because of segregation. Many were faithfully promised, before enlisting that they would have an opportunity to learn a trade, or continue with their previous studies. As yet there are no educational facilities for the Negro."

Happy Days in the Army

In a description of the American professional soldier, the Infantry Journal for September-October 1940 declares: "Your industrialists cannot get a man to work overtime 15 minutes without giving double pay, whereas the professional soldier in peacetime can work 24 or 48 hours at a stretch."

"Silly and Unscientific"

Advice on war propaganda in the September-October 1940 Infantry Journal insists: "Do not say to a soldier that war is silly and unscientific." We agree. Say to him that it's as sensible as Wall Street profits and as scientific as the electric chair.

ON THE WAR FRONTS

by GEORGE STERN

Now that Greece has joined the fight for "freedom" our big newspapers find it convenient to omit any discussion of the character of the Greek regime of John Metaxas. There is good reason for this, because the government of Metaxas is one of the bloodiest dictatorships in South-eastern Europe. It was established by coup d'etat four years ago and maintained itself by the most ruthless terror against all its opponents.

Under Metaxas there has been neither freedom of press, nor freedom of assembly, nor toleration of political parties. Those opponents of the regime who could, like many of the Venizelists, fled abroad. All others were thrown into vile prisons or concentration camps located in penal colonies on islands in the Aegean. Not a few of our Fourth Internationalist comrades suffered this fate.

Thus Greece's fight cannot be remotely characterized as part of any fight for "democracy." It is part, rather, of the imperialist struggle for power in the Mediterranean. Greece was better able to resist attack first because the attackers were the Italians. Events have already proved that the Mussolini military machine does not match in striking power that of Hitler's Germany.

In the mountains of Albania the comparatively ill-armed Greeks have demonstrated this with the greatest of ease. The second factor in Greek

resistance is British naval control of the Mediterranean. Like all the smaller nations of Europe, Greece was placed between the hammer and the anvil by the development of the war. Had Metaxas chosen to throw in with the Axis, his coastline was at the mercy of the British fleet.

A third factor in determining Greek policy is Turkey. A Greece within the Axis would have become not only the theater of British naval operations but might also have been the object of immediate Turkish operations overland.

As it is, the Greeks have chosen to resist Italy and have secured, naturally, important British support. They can in addition regard Turkey, for the time being at any rate, as a friendly ally at their rear.

Cold and hard self-interest based on strategic considerations govern Greece's role in the war, not noisy abstractions about "freedom" and "democracy." The elements of a genuine national struggle by the Greeks in defense of their homeland are completely obscured within the framework of the inter-imperialist conflict in which Greece is but a pawn. Certainly they are smothered totally by the Metaxas dictatorship.

"Freedom" for Greece cannot be won under Metaxas but against Metaxas. The war doesn't change this fact.

(Continued on Page 4)

(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.

Bertram D. Wolfe Has Resigned From the Lovestone Group

Dear Comrades: Wednesday, Nov. 13, at the summarizing of the Independent Labor League of America pre-convention discussion on the war issue, Bertram D. Wolfe, reporter for the minority, resigned from the organization.

Reporting for the majority (Lovestone, Herberg, Herman et al) which represents pro-Alled views ranging from demands for limited aid, to support of the recent battleship gift and calls for more, was B. Herman, who holds an extreme pro-British view.

Wolfe reported for the minority, which supports an anti war position containing variations from the orthodox Leninist position to pacifism. Wolfe's resignation left the brunt of the fight on primarily younger elements who, deprived of his experienced assistance and prestige, will not be able to bring any sort of forceful opposition against the seasoned maneuverings of Lovestone and Co. Expect-

ally since the minority has but one member left on the leading political bureau, Jim Cork.

Herman directed slanderous accusations against the chief minority spokesmen: Wolfe, Cork, Stewart, Kone and Symonds. Part of his accusations were to accuse minority spokesmen of echoing the Daily Worker, Herbert Hoover and Lindberg and of acting in a manner that will please Hitler, of being liars and fakers. These tactics aroused the anger of most of the general membership but most of them can be counted on to follow Lovestone.

In Wolfe's resigning without feeling it necessary to dignify the minority's stand by presenting a resolution or attempting to form a minority faction to fight for an anti war position at the convention in late December, the I.L.L.A. makes its final bow and will shortly, after the convention give up any pretenses at being a political organization it will continue solely as a "discussion and publication society." A statement amounting to this was made at the meeting after Wolfe's resignation by D. Benjamin, who re-

cently resigned as N. Y. District organizer after holding the position for a number of years. We who write this feel the left wing movement should know about Wolfe's resignation and the accompanying situation even though he has not seen fit to publicize it nor has the Workers Age deemed it necessary to announce it as yet.

For REVOLUTIONARY Socialist Unity, from a group who will continue to seek it.

(Upon being informed by us of the receipt of the above letter, Comrade Wolfe confirmed the fact of his resignation from the Lovestone group. He states that he does not plan at present to join another organization.—EDITORS.)

Portrait of Trotsky At Whitney Museum

Included in the Whitney Museum's annual exhibition of contemporary American painting, current until January 8, is a portrait of Leon Trotsky by Harold Weston. Although the picture attracts attention more because of its subject matter than as an outstanding work of art, it is well-painted and expresses appropriate forcefulness. Comrades will take pleasure in seeing it. The Whitney Museum is on Eighth Street, near Fifth Ave., New York City.

Note For Wall St

The semi-Official Infantry Journal for September-October 1940, declares: "After all, we helped beat the Germans in 1918 and we can do it again just as then." Get ready for another 1918, boys! Remember those billions in war profits?

Progressive Stand of the CIO Convention

Its Defense of Industrial Unionism Must Be Backed Wholeheartedly

By FELIX MORROW

(This is the second of a series of articles on the CIO Convention.)

I think it is worth dwelling again, as in my first article, on the great significance of the stand taken by the CIO convention on labor unity. I have described the dramatic sequence of speeches, culminating with that of John L. Lewis, affirming the continuance of the fight for the victory of industrial unionism in the mass production industries. It is worth repeating that Lewis was so effective precisely because he told the whole truth when he told the CIO unions: "There is no peace because you are not yet strong enough to command peace upon honorable terms."

One can hardly exaggerate the cumulative effect of the speeches of the pro-CIO forces. It was certainly devastating to the Hillman supporters. The corridors had been full of talk about defections to Hillman among the Rubber Workers, the Auto Workers, etc. If any of these had wavered, it was not apparent when the debate on unity took place! When it came time to vote, not even the Amalgamated delegates chose to record themselves in opposition.

The importance of this great victory is best realized if we recall the atmosphere in which the convention met. For months, the delegates had been under governmental and employer pressure to effect "unity" with the AFL.

That pressure had increased tenfold since Roosevelt's electoral victory. Would the delegates resist all that pressure? Unfortunately they, and especially their chief figures, had shown themselves unable to resist other kinds of pressure from the same sources: they have been cowed by the "national unity" bullyhoo to the point of well-nigh surrendering the strike weapon.

It was not accidental, for instance, that the key problem of organizing Ford was almost forgotten, and had to come on the floor the last day by unanimous consent of the delegates—apparently the UAW delegation had forgotten to hand in any resolutions on the Ford issue before the convention!

It must be reported that, despite some perfunctory speeches which may look well in the printed record, the entire psychology of the convention leadership, was that of people on the defensive who fear the consequences of turning the tide toward an offensive against the bosses and their political agents in Washington.

That means that the gap between Lewis, Murray and their associates on the one hand, and the Hillman breed on the other, is by no means deep enough to assure the future of the CIO Hillman is satisfied by Washington's handouts; Lewis and Murray aren't. But both Hillman and

Lewis-Murray think primarily in terms of handouts from Washington, are preoccupied with aid from the NLRB and the governmental agencies in general, rather than in leading the organized workers to win their demands by their own independent strength.

All this is unfortunately true. But by the very decision to continue the fight for industrial unionism, the convention committed itself to a road which will lead many a labor leader who now thinks in Murray and Lewis terms into realms he never expected to tread.

The road of industrial unionism has a logic of its own, which is not the present logic of Lewis and Murray! It is a logic of militant struggle for the great masses, of class struggle, though Lewis and Murray deny the reality of that class struggle.

The methods of class collaboration, of currying favor with the bosses and Washington have brought no results. Their bankruptcy becomes increasingly evident with every passing day.

In this epoch of the death agony of capitalism the workers are literally driven to struggle for very preservation of their lives against the war machine of the government and the bosses. Fight or die! Increasingly, those become the only alternatives. The decision of the CIO convention assures the workers of a powerful weapon in the coming great battles.

That is what the convention will be remembered for, that is what will be recorded in history as its enduring contribution, when all the patriotic and conciliatory speeches of Lewis and Murray will have been long forgotten.

AFL Convention...

(Continued from Page 1)

power to suspend international unions "in case where 2 or more national and international unions unite and conspire to create and launch an organization for any purpose dual to the American Federation of Labor."

David Dubinsky, head of the In-

ternational Ladies Garment Workers who deserted the CIO industrial unions "in cases where 2 or more would be greener pastures inside the AFL, attempted to oppose this resolution. Dubinsky complained that this resolution was an effort to skirt around a promise which he alleges the Executive Council made to him as a condition for his return to the AFL fold, that no international union would be suspended from the AFL without the majority approval of a convention.

One indication of how the industrial unions would be cut to ribbons if the CIO unions should return to the AFL was given during the session of November 26. Representatives of several local "federal" unions, which have a semi-industrial character, caused a minor storm in the convention by charging the craft unions with raiding their membership.

CRAFT RAIDS PROTESTED

Michael O'Gorman, representing a federal union of 2800 members at the Midvale Steel Co. in Philadelphia, attacked the craft unions on this score and pleaded with the craft internationals "to leave us alone." Morris Pratt, speaking for the Refinery Workers federal union of East St. Louis, charged that the Operating Engineers Union was trying to "take over" his organization. Other delegates from federal unions made the same plaint.

Even Dubinsky, making a violent denunciation of the CIO and Lewis on the question of unity negotiations, was forced to call attention—in his own cowardly and feeble way to be sure—to the real hostility toward industrial organization still burning fiercely among the AFL tops. During the session of November 28, Dubinsky pleaded with the craft chiefs, declaring, "There is no need for differences between labor. But there must be a broader attitude toward those who favor industrial organization." He admitted sadly that he would prefer a "more progressive" attitude in the AFL toward the problem of organizing the unorganized and the industrial form of union.

JIM CROW CONTINUES

In striking contrast with the brotherhood with which the many Negro delegates were treated at the CIO convention, and the various progressive steps taken by the CIO to unite the Negro and white workers, the AFL convention reaffirmed its traditional Jim-Crow policy. The modest proposal of A. Philip Randolph, President of the Sleeping Car Porters, for the setting up of an inter-racial committee within the Federation to remedy discrimination by unions against Negro workers, was rejected. The convention merely repeated the hands-off formula it has used so often before, merely asking the international unions "to give most sincere consideration" to the problem—carefully avoiding the setting up of any machinery which might actually do something on the matter. The action of the convention brought a bitter and merited rebuke from Randolph who year after year has vainly sought justice for his people from the craft-moguls.

FAWNING UPON ROOSEVELT

One of the most disgusting aspects of the convention was the manner in which Green and Co. fawned and scraped before the government and its representatives. While graciously accepting an \$8000 increase, bringing his yearly salary to \$20,000, Green was eager to offer the "sacrifices" of the workers for the sake of "national defense."

Green went so far as to state: "There are a number of ways in which we (!) can sacrifice—by giving service of the highest or-

Negro Delegates Jim Crowed by AFL Central Labor Body

A. Philip Randolph and Milton Webster, the lone Negro delegates at the AFL convention at New Orleans, in the midst of their vain fight to wipe out the AFL crafts' policy of the AFL crafts, found themselves Jim Crowed out of an entertainment for the convention delegates arranged by the New Orleans Central Labor Council.

Then the New Orleans central body had the gall to send Randolph and Webster a check providing for their separate entertainment. Needless to say, Randolph and Webster sent the check back.

der and by preventing the interruption of production through stoppages for any trivial reason—or for any reason."

The next day, it is true, Green back-watered on this extreme assertion by excitedly informing the press, "I meant no such thing as giving up the right to strike. I was referring to the need of setting up tribunals or other machinery to safeguard against the necessity for strikes." No doubt a lot of heat had been turned on Green by some of the delegates between the two statements.

THE "RACKETEERING" ISSUE

The sorriest spectacle at the convention was Dubinsky. He introduced a resolution to give the AFL executive council power to oust any union official found guilty of "any offense involving moral turpitude."

All Dubinsky received for his efforts was a good sock in the mouth and the enmity of all his "friends" among the AFL officialdom.

The officialdom, in turn, presented a cowardly front on the whole matter. Instead of telling the bosses to go to hell and keep their snouts out of the internal affairs of the unions; denouncing the smear campaign "to help Labor for its own good" as nothing but an attempt by the bosses to get their fingers into the union affairs; and instructing the bankers and industrialists to have a mind for their own racketeering which takes billions for the thousands taken by the relatively few labor racketeers; the AFL leaders passed a feeble resolution condemning racketeering in general as a concession to this boss pressure.

Nothing is more condemnatory of the entire conduct of this convention than the fact that a major share of its time was spent in fighting and fumbling over the issue of "racketeering."

To add spice to the mess concocted at the convention by the craft chiefs, Madame Perkins, Milo Warner, head of the American Legion, and Sir Walter Citrine, and a whole parade of similar types, whooped it up for war, unlimited support to the Roosevelt administration and its anti-labor pro-war program, and for more "sacrifices" from the workers. Citrine, who was knighted by the British monarchy and not without cause, described "with pride" the "voluntary" surrender by British labor of the right to strike and the acceptance of "practically unlimited" working hours in the interests of British imperialism.

In every respect this AFL convention demonstrated that the CIO is still the basic and progressive union organization of American labor.

Lenin, Trotsky and the First World War

By JAMES P. CANNON

In advancing our military transitional program, we proceed from the point of view that permanent war and universal militarism have become the dominant characteristics of our epoch, and we visualize the social revolution as the immediate outcome of the imperialist war. We begin, as did Lenin, with a declaration of irreconcilable class opposition to the imperialists and their war. It is only by means of this principled standpoint of class opposition that the cadres of modern Bolshevism are formed and clearly delimited from all other parties, groups, and tendencies, which to one degree or another, tend toward conciliation or collaboration with their national ruling class in the war.

But the situation which confronts us today is not an exact duplication of that which confronted the revolutionary Marxists at the outbreak of the first World War in 1914. For one thing, the capitalist order has reached a far more advanced stage of decay and is more susceptible to revolutionary overthrow. In addition, we have the benefit of twenty-six years of the richest historical experiences which have been generalized by the great Marxist, Trotsky. These circumstances enable us to go farther, with more concretely worked out slogans of agitation to advance the class struggle under conditions of war and militarism, than was possible for the revolutionary Marxists at the beginning of the first World War.

Trotsky, the author of our program, contributed extremely important thoughts to the workers' vanguard facing the second World War: the immediacy of the revolutionary perspective in connection with the present war, and the necessity for transitional slogans which can serve to mobilize the masses for independent class action leading up to it. It is precisely this immediacy of the revolutionary perspective that makes the transitional program a burning necessity.

CONTINUING, NOT REPEATING, LENIN'S WORK

"Our policy," Trotsky wrote, "the policy of the revolutionary proletariat toward the second imperialist war is a continuation, of the policy elaborated during the last imperialist war, primarily under Lenin's leadership. But a continuation does not signify a repetition. In this case too, continuation signifies a development, a deepening and a sharpening." (*Fourth International*, October, 1940). He reminded us, and we repeated after him, that not even Lenin had visualized the victory of the proletarian revolution as the immediate outcome of the first World War.

At this point Lenin suddenly acquired an advocate in a camp which hitherto has not been distinguished by its fidelity to Leninism. Shachtman, comrade-in-arms of the avowed anti-Bolshevik Burnham, and the present leader of the "Workers Party" (the Burnham group minus Burnham), comes to the defense of Lenin against us. The "floating kidney," as Trotsky denominated Shachtman, bobs up in the most unexpected places!

However, we have committed no assault on Lenin, and he is in no way in need of the dubious "defense" of this attorney. It is necessary to take a little time out to prove this, because the authority of Lenin is one of the greatest treasures of the revolutionary movement. His name is written beside that of Trotsky on the banner of the Russian revolution. We proclaim the extension of this revolution throughout the world in the name of Lenin-Trotsky. We must not permit the slightest confusion as to how we regard Lenin; and it is a matter of simple respect to his memory to protect him from the hypocritical support of an advocate who is known among Leninists only as a betrayer of Leninism.

It will take a little time and space, but this

can't be helped. It is a simple task—mainly work with a shovel. His own confusion and instinct to sow confusion—two qualities always happily married in Shachtman's factional "polemics"—plus his unfeeling twisting, falsifying and misrepresenting the words of others and the events of the past are all piled together here also. It is simply necessary to dig this stuff away, and then to unwind the "quotations" and replace the historical incidents in their true position. Then nothing will be left of the dirty mess that Shachtman has made of our alleged attack on Lenin and Shachtman's "brief" as attorney for the defense.

WHAT LENIN REALLY SAID!

The defense of Lenin is the second "point" in Shachtman's indictment of our military policy. The occasion for it was the publication of my speech to our Chicago Conference which adopted our resolution. Shachtman made a big "case" out of what I said about Lenin, or rather, what I didn't say. Here are the sentences which Shachtman quoted from my speech: "We said and those before us said that capitalism had outlived its usefulness. World economy is ready for socialism. But when the World War started in 1914 none of the parties had the idea that on the agenda stood the struggle for power. The staff of the best of them was essentially a protest against the war. It did not occur even to the best Marxists that the time had come when the power must be seized by the workers in order to save civilization from degeneration. Even Lenin did not visualize the victory of the proletarian revolution as the immediate outcome of the war."

Shachtman characterized this as a "monstrous falsehood," and as a "complete misrepresentation of the views and traditions of the Bolsheviks in the last war." He offers a number of "quotations" to prove that Lenin and the Bolsheviks advocated revolution during the war, he implies that Lenin expected revolution as the war's immediate outcome, and finally asks: "And above all, what in heaven's name was the meaning of Lenin's slogan, repeated a thousand times during the last war, 'Turn the imperialist war into a civil war!'"

Our quotation undoubtedly establishes the fact that Lenin was in favor of revolution, that he had a program of revolution. And he tries to make it appear that I denied it, or didn't know it. Shachtman's whole case rests upon this false construction. Lenin advocated the "program of revolution" not only during the World War but before it, before 1905, from the very beginning of his activity as a revolutionary Marxist. Shachtman's entire argument is directed against a contention which I did not make.

He makes his argument appear superficially plausible by the use of two well-known devices of literary charlatans. First, he mutilated the quotation from my speech, breaking it off short and eliminating immediately following sentences in the same paragraph which made my meaning more clear and precise. I wrote: "Even Lenin did not visualize the victory of the proletarian revolution as the immediate outcome of the war." Shachtman twisted it and distorted it into a denial that Lenin had "a program of revolution," during the war. But I think it is thoroughly clear to a disinterested reader that I was speaking of something else, namely, Lenin's expectations as to the immediate outcome of the war, and not at all of what he wanted and what he advocated.

LENIN'S OWN WORDS QUOTED

My meaning was made more precise by the sentence which immediately followed: "Just a short time before the outbreak of the February revolution in Russia, Lenin wrote in Switzerland that his generation would most probably not see the socialist revolution. Even Lenin had postponed the revolution to the future, to a later

decade." The context of my published speech, from which the sentences were extracted, makes it even clearer that the references to Lenin were concerned not at all with differences of program, but only with the immediate perspectives of the revolutionary Marxists in this war and in the first World War. I don't see how anyone can seriously dispute our contentions on this point because the words of Lenin himself constitute the basis for the reference. The October *Fourth International* cites two exact quotations on the point to which I referred without directly quoting.

"It is possible, however, that five, ten and even more years will pass before the beginning of the socialist revolution." (From an article written in March, 1916, Lenin's Collected works, vol. XIX, p. 45, Third Russian Edition).

"We, the older men, will perhaps not live long enough to see the decisive battles of the impending revolution." (Report on 1905 Revolution delivered to Swiss students, January, 1917, idem, page 357).

That is not all. The main quotation from Lenin which Shachtman cites in his polemic against us—a quotation which he also mutilates to twist the meaning—shows that Lenin was not speaking of the revolution as an immediate perspective; that is, the quotation will show it when we restore the words which Shachtman cut off in the middle of a sentence. He quotes from the article of October 11, 1915, which appears on page 347 of the English edition of Lenin's works, Volume XVIII: ". . . It is our bounden duty to explain to the masses the necessity of a revolution, to appeal for it, to create the fitting organizations, to speak fearlessly and in the most concrete manner of the various methods of forceful struggle and of its 'technique' . . . There Shachtman ended the quotation, breaking Lenin's sentence off at a comma.

WHAT SHACHTMAN LEFT OUT!

Here are the immediately following words which he left out: "This bounden duty of ours being independent of whether the revolution will be strong enough and whether it will come in connection with the first OR SECOND IMPERIALIST WAR, etc." Lenin obviously was not arguing about the immediacy of the revolution as we visualize it in connection with the present war, but about the necessity of advocating it and preparing for it.

If any further proof is needed one only has to read the rest of Lenin's article! In the very same article, on page 349 of the same volume, Lenin continued: "As to the untimeliness of preaching revolution, this objection rests on a confusion of terms customary with the Romance Socialists: They confuse the beginning of a revolution with its open and direct propaganda. In Russia, nobody places the beginning of the 1905 Revolution before January 22, 1905, whereas the revolutionary propaganda, in the narrow sense of the word, the propaganda and the preparation of mass action, demonstrations, strikes, barricades, had been conducted for years before that. The old *Iskra*, for instance, preached this from the end of 1900, as did Marx from 1847 when there could have been no thought as yet about the beginning of a revolution in Europe."

Shachtman took my remarks about the immediate perspectives of Lenin during the first World War, lifted them out of their context, mutilated the paragraph from which they were extracted, twisted them into an attack on the program and traditions of the Bolsheviks which was not intended or implied in any way by me, and then Shachtman attempted to bolster his thesis by quotations from Lenin which in reality prove the opposite—when they are honestly quoted without breaking off sentences in the middle, and without suppressing other sentences in the same article

which make Lenin's real meaning even clearer. To top off his exercise in literary skulduggery Shachtman refers to the "outlived" Lenin, using quotation marks to convey the impression that he is quoting me. That is an outright literary forgery. I never used such an expression and could not do so; it is not my opinion.

HIS ATTACK AIMED AT TROTSKY

All this literary fakery and forgery in "defense" of Lenin has a fundamental aim which is not frankly avowed, but only thinly disguised. Against whom is Shachtman really defending Lenin? To be sure, he mentions only "Cannon," but it is perfectly obvious that Cannon in this case is only serving Shachtman as a pseudonym for the real target of his attack. My remarks about Lenin's perspective during the first world war were no more and no less than a simple repetition of what Trotsky said on the subject. It was he who called our attention to the relevant quotations and explained their precise significance.

In the October number of our magazine *Fourth International* which Shachtman had at hand when he wrote his article in *Labor Action* of November 4th—he refers to the Goldman-Trotsky correspondence contained therein—Trotsky wrote: "Prior to the February Revolution and even afterward, the revolutionary elements felt themselves to be not contenders for power, but the extreme left opposition. Even Lenin, relegated the socialist revolution to a more or less distant future . . . If that is how Lenin viewed the situation, then there is hardly any need of talking about the others."

Here is the real nub of the matter. Shachtman's attack on "Cannon" in behalf of Lenin is in reality aimed against Trotsky in a cowardly and indirect manner. He wants to set Lenin against Trotsky, to make a division in the minds of the radical workers between Lenin and Trotsky, to set himself up as a "Leninist" with the sly intimation that Leninism is not the same thing as Trotskyism. There is a monstrous criminality in this procedure. The names of Lenin and Trotsky are inseparably united in the Russian Revolution, its achievements, its doctrines and traditions, and in the great struggle for Bolshevism waged by Trotsky since the death of Lenin. "Lenin-Trotsky"—those two immortal names are one. Nobody yet has tried to separate them; that is, nobody but scoundrels and traitors.

Shachtman's article in *Labor Action* serves the same aim as the special "Trotsky Memorial Issue" of their magazine which was published only to defame the memory of Trotsky, to belittle him, to justify themselves against him and, at the same time—like any shopkeeper looking for a little extra profit—to claim his "heritage."

Trotsky, as if anticipating such attempts, gave this answer in advance. Here is what he wrote in the *Socialist Appeal*: "Only the other day Shachtman referred to himself in the press as a 'Trotskyist.' If this be Trotskyism then I at least am 'no Trotskyist.' With the present ideas of Shachtman, not to mention Burnham, I have nothing in common . . . Towards their new magazine my attitude can only be the same as toward all other petty-bourgeois counterfeits of Marxism. As for their 'organizational methods' and political 'morality', these evoke in me nothing but contempt."

The literary manners and morals of petty bourgeois dabblers in politics are no better than their theses. With such people, as Trotsky once remarked, it is not sufficient to check their theses; it is necessary to watch their fingers too! If we keep this salutary warning in mind the "theses" of Shachtman directed against our military transitional program can be disposed of without difficulty. As I said before, it is mainly work with a shovel.

The Negro Struggle

By ALBERT PARKER

The Army is the Boss!

Roosevelt knows how to put over his policy of Jim Crowism in the armed forces in a smooth and polished manner, but not all his assistants have the same experience and technique that he has.

For example, take the case of Brigadier General Hershey of the Selective Service Administration, one of the men in charge of the draft.

When he was asked in a recent interview how it happened that the administration was segregating colored soldiers and sailors when the Selective Service Act had a provision prohibiting racial discrimination in the armed forces, he replied:

"The act says there is to be no discrimination, but the act also says that no man may come into the army who is not acceptable to the army. The navy, of course, is worse, and the marines will not accept colored applicants. I regret this state, but unfortunately the army gets the final say."

And then, as if to make sure that everybody got the point, he said, in discussing the policy of separate regiments for colored men:

"The selective service system has nothing to do with where the man goes. We are purchasing agents. What they do later is of no interest to us... Even though the act provides against discrimination, the army has the right to introduce the question of acceptability."

A Scabby Role

We have had occasion in the past to criticize the action of Edgar Brown, head of the United Government Employees, in approving Roosevelt's Jim Crow policies in the armed forces, and to point out how he in this way played into the hands of the Negro people.

Now comes new testimony to corroborate our charges against him.

For last week, Judge William Hastie, civilian aide to Secretary of War Stimson, issued a statement which by implication at least tries to divert part of the blame from Roosevelt. Said he:

"Divided opinion among colored citizens on the problem of segregation in the army makes for great difficulty in solving the problem. As long as people who are opposed to mixed units are able to point to colored persons as also agreeing with this position, our problem is extremely difficult..."

Usually, when the great majority of the workers in a factory have organized a union and presented demands to the bosses for a contract and better conditions, one or two scabs appear who say that the boss is a great guy and doing what he can to help the workers, and so on, and the bosses always point to these scabs as justification of their attempts to smash the union. Brown is playing the same role as a scab in the fight against Jim Crowism.

It's Always There

In Philadelphia last week "the city's business, professional and military leaders" threw a luncheon at the exclusive Manufacturers' and Bankers' Club in honor of the first 150 young men they were sending off to the draft from that city. Among these were 16 colored men.

Then, the story goes, "twenty gifts were presented each of them by mid-city merchants and pretty girls pinned carnations on their lapels."

Then Judge Vincent A. Carroll, a colonel in the Cavalry Reserves, had a speech to make about the Negroes and "national defense."

"You are showing the world," said he, "that the Negro people of this nation have at heart the maintenance of democratic freedom, as they have since Crispus Attucks, one of their race, lost his life on Boston Common with the other patriot martyrs of the Revolution."

But the photograph of the affair printed in the newspapers shows—yes, you guessed it!—the 16 Negroes segregated off at a separate table!

Cavalrymen Won't be Jim Crowed

An interesting story was printed in the Afro-American last week, telling of the determination of several members of the Tenth Cavalry situated at Fort Dix, N. J., not to be Jim Crowed.

Motion pictures were being shown at the post theatre, and those in charge of it attempted to segregate Negro soldiers into one part of the building. They refused to be party to such an act, and left the theatre, demanding their money back.

But the most interesting part of the story tells the complaint of one of the men to the Afro reporter:

"The colored soldier is not promoted because of his character, intelligence and ability, he said, he is promoted because of his docile attitude, his inability to think for himself, and his willingness to accept orders from his superiors in a 'hat-in-hand manner.'" The order to segregate the soldiers at the post theatre would be rescinded if our (colored) officers demand it, he said."

This emphasizes again the need for a system of military training under control of the trade unions, which would end discrimination and segregation, and would establish special officers' training camps to train workers to become officers, so that the worker-soldiers would have officers on whom they could depend to fight for their rights.

Next week we shall discuss the widely publicized Conference on the Participation of the Negro in National Defense, held at Hampton Institute, Va., and see what if anything it contributed to the fight for equality in the armed forces.

Women Workers In The Last War

Now, Again, As The Men Face Death, The Women Face Factory Horrors

By MARY DANTE

Almost from the beginning of American industry, women have slaved in the factories. With the development of improved machinery requiring less operating skill, the manufacturer maintained and raised his profits through employment of cheap labor, including that of women and children.

What reasons did government officials and "respectable" citizens give for colonization of women into industry? Alexander Hamilton's declaration on this question is typical: "In general women and children are rendered more useful by manufacturing establishments than they otherwise would be."

ONE EXCUSE OR ANOTHER The "respectable" citizens insisted that women were kept out of vice through employment. Instead of being destitute they were provided with "abundance for a comfortable subsistence." In all periods the capitalist class have found one excuse as good as another to justify their exploitation of the wage worker.

It was not until 1914 with the outbreak of the first world war, however, that women were recruited into the factories on a mass scale. From then on women assumed increasing importance as a section of the working class.

From Research Report No. 8 of the National Industrial Conference Board, we find the following: "The proportionate increase in employment of women appears to have been particularly marked in the war industries, especially in the metal and machine trades."

IN WAR INDUSTRIES In 1917, 1,366,000 women in 15 states were employed directly or indirectly in factories necessary for carrying on the war. Approximately 100,000 were employed in munitions, airplane, and metallurgical factories all of which are

and night shifts alternating every two weeks. Sanitation, air and light were inadequate in most factories.

Extreme pressure from the workers forced government investigations and in many factories such necessities as lavatories, washing facilities, and drinking water were finally given the workers.

Women complained that the vibrations of the big machines made them nervous and tired after a few hours work. They enjoyed no home life or recreation after work. In families where the mother and father worked different shifts they would not see each other from one day to the next. There was no chance to provide adequately for the rearing of the children.

LEFT IN CHILDREN'S HANDS

Serious difficulties arose in many families. Of necessity small children took over the household duties of the working mother. Such cases as this were common: An eleven year old girl cared for three younger children one of whom was a two year old baby. She did the housework and fed the children. In spite of her efforts the children were undernourished, unkempt and peevish.

This was the family life the capitalist class held up as "sacred" when they slandered the Russian workers who in 1917 risked their lives to overthrow a government which bred and upheld the same "sacred" home life.

LIVING COSTS GO UP

The increasing demand for more labor power forced the bosses of munitions factories to pay higher wages than the mercantile establishments. This, however, did not mean that the workers enjoyed

of predominant importance in war.

Loading lumber, wheeling and shoveling coal, and working as street car conductors were some of the other occupations performed by women during the last war. Citing the "emergency," the capitalists demanded suspension of labor legislation. The representatives of the capitalists in the state and federal government bowed to these demands. The government was the first to take away the eight hour day in the Navy yards.

Without organization the women were unable to offer any effective resistance to the boss. In some factories women were forced to work from 7 A.M. to 5 or 6 P.M. No more than 15 minutes was generally allowed for lunch time. Certain workers were not allowed to leave their machines even while they ate their lunches. Other girls worked 10-12 hours a day on split shifts, or on day

ROBBERED OF 8-HOUR DAY

What effect did the war have on the women workers? In the munitions industry they were unorganized and as a result the "munition kings" began to rob them of the eight hour day established by the men workers after long struggles.

Without organization the women were unable to offer any effective resistance to the boss. In some factories women were forced to work from 7 A.M. to 5 or 6 P.M. No more than 15 minutes was generally allowed for lunch time. Certain workers were not allowed to leave their machines even while they ate their lunches. Other girls worked 10-12 hours a day on split shifts, or on day

New Union Problems, As Tool Industry Expands Capitalism Rules German Economy

The needs of the imperialist war machine have suddenly spotlighted the machine tool industry as one of the vital parts of American industry.

Until recently this industry withstood the great specialization which characterized other industries. The all around machinist, trained over a period of years, was in demand in preference to the man who could operate only one or two machines.

With the introduction however, of automatic and semi-automatic machinery, the skilled machinist has in many cases given way to the specialized machine hand. Once this division began, its spread in the industry proceeded at a terrific pace, until today one can list more than 30 different types of machine hands.

ELECTRIC EYES DO WORK

This division of labor has followed the increasing development of technological improvements in the industry. Semi-skilled men can now operate lathes equipped with electric eyes and turn out minute precision work at a very high rate of speed. Formerly this kind of work could be done only by highly skilled men and at a much lower rate of speed.

The big machine plants find this development economical for them in more than one way. Over a period of many years the skilled machinists both in the AFL International Association of Machinists and the CIO United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers have built up a relatively high wage standard.

The bosses find it much cheaper to hire a semi-skilled man and place him on one machine, doing a specialized operation, than to hire trained machinists or tool makers and pay the full scale. Many of the older men in the trade refer to the younger semi-skilled workers as "half baked." These older workers have not yet understood that as a result of the improvements machinery today does more quickly and efficiently a great deal of the work which they had to spend years in learning.

THOUSANDS IN SCHOOLS

To meet the need for large scale production, the government is putting thousands of young workers through the defense schools, giving them a quick training in preparation for running specialized machines in war industry.

After the war has ended and the market it created for machine tools collapses, these young workers will find themselves out of jobs.

At present, many of the older workers in the industry resent the sudden influx of these younger semi-skilled workers, seeing in them a threat to the wage scales

they have built up by hard struggles after a period of many years.

Thus the development of the industry poses big problems for both the skilled and semi-skilled men. The answer cannot be simply a blind opposition to new technological changes—changes that are inevitable.

Nor can the answer be found in opposing young workers learning a trade. Those union leaders who believe the problem can be solved by simply demanding some trade union representation in the administration of the schools will find that this too will leave everything exactly as it was before.

There is only one solution—a real campaign by both the skilled and unskilled workers for the six hour day with no decrease in pay!

This is the only way in which the wage scales of the skilled men can be protected and opportunity given to absorb the semi-skilled

and unemployed into the industry.

That this solution is not utopian is shown by the fact that some unions have already taken it up and in at least one case, that of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, has achieved some real successes.

For the 6 hour day with no decrease in pay!

In Los Angeles

Buy the APPEAL at

Lazerus Candy Store 2109 Brooklyn Ave.

Book Store E. 1st St. & Rowan Ave.

Sam Smit's Newsstand 5th & Main St.

TROTSKY MEMORIAL FUND

The following additional contributions to the Trotsky Memorial Fund have come in during the last week:

Milwaukee	\$ 3.10
Buffalo	5.00
Detroit	85.00
Boston	13.00
Chicago	16.00
Philadelphia	8.00
TOTAL	\$180.10

Branch	Quota	Amount paid	%
Milwaukee	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.10	102%
Baltimore	10.00	10.00	100
Rockville	7.00	7.00	100
Toledo	50.00	50.00	100
Detroit	200.00	200.00	100
Lynn	100.00	83.00	83
Boston	100.00	72.50	73
Chicago & Indiana Harbor	200.00	121.07	61
Newark	150.00	70.50	47
Allentown	15.00	6.00	40
Flint	150.00	56.00	37
San Francisco	100.00	35.00	35
Los Angeles	150.00	49.15	33
Philadelphia	30.00	8.00	27
New York	1000.00	255.00	26
Minneapolis & St. Paul	1000.00	230.00	23
Buffalo	25.00	5.00	20
New Haven	20.00	3.50	18
Youngstown	50.00	6.00	12
Akron	10.00	0.00	00
Cleveland	70.00	0.00	00
Hutchinson	10.00	0.00	00
Pittsburgh	10.00	0.00	00
Portland	10.00	0.00	00
Quakertown	7.00	0.00	00
Reading	5.00	0.00	00
Rochester	15.00	0.00	00
St. Louis	5.00	0.00	00
Texas	5.00	0.00	00
Individual Contributions		2.30	
TOTALS	\$3509.00	1275.12	36%

The capitalists and their intellectual pimps are conducting a campaign to show that Nazi economy is "socialist" and thus discredit the idea of socialism. Prof. Sidney Hook is among those who have tried to picture Nazism as having "overthrown capitalism."

Let him, if he can, explain the following: The German Economist, a leading Nazi financial magazine, has recently launched a campaign under the slogan, "More private financiers to the fore!"

The magazine makes a plea for the investment of more private capital, pointing to many fertile fields for investment which lie fallow at the present time. The magazine reveals that there is a vast capital-hungry market in Germany.

The German Economist, which prints the mind of the Nazi regime, also advocates alleviation of taxes on businesses and corporations in order to facilitate the creation of more private capital.

HITLER'S REAL FACE "High dividends cannot be considered immoral," states the article, and suggests that established enterprises increase dividend payments to shareholders as a means of increasing the amount of capital in private hands for development of new enterprises.

The article concludes that there must be an increase in the number of people who can dispose of private financial means, i.e., more wealthy capitalists. The article warns that "Otherwise private initiative would be overruled by State administration." Lenin wrote in State and Revolution: "Imperialism in particular, the

era of financial capital, the era of gigantic capitalist monopolies, the era of the transformation of simple trust-capitalism into State trust-capitalism shows an unprecedented strengthening of the 'State' and an unheard of development of its bureaucratic and military apparatus, side by side with the increase of oppression of the proletariat, alike in the monarchical and the freest republican countries."

LENIN FORESAW IT

He adds, as if to complete the picture of the modern Nazi regime: "Here we have what is most essential in the theoretical appreciation of the latest phase of capitalism, that is imperialism, viz., that capitalism becomes monopolistic capitalism. This fact must be emphasized because the 'reformist' middle class view that monopolistic capitalism, whether private or State, is no longer capitalism, but can already be termed 'State Socialism' or something of that sort, is one of the most wide-spread errors. The trusts, of course, have not given us, and indeed, cannot give us, full and complete order and system in production. But, however much of an ordered plan they may yield, however closely capitalist magnates may estimate in advance the required extent of production on a national and even international scale, and, however carefully they may regulate it, we still remain under capitalism—capitalism, it is true in its latest phase, but still, undoubtedly, capitalism."

Thus 15 years before the coming to power of Hitler, Lenin called the turn on those "democratic" capitalists who term "socialistic" the State Capitalism of the malevolent Hitler rule.

READ!!
 "Defend The Negro Sailors of the U. S. S. Philadelphia"
 16 pages 2c per copy
 1 1/2c in bundle orders of 10 or more
 Learn the truth about how the colored sailors and soldiers are Jim Crowed in Uncle Sams' Armed Forces! And in industry! Read this pamphlet and understand why it is absolutely necessary that we have union control over the military training of the workers!
 PIONEER PUBLISHERS
 116 University Place New York, N. Y.

Military Arts For Workers In New Book

NEW WAYS OF WAR. By Tom Wintringham. Penguin Books. 126 pages 25c.

By CARL O'SHEA

The author of this pamphlet, before he became commander of the Local Defense Volunteers in England, was a Stalinist. He commanded the British Battalion with the International Brigade in Spain and his explanation for the failure of the Loyalists—"we lost because Hitler and Mussolini had then . . . friends in Britain, powerful enough to prevent us getting arms and food"—is one quite acceptable to the Comintern although it has parted company with Wintringham.

But let that lie for the moment. Tom Wintringham, while he has no political credentials, does have military credentials. One goes to the pamphlet NEW WAYS OF WAR for what the author has to tell us about the very practical side of the military arts. And the average worker can find a great deal of valuable information in this little pamphlet.

NEW WAYS OF WAR is the hand-book which millions of British citizens in the Local Defense Volunteers are using today. It gives one a picture of the historical development of war. It shows how military tactics and weapons parallel changes in industry and transport.

Concrete and Practical Information

Now for the meat of the book. Would you like to know how to make home-made grenades that can stop tanks and armored cars? how to drill men intelligently? how to make effective ordinance of a regular shot-gun and shot-gun shells? how to make a field unuseable as an air-drome? how to stop a tank with home-made grenades? how to construct an anti-tank trap? to defend a house (or a trade union hall)? to defend a city against modern arms? to make a road-block and to defend it? how to check motor cycle troops? how to build a defense position?

You will find this priceless information, together with illustrations and formulas, in NEW WAYS OF WAR.

Despite its political dress, this is one of the most valuable books published in recent years.

I recommend this book to every comrade, to every serious worker, to every Union Defense Guardsman in the United States. Study it, pass it on to your friends.

Wintringham tells how troops in Spain were trained by being shown old war films, corrected by short lectures. Wintringham's hand book is to be used in the same way.

His Politics Worse Than Useless

Politically now, he is a Fabian with a strong People's Front hangover from Spain. His political criticisms are those of the Fabians. Wintringham would reform the British army, but would not call for an army under control of the organized workers. Wintringham is for defense of the British "fatherland," now, under Churchill. He is not for socialist revolution.

But let him speak for himself: "Those who say that this war is a war between two great Empires, each fighting for the right to rule and exploit other peoples without the latter's consent, are speaking of a war that is past. They are, to be exact, speaking of Mr. Chamberlain's war. Mr. Chamberlain lost that war. It is over. We are now engaged on quite a different struggle," etc., etc.

And Wintringham wonders why India is not given its freedom, and why the British government, instead of arming the Local Defense Volunteers, takes their weapons away.

But as I say, we go to this book for military, not political, knowledge.

Trade Union Control Of Military Training

Our party advocates universal military training under trade union control, and financed by the United States government. Whether we can achieve this will be decided by the struggle. If enough organized workers demand it, we can have it. Our very demand raises the political understanding of the workers.

In the meantime we have the problem of guarding our union halls, our picket lines, from fascist groups. The fascists will have a mighty tough job cut out for them if every trade unionist assimilates the knowledge available in this pamphlet and helps form a Union Defense Guard to defend himself and his union. This pamphlet should be a hand-book for every worker.

A Real Good Time This
 SATURDAY, DEC. 7th
 8.30 P.M.
 OLD TIME BEER PARTY
 IRVING PLAZA
 Victoria Hall
 Irving Place and 15th Street
 Dancing-Refreshments-Entertainment
 New York Local S. W. P.
 ADMISSION 49c

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. IV—No. 49 Saturday, December 7, 1940

Published Weekly by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASSN.
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-1647Editorial Board:
FELIX MORROW ALBERT GOLDMAN
General Manager:
RUTH JEFFREYSubscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
orders: 8 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

ON THE WAR FRONT:

For:

1. Military training of workers, financed by the government, under control of the trade unions.
2. The establishment of special officers' training camps, financed by the government and controlled by the trade unions, to train workers to become officers.
3. Confiscation of all war profits—all company books to be open for trade union inspection.
4. Expropriation of all war industries and their operation under workers' control.
5. Trade union wages for all workers drafted into the army.
6. Full equality for Negroes in the armed forces—Down with Jim Crowism.
7. An end to secret diplomacy.
8. A peoples' referendum on any and all wars.

AT HOME:

For:

1. A job and decent living for every worker.
2. Thirty-thirty—\$30 weekly minimum wage—\$30 hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
3. \$30 weekly old age and disability pension.
4. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.
5. Workers Defense Guards against vigilante and fascist attacks.
6. A twenty-billion dollar Federal public works and housing program to provide jobs for the unemployed.
7. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
8. An Independent Labor Party based on the Trade Unions.
9. A Workers' and Farmers' Government.

Watch Out For Rats!

The Vultee aircraft strikers deserve the warm congratulations of the entire trade union movement for having carried their strike to a settlement which, though a compromise, nevertheless secured substantial gains. They fought against formidable opposition: the strike branded "communist" by Attorney General Jackson and Dies, a rabid strikebreaking campaign by the entire capitalist press, strong pressure exerted by Sidney Hillman's "labor" section of the National Commission, a united front of all the aircraft companies throughout the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, etc. It is a tribute to the strikers that they fought their way through this opposition.

It is plain that every strike will face similar pressure, and on an increasing scale. The pressure will be expertly applied against the unions. Violence and deceit will be mingled to paralyze the unions. There is less to fear for the moment from the crudest enemies, like Congressmen Smith and Dies, than from the more clever enemies who pose as friends. The dominant policy in Washington today is not the rabid and stupid one of Dies, but the iron hand in the velvet glove of Roosevelt and Hillman.

The Roosevelt-Hillman policy is aptly formulated in an editorial in the *New York Times* of November 20, which proposes to "avoid government coercion or elaborate machinery as much as possible," and therefore declares: "The problem of public policy is to eliminate such strikes, or to reduce them to a minimum, with the least possible use of coercion." But, note well, this means the use of as much coercion as is necessary to eliminate strikes. The *Times* formula, superficially liberal, in reality is identical with the statutory instructions to policemen concerning making arrests: use only so much force as is necessary to subdue the victim.

Despite all the cleverness and power which the employers and their political agents can utilize against the trade unions, the workers would find it relatively easy to win their strikes—were it not for the fact that the employers also have agents within the trade unions. And we don't mean merely stool-pigeons. We mean those trade union leaders and their friends who are succumbing to the employers' propaganda and policies.

One example is the crew that write and publish the *New Leader*, the weekly organ of the Social Democratic Federation. Its editors are so far-gone in their patriotic frenzy that, in their November 30 issue, they actually boast that they branded the Vultee strike as "communist" before Jackson and Dies had done so! And their headline of the week, based on the Vultee strike, is: "Gov't Fails to Stop C. P. Sabotage of Defense." In other words, a complaint that the government didn't crack down harder on the Vultee strikers! And

in an editorial in the same issue, deliberately suppressing the strikers—the true—story of why they had to strike to get their raise, the *New Leader* says: "Twelve days have been wasted at the Vultee plant. The increase of twenty-five per cent in basic wages could have been won without a day's stoppage. . . . Such acts will not long be tolerated."

What does the *New Leader* propose? The putting of "all action affecting labor's part in national defense" into "the hands of a single body, similar to the War Labor Board set up in 1917." As to the anti-labor record of that War Labor Board, we shall have plenty to say in the coming weeks. Today we hurry ahead to give you the pay-off in that *New Leader* editorial, on how the board will work: "There are men who deserve and enjoy the confidence of the public and who, sitting with representatives of labor, of the employers, and of the administration, can procure harmony of action, not so much by mandatory action as by such fairness and intelligence as will make compulsion unnecessary."

What is the *New Leader's* formula, but another variation of that of the *New York Times*? The policeman shouldn't use his club to subdue his victim except as it is necessary.

The *New Leader* is a little more brazen than are the union leaders who finance it, but it speaks their mind, a mind completely dominated by Washington. As the workers confront the employers, they would do well to guard themselves against a stiletto in the back from these "labor leaders" and their friends. Indeed, one can put it more plainly: the workers will win their battles and extend their gains in the coming period only to the extent that the traitors within the labor movement, typified by the *New Leader*, are exposed for what they are and rendered incapable of stabbing the workers in the back.

The Draftees' Health

Army officials and the capitalist press are "surprised," "unable to understand" and "disappointed" at the exceptionally high number of rejections for physical disabilities which the draft doctors have been compelled to issue during examination of the first batch of draftees.

The figures are certainly startling enough. On the basis of previous experience, particularly during the World War draft, rejections should have averaged less than two per cent. The present average for the nine army corps areas is set "conservatively" at 15 percent, ranging in certain areas as high as 25 percent. In the New York area, one out of every four draftees has been rejected as physically unfit.

This is startling, but not "surprising." Eleven years of capitalist depression have eaten into the flesh and bones of the workers. Eleven years of mass hunger, undernourishment, worry and nervous tension and medical neglect, have taken their deadly toll. The bad lungs, weak hearts, intestinal disorders, rotten teeth, faulty eye-sight, neglected hernias are part of the price the working class has paid for eleven more years of capitalist economic anarchy and social chaos.

No, the army officers and the boss press may not be able "to understand" why one out of four of the best and strongest layer of American society is physically unfit for military service. But the workers who have existed on "home relief" and \$36 to \$52 monthly WPA jobs can understand. The youth in the CCC camps and on NYA can understand. The millions of workers who today still average, in the majority, less than \$800 yearly incomes—\$15 per week—they can understand.

And they can and must understand one thing more. The bosses are preparing for a war in which these deprived millions are being asked to give their lives for the purpose of preserving a social system, capitalism, which can only promise more disease, more physical deprivation, more pain and wasting away for the workers.

Not Red, But Yellow

It doesn't often happen, but here is one time we agree 100% with a point made by the Stalinist *Daily Worker*. It says:

"Entirely out of harmony with the main decisions and the generally progressive character of the CIO convention was the resolution adopted which attempted to lump Communism together with its antithesis, Nazism and fascism, and which lumped together the Workers' State, the USSR, together with the imperialist dictatorships of Hitler and Mussolini. . . . (the resolution) gave an opening which the red-baiters and reactionaries of all shades will endeavor to exploit, distort and press to the maximum in order to try and sow confusion, division and strife within the CIO, and the entire 'progressive movement.'" (Daily Worker, Nov. 30)

But the *Daily Worker* doesn't tell the whole story. That red-baiting resolution was voted for by all the Stalinist heroes: voted for by Joseph Curran, Mike Quill, Harry Bridges, the Fur Workers delegation and, in a word, by every Stalinist and Stalinist sympathizer in the convention!

Furthermore, the Stalinists cannot pretend that they were caught off-guard. Every delegation in the convention had caucused, the previous night to decide their policy toward that red-baiting resolution; and also to decide their policy toward a proposal to vote for a motion to close off all debate immediately after introduction of the resolution. The Stalinists also voted—every last one of them—for that motion which prevented any debate on this red-baiting resolution.

And now the *Daily Worker*, with pious hypocrisy, deprecates that resolution. Why didn't the *Daily Worker's* comrades and heroes vote against closing debate, speak out against the resolution, and vote against it?

The Stalinists reds? No, they're yellow all the way through.

Why The Farmers Voted
Against RooseveltThey Repudiated The "New Deal" For the Same Reason
That They Voted Against Hoover In 1932

By PETER GRAVES
MINNEAPOLIS, Minn.—In the recent elections the farmers deserted the "New Deal" in droves. A bloc of seven Midwest farm states voted against Roosevelt, though the President had hoped his selection of Henry Wallace as running mate would again bring in the farm vote. Minnesota remained in the Roosevelt column only because of the heavy vote he received in the urban centers.

The election results came as a surprise to Wallace and his friends. Conservative farm leaders—including many in the Grange and the Farm Bureau—say the election indicates the ruggedly individualistic farmers wanted to be left alone, that they do not want or need any help in solving their problems.

Others like M. W. Thatcher (Democratic Party lobbyist in Farmers Union ranks) scurry about seeking a scapegoat. Interested in protecting Roosevelt at all costs, these people insist that somebody must have been disloyal.

WHY FARMERS SHIFTED

All such explanations are false. The true explanation is simple and exactly what it appears to be: the farmers have repudiated the New Deal because the New Deal was not solving the farmers' problems, because the New Deal was not doing enough for the farmers or was not doing the right things.

It is necessary to recall the recent political shifts in the farm vote. In 1932 the farmers really started hunting for a program to relieve their acute distress. They deserted Hoover and the Republicans, their traditional party, because they were disgusted with the lack of government assistance under Hoover and voted for Roosevelt. They hoped desperately that a fresh face like Roosevelt's would be able to cope with the problem of low farm prices, intolerable debt and interest burdens and the dispossession of thousands of tenants and delinquent borrowers.

In 1940 many farmers voted against Roosevelt, rather than in favor of Willkie whom they knew as a Wall Street man, because they were disappointed in what has been achieved.

WHERE BENEFITS
CAME FROM

Some thoughtful farmers realize that what little had been done in easing farm credit, in stopping some foreclosures, the few minor gestures of the Farm Security Administration in rehabilitating busted farmers and reestablishing tenant farmers on the land, had nothing to do with administration good-will. It was due entirely to the militant struggle of the farmers themselves, conducted under the leadership of the Farm Holiday Association and when the As-

sociation became defunct. Washington continued to fear its revival and extension.

Such measures as were won were pitifully inadequate. The relative stabilization of farm prices through the AAA, the Commodity Credit Corporation, etc., were not giving farmers parity income to cover costs of production. Farmers were still being forced off the land because of low farm prices. Technological advances such as tractor improvements, combines and power machinery generally, had actually made necessary larger farms for the most economical use of machinery. The discrimination by the AAA against small operators intensified this trend toward larger farmers, thus forcing more farmers off the land to eke out a dreadful existence on WPA in the villages.

Yes, the vote in the farm states indicates that the farmers are in a deep crisis and want to move towards a solution of their problems.

HOLIDAY COMMITTEES
POINTED THE WAY

If farm leaders had the courage and the sense to tell the truth, the farmers would—as they must eventually—realize that there is only one way in which they can find any answer to their problems. That answer was pointed out years ago by the old Holiday committees: a militant program of organized struggle, carried out together with the exploited workers of the cities, against the common enemy.

Such a program will require a clean sharp break with both the Democratic and Republican parties. Both old parties are owned and controlled by Wall Street and its Sixty Families. These outfits are two wings of the same bird of prey.

It is necessary for both urban workers and farmers to cease this silly jumping back and forth from the frying pan to the fire, to stop this meaningless journey from one old capitalist party to the other.

A NATIONAL LABOR PARTY!

What all the exploited must do is to unite in organizing their own national party independent of all alliances with all capitalist groups. What is needed is a national labor party controlled and manned and led by the organized workers and farmers.

Such a party need not repeat the errors of the old one-state "third" parties like the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party. The Farmer-Labor Party failed, not because it was too radical, but because it was not radical enough. Because opportunist leaders and professional politicians managed to take control of the organization away from the farm and labor organizations. Because such leaders

thought it was smart politics to seek an alliance with the New Deal. Because such leaders were willing to sell out the principles of the movement for temporary electoral successes, and received their just deserts by winding up without even the electoral successes.

STALINISTS SERVED
ROOSEVELT

These "practical" politicians, it must be recalled, had as their allies at that time the Communist Party, then the most ardent supporters of the New Deal (this was prior to the Hitler-Stalin pact). Thus, under the combined pressure of the politicians and the Communist Party, the Farmer-Labor Party was tied, as we said at that time, like a little dog to the New Deal. But farmers and workers were already then becoming disgusted with the inadequacy of the New Deal—they wanted a REAL program of concrete planks that would answer the most urgent of their immediate needs.

In an "Open Letter to Governor Benson," issued before the 1938 elections, the Socialist Workers Party pointed out such facts as these. We pleaded with the Farmer-Laborites that the party must be armed with a program that would inspire the party and its followers to the utmost efforts. This advice was ignored and the FLP was defeated.

In the 1940 elections the Socialist Workers Party, under the campaign name of the Trotskyist Anti-war Party, ran its own candidate for United States Senator in Minnesota. Dr. Grace Carlson. Dr. Carlson received 8,761 votes, more than the combined vote received by Norman Thomas and Earl Browder. Over half of Dr. Carlson's votes came from the counties outside the metropolitan areas. Several thousand farmers thus indicate they see that they must lock arms with the city workers to build a national labor party and set up a Workers and Farmers government in Washington.

This is the program that Dr. Carlson urged. Today only the most advanced workers and farmers, the vanguard, see the truth and logic in this program. Tomorrow, by the thousands and hundreds of thousands, the exploited will flock to such a banner.

The Socialist Workers Party calls upon the members of the Farmers Union to press within their organization for a national labor party, to break with the two old capitalist parties, who can give us all only increasing misery and war. Take the road forward with a national labor party!

Sailors Firm In Strike. . .

(Continued from Page 1)

strike. Finally they are indirectly appealing to Washington to embark on some kind of action against the Sailors Union.

This disloyal factionalism has characterized Stalinist policy from the outset of the strike two months ago. At that time, the SUP agreement with the operators had expired. Negotiations were getting nowhere. The SUP, although the union with more men involved in steamships work than all the other unions combined, held up action in order to consult with the other unions. It offered them a united front: joint strike action and no agreement signed until all unions had received satisfactory agreements.

The offer was neither accepted nor rejected, but in the meanwhile, without consulting the SUP, the MFWO and the Cooks and Stewards took strike votes and tied up the ships.

UNITED ACTION REFUSED

A few weeks later when it once again became clear that the shipowners were not at all disposed to grant any real concessions, the SUP once again appealed for united action. And once again the offer went begging. Finally after weeks of deadlock, with the large SUP steamship membership suffering most from the protracted strike, the Stalinist Maritime Federation leadership signed agreements for the MFWO and the MCS and the MEBA. Again without consulting the SUP.

The Firemen and Cooks and Stewards accepted wage increases of \$7.50 and \$5.00 respectively and five cents an hour overtime. The Engineers accepted a \$10 increase with ten cents an hour

overtime. The shipowners had made similar proposals two weeks after the strike started; they were accepted a month later.

It was therefore a tough gang that the SUP had to negotiate with when they tried to wrest some real demands for themselves. The shipowners laid the Firemen's agreement on the table, offered it plus a few changes in working conditions. Take it or leave it! Besides, they refused to negotiate any further until the SUP membership had expressed itself. The SUP membership did: by a two to one vote it turned down the offer. The Masters Mates and Pilots likewise turned down an offer for a \$10 monthly increase and ten cents an hour overtime.

The present position of the SUP is best stated by the Negotiations Committee which said in its report to the membership:

"... we are faced with a split strike (offshore vessels operating while steamshipers are tied up—Ed), with three CIO unions ready to return to work and willing to do anything they can to prevent the Sailors from making any real gains. We must also remember that a great deal of steamship cargo is still moving up and down the coast despite the strike (Cargo is moving in offshore vessels and by truck and rail—Ed) and that in the event we stay out we may not be able to prevent this. We are going to face a barrage of publicity charging us with prolonging the strike, and in the event of a protracted tie-up we are faced with a severe drain on our strike funds."

Thanks-to the Stalinists, they might have added.

Many 'Trotskyists'
Reported Seized By
Nazis In France

The London correspondent of the JEWISH EXAMINER reports, in its Nov. 22 issue, mass arrests of "Trotskyists" by the Nazis in France, as a good-will gesture to Stalin.

Suddenly, says the correspondent, "the Nazis have taken to arresting great numbers of Jewish workers and intellectuals in the German-held zones of France on the sole charge that they are Trotskyists. This, of course leaves but one interpretation: that the Nazis are making a dramatic effort to insinuate themselves in Stalin's good graces."

"London hears that the Soviet ruler is kept closely informed of this newest manifestation of Nazi friendship for him, and that he is assured by the Nazis that in their France Stalin's bitter foes will not be permitted to raise their heads."

"The oppressed class must support the oppressing class of its nation, when the latter is applying force in pursuit of its objective; but the oppressed class has not the right to make use of force in order to secure for itself a better situation in a society based on oppression. Thus reads the bourgeois criminal code."—Trotsky, *Whither England?* Page 39.

NOTEBOOK
Of an Agitator

Union Boy Gets Raise

Under the heading of "Trade Union Progress" or "Benefits of Organized Labor" we record the news that brother William Green was granted a wage increase by the AFL Convention from \$12,000 to \$20,000 per annum—and it is not Confederate money, either. Twenty grand is a nice piece of change any way you look at it, and the action of the convention shows what organized labor can do for a man who works neither with hand nor brain but only with the larynx.

Brother Green is not the only union boy who got something in his stocking a month before Christmas. Brother Meany, Secretary-Treasurer of the AFL, got raised from \$10,000 to 18,000. And that, as the saying goes, ain't hay. Green and Meany are still trailing behind John L. Lewis who is sacrificing his life for \$25,000 per year from the coal miners. Lewis swears by the Bible, especially that page where it says "The laborer is worthy of his hire"; and he is also strong for the other scriptural injunction, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn." Lewis treads heavily, has a big muzzle and needs a lot of corn. But even he has been nosed out in the race for big money by Tobin who got raised from \$20,000 to \$30,000 per year at the recent convention of the big hearted teamsters.

Topping them all, is brother Jimmy Petrillo, head of the Musicians, who doubles up on two jobs, drawing down \$20,000 as president of the Chicago local and \$15,000 as International President—a total of \$35 grand, and this of course doesn't include expenses and birthday presents. These are only a few who stand out conspicuously by the extraordinary size of their honoraria. The unions are lousy with run-of-the-mill labor skates who struggle along on ten grand or so in regular salaries. Sidney Hillman, for example, puts up a poor mouth and does the best he can on \$12,500 per annum.

Who's against these wage scales which enable the labor leaders to keep body and soul together and have a little spending money in their pockets at all times? Many appealing arguments can be made and have been made for providing the labor leaders with a standard of living to which the rank and file are not accustomed:

(1) It gives the workers a sense of vicarious satisfaction to see their servants living on the fat of the land—they feel rich by proxy.

(2) It is a form of insurance to the unions against their representatives keeling over from malnutrition in the very midst of a conference with the bosses.

(3) It puts them on the same social plane as the bosses and frees them from inferiority complexes.

(4) It keeps them—or ought to keep them—from stealing from the union treasury.

Another important thing to remember is that Green got his raise without striking for it. In fact on the very day (or the day after) he opened his pay envelop and discovered eight thousand extra dollars peeping out at him, he was sounding off against strikes in "defense" industries in general, and the Vultee strike in particular.

On the same day (or the day after) he got his raise our hero pinned his ears back, oiled up his throat and gave out an oratorical and oracular pronouncement in favor of the "capitalist system." And no doubt he meant it sincerely, insofar as he knew what he was talking about. He was speaking from a practical and personal standpoint. Green, of course, is hardly a profound student of the history and anatomy of social systems, their origins, development, decline and replacement by others. This couldn't be expected of him. Since he quit coal mining 50 odd years ago his time has been pretty well taken up with preaching, praying, orating and drawing his pay check.

Green may not know much about the historical, philosophical and theoretical aspects of "the capitalist system," but he has got a damned good hunch about the practical side of the question. What he lacks in knowledge of the law of value and the automatic regulation of prices, he makes up in mother-wit and good old fashioned horse sense; and he figures that a system which makes it possible for a man to simply open his mouth, lean back on his haunches and below at regular intervals that "all is well," and then find an annual check for twenty thousand in his hand—that is a first class system no matter what you call it.

So far, so good. The workers who pay the bill are not stingy, they might as well be broke as the way they are, the fat salaries make the labor leaders happy and may keep them from stealing, so what the hell!

What These Salaries Actually Do

The main hitch is that the ten-twenty-thirty thousand a year salaries for the labor leaders provide them a standard of living far removed from that of the rank and file of the workers. The leaders live like petty-bourgeoisie, and not so petty at that, and soon cease to think like the poverty-stricken masses who have the dubious blessing of capitalism interpreted to them in the shape of inadequate diet, restricted educational possibilities for their children, unemployment, eviction notices and the policeman's club on the picket line.

Every once in a while this glaring contrast between the over-fed leaders and the under-fed masses is expressed in the most dramatic form. The concurrence of Green's raise of salary to \$20,000 per year and the strike of the Vultee workers against a wage scale of 50c. per hour was such an occasion. The workers went on strike, said nuts to the threats and pleas that they keep slaving at the old rate "in the interests of national defense," and inched up their pitiful wages to 62½ cents. Green denounces the strike, praised the system which exploits and enslaves the masses, and calmly drew down a hike on his pay check from twelve thousand to twenty thousand per year.

They were both right—in their way. Only, they were each speaking from opposite sides of the picket line. The Vultee strikers spoke for themselves—and for their oppressed class for whom "all" is not "well" by a long shot. Green spoke for himself—as an agent of the exploiting class operating in the labor movement. That is why they could not find a common language on the question of strikes.

There is a lesson in this coincidence. No doubt, Green deserves his twenty grand. But why should the workers pay it? That's where the swindle comes in.