

VOTE SOCIALIST!
NORMAN THOMAS
FOR PRESIDENT

Workers Age

Weekly Paper of the Independent Labor League of America

HOW CAN THIS WAR BE TURNED INTO A "CIVIL WAR" by F. Brockway page 4
THE A. F. L. AND UNEMPLOYMENT by George L. Meany page 2

Vol. 9, No. 29.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JULY 27, 1940.

5 CENTS

Norman Thomas Denounces Peace-Time Conscription

By NORMAN THOMAS

(We publish below the statement of Norman Thomas, socialist leader and candidate for President, before the Senate Military Affairs Committee—Editor.)

ON August 30, 1938, the New York Herald-Tribune carried an article headed "Senator Burke Praises Hitler and Nazi Rule as He Returns." The article which is in substance an interview with the Senator on his return from Europe, directly quotes him, among other things, as saying: "In the things Hitler is actually doing to bring about the well-being of the entire German people, I think he is greater than Bismarck."

It is symbolically appropriate and significant that it is a Senator holding these sentiments who is author and sponsor of the proposal for peace-time military conscription which your committee is now considering. For no proposal could be more in line with fascist regimentation and less in accord with American tradition and the American way of life than this bill.

I am aware that an elaborate effort is being made by powerful men and forces in this country to represent the bill as somehow valuable for democratic discipline and the inculcation of loyalty. The sufficient answer is to be found in the history of all great nations which have adopted conscription. Not one of you will seriously tell me or the American people that military conscription has made for democracy in Japan, Russia, Germany or Italy, or preserved democracy and eradicated disloyalty in France, Belgium or Holland. You will not tell me that the youth of conscript Europe are superior to the youth of comparatively free America. For individuals, military conscription is not freedom but serfdom; its equality is the equality of slaves.

No people would endure peace-time military conscription, its costs, its regimentation and its compulsion, for a single day except under the bitter constraint of real or alleged necessity for defense. Defense is a legitimate and necessary consideration of every government. But the United States, thanks to geography and history, is not in the position of France and Great Britain, much less of Switzerland. Unless we are to go in for foreign military adventures, we are concerned for a relatively easy defense primarily to be entrusted to the navy, the air force and the highly trained operators of mechanized warfare. For these services, no nation in the world looks to conscripts, called up for eight months or a year's service. It is the unanimous verdict of competent observers that it was the highly-skilled, mechanized units of Germany which crushed the best of the old armies based on universal military training—the French.

But this is by no means the major objection to this bill or the whole idea of peace-time military conscription. Unquestionably, we live in a world of risks. These risks include some danger from foreign foes against which we should guard. But for our America, the greatest danger is not conquest by Hitler, but the adoption of Hitlerism in the name of democracy. Conscription, whatever may be the hopes and intentions of some of its present supporters, is a nation potentially as powerful and aggressive as ours, is a road leading straight to militarism, imperialism and ultimately to American fascism and war.

Conscription jeopardizes the rights of labor. It gives reaction an instrument of repression. The Burke bill, or any probable modification of it, if it became law, would be administered in accordance with regulations already drawn up by the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee. The provisions for deferred service are very important. Class II (the deferred class) will include the highly skilled, who would be more valuable to the war machine as workers than as soldiers. To enter a claim for occupational deferment, a worker will have to submit two affidavits, one by his immediate superior, another by the executive head of the enterprise

(Continued on page 2)

Pan-American Trade Unity Faces Grave Difficulties

Hemisphere Cooperation Vital But Must Avoid "Big Stick"

THAT the United States cannot look upon a Nazi victory in Europe with equanimity is as readily seen by the anti-war forces as by Mr. Stimson himself. The most pressing problem is not the slight possibility of immediate Nazi military attack on this hemisphere, but the political menace involved in Nazi economic penetration of Latin America by barter and blocked-currency blackmail. For some time, the Administration has been considering plans to organize the U.S.A., Canada and all Latin America into a closed economy to counter such a drive. When France collapsed in mid-June and the conquest of Britain became an imminent possibility, the time seemed ripe to produce a concrete plan to isolate the western hemisphere.

MAIN FEATURES OF THE PLAN

The plan, worked out by obscure government economists and filtered thru the agile brain of Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle, was announced simultaneously by the White House and the Departments of State, Commerce, Treasury and Agriculture. It consisted of a preliminary outline for a hemisphere cartel, a complex U.S.-financed, \$2,000,000,000 incorporation of the entire foreign trade of North and South America (including Canada). The cartel would be a master holding company controlling lesser corporations organized as hemisphere pools of such individual commodities as coffee, cotton and oil. It would be directed from Washington by a board of ten, only three of whom would be from outside the U.S.A. All the export surpluses in the Americas would be bought up, and marketed abroad on American terms. If no acceptable market could be found, surpluses would be dumped in the ocean to prevent Adolf Hitler from using Dr. Schacht's blocked currencies to feed Europe and gain a political foothold in the western hemisphere. In turn, U.S. credits to Latin America would be blocked whenever possible. President Roosevelt gave specific assurances that no Latin American agricultural surpluses would be thrown into the U.S. domestic market to distress the midwest and southern farmers. It is generally assumed that

Hitler, if he does succeed in conquering Britain this Summer, will organize Europe into a similar trading unit controlled from Berlin. Obviously, the Far East will soon be operated as a Japanese corporation. Soviet Russia has always traded in world markets as a closed corporation. Thus, a western-hemisphere cartel would round out an entirely new world trade structure consisting of four gigantic companies.

The obstacles in the path to pan-American cartelization have been under-emphasized. It has been too easy to assume that all South America would jump at the chance. Yet recently Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay decided to send only minor officials rather than their foreign ministers to this month's Pan-American Conference in Havana where preliminary discussion of the cartel holds top place on the agenda. The most important governments of Latin America, indisposed to anger a winner, fearful of any hint of Yankee imperialism, and mindful of the prospects of huge sales of foodstuffs to hungry Europe, are wary of tying themselves down. Argentina, always anxious to challenge U.S. leadership, may try to form a trade block of her own to deal with Europe.

Aside from political obstacles, which may by themselves prove insurmountable, there are tremendous financial and economic difficulties involved. Latin America must literally export or die. Her sales to Europe normally comprise more than half her annual export total of close to \$1,250,000,000. Between 15% and 20% go to Germany proper. About a third come north to the U.S.A. Before the war, Nazi Germany, by virtue of a tremendous drive waged in accordance with Dr. Schacht's strategies, coupled with huge Latin American surpluses, had acquired a strong trade position—ahead of the U.S.A. in Brazil—largely at the expense of the British. A final Nazi victory would mean that Germany will control all European buying. Whether Latin Americans will be willing to leave their export trade to the discretion of the U.S.A. depends on what guarantees and concessions the U.S.A. is willing to grant.

Roosevelt 'Drafts' Self for Third Term, Repudiates Democratic 'Peace' Pledge

Hitler Tells Britain to Sue For Peace or Lose Empire

Reichstag Address Regarded as Prelude to Direct Assault; Washington-London Rift on Closing of the Burma Road

The day on which the total German attack on Britain would be launched seemed to be near last week as Chancellor Hitler, addressing a hastily summoned session of the Reichstag, warned that if the British did not "listen to reason" and sue for peace, the result would be war to the death, with the annihilation of one or the other. "Churchill may believe it will be Germany," he added, "but I know it will be Britain." The Nazi Fuehrer disclaimed all desire to destroy the British empire and characterized his remarks as "one more and final appeal to reason in England."

The reference to Britain came at the close of the long address, mainly devoted to a review of German military operations up to the conquest of France. Of particular importance was Hitler's emphatic declaration that Russo-German relations were "firmly established" and their "respective spheres of interest" had been "clearly defined" despite British attempts to sow dissension between the two allies. Hitler also made some very cordial references to Italy and Mussolini. There was not a single reference to the United States or to President Roosevelt, however, in striking contrast to Hitler's former practice.

Official Britain met the Nazi ultimatum with silence. The general reaction seemed to be that Hitler had said nothing new, nothing that could change the government's policy of fighting to the bitter end. But

rumors of behind-the-scenes peace feelers—entirely unofficial in character, of course—persisted.

Meanwhile, fighting in the air and on the sea continued last week, the forty-sixth of the war. The British and German air forces intensified their aerial attacks, and in the Mediterranean the British reported important successes over the Italians. But these actions were merely preliminary to the decisive assault on Britain which, it was universally felt, could not be far off.

The closing of the Burma road—one of China's main munitions supply routes—was reported in the House of Commons last week and justified by Winston Churchill himself. The Prime Minister told the House that the purpose of the act was twofold: (1) to "relieve tension with Japan" while Britain was fighting a life-or-death struggle at home; and (2) to provide an interval during which China and Japan might "arrive at a settlement." He said Britain was ready to consider abolition of extraterritoriality in China, return of British concessions, and revision of treaties regarded as "unequal."

Mr. Churchill's words made it clear that Britain was embarking on a policy of "appeasing" Japan, at least for the time being, during the acute emergency of the war. In Washington, Secretary of State Hull issued a statement criticizing the closing of the Burma road as "an

unwarranted obstacle to world trade." There was much speculation as to the significance of this declaration for it appeared to put the United States at odds with both Britain and Japan. Did it mark a break in the unofficial but open cooperation on Far Eastern policy between the United States and Great Britain? There were some who regarded the incident as possibly as significant as the historic break between Washington and London on January 1932, when London refused

(Continued on Page 2)

What Price Party Platform?

THIS more or less meaningless plank [on foreign policy adopted by the Republican convention] left the candidate free to formulate his own stand on foreign policy. Similarly, a strong peace plank in the Democratic platform would not seriously handicap Roosevelt . . . as the Democratic candidate. "Platforms, being temporary vote-catching devices, are customarily forgotten almost before the convention bunting is taken down." —Marquis W. Childs, New York Post, July 9, 1940. "The isolationists are gleeful over the peace plank, but their satisfaction will inevitably be short-lived, since platform pledges are hardly remembered after the ink is dry." —Marquis W. Childs, New York Post, July 18, 1940.

Convention in Revolt Over Running Mate

Platform Includes Statement Against Foreign Wars, Endorsement of New Deal

Chicago, Ill.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was nominated for the presidency of the United States for the third time by the Democratic party at its convention here last week. This precedent-breaking action was taken by the delegates on the first ballot by "acclamation," Mr. Roosevelt receiving 946 of a total of 1,100 votes. Three other candidates were placed in nomination—James Farley, John N. Garner and Millard Tydings—largely as a form of protest against the third-term movement, but they received only a scattering vote. The next day, Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace, the President's own choice, was named for the vice-presidency.

The Democratic gathering was unquestionably the most thoroughly bossed convention in American political history—bossed by remote control by President Roosevelt from the White House thru Harry Hopkins and other third-term managers (some newspapermen wondered whether "messengers" was not the better word) in Chicago. On the eve of the nominations, the President had Senator Barkley, permanent chairman, present to the convention a statement that he "has never had and has not today any desire or purpose to continue in the office of the President, to be a candidate for that office, or to be nominated by the convention for that office." From these words, the delegates well understood that Mr. Roosevelt was a candidate and was ready to "submit" to a "draft." After that, the nomination was inevitable.

For at bottom, the delegates were in a position where they simply had to choose Mr. Roosevelt as their candidate. So successfully had the President blocked the build-up of other presidential possibilities that only with him as standard-bearer could the party hope to win in November, especially against so strong a Republican candidate as Willkie. But the resentment of the delegates at the rigid overhead control from the White House broke thru with surprising force when it came to selecting a candidate for vice-president. Mr. Roosevelt's agents let it be known that Henry A. Wallace had been hand-picked for that post. Then the revolt was on. Speaker Bankhead, Jesse Jones and Paul McNutt were nominated in opposition, the latter two without their consent. The feeling was high, the tension extreme. Boos for Wallace and cheers for the rival candidates gathered force as the proceedings continued. Protests against "control from the top down" were voiced and bitter complaints that it was not a "free and open convention." There was no mistaking the sentiments of the delegates or the gallery. Nevertheless, on the roll-call vote, the Roosevelt steamroller, the somewhat limping, managed to put Wallace over, tho' without the help of the unit rule. He was nominated by a vote of 627 to 328 for Bankhead, the runner-up. It was no secret that Mr. Wallace, especially vulnerable because formerly a Republican, had received the votes of a majority of the delegates only because Mr. Roosevelt had demanded it and had virtually made it a condition of his own acceptance.

The renomination of Mr. Roosevelt followed the adoption of a platform which was reported to the convention by Senator Wagner and adopted against a few negative votes. The platform was reported out from the committee unanimously but only after sharp disagreements on the foreign-policy plank had been "ironed out." From the very beginning, it was obvious that the sentiment of the convention, reflecting the mood of the people back home, was strongly in favor of a pronounced "peace" plank that would help remove the stigma of "war party" from the Democrats. In his keynote address, Speaker Bankhead carefully skirted around the Administration foreign policy and made strenuous efforts to depict the President as an upholder of neutrality and a foe to intervention. The foreign-policy sub-committee continued the trend an' drew up a plank at many points at variance with the Administration's course. Before this sub-committee and before the full platform committee, vigorous protests were raised by Senator Pepper, Secretary of Agriculture Wal-

(Continued on Page 2)

A FINE RECOMMENDATION



F.D.R. Arms Drive Seen Perilling Civil Rights

Civil Liberties Union Warns Against New Wave of Repression, Intolerance

New York City agencies engaged in protecting civil rights been confronted with such an array of threatened measures of repression. Added to the federal measures are local enactments and orders, mob violence and hasty formation of citizens committees dedicated to stamping out "subversive influences."

During the past year, the report pointed out, the United States Supreme Court handed down a series of decisions favorable to the rights of citizens, the Department of Justice moved to protect these rights, collective bargaining progressed favorably, strikes declined and there were few cases in the courts involving civil liberties. On the other hand, the report assailed pending federal restrictive legislation and deplored the flagrant decision of the Supreme Court, President Roosevelt's order of last September to the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate "subversive" activities, the continuation of the Dies Committee's investigations, and the mob violence against Jehovah Witnesses. Activities of self-styled "patriotic" organizations continued last year, the report declared. "An inquiry of the Union's correspondents in forty-six states, made in the Spring of 1940, showed agreement on the American Legion as the most active agency of interference with civil rights. The Legion has taken first place in this canvass continuously for several years. In only two instances was the Legion reported as opposing what may be characterized as fascist movements. While there is no formal connection between the Legion and native fascist organizations of the character of the Bund, the Silver Shirts and the Klan, a community of interest brings them together in attacks on radicals and militant labor!"

(Continued on Page 2)

ECONOMIC DIFFICULTIES

However, the basic economic obstacles in the way of the plan are not German. Most important is the fact that too many Latin American, Canadian and U.S. products compete with each other in export markets. Europe normally gets 93% of Argentina's meat, 80% of her corn, most of her wheat, 40% of her hides. Europe also buys 40% of Brazil's coffee and most of her cotton. The rest of Latin American trade follows a similar pattern. Cotton is the leading export product of the U.S. Wheat is Canada's biggest export.

In addition, Latin America is encumbered by unmarketable surpluses as is the U.S.A. Governments have been forced to grant export subsidies. Not long ago, Brazil was burning coffee for the same reason Iowa farmers slaughtered little pigs and threw them away. Among current unmarketable hemisphere surpluses outside the U.S.A. which the cartel would have to buy are the following: in Argentina, 20,000,000 bushels of wheat, 300,000,000 bushels of corn, 500,000,000 pounds of beef; in Brazil, 400,000 bales of cotton, 1,700,000,000 pounds of coffee; in Cuba, 1,000,000 tons of sugar; in Uruguay, 120,000,000 pounds of beef; in Canada, 300,000,000 bushels of wheat, 70,000,000 pounds of pork and bacon. A good part of these surpluses are the result of the European blockade.

The practical problem to be faced is whether the nations of Latin America, or even Canada, would refuse bargain offers from a Nazi Europe for these staggering surpluses in favor of adherence to a U. S.-administered barter agency—which would be, in reality, the controlling instrument of U.S. foreign policy. It is now common knowledge that Nazi agents, on the assumption that Britain will collapse or capitulate before the end of the Summer, are offering German goods at bargain rates for delivery in Brazil, Argentina and elsewhere by October. A few orders are even reported to have been placed.

To make the inter-American cartel work, assuming that Latin America can be persuaded to cooperate, will require strict control of hemisphere agricultural produc-

tion—a complex matter when the wheat fields and cotton fields of Argentina, Canada and Brazil are added to those of the U.S.A. Among the implications of the plan is the possibility that U. S. taxpayers may be called upon to pay the Brazilian farmer to plough under his cotton acres, the Argentine farmer to refrain from planting wheat, or the Uruguayan rancher to slaughter his cattle just to get rid of them. Nor would it be any great surprise if U.S. farmers objected to the purchase of competing agricultural products with their own money, despite the President's promise that no foreign surpluses will be dumped in the U.S.A. The whole plan becomes reminiscent of the most un-economic aspects of the A.A.A.

No announcements have been made regarding penalties that might be applied against countries that violated such an agreement after entering it, or what coercive measures, if any, might be taken against countries that decline to adhere to the plan in the first place. Since the Administration plan seems to imply economic dictation from Washington, it might again become the duty of the U.S. navy and marine corps to police Latin America.

TOWARDS A PAN-AMERICAN ECONOMY

Any attempt to develop a sound pan-American economy must first remove Latin American fears of a repetition of the Dollar Diplomacy which supported ruthless private exploitation of their resources and made the ground fertile for "Fifth Columnists" long before Hitler had them. Pan-American economic cooperation and integration are desirable even without a Nazi menace. To meet the real challenge to U.S. democracy, it must be achieved without resort to the brutal regimentation of Nazism. A pan-American cartel, undertaken as protection against totalitarianism, is obviously a failure from the start if it operates on the old imperialist principle.

Whatever else may be necessary to such a cartel, the first requisite would seem to be increased purchases of Latin American goods by the U.S.A. and increased assistance in the unselfish development of Latin American resources. The fact too easily overlooked in a wave of Good-Neighbor rhetoric is that the U.S.A. normally does not buy enough to shake out the foreign exchange necessary for Latin America to pay for U.S. goods. Latin Americans raise the foreign exchange from their own sales in Europe. Since, one after the other, all their European markets outside the British Isles have been blockaded, their purchases in the U.S.A. have lagged in recent months.

At the same time plans were

A.F.L. and Unemployment

By GEORGE MEANY

(These paragraphs are from an address delivered recently by Mr. Meany, who is secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor.—Editor)

THE breath-taking speed of world developments, the very suddenness with which we have been brought face to face with the necessities for national defense, have blurred our understanding of the implications and consequences of unemployment, have confused the issue, have in fact shifted the problem itself out of focus of national attention. These developments have aroused in the ranks of labor a growing and insistent realization that the nation must not permit itself to be blinded to the basic wants of its people by the lightning flashes of aggressive warfare abroad, that the roll of the thunder of destruction must not drown out the call for remedy of our most fundamental organic needs.

UNEMPLOYMENT THE TEST OF DEMOCRACY

On the ability of the American people to end unemployment depends the future course of the nation and the very survival of our democratic institutions. The strength of a democracy must be measured by the strength of all its citizens. Our political and social fabric is only as strong as the cloth in the shabby coat of the workers to whom society fails to give the opportunity to earn a living. The idleness of men, machines and capital has been eating into the very texture of our society for the past ten years.

Our economy must be brought to full activity for it is our economic strength which will determine our national strength. Full employment must be attained before all else.

The job which is to be done and which we shall do is one which calls for earnest and practical cooperation of labor, management and government. The time has come for us to demonstrate to the world that a more thorough job in liquidating unemployment, one which yields lasting and permanent results, can be achieved. This we can do if we define our goal and develop a common agreement as to the most effective methods of attack as well as to the rights, obligations and duties of each group. A general agreement as to our objectives must be made specific. A general accord as to what is to be done must be reduced to a concrete program, a week-by-week schedule necessary to carry out and complete the task.

HOW BIG IS UNEMPLOYMENT?

Let us determine the size of the task before us. What is the extent of our unemployment today? On the basis of the data available from government sources, the American Federation of Labor estimates that more than 10 billion persons are still without normal private employment today. This means that more than 10 million persons are in industry, agriculture and trade and are denied opportunity to earn a living thru productive activity.

Several unemployment estimates have been maintained by different agencies and institutions over a period of years. Some of these estimates place the figure of total unemployment considerably higher than our estimate, while others estimate the unemployment to be slightly less. Allowing for the differences due solely to the varying definitions of unemployment and the consequent inclusion or exclusion of certain groups, all of the estimates continued over a period of years by reputable institutions show amazing similarity in their final results.

Pan-American Unity Faces Difficulties

(Continued from Page 1)

threatened by the possible developments of the war.

Manganese production in Cuba and Brazil could be increased to a degree close to hemisphere self-sufficiency. The U.S. buys 99% of its tin in the Netherlands Indies and Malaya, but Bolivia could easily produce enough to fill American needs. Investment in a hemisphere smelting industry would accomplish it. Increased production and purchases from Latin American chromium, platinum and tungsten mines would strengthen a hemisphere economy; so would increased purchases of cacao in Latin America instead of Africa, and the development of vegetable fibres. It would not take many years to develop subsidiary sources of rubber in Brazil and Central America. Such measures should be at least as important in hemisphere economic cooperation as an export cartel.

Approached in some such way, the problem of a hemisphere economy is not incapable of solution along democratic lines. And solved along democratic lines it must be if it is not to prove self-defeating as a program of defense against totalitarianism.

Read—Spread
WORKERS AGE

who insist that unemployment is practically non-existent and that these estimates are a mere flight of fancy of those who make them. The final answer to these allegations will be found in the 1940 census, which is now being completed. But even before the census results become available, we can rest our case not only on the reasonableness and reliability of our method of making the estimate, but also on many indisputable factual sources which substantiate our general conclusions.

In 1937, when business and industrial activity exceeded the 1939 levels, a voluntary registration of those unemployed showed that in the country as a whole more people were unemployed than our estimate counted at the time. The active file of the United States Employment Service, despite the extremely incomplete and limited coverage of employment-service facilities, contains a register of more than six million people actively seeking work. This and much other corroborating evidence cannot be lightly brushed aside any more than the known and very real presence of unemployed wage earners in individual communities can be overlooked.

DO THE UNEMPLOYED WANT TO WORK?

More and more often, we hear in public discussion and read in newspapers the opinion that not only the amount of existing unemployment is grossly exaggerated, but that those who are unemployed don't really want to work and are not seeking employment. Such allegations merely reflect the wishful thinking of those far removed from the plight of the man in the street, those who close their eyes to the realities distasteful to them and shirk their responsibilities in providing a remedy. Or sometimes such expressions are carefully and cleverly calculated by special pleaders to confuse the real issues and to conceal the real facts.

What are the real facts? Do the unemployed hunt for jobs, or do the jobs hunt for the unemployed? Recently, the Department of Sanitation of the City of New York announced that 2,500 jobs would be available under civil service for "sanitation men." Not less than

85,000 men applied for these jobs, and by March 1940, 75,000 had taken the civil-service written examination to qualify for physical examination still to be held. The Brewster Aeronautical Corporation announced last February that it would interview applicants for 250 jobs to be made available at its new aircraft plant in Newark. To tell you what happened, I will quote from the account published in the New York Times:

"NEWARK, N. J., Feb. 26.—Nearly 20,000 job-seekers, some of whom had been shivering in the chill blast of the mowdowns here since 1 a. m., besieged the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation at Newark airport this morning.

"Amazed at the turn-out, officials of the company announced that only 250 jobs were available, which would be filled for a month. Within six months, they said, the force would be increased to 1,500. The concern, which has a plant in Long Island City, recently leased the municipal hangar here for the manufacture of aircraft.

"A vanguard began to assemble at 1 a. m. The chill darkness became dotted with fires that were later extinguished by airport police, who feared damage to the hangar. The early birds then huddled against the giant shed.

"By 6 a. m., two hours before the company opened its offices, thousands were packed around the hangar. As the morning drew on, highways became jammed with automobiles bearing job-hunters. Traffic was snarled for several miles north and south of the field."

These are just two examples, but they could be multiplied by examples taken from every community in every part of our country. They prove beyond dispute that the demand for jobs by the unemployed is very great. The desire of those unemployed to find work and to earn a decent living in private industry is as genuine as the distress of unemployment and the anguish of insecurity suffered by them and their families.

(The second part, dealing with the A. F. of L.'s program of meeting the unemployment problem, will appear in the next issue of this paper.—Editor)

R.C.A. Strike Fiasco Under Stalinist Lead

CIO Communication Union Takes Irresponsible Action In Walk-Out

By JACK BROADANDWALL

CRIMINALLY inept leadership was again responsible for a strike fiasco in a Stalinist controlled union. This time Mervyn Rathbone's American Communications Association was involved.

Despite the worst crisis in the history of the communications industry, the C.I.O. union leaders ordered the workers to leave their machines in the middle of the day to attend a meeting where they were to ask why negotiations with the Radio Corporation of America were not proceeding more rapidly.

Increases had been requested totalling \$500,000 for workers whom the A.C.A.'s circulars previously had termed the best paid in the "Street." R.C.A. offered \$139,000 as against \$55,000 recently gained by approximately the same number of Mackay workers.

Considering the fact that normally R.C.A.'s business was 9,000 to 11,000 messages a day, while the day before the strike it amounted only to 6,200, due to European war conditions, the action of R.C.A. leaders in staging a walk-out intended to be a demonstration but which turned out to be a lock-out must be characterized as utter recklessness typical of Stalinist methods.

Not all the workers walked out. Demands of the union included the firing of those who remained at work and pay for time lost in the lock-out.

At the end of ten days the strike was settled upon the original offer of \$139,000 with wage increases. The company also granted a bonus of \$25,000 for the year 1940, which came to less than the time lost thru the walk-out. And instead of discharging those who had remained at work, R.C.A. promoted them!

Mackay workers helped the strikers, altho the consensus of opinion among communications workers was that it was a bad business. The effect on Western Union radio workers whom A.C.A. had been trying to organize can easily be imagined.

Millions Still Lack Old-Age Protection

Many Groups Are Deprived of All Benefits

New York City.

MILLIONS of aged Americans are still without adequate old-age protection despite revision of the Social Security Act. More than a third of all persons over 65 have neither jobs nor pension provisions of any kind. Most of these, totaling more than 2½ million, are dependent on their children, relatives or friends, or are on relief. Such are the main findings of the Public Affairs Pamphlet, "Pensions After Sixty," by Maxwell S. Stewart, published recently by the Public Affairs Committee here.

Among the needy aged listed as being denied protection under the Social Security Act are: (1) those whose irregular work who cannot qualify for old-age insurance; (2) those disabled by sickness or accident before reaching the age of 65; (3) the wives and widows of older men who have not themselves reached 65; and (4) those excluded from old-age insurance because they happen to be employed on farms, as

domestic servants or in non-profit organizations.

As a consequence of these gaps in old-age security, the United States is seen faced with demands which threaten the country's welfare. It is estimated that the adoption of the Townsend Plan, for example, would cost nearly \$29,000,000,000 a year, or close to half the national income. As against this, the transaction tax proposed by Townsend advocates would yield about \$6,200,000,000 a year, leaving about \$23,000,000,000 to be raised some other way. The General Welfare Act, California's "Ham-and-Eggs" plan, and some of the other panaceas, altho less expensive, would also impose an intolerable burden on the national economy. No justification is found for the contention that the payment of huge pensions would greatly increase the nation's prosperity.

Altho granting that the panacea proposals have aided in achieving such provisions as are now made for the aged, warning is given against aiding the aged and ignoring the unemployed and other groups in need of relief.

"We should guard against the idea that our present provisions for the aged are adequate merely because they are better than they were a few years ago," Mr. Stewart concludes, "but we should also be on guard lest our sympathy lead us to adopt proposals which threaten our national prosperity, or work to the disadvantage of the sick, the disabled, the unemployed, dependent children or other groups in need of help."

Abstract ideas of liberty, equality and free progress that inspired the sincere men among the middle classes of 1789-1793, it is the practical embodiment of these ideas that counts. Into what deeds shall be translated the abstract idea? By that alone can we find its true measure.

"If, then, it is only fair to admit that the middle classes of 1789 were inspired by ideas of liberty, equality (before the law) and political and religious freedom, we must also admit that these ideas, as soon as they took shape, began to develop exactly on the lines we have sketched: liberty to utilize the riches of nature for personal aggrandizement, as well as liberty to exploit human labor without any safeguard for the victims of such exploitation; and political freedom organized so as to assure freedom of exploitation to the middle classes." (P. Rotchkim, "The Great French Revolution")

The abstract ideals of the French Revolution have given way to these conditions which prevail in every capitalist nation today and thruout every colonial empire. Behind the ideals of the French Revolution, imperialist France has won the support of the French masses to build the second largest colonial empire in existence. The French peasants and workers did not want colonies. They saw no sense in "expensive" wars in the uttermost corners of the earth. The French people have always been taught to think that the role of their country in its overseas possessions was to build up the native races in the French image. However, this liberal attitude has not lightened the horrible burden of exploitation placed on the backs of the French colonial masses. In Algeria, France's oldest possession, the French and Algerians mix socially. Nevertheless, the natives have been dispossessed of two-thirds of the cultivable land by the whites. France, forty-two million people, rules over sixty-five million colonial peoples. In a Chamber of Deputies of 618 members, Algeria had ten representatives while the rest of the empire was allotted seven. The facade of French democracy evidently had little effect in determining or swaying French colonial policies.

To argue that French colonial subjects should be denied full citizenship and the franchise until they have become "assimilated" is simply to argue that the broad masses of French colonials are incapable of intelligently administering their own affairs and should therefore not be entrusted with democratic rights. This argument is as old as history. It was employed by the slave-holders and reactionaries of the South who were opposed to granting the American Negro the full rights of citizenship. Slaves will never be "mature" or "intelligent" enough to deserve freedom in the eyes of their masters!

(Continued in the next issue)

Hitler Tells Britain to Submit or Die

(Continued from page 1)

to go along with Secretary of State Stimson on his "vigorous" Manchurian diplomacy. The prevailing opinion in informed circles, however, did not go quite that far.

The Far Eastern situation was further complicated by the forced resignation of the Yonai cabinet in Tokyo under army pressure, apparently because its policy towards Britain and the United States was regarded as insufficiently "firm." A one-party government of the military-fascist type, headed by Prince Konoye, was expected to follow.

The main action of State Department was turned in another direction last week, towards the Pan-American Conference at Havana. Secretary Hull, departing with his staff for Cuba, indicated that among the political and economic problems of the western hemisphere that would arise would be the disposition of New World possessions of conquered European countries, means of combating German-Italian-Japanese trade-barter systems, and resistance to "Fifth Column" activities. Even before the conference opened, it seemed destined to turn out a failure. The most

French Colonial System Kept Masses in Bitter Slavery

"Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" Meant Nothing to Negroes

By CLARENCE JENKINS

THE overwhelming majority of the Negro people in the United States are opposed to American intervention in the present war in Europe. The tragic lessons of that last World War have convinced them that they have nothing to gain by supporting another crusade to "save democracy." Despite this mass sentiment and the lessons of experience, sections of Negro intellectuals in Britain, France and the United States have initiated an international propaganda campaign to mobilize the Negro masses in the present struggle with the fascist imperialist powers.

The Pittsburgh Courier, one of the most rampant pro-war Negro newspapers in the United States, is waging a vigorous propaganda in the armed forces of the United States. Before the French collapse, Walter R. Merguson, European war correspondent for the Courier, transmitted glowing message from Senegalese soldiers to their "racial brothers" in the United States. Mr. Merguson, it would be well to note, was working with the French war-propaganda agency.

The "five-for-France" campaign, which had its headquarters at Atlanta University, was conducting a drive to collect five cents from students of various Negro universities, schools and colleges "to give, something, no matter how little, to the brave Senegalese and West Indian soldiers who are fighting to save the noblest country in Europe." Behind this drive were such educators and intellectuals as W. E. D. Bois, Ira De A. Reid, Countee Cullen, Alain Locke, V. B. Spratlin and a host of others.

DEFENSE OF FRENCH IMPERIALISM

In the March 1940 issue of the Crisis, George Padmore presented a well-documented expose of British and French colonial policies and the horrible conditions of exploitation and repression thruout the French and British empires. This expose provoked considerable discussion in this country and abroad, some comment appearing even in the important West African Review. In the June issue of the Crisis, there were published two articles in reply, one by Louis T. Achilles and the other by Harold Moody and W. B. Mumford, both defending French and British colonial policies.

Moody and Mumford's argument is self-refuting and warrants no serious consideration here. However, Mr. Achilles does raise several points that agitate the minds of millions of Negroes.

In an imposing argument entitled, "Upward to Citizenship in the French Empire," Mr. Achilles

argues: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity! It is behind this still progressive slogan of the French Revolution that the various races and peoples of the French empire are uniting today more than ever, in order to protect and improve the most human form of colonial relationship that has ever existed in modern history.

"Democratic rights have been proclaimed by the French Revolution itself to be inalienable and innate to man. But the practical exercise of such rights in the particularly elaborate and extensive governmental set-up of a modern democracy, requires an apprenticeship that has not been fully acquired by the white democracies. Would it seem reasonable for France to assimilate to the Parisian or the Guadeloupean voter, the African, Madagascan or Indo-Chinese subjects, who cannot speak the language used in the Palais-Bourbon, are not familiar with the past history of France, who, because of their general inability to read, are out of touch with current issues which the empire has to face, and who, finally, have not yet introduced into their own local civilizations these old traditions and principles that guide France's national policy?"

"Looking at the French empire, one should, therefore, bear in mind its diversity and how recently some of its component peoples (the largest ones, in fact) have been brought into it. There is no denying that the distinction between subjects and citizens, while it is justified by its realistic and educative virtues, serves at the same time the 'imperialistic' aims emphasized by Mr. Padmore and many other critics of colonialization. Conquered by force, often exploited by unscrupulous agents of industrial concerns (not without the indulgence or complicity of some selfish, careless officers), far removed from the controlling administrators, from parliament and the tribunal of public opinion, the natives of these larger and newer colonies have, at various times and in different regions, undergone the inhuman treatment denounced by famous French writers.

"While the government tries to and does remedy this condition so characteristic of the traditional capitalist colonialization, there is no doubt that it also endeavors to check revolutionary tendencies by discriminatingly granting full citizenship to the natives. But, oppressive and repressive as it may be, this system has a developing value which exposes the subject to the progressive and difficult tests of citizenship, in order to give birth to African nations which, in their already successful elite, render a homage to the practical soundness

of this process of gradual assimilation.

"French imperialism has done more than exploit natural resources and put the natives to work; it has awakened in their consciences the dignity of human personality, slumbering under the spell of ancestral traditions often exacting and totalitarian; it has invited them, originally by force, to enter into the modern civilized world of the automobile and the radio by the regal road of French democracy where man is respected regardless of his race, and to adopt as their own a legion of heroes, from Vergingtorix to Pasteur, not to mention Joan of Arc and Voltaire.

"Forced into this empire, now the colonial peoples want to remain parts of it, with loyalty that defies 'economic laws' and speaks highly of their feeling for the greatest values of human life."

Mr. Achilles is not speaking here for the French colonial masses, but for the French colonial middle-class elite that clings pathetically to the umbilical cord of its parent body—French imperialism.

Mr. Achilles argument may be summed up as follows:

1. Modern French imperialism is actuated by the progressive spirit and ideals of the French Revolution. Its chief aim is to extend democracy and the French bourgeois revolution thruout the French empire.

2. This can best be achieved thru a gradual process of assimilating French colonial subjects in the modern French democratic set-up after an extended period of apprenticeship under the tutelage of French imperialism. Such a process creates a colonial elite and lays the groundwork for the African nations.

3. The brutal subjugation and exploitation of the colonial peoples by French imperialism may be excused on the ground that French imperialism has introduced modern civilization, reforms and social improvements to its colonial subjects which have "awakened in their consciences the dignity of human personality, slumbering under the spell of ancestral traditions."

The French colonial masses everywhere thruout the empire now (France was then still in the war) proclaim their undying loyalty to France and are volunteering to give their lives to remain under the tutelage of imperialist France and travel along the "regal road of French democracy."

REALITY BEHIND THE IDEALS

Apparently Mr. Achilles is ignorant of the historic character of the French Revolution and the nature of modern capitalist imperialism. For however lofty were the ab-

L.I.D. Students Picket to Aid Frisco Strikers

Parade in Caps and Gowns Before Gantner & Mattern Showrooms in New York

Brooklyn, N. Y.

A GROUP of students representing nineteen national colleges and universities picketed last week the New York showrooms of the Gantner and Mattern Knitting Mills, a San Francisco firm that has locked out several hundred workers on the West Coast. The showrooms are located in New York City. The firm manufactures bathing-suits under the trade names of Golden Gate, Hi-Boy, Bo-Sun and Widen.

The students who come from all parts of the country are attending the Summer school of the League for Industrial Democracy. In the course of their study, they investigated the Gantner and Mattern situation and found that the workers, some of whom had been employed by the firm for over two decades, had been unjustly locked out. The students ruled the firm "unfair" in its refusal to negotiate with the I.L.G. W.U. and went on the picket line Friday morning, July 19, to demonstrate in behalf of the locked out workers.

Many of the students wore caps and gowns. They sang "Solidarity" and "God Bless America."

The national character of the strike was emphasized by these students who came from as far north as Vermont, as far west as California, and as far south as Texas. This was the first time these students, many of them doing graduate work, were on a picket line.

Roosevelt "Drafts" Self For a Third Term

Repudiates Democratic "Peace" Pledge

(Continued from Page 1)

defense plank, but does not mention conscription, despite the President's advocacy of the idea. On aid to belligerents, it declares: "We pledge to extend to these [liberty-loving] peoples wantonly attacked" all the material aid at our command consistent with law and not inconsistent with the interests of our own national defense"—in this way embodying the "isolationist" demand that aid to the Allies be kept within the restrictions of the neutrality law.

Senator Wheeler, leader of the anti-war group at the convention, had considerable influence in shaping the foreign-policy plank and expressed his satisfaction with it. After its adoption by the platform committee, he issued a statement withdrawing his name as a candidate for nomination on the ground that, after President Roosevelt had declared his desire to be renominated, it would "serve no useful purpose" for him (Wheeler) to persist, particularly in view of the satisfactory platform pronouncement on foreign policy. The Senator's declaration was generally interpreted as expressing his own personal opposition to the third term.

Immediately after the adoption of the platform, Harry Hopkins, the President's personal representative in Chicago, stated: "There is nothing in the foreign-policy plank which changes by one jot or tittle the foreign policies of the President or the Secretary of State. I refer not only to present policies but to future policies." This effort to nullify in effect the solemn pronouncement of the convention was followed up by President Roosevelt himself. In his address accepting the nomination, Mr. Roosevelt went out of his way to reaffirm his foreign policies. As the New York Times pointed out, "this was considered as a modification, if one were needed, of the strong non-interventionist tone of the party platform."

The only other important conflict on the platform was over the third term. After Senator Wagner finished reading the platform and moved for its adoption, Elmer J. Ryan of Minnesota offered an amendment to insert the declaration of the 1896 Democratic convention against a third term as a violation of American tradition. He was met with boos, groans and jeers, and received only a few faint eyes on the vote.

In the field of domestic affairs, the platform enthusiastically endorses and pledges the continuation, and extension of all New Deal policies on agriculture, labor, power, finance, business, unemployment, housing and other issues.

serious problem was the fact, made sufficiently clear by Foreign Minister Cantilo in a speech at Buenos Aires, that Argentina seemed determined to maintain its direct export and trade connections with Europe, particularly since the United States appeared unwilling to make adequate compensating concessions of an economic nature to the White House. On the continent of Europe, the German overlords continued ruthlessly consolidating their domination over the conquered countries. The Dutch trade unions, numbering 300,000 members, were officially dissolved by the German occupation authorities and the workers turned over to the autocratic control of a Labor Front leader, an obscure Dutch fascist. In Denmark, preparations were under way for a German-controlled "general election" thru which the Nazis would gain "legal" control of the country. There are 70,000 German troops in Denmark.

In France, the struggle for power among the cliques in the new fascist states flared up with attacks on Marshal Petain and other "men of yesterday." Obviously with the approval of the German rulers, the controlled press opened a barrage under the slogan, "The new situation requires new men." A far-reaching shake-up in the government was widely expected.

After general "elections" conducted under the bayonets of Russian soldiers, the governments of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania last week decided to abandon independence and join the U.S.S.R.

INFORMAL HOUSE

KERHONKSON, N. Y.
(7 miles from Ellenville)

Situated at the foot of the Catskills midst all the wonders of woods and water. An ideal vacation spot for adults—known for its friendly, informal spirit and rustic charm.

Rates: \$2.75 per day—\$16.00 per week

For further information call or write

<p>ARTHUR BOYER, Manager Informal House Kerhonkson, N. Y. Tel. Kerhonkson 8118 R</p>	<p>EDWARD K. WELSH 40 Morningside Avenue New York City Tel. MOument 2-3117</p>
--	--

The European War and Our Basic Tasks in America

Big Responsibility Is to Keep U. S. A. Out of War

By CARL NIELSEN

(This is a discussion article on socialist policy on the war. As in all discussion articles, the views expressed are those of the writer himself and not necessarily those of this paper or of the I.L.L.A.—Editor.)

Arriving at a proper and effective position on the question of "Does it make a difference who wins the war now in progress," one difficulty is in avoiding a sterile and rigid infantile leftism, on the one hand, and getting caught up in the whirl of panicky opportunism, on the other. Even the word "position" is a misnomer. One can scarcely arrive at a position and hang on to it when the very ground under our feet seems to change faster than the process of measuring it.

One horn of the dilemma arises out of the fact that the advance of Hitler's hordes has been so overwhelming quantitatively that it seems to have given a new qualitative basis to Nazism, and hence requires a reevaluation on our part of the respective roles of the Allies and the Axis powers in the present world conflict.

The other half of the problem arises when we attempt to work out a line for the United States to pursue in the face of a realization that the greatest threat to the labor and socialist movements is war itself, which means that the maintenance of some semblance of an independent labor movement depends upon keeping America out of the war.

TWO BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

In working out a solution, we are faced with the following: (1) Unless it is accompanied by some concrete program of action, a decision that an Allied victory is preferable to a Hitler victory remains merely an exercise in metaphysics. (2) In providing military aid to the Allies, the United States changes from a neutral to a non-belligerent. Aid short of war becomes, as Wolfe has said, "shorter and shorter of war" until we are finally drawn into the maelstrom. This point has been so well argued in the Workers Age and elsewhere that no further time need be spent in elaborating it.

Let us assume that the House of Commons provides every British citizen with arms. How much does this change the situation? It certainly changes it from the point of view of the British worker, providing he is placed in a position to lay down conditions to the Churchill government or to Parliament as to the conduct and termination of the war.

Would it then be proper to favor conditional military assistance in the form of the materials of war to Great Britain? The obstacle in the path of a "yes" answer to this question lies in the consequences to the United States. If it is true that we are treading the path to active participation by supplying the materials of war to the Allies now, a shift in the internal situation in Great Britain as described above does not magically negate or reverse the driving force of the British. How is it possible to justify an urge military aid, conditional or unconditional, to the Allies without justifying the spur to totalitarianization in America such aid carries in its wake—nay, which even goes before it? Or have we been wrong in insisting that American participation in the war would assure a totalitarian regime here? Or have we been wrong in insisting that supplying arms to the Allies brings us nearer to the brink?

ROLE OF U.S.A. IN EUROPE

Let us assume that the British workers decide that to properly conduct and terminate the war, it is necessary to establish a workers government in the British Isles. The British ruling class would then do one of two things. Either it would

ask the United States to cease sending more munitions, preferring to capitulate to Hitler and take its chances with him, or it would insist that the United States come actively into the war to defeat Hitler and avert the threat of social revolution in Great Britain. Neither course of action would be likely to aid the British workers. In other words, the only role that the United States can play in the present war is a reactionary one both with respect to our domestic affairs and to European affairs.

The situation is not parallel to that of Spain. We did urge the United States to send military aid to Spain because doing so carried no risk of being drawn into it ourselves. On the other hand, the role of the U.S.A. in relation to Great Britain might be similar to that of Stalin in Spain. We might provide enough aid to prolong the war for appearance's sake, in lip service to the slogan "save democracy," but the U.S.A. would see to it that there would be no social revolution in Great Britain.

OUR CHIEF RESPONSIBILITY

The answer to the whole problem lies in a recognition that our responsibility to the international working-class movement can best be discharged by keeping this country out of the war. If we can accomplish this task, we will have at least one country in which an independent labor movement can exist. We will carry the torch from which the labor movements in Europe can be relighted after the blackouts are over there.

Keeping this country out of war should be coupled with the task of giving all possible independent aid

to the underground labor and socialist movements in Europe.

Such a position does not, in the writer's estimation, involve a disregard of the strategy of "utilizing a disaster inflicted by one ruling class upon another" for the benefit of the working class. The point is that, in this present situation, military aid to Great Britain is not equivalent to the utilization by the working class of the resources of its ruling class for its own benefit, whether one is referring to the working class of Great Britain or of the United States.

An example of this kind of strategy that appears more likely to take place is a conflict between Stalin and Hitler. Hitler might survive his conquest of Britain, but it is unlikely that either Hitler or Stalin would survive a Russo-German war. If Stalin strikes at Hitler before Hitler is able to conquer Britain, then Hitler will be in a precarious position. Britain will have a chance to recuperate and strike a blow from behind at Hitler, or it may withdraw from the conflict altogether.

There are some who may feel that the position taken in this article fails to recognize the changed character of Britain's role in the war against Hitler that would take place if the entire British working class was provided with arms. On the contrary, the writer would be in favor of giving all possible arms and supplies to the British workers under such circumstances, except that, in the process of doing this, the U.S.A. would be drawn more and more into the war in which it could play only a decisively reactionary role for the British working class and for the American working class.

Our First Duty in the Present Crisis

Our Main Enemy Is Totalitarianism at Home

By BERTRAM D. WOLFE

(This is the second of a series of two discussion articles by Bertram D. Wolfe on our policy on the war. Since they are discussion articles, they represent the views of the writer himself and not necessarily those of this paper or of the I.L.L.A.—Editor.)

The first duty of any labor or radical movement is its responsibility to the masses of its own country. Only by serving them adequately can it fulfill its international duties at all. Therefore, the core of any analysis by a given organization must be the role of its own ruling class, the situation in its own country, the part that country is likely to play on the international arena. Any "international" analysis ignoring, neglecting, or abstracting from this premise is bound to be detrimental at home and useless or worse internationally.

What we must fear most, and fight most, in our own country is:

a. The attempt to involve us directly in the European war and the steps taken in that direction.

b. The increasing speed of the trend towards totalitarianism here even before intervention, as a preparation for such intervention.

c. The attempt to set up a continental Lebensraum under American dominance as a war block against a German-dominated Europe, a Japanese or Russian, or Japan-Russia-axis-dominated Asia.

d. The attempt to enlist our feelings so completely on one side as to make all opposition to the above three tendencies impossible, the attempt to convince us that one side fights for freedom and democracy, the other for fascism, that it is an ideological war, that civilization is fighting barbarism, that England's fleet is our first line of defense, that a victorious Germany will immediately invade America, and that we must devote our economy and political structure and feeling and thought and social life totally to that coming conflict now.

This is the main actual danger for the American working class and the American people, that they will overlook the realities at home and the real struggles in which we must engage, because of absorption by this plausible but fallacious and distorted picture of the European war. Here our real strength and activity must be exerted. This must be the point at which our meager forces of activity and patient explanation must be applied. This is what it means in America to swim against the current and maintain an independent and internationalist position.

MAIN FEATURES OF SITUATION

The core of the situation here is the following:

a. There is a rapid trend towards totalitarianism here. Politically it is manifested in the playing with coalition cabinets; in the theory that only one man can save us, the third-term drive; in the "Fifth Column" hysteria; in the reducing of the foreign-born to the role of national scapegoat; in the destruction

of the LaFollette bill, the Wagner Act, the relief law (for example, no communists or "splinter groups" to receive relief via W.P.A., the order for the able-bodied in New Jersey to enlist, the cutting of the relief appropriations, etc.); in the proposal by the President of forced labor and military service to the state by the youth of both sexes; in the Supreme Court decision on religious freedom in the case of Jehovah's Witnesses; in the F.B.I. activities, raids, and appeals for sniping; in the mounting atmosphere of political persecution, frenzy, and terror. All of this is offered under the guise of defense of America and aid to the Allies and fighting Hitlerism.

b. Economically, it is manifested in the hysterical preparation of armament for entrance into the present war or its continuation in the near future by America and England or America alone; in the proposal to buy up the market of the whole of the two Americas and store or destroy all surplus crops and materials, beginning with a revolving fund of \$2,000,000,000, to be supplemented by securing or seizing air bases in Latin America and closing all its markets to the continent of Europe if Hitler wins; in the setting up of the War Resources Board; in the fantastic budgets of three, four, five billion additional dollars for arms all within a few days and just as a sort of starter; in the frank militarization of what is left of relief organization; in the cutting of all government expenditures except those for arms; in the development of an armament economy and the subordination of all our life to it; in the raising of the debt limit; gold purchases, enormous new tax burdens on the masses.

c. Intellectually, it is manifested in the new hysteria of the Mumfords, Franks, MacLeishes, who have lost their bearings and are engaged in demonstrating once more that "it is the function of the intellectual to debunk wars after they are over and to justify them while they are going on or about to begin." But these will soon be lost in the lower-grade variety of war-shouting. A sample of how even the best talent degenerates to the low-grade level and is lost in it is provided by Mumford in prose and Edna Saint Vincent Millay in poetry. Tomorrow, it will be the whoopers and shouters, the cudgellers and literary gangsters, the crude chauvinists and hate-mongers whose voice alone will be heard if the trend is not stopped.

The present intellectual and emotional battleground lies along the line of "help the Allies short of war" and "if Hitler wins, no American will be free," and therefore give up your freedom now to defeat Hitler. Without falling into the false and abstract analysis that "it makes no difference who wins," we have to fight the view that our fate here is mainly determined by who wins in Europe, rather than by what we do here and what the masses do in all the European countries.

MAIN ENEMY AT HOME

Our main enemy is not Hitler but the American totalitarian trend. We

"WE, PHILIPPE PETAIN, DECREE..."



—from the New York Sun

Churchill No Reliance In War on Hitlerism

Link With Chamberlain Shows Real Danger

By D. BENJAMIN

(This is the second of a series of discussion articles by D. Benjamin. Since they are discussion articles, they represent the views of the writer himself and not necessarily those of this paper or of the I.L.L.A.—Editor.)

It is no accident that Churchill did not break clean with the appeasers and Munichers, Chamberlain, Hoare, Halifax. He justifies this on the grounds that the present is not a time for "recommitments"—as he was dealing with personal matters! And this in spite of growing pressure for a cleansing coming from labor in England, labor that exercises such a strategic and important role in that country today. If the real reason is that Churchill feels he is not strong enough to carry thru such a major operation, is that not an indication of the power of the "appeasement" attitude in the ranks of the British ruling class? And will that power not assert itself more vigorously as the crisis resulting from Nazi invasion becomes more acute? And how is it that Churchill, the champion of the fight against Hitler, does not make a clean and public break with the Chamberlains?

CHURCHILL PROTECTS THE "APPEASERS"

How is it that Hoare, appeaser par excellence, is sent as ambassador to Franco by the very same Churchill? That is not an ordinary job these days, nor can the appointment be termed a reward for past services or a way of putting Hoare on the scrap-heap. Can we forget that Franco is indebted to Hitler and Mussolini; that Franco was the intermediary in the arrangements for an armistice between Hitler, Mussolini, and the Petain government; that Petain, friend of Franco, was sent by the Daladier government to Spain? (It would seem from results that Petain and Franco prepared the ground well!) Is Hoare, co-author with Laval, the present leader of fascist France, of the notorious Hoare-Laval pact betraying Ethiopia to Italian fascism, and a leading representative of the Munich "appeasement group" in England, being groomed to play a role with Franco similar to that played by Petain? Given certain circumstances, the gap between being the agent of imperialist war or the agent of imperialist peace is not so great that it can not be bridged, as was shown by Petain—vice-premier in the "war" cabinet of Reynaud and premier in the "peace" cabinet of Petain. At any rate, the British ruling class can adapt itself to imperialist war or imperialist peace, as the circumstances seem to

must analyze the nature of the "defense" policies of the government, and its totalitarian drives under the guise of fighting totalitarianism. The struggle against totalitarianism in America is first of all a struggle against America's entrance into the war and the totalitarian preparations for such entrance. The slogan "Aid to the Allies" is a deliberate snare for our involvement. "Short of war" becomes shorter and shorter of war until we are in it. If we could separate the question of aid from the drive towards war involvement, our attitude might be different, but we are deceiving ourselves and those who listen to us, if we pretend that such a separation is possible under the present real situation and the dynamics of present forces. Even when we would have to consider seriously the problem of how to aid the masses of England or France without aiding the governments that oppress

demand, and can find appropriate agents, prime ministers and cabinets to carry the project thru.

Does it have no significance that Churchill appointed to his cabinet as Minister of Colonies and Secretary of State for India two fascist-minded individuals, Lord Lloyd and L. S. Amery, both of whom indicated great admiration for Mussolini's regime and work? Lord Lloyd was one of the strongest advocates of Franco at the time of the Spanish civil war. Peculiar that Churchill placed these men in positions involving the protection of British imperial interests while he gave Morrison and Bevin of the Labor Party the jobs of Minister of Supply and Minister of Labor, the jobs of mobilizing British labor behind the British government and its need of increased production of munitions and armaments.

In the June 20 issue of the New Leader, paper of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain—a party that has the finest record today in the fight against fascism and capitalism, against what both Nazi Germany and imperialist Britain stand for—are printed excerpts from speeches and writings of leaders of the British government, both from the Churchill and Chamberlain wings, and these confirm my contention that the ruling class of England is fighting a war, not against Nazism and fascism, but for the maintenance of the British capitalist and imperialist system.

Since the war on England's side is not a war against fascism but one for imperialist ends, it is not a progressive war, but a reactionary war, and therefore can not and should not be accorded support by labor. Hitlerism must go, but those who were responsible for Versailles, which provided the soil and helped bring on Hitlerism; those who refused aid to democratic Germany before Hitler's conquest, thus increasing economic difficulties there and playing into the hands of Hitler's movement; those who refused to allow Anschluss and Germany to annex not only Austria but the Sudetenland; those who furnished financial aid again and again to both Hitler and Mussolini; those who made pre-Hitler Germany disarm but did not carry out their own pledges to do the same, thus giving Hitler telling points with which to appeal to the German people; those who appeased Hitler and Mussolini, handing over to them the smaller countries (Ethiopia, Spain, Austria, Czechoslovakia); those who praised

(Continued on Page 4)

Indian Independence Movement Retreats

Gandhi, Nehru Shelve Aims for War Crisis

By J. CORK

THE bitter experience which Indian nationalism had during the last World War, when Britain cynically violated its own promise of home rule to India just as soon as the war was over, marked a new stage in the development of the Indian nationalist movement. The Amritsar massacre, which terminated in terror the post-war nationalist agitation for the promised home rule, pushed the movement along a new line of militancy, struggle and sacrifice. Ever since then, the cry for independence, for complete separation from the British Empire, has become louder and more unequivocal. Practically every convention of the Indian National Congress in post-war years raised independence as its chief demand, its first resolution. Differences have, of course, existed within the Congress as to the methods thru which independence might be achieved, but the goal itself was rarely, if ever, questioned. England's difficulties were regarded as India's opportunities, and a war situation in particular, it was stressed time and time again, would offer India its most favorable situation for boldly striking out for independence.

DRIFT AWAY FROM OLD POSITION

Recent developments within the Indian National Congress, however, indicate a steady drift away from this line. As the war situation has grown worse for England, there has taken place a dilution of the independence slogans of the Congress, especially on the part of its dominant right-wing section. England's difficulties are now regarded as a reason for shelving India's opportunities. Every sort and variety of demand is now offered as a substitute for the old demand of complete independence. Some are for postponing the demand until after the war. Others, who still talk of independence now, really mean dominion status within the empire and no separation from England. All sorts of compromises and "arrangements" are being offered to Britain. The Indian nationalist movement is in process of succumbing to the same illusory promises to which it succumbed in 1914.

VIEW OF NEHRU AND GANDHI

This process is clearly reflected in the attitude of India's outstanding and most representative leaders, Gandhi and Nehru. In an article in the American Atlantic Monthly of April 1940 (written, no doubt, some weeks earlier), Nehru still voiced the old demand: "Attempts will no doubt be made again by the British government to come to terms with Indian nationalism. But they are foredoomed to failure unless they recognize that there are no half-way houses to Indian freedom, and that this can no longer be reconciled with British imperialism. That imperialism will have to be liquidated, and India acknowledged to be an independent country. Dominion status and the like have ceased to have significance and, in any event, they have no application to India."

This clear and unequivocal attitude was, however, drastically modified in a statement made by Nehru early in May, which was reported in a number of Indian newspapers as follows: "Independence need not necessarily mean a final break with England." This statement was interpreted in the newspapers as essentially a demand for dominion status. A little later, on May 20, 1940, Nehru, speaking at Lucknow, went still further in modifying his position: "Launching a civil war at a time when Britain is engaged in a life-and-death struggle would be an act derogatory to India's honor." As to Gandhi, his efforts not to embarrass Britain, to patch up some sort of a compromise with it, and in the meantime block any sort of anti-English campaign, are evident. In his own newspaper, Harijan, he has written the following at various times recently, in May and June:

"The Congress has caused no embarrassment to Britain. I have declared already that I shall do nothing to embarrass Great Britain. She will be embarrassed if there is

anarchy in India. That the Congress, so long as it is under my discipline, will not support."

"Prevention of civil disobedience, I believe, is common cause between the government and Congress. I am leaving no stone unturned to prevent it."

In a recent interview with the Times of India, Gandhi said: "I would welcome a settlement which insures peace with honor. I am not averse to coming to terms with Britain on matters like defense and commercial interests."

The intent of Gandhi's position is clear. Certain sections of the Congress left wing, however, continue to push demands for immediate and unequivocal independence, chiefly the Congress Socialist Party and the group of M. N. Roy. In the May 12, 1940 issue of his paper, Independent India, Roy wrote:

"I will stand by the principle of the capture of power by the masses. Power cannot be voluntarily transferred. We have, therefore, to prepare the masses for the capture of power."

SOFT WORDS AND IRON FIST

England is in great difficulties with regard to India. In its present dangerous situation, it treads cautiously. It has promised India dominion status at the end of the war, and all sorts of reforms as well.

But inside India, while the various sections of the Indian National Congress debate the issue, the British power acts with its old imperialistic "firmness." The soft words uttered by the Viceroy or the Secretary of State for India are not allowed to interfere with the exercise of control or with the subordination of all Indian interests to British war needs. India was declared a belligerent without its consent. Indian troops were taken out of the country without consultation. A Defense of India Act was passed with some pretty harsh sections in it, one of them making offenders "punishable with death or transportation for life or imprisonment for a term which may extend to ten years. . . ." Under it, many leading militants have already been arrested—Narain, head of the Congress Socialist Party; Bose, head of the Forward Block in the Congress; and others.

Important industrial and mineral resources in India have been placed under the direct control of the British government—for instance, the largest steel works in the East, the Tata Iron and Steel Company; the oil fields at Digboi; large forest tracts; and many revenue-producing projects, such as tea plantations. At Digboi, an oil-workers strike for improved conditions was violently suppressed.

Since the declaration of war, the continued rise in the cost of living has brought untold hardship to the poverty-stricken workers and peasants. In the mill areas and textile districts, as at Cawpore and Bombay, food riots have taken place, and similar outbreaks have occurred in many villages. The British authorities have, of course, sent troops to shoot down the protesting crowds. Nothing must be allowed to interfere with imperial control!

INDEPENDENCE SLOGAN STILL VALID

There are some radicals who, on the basis of the present world situation, are beginning to harbor the idea that perhaps it might be best for India to shelve the slogan of independence for a while. If Britain is defeated, which is very possible—so the argument runs—all its colonies, including India, will fall under the more brutal domination of some totalitarian power or combination of powers. This is an old idea, but it still doesn't hold water. Even assuming a German victory, direct control of India by Germany is highly improbable, considering the distance and geographical location, as well as his control over the European continent. As for Japan, assuming even that England and the United States vacate the Far East, it will have its hands full for years in China, and it is extremely questionable whether it will be able to handle even that job. Russia remains a question mark.

But even if the danger of India's falling under the control of some other power did exist, the drive for independence should not slacken. The momentum of this drive would present a serious obstacle for any designing power. Its success would reverberate around the world, setting off forces that might help start a counter-current against the fascism that is threatening to engulf the world.

Carney Urges Reevaluation Of War Situation

London, England, June 3, 1940.

Editor, Workers Age: BEN Gitlow's "I Confess" was very cleverly reviewed in the Workers Age, a very good publication, which ought, however, to have more factual material. A kind of "Grapes of Wrath" with facts and figures, at least every other issue. Its basic material is very good.

Lately, I disagree with Lovestone's attitude towards the war in Europe.* Now the war is more ideological than economic. I do not think

this war will end very soon. The destruction will be terrific, but I see no sign of a crack-up in Germany, and any hope at the moment in that direction is pure wish fulfillment. Here in England we are now taking the war much more seriously. The old politicians are breaking up and what the new political alignments may be all depends on labor.

I think Lovestone ought to make a reevaluation of the situation in Europe. I may be speaking a little ahead of developments, but I detect changes in the Independent Labor Party.

The communists here are of no moment. The crowning acts of humiliation is the refusal of even the government to view them with alarm. The greatest sentence yet given to any of the leaders is twelve weeks in jail.

JACK CARNEY

1939

Bound Volumes of the
WORKERS AGE

now ready for sale

Hard Paper Covers\$1.50
Cloth Covers\$2.00

Add 25 cents postage for mail orders

(Limited Supply)

WORKERS AGE BOOKSHOP
131 W. 33rd St., N. Y. C.

WOODSTOCK
TYPEWRITER

A YEAR SUB TO
WORKERS AGE
6mos. 60¢
subscribe now!

Workers Age

Organ of the National Council, Independent Labor League of America, 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Publishing Association. Subscription Rates: \$1.50 per year; \$85 for six months; 5c a copy. Foreign Rates: \$2.50; Canada \$1.75 per year.

Entered as second class matter Nov. 5, 1934, at the Post Office New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Phone: LACKAWANNA 4-5282.

WILL HERBERG, Editor

Vol. 9.

SATURDAY, JULY 27, 1940.

No. 29.

TIME FOR SOBER THOUGHT

ACCORDING to the best reports, the President has to-date asked the present session of Congress to appropriate nearly fourteen billion dollars for purposes of "national defense," and Congress has been more than eager to oblige. A sum so vast—it tops all peace-time records and comes very close to the war-time record of 1918—is a very grave matter, even for so rich a country as the United States, particularly at a time when federal relief and social-service budgets are being slashed to the bone. It is therefore to be presumed that the President made these requests for funds with a full sense of the responsibility resting upon him, after mature and careful deliberation and on presentation of detailed information to Congress and the people.

The record shows nothing of the sort. The amazing confusion of armament authorizations, appropriations and expenditures baffles even the experts, and it would do little good for us to try to unravel it here. But there is one aspect of this incredible situation that fairly cries aloud for comment.

On June 4, at his press conference, the President declared somewhat emphatically that he saw no reason vital to national defense for holding Congress in session through the emergency. On June 11, he repeated that, while he did not desire to be in a position of saying that Congress should adjourn, he saw no reason why it could not clear up its work and go home.

And then, on July 10, less than a month later, President Roosevelt sent to Congress a message asking for nearly five billion dollars more!

Did the President know on June 11 that, within a few weeks, he would be calling on Congress to appropriate an additional five billion dollars for "defense"? If he did, why did he see no reason for Congress to remain in session? If he did not, are we to conclude that he made up his mind on an appropriation of five billion dollars in the short space of three or four weeks? In short, did the President know from one day to the other what he was going to ask and why?

The situation in which this country finds itself is critical, and it is not Hitler who is menacing it at the present time, except indirectly. The people have been driven into a veritable hysteria by the panic propaganda of the war party, headed by the Administration. Congress, lately so niggardly in doling out dollars to the unemployed, has lost all sense of reality; it has forgotten how to add—billions don't mean anything to it any longer. Anything goes if only it is labeled "national defense." And so additional billions are saddled on the people, exactly for what nobody seems to know, the President hardly more than anyone else, if we are to go by the record. Sales and consumption taxes are increased, income-tax exemptions lowered and rates raised, the national debt sent shooting skyward. An armament economy begins to emerge in formidable proportions, and an armament economy is bound to collapse sooner or later "like a house of cards," as the President knew how to point out in 1936. And looming in the sinister background is the foreign war in Europe or the Far East for which the Administration seems to be preparing with might and main.

Isn't it about time for the country to wake up? It may soon be too late!

LAST WEEK, Ambassador Bullitt arrived from France with the following rather curious report, according to the New York Times of July 21, 1940:

"William C. Bullitt, American ambassador in France, returned to the United States yesterday with praise for Marshall Henri Philippe Petain . . . and with disbelief that the government of Premier Petain rightly could be called a fascist state. He also refused to put any faith in the suggestions that Vice-Premier Laval was the real head of France's reconstruction administration."

Just what is Bill Bullitt's game? And what is the game of the Administration for which he speaks or which is speaking thru him?

THOMAS DENOUNCES CONSCRIPTION

(Continued from Page 1)

in which he is employed. This rule gives the employer tremendous power over his workers. Confronted by the "ascending spiral" of war economy, labor will demand higher pay. By refusing to endorse claims for occupational deferment, an employer can get rid of active labor elements by the simple device of seeing them off to war, or, in peace-time, to the training camp. For anti-union employers, it is the chance of a life-time. Claims for deferment by tenant farmers (and presumably sharecroppers) must be supported by affidavits from "the owner of the land or the letter's agent" and by a near neighbor.

If President's Roosevelt's idea of training boys and girls for industry in connection with military defense should be adopted in the wording or execution of a conscription law, there is no way that can be devised in our capitalist country for such service to be used without imperiling all labor standards.

What we most should fear is the psychological effect of conscription on the American people, and the temptation these conscripts and reserves offer to military adventure. We are not little Switzerland, obviously incapable of anything but defense. We are a powerful nation with plenty of men and corporations hungry for profits of imperialism. We have before this tried Dollar Diplomacy. What would some ambitious militarists and imperialists do with an army all dressed up with no place to go?

I asked a major in our reserve forces that question in a radio discussion, and he thought we would use it primarily "to preserve order at home"—that is, to "keep labor in its place." I think it equally likely that we would soon use it to "keep order" in Mexico or some other American country where the temptation will be strong to go in for imperialism in the name of protection from possible aggression from abroad, much along the lines of Russian "protection" of the Baltic states or German "protection" of Denmark.

I am not insulting my own country and my own people when I say this. I am simply acknowledging that we are human and that on this nation all the pressures toward imperialism will operate in full force. A conscript army is the ideal tool of such imperialism. Colonel Lewis Sanders, testifying before your committee on July 5, declared: "They (the registration provisions of the bill) will force an America unified in thought." This is precisely the goal of fascism: a nation so "unified in thought" can easily be manipulated into imperialist adventures. No strong tribe or nation has ever gone in for such degree of navalism, militarism, armament economics and conscription as we now contemplate without going in for imperialism. This is true from the days of the ancient Assyrians to the modern Japanese and Europeans. We will be no exception. In the name of defense, if we adopt conscription we shall enter the road whose end always has been and always will be not freedom but military regimentation, not peace but war.

You will observe that my major objections are to conscription, not merely to this Bill. I certainly do not think Major George Fielding Eliot makes a good case for his mild version of brief military training for the most physically fit of our youth. Still less do I approve President Roosevelt's amazing proposal for including girls and boys in his military conscription for combatant drill and industry. I am a good enough socialist and American to believe that 18-year-old girls, yes, and boys, can be better trained for jobs and life in their homes under healthy conditions than in any government military camps. Especially is this true if our major planning should be not for the conquest of other nations, but of poverty.

If I were to discuss details, I would emphasize the cumbersome and costly nature of the Burke bill, its unfairness to men and their families dependent on jobs, the inadequacy of its \$5 per month pay, and its treatment of conscientious objectors. Partial and inadequate exemption, it appears, is to be based not on individual conscience, but on membership in certain sects. It is a new kind of vested right!

It is not however with detail that I am chiefly concerned. It is with the preservation of the American way of life as against fascist regimentation and the type of conscription which has cost Europe so dear. Your committee and the Congress of the United States will tragically fail in your duty to our people and democracy if you do not take advantage of the good fortune of our historic and geographic position which removes from us the temptation and excuse to follow in the paths which have led Europe to such unnecessary poverty, regimentation, war and suffering.

How Can this War Be Turned Into a Real "Civil War"?

Brockway Declares Socialism Can Defeat Hitlerism

By FENNER BROCKWAY

(Fenner Brockway is political secretary of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain.—Editor)

A remarkable article appeared in the London Evening Standard, Lord Beaverbrook's most influential political paper, recently. It had the startling title, "The Great Civil War."

"This is not a war of nations at all," declared the editorial. "It is a mammoth civil war. Goethe and Garibaldi, a great German and a great Italian, are on our side. We should recognize no boundaries except those which exist in the human mind. A man, whatever tongue he speaks, needs only one passport to cross the frontier—faith that the cause of true freedom must conquer."

The writer argued that the tribesmen of Abyssinia, the subjects of the Italian Empire, are Britain's allies. He held out the same hope for the Arabs in the Empire. He recognized that there are Italians who desire to throw off the yoke of fascism, and even Germans. Then followed this striking passage:

"He (Hitler) works on Napoleon's maxim that men are governed most easily thru their vices. Across all frontiers, therefore, he works on the attributes of avarice, deceit and cowardice to gain allies in the midst of his enemies.

"Cannot we across all frontiers seek to gain allies by appealing to men's virtues, their love of freedom, their hatred of tyranny?"

"The Italian enemies of Mussolini and the German enemies of Hitler did great deeds in throwing back the forces of Mussolini and Hitler from the ramparts of Madrid.

"A chief purpose of our propaganda should be to gain such confederates. Why should freedom not have her Fifth Columns?"

ALLIES OF FREEDOM

The writer might have gone a great deal further in listing the potential allies of freedom within the fascist territories.

In every town of Germany, there are little groups of heroic men and women who have carried on the struggle against Nazism, small in numbers but of a character which makes their quality as allies out of all proportion to their strength. There are thousands of men and women, resolute to death, within the concentration camps of Germany.

In the factories of Vienna, the fire of socialism still burns secretly in the hearts of thousands of workers.

In the Tyrol, a nationalist hatred of German domination slumbers close below the surface.

In Czecho-Slovakia and Poland, in Denmark, Norway, Holland and Belgium, and now in a large area of France, the millions cherish their longing to be free, sometimes on national, sometimes on socialist grounds.

The potential "Fifth Columns of Freedom" are much larger than the Fifth Columns of fascism which the Nazis have established in the different countries.

Then why have not these potential "Fifth Columns of Freedom" become a fact? Why has not this war become the "Great Civil War," recognizing "no boundaries except those which exist in the human mind"?

The answer to this question is that the two sides in the war have not sufficiently reflected the clash between tyranny and freedom to deposit the slaves of "avarice, deceit and cowardice" on the one side, and to mobilize those who love freedom and hate tyranny on the other.

We can take one example from the Evening Standard article. The "Italian enemies of Mussolini and the German enemies of Hitler" who did "great deeds in throwing back the forces of Mussolini and Hitler from the ramparts of Madrid"—have they any reason to regard the British government as the tabernacle of freedom?

Did not the British government refuse them arms? Did not the policy of the British government lean on the side of Mussolini and Hitler and Franco in that struggle? Did not many of its representative supporters, including some of those who now have places in the present War Government, openly support the cause of Franco?

The truth is that this "Great Civil War" goes much deeper than the Evening Standard writer suggests. The inspiration of freedom not only spans the frontiers. The mentality of tyranny also does so. And the mentality of tyranny is possessed by many who belong to the ruling class of Britain, as well as by the rulers of Germany and Italy.

We have elsewhere presented quotations from the writing and speeches of many typical representatives of the British governing class, including leading members of the present War Government. They reflect an admiration for Hitler, Mussolini, Franco and the fascist systems over which these dictators rule. How can it be expected that those who hate fascism on the other side of the war frontiers will act as "Fifth Columns of Freedom" in alliance with such recent friends of fascism?

The British ruling class will wage

Debacle Shows Failure Of French Ruling Class

"NEVER has there been a sorer tale of incompetence than the resistance of the French ruling class to the German invasion.

"The people of France, the rank-and-file soldiers, have fought as only they can fight, without adequate equipment, adequate leadership.

"It is not the people who have failed to stand against the fascist rush. It is their leaders—representatives of the class who built up Hitler and who fight him now with many backward glances at their property, at their bank balances and still with the idea at the back of their mind, despite all experience, that the Nazis are better than the socialists."—From the June 20, 1940 issue of New Leader (London), official paper of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain.

war to a long limit with the ruling class of Germany to defend its imperialism against German imperialism, but the essence of freedom is in neither.

FASCISM AND IMPERIALISM

Fascism is imperialism a stage further on. Imperialism combines the denial of democracy to colored peoples with the grant of political democracy to the white peoples. Fascism denies democracy both to the white and colored peoples.

This has been the difference between imperialism in the British sense and fascism in the German and Italian sense so far. But who can doubt that the British ruling class would resort to the suppression of their white peoples if necessary to maintain their power, privileges and profits?

If an appeal is to be made successfully to the friends of freedom in the fascist territories, Britain must represent freedom in spirit and practise.

Britain must acknowledge the equality of all races, whether they be black, brown, yellow or white. This must be given practical expression by the recognition of the right of India and the colonial peoples to political independence, and by the transference to them of the natural resources within their territories, now owned and exploited by British capitalists and financiers.

If Britain did this, the reality of freedom as its inspiration would become clear to all.

But this is not enough. In Britain itself, freedom is denied.

The greatest enemy of freedom is poverty. It imprisons human fulfillment far more widely than do prison bars. Economic dictatorship is a bigger factor than political

dictatorship in the daily repression of the lives of the masses of all peoples.

If fascism is to be defeated on the ideological front, it must be defeated by its opposite—a socialism. Fascism is the climax of the old order which has brought the world to disaster. There is only one power which can overcome it—the challenge of the new order which shall in time replace it.

SOCIALISM CAN WIN THE WAR

Britain must apply the principle of human equality to its own population. The possessing class must go. Social equality must come. There must be no luxury incomes side by side with poverty. Wealth must be conscripted. We must carry thru the social revolution. Do that—and this becomes the "Great Civil War."

Social equality in Britain, colonial freedom in the British Empire—this is the way to establish the "Fifth Columns of Freedom" in the fascist countries.

Accompany these changes with a declaration for a peace based on the same socialist principles—the equality and freedom of all peoples in a coordinated international order, the distribution of world resources according to world needs. Do that, and the peoples of the world, weary with war, weary with repression, weary with insecurity, will become one vast "Fifth Column of Freedom," overthrowing Nazism, imperialism, capitalism.

But the British ruling class will not do this. It cannot defeat Nazism. It must be done by the British working class and by socialism.

This is not utopian. War is the time of great changes. It is our duty to realize the destiny of the workers to save the world.

Churchill No Reliance In War on Hitlerism

Link With Chamberlain Shows Real Danger

(Continued from Page 3)

the Nazis and fascists for restoring "order" and showing labor its oppress and the oceanic islands in fascist-like manner—those cannot be the social forces thru which a vigorous and effective fight can be waged to destroy or even to defeat fascism. These, on the basis of the common denominator of capitalism—private ownership, exploitation and oppression—have too much in common, and while, having deadly combats with each other for the division of the spoils and plunder, always keep an eye on the working masses and the danger of their "spilling the applesauce." As against the actual or even potential danger of socialism and the overthrow of their economic and social order, they will come together even if only temporarily, postponing until another day the settling of accounts with each other.

All the above was necessary in order to make clear how Hitlerism can not be fought. It wasn't stopped in Germany by dependence on the lesser evil (Hindenburg, von Schleicher, von Papen, Bruening), such as was often practised by the social-democrats there, while the Communist Party was busy splitting the German working class and making united fronts at times with the Nazis against social-democracy. Nor can Hitlerism be stopped internationally by depending on the lesser evils there—the Daladiers, Reynauds, Petains, Chamberlains, and Churchills. Just as capitalism has outlived its usefulness and has become a menace to the very lives, security, welfare and freedom of the people, just so, have the ruling classes and agents of decaying capitalism proved that they cannot be depended upon to make any further fights for social progress and humanity. There must be a fundamental change in the political and social set-up of England and France, not only because such changes are necessary and desirable in themselves, but because only in that way can an effective fight be made against the aggression and spread of Hitlerism, only in that

way can real aid and inspiration be given to the German people and those conquered and oppressed by Hitler in their fight to destroy Nazism completely.

There is a way to fight Hitlerism and to fight it effectively. That way is the road of independent action and resistance by the working class—the development of a third camp based upon the working class of such countries as England, the United States and even France, the underground movements of the fascist and the fascist-conquered countries and the colonial peoples struggling for freedom against imperialism.

Certainly, this third camp could make no worse showing than that accomplished by the gentlemen of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Look at France, for example. But the fact of the matter is that the populations and working masses of the world could best be aroused for a finish fight against Hitlerism by a social force coming to court not with "unclean hands," such as the Churchills and Daladiers are. The pledge of the labor movements working in independent fashion, dissociating themselves from the imperialist bourgeoisie and their dirty game of imperialism and power politics, speaking out boldly for freedom for the colonial peoples, for a peace without annexations or conquests, for peace terms based on the socialist distribution of the resources of the world according to the needs of all peoples, for the equality and freedom of all peoples in a coordinated international order—the working class acting in this way could make the issue clear; real freedom and democracy against slavery and fascism. On this basis, the working masses and progressive forces of the world could be gotten to throw themselves into the struggle with heart, with a readiness to sacrifice all, with enthusiasm such as was shown by the heroic Spanish workers in their long and successful defense of Madrid against the hosts of Franco backed by Hitler and Mussolini, even though the latter had dominance in the air and the advantage in arms.

Only Socialism Can Call Upon the Future . . .

"HE (Churchill) told us that the government is united in its resolve to resist the Nazi onslaught to the utmost of our powers. We rejoice to hear it. . . . He summoned to our aid all that is great and glorious in our past. But what he did not do, and what he could not do, was to summon the future, for Mr. Churchill is the spokesman of his order and of his class, and that class and that order are dying. That is why Mr. Churchill ennobles retreat and can rally the nation to make its stand here in this island, but he cannot unfold for us the plans for victory, because there is not another victory left in the order to which he belongs and of which he is the last distinguished representative. . . . And that is why under his guidance we shall hold out here against the Nazis, but at the same time, we must find new principles of action if we are to take the offensive against Hitler and win the world to freedom."—Aneurin Bevan, M. P., left-wing Labor Party leader, in the June 21, 1940 issue of the London Tribune.

Our First Duty in the Present Crisis

Our Main Enemy Is Totalitarianism at Home

(Continued from Page 3)

press them, without aiding the Petains, for example. But the fact is that the drive for aid is but the stalking-horse for the drive for our entrance into the present war, or a war of the near and immediate future, for the control of South America, the Far East, and Europe.

The strides towards involvement are rapid. The new "Monroe Doctrine," which pledges us to defend any colony to which a rump French government or the British government might retire in the new world, represents an immediate danger of such involvement.

It is necessary to demonstrate to our people the fantastic nature of the theories of an attack on America by a victorious Germany, because of distance, lack of feasibility of air raids except as isolated stunts over distances much greater than the English Channel, lack of feasibility of great landing parties in the new world, or building of huge war industries and great air bases in Latin America, the difficulty that Germany will have in occupying and maintaining in subjection even the continent of Europe, and the lack of reserve man-power to reconquer even the European colonies which will tend to become free in fact or in form, as the war progresses. (When Napoleon conquered Spain and placed his brother on the throne, the Spanish colonies in these two continents remained "faithful to Spain" and refused to recognize his overlordship. They were never reconquered either by Spain or France.) This problem will grow in magnitude regardless of who wins in Europe, or whether there is a stalemate. The main danger to us in the circumstances lies in our trying to seize them or aid England or France to reconquer them. One of our international duties is once more to link up the independent struggle of the masses in Europe and America with the struggle for colonial freedom. The main ideological danger of the moment here is to glorify the British Empire. For India, for example, or French Africa, Germany is not the "greater evil." Their immediate task is to free themselves, now, in war time, while Europe is weakening itself, from all European domination.

We have other international duties which do not fit into the formula, "Aid to the Allies." Naturally, we cannot dictate to the European movements, but we can decide and must decide which trend among them to cooperate with and support. The actual struggle for an end to the war, for the freedom of their lands from foreign domination, for freedom against their domestic totalitarian trends, for cooperation with each other in the building of a socialist United States of Europe, they will have to work out for themselves. We can only give fraternal advice, and support to the movements and trends that seem best to us. But some criteria we have. Among them, I would emphasize the following lest they be overlooked or slurred over in our thinking and action:

Countries like France and England cannot be defended adequately if the masses follow their governments, and the bureaucrats and generals of the ruling class. These are no true enemies of fascism. They admire Hitler's domestic accomplishments, would like to install and tend to install the same institutions at home, and more recklessly in their colonies; they object only to the extension of Germany's might and sphere of influence until it threatens their own. They helped Hitler rise to power, deliberately favored his victory over his own masses, over Austria, and Spain, Italy's over Ethiopia, etc. The American ruling class gave financial help to the same end. They even gave Hitler his "ideological cause" by their brutal imperialist peace of Versailles, his opportunity by refusal to let a republican Germany solve any of its problems with their economic and political support. What they did not foresee is that in place of using him as a spearhead against the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union would disintegrate from within, develop its own peculiar totalitarianism and imperialism, and end up as a junior partner of Hitler.

Even in war time, these apostles of anti-Hitlerism praise his "domestic achievements," his crimes against his own people. They were

and are defeatists in the struggle against Hitler if the alternative is a victory of the masses and of socialism in Germany, or in their own countries, or in Italy or in Spain, or anywhere else. They are divided between two groups who are ready to sacrifice a part of the privileges to a totalitarian system which will preserve its remnants, and a group which would like to defend their interests by war, exploit the anti-fascist sentiment of the masses to that end, but surrender rather than permit the masses to triumph in their own country, or even in Germany and Italy. This alone explains Ethiopia and Spain, Munich and the defeatism in the top layers of the French and British army and governing bureaucracy. The Petains and Daladiers, the Reynauds, the Blums and Daladiers, concealed and sheltered the Cagoulards "so as not to weaken the defense." Aid to such governments is aid to the Cagoulards, to the native totalitarians and true "Fifth Columnists," against the French and English masses. Today, Hitler himself leaves machine guns and tanks in the hands of Petain to cope with the French masses. We must find our way to aid the independent movements of the masses, to encourage such movements in both camps. They and the colonial peoples alone are our camp. Only that independence has some chance in the near or more remote future to put an end to the trend to imperialism, totalitarianism, capitalist decay and war. Hitler himself is strengthened by his opponent ruling classes. And he is strengthened in his appeal for national unity at home by national unity under such leadership in the opposing lands. Only an independent mass movement in France and England and here can ever hope to help and revive the trend to class independence which is beaten and bruised in Germany but has never died. If the Allies were to be victorious, they would not only divide Germany, but would support some new Hitler, a Goering, Thyssen or other dictator, with tanks and guns, to set up a dictatorship there once more.

It is correct for the I.L.P. to demand arms for all working people, for the entire population of the British Isles. But we at least must understand what at this moment they cannot publicly say: that those arms will not be given, nor could they be used effectively against Hitler unless they were used to displace the unreliable high command, the ruling cliques, and then to free the colonies and summon them to fight under their own leadership for their freedom, and to carry on a revolutionary war against Hitler, summoning the peoples of all the European conquered lands—yes, including the conquered masses of Germany and Austria—to join in the common struggle. Then and only then could we favor aid, but then our government would not be willing to give it. For the present, the aid we give must be that of our example of independence of our own government, and aid to the independent movements in all the warring countries without exception.

TASK IN AMERICA

There is no danger in America that the masses will see no difference between a Hitler victory and a British victory. The real danger, on which we must direct our energies, is that they will see a greater difference than really exists, see the two sides as progress and decay, civilization and barbarism, totalitarianism and democracy, and thus present no obstacle to, rather a force for, our own entrance into war and the growth of totalitarianism here. There is the overwhelming current against which we must swim. A realistic analysis of the very circumscribed margin of difference in temporary results between the victory of one side and the other, if subordinated to that effort on our part, will be helpful in it. But if we exaggerate the difference or permit ourselves to be towed walking backwards into the camp of "aid to Britain," which means war, if we permit the emphasis on difference to obscure the contrary, then our movement is lost and cannot serve the task of opposing totalitarianism and war at home, nor aiding that struggle in war-torn Europe.