

**1000
New Subscribers
By April 1st!**

Socialist Appeal

Official Organ of the Socialist Workers Party, Section of the Fourth International

Issued Twice Weekly

**Get the Appeal
At Your Local.
Newsstand**

VOL. III—No. 13

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 1939

375

3¢ per copy

COURT OUTLAWS SIT-DOWNS

New Fight Begins for War Referendum

La Follette Group Backs Amendment

Mass Sentiment Against War Punctures Roosevelt Plans to Evade Nation-wide Vote

SERIOUS FLAWS IN BILL

(Special to the Socialist Appeal)

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 2.—The tremendous public sentiment against plunging the United States into the rapidly approaching world war managed to break through the iron barrier of Roosevelt war preparations Feb. 28 in the Senate with a proposed amendment to the Constitution providing for a popular referendum before war could be declared by Congress.

The new proposal, backed by a group of twelve senators headed by Senator La Follette of Wisconsin, is similar to the Ludlow amendment which was killed in the House last year.

The Ludlow amendment as originally proposed declared against Congress engaging the United States in any war without a popular referendum unless an attack was launched against the mainland of the country.

War Mongers Attacked Bill

Both the Economic Royalists and the Stalinists attacked this proposal viciously. The Economic Royalists argued that it would tie the hands of the government in carrying out its foreign policy. The Stalinists, hoping for a war alliance between the Stalin government and the Roosevelt administration, argued that it would commit the government to "isolation" and in actual practise prevent it from "actively" engaging in the "fight against fascism."

As the attack grew in fury from the war-mongering capitalist camp and the war-mongering Stalinist camp, Ludlow acceded to amendments to his bill which greatly reduced any effectiveness it might have exerted had it been passed. The House later killed even this emasculated version.

Contains Grave Defects

The present proposed amendment to the constitution contains very grave defects. The referendum would be called when in the opinion of Congress "a national crisis" existed, but only to decide on war in Europe or Asia. If the administration decided that the war should be started in Latin America, it could be launched immediately without the referendum. Moreover, wars in these days are started and sometimes ended without even the formal declaration of war, much less the declaration that a "national crisis" exists.

Secondly, and more important, if Congress wished to make a formal declaration of war without calling for a referendum, it could do so if in its opinion any of the following conditions existed: (a) The United States or its possessions had been attacked, (b) The United States or its possessions were immediately threatened with attack, (c) Any non-American nation had attacked or was threatening to attack any country in the Western Hemisphere.

How It Would Work

Translated into the language used by the Roosevelt administration at secret conferences and in secret war commitments, this means, for example, that if the people don't want war and the majority will vote against it, then Congress, strictly conforming to the amendment, can decide that any nation—Japan, Germany, Italy or one of the other capitalist rivals such as France or Great Britain, "threatens to attack" Mexico, Brazil, or Patagonia, or one of the remote outlying islands of the United States in the Pacific Ocean.

Already those who are deliberately steering the nation into war have started their attack against even this mild and imperfect call for a referendum. Neither the Economic Royalists nor the Stalinists can permit so much as the idea to enter the mind of the public that there is a war referendum in the constitution. In a public statement today Secretary Hull

AUTO UNION WPA DIVISION PERILED BY STALIN GANG

Stalinists Seek to Force Jobless Into W.A.A.

(Special to the Socialist Appeal)

DETROIT.—The United Automobile Workers Union first launched a campaign to organize the W.P.A. workers of Michigan in the early months of 1939. Michigan, at that time, had over 150,000 workers on the W.P.A. payrolls. The vast bulk of these men were automobile workers and other mass production workers. This campaign constituted one of the most progressive steps of any C.I.O. union.

The U.A.W. was the first important International union that recognized unemployment as a responsibility of the labor movement itself and assumed its rightful obligation to organize the W.P.A. workers in the states where it dominated the labor movement.

The bold stand of the U.A.W. marked a sharp contrast to the timidity and confusion of the C.I.O. national leadership. The only advice and leadership the C.I.O. leadership provided to its affiliated unions consisted of several mimeographed bulletins over the signature of Ralph Hetzel, National Unemployment Director, advising all local unions to hold on to its unemployed membership. How this was to be accomplished, Mr. Hetzel did not know.

In effect, the C.I.O. policy meant no organization of the W.P.A. workers.

Set Up Staff

The Stalinists quickly stepped into this picture of confusion and uncertainty. Through their control of key C.I.O. central labor bodies, they "implemented" the national C.I.O. policy by the proposition that all other workers other than the C.I.O. enumerates, be required to join the Workers Alliance. The C.I.O. central labor bodies thus turned the W.P.A. and unemployed workers over to the defunct Workers Alliance. In spite of this shot in the arm, the Workers Alliance organized no W.P.A. or unemployed workers during this whole period in the mid-western states.

The progressive character of the automobile workers program is obvious. For the first time, organized labor stopped mouthing pious phrases about the unemployed. An organization staff was set up, dues were placed at \$50 per month, proper arrangements were made with the other International unions in Michigan and the drive was all geared to start.

Wrecking Crew in Action

Were the Stalinists going to allow the W.P.A. workers to actually be organized in a union not under their complete control? Perish the thought, said Earl Browder and his Michigan lieutenant, Bill Geber. The wrecking crew got into action!

The first monkey wrench was thrown into the machinery by George F. Addes, union secretary-treasurer. He sent out a circular letter to all local unions, commanding, in effect, the previous instructions issued by the union President. It was illegal, Addes, stated, to charge 50¢ dues; the constitution required that dues be set at \$1.00; the fact that this was a W.P.A. auxiliary and the men involved were earning \$80 per month meant nothing to Addes.

South America, it has been repeatedly proved, figures larger

(Continued on Page 3)

SUBSCRIPTION NOTICE

Due to loss of second class mailing rights in the Bronx and Manhattan boroughs of New York City, the *Appeal* finds it necessary to increase subscription rates for these two boroughs only.

Henceforth, the rate of all subscriptions in Bronx and Manhattan is:

\$1.50—6 months

\$3.00—1 year

This increase is necessary to cover additional mailing expenses, and takes effect immediately.

"Our Interests" Must Be Defended!



Court Decision or Not--The Right To A Decent Living Comes First!

AN EDITORIAL

The Supreme Court has ruled that sit-down strikes are illegal.

The Labor Board cannot compel an employer to re-hire a worker who took part in such a strike.

This brutal blow was delivered at the working class and the labor movement by Roosevelt's "liberalized" court.

Roosevelt's direct appointees joined the right reactionaries of the Court in declaring sit-downs illegal.

The Declaration of Independence about which all "democrats" talk so much, states that we have the unalienable rights of Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness.

Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness mean absolutely nothing without the RIGHT TO A JOB FOR EVERY WORKER and the RIGHT TO A DECENT LIVING.

These rights come before everything else—whether the Supreme Court or anybody else says so or not.

The Supreme Court decision means:

The worker does not have the right to a decent living, because he has no right to fight for one.

The American workers found out that one of the best and quickest ways of winning their demands for better conditions was the sit-down strike.

The capitalists, who would like to see labor reduced to the level of starving serfs, shouted: Get out of our plants! They belong to us! They are our private property!

The workers replied: Here we stay until you recognize our union, pay us better wages, shorten our working day.

The workers were saying: Our right to live as decent human beings comes before your right to private property.

THEY WERE 100% CORRECT!

Now, the Supreme Court says: The right to private property comes before the right of the workers to live decently.

It says so now, when it thinks labor is asleep, not fighting.

It didn't dare say a word about it before, when hundreds of thousands of workers were in action, sitting-down in the plants of big capital, and in no mood to be trifled with.

Why was it silent? Because the Supreme Court, like its capitalist masters, fears the power of the organized working class in action.

We repeat: the right to a job and a decent living comes ahead of the right of private capitalist property.

And labor will enforce that right, with its own organized strength, whenever it deems it proper, necessary and effective—Supreme Court or no Supreme Court!

Martinez Barrio added that at least 100 deputies are required to pass on the resignation, and that the last session of the Cortes at Figueras on Feb. 1 had assembled less than that number. He indicated that, with the deputies even more scattered by the collapse of Catalonia, it would be impossible for the government to act on the President's resignation.

Property Rights Take Precedence

Roosevelians and Tories Join Hands In Striking Brutal Blow At American Labor Movement

ALL NINE BAN SIT-INS

Continuing the headlong policy of "business appeasement," for which the lead has been given by the Roosevelt administration during the past month, the Supreme Court last Monday fawned on Wall Street and struck hard at labor in three vicious and reactionary decisions.

The decisions were handed down on appeals by the Fansteel Metallurgical Corp. (North Chicago), the Columbian Enameling and Stamping Co. (Terre Haute), and the Sands Manufacturing Co. (Cleveland), from the rulings of the National Labor Relations Board made under provisions of the Wagner Act.

The Fansteel case was the most spectacular of the three, involving as it did the legality of sit-down strikes. During the bitterly fought Fansteel sit-down strike, which was finally smashed by the brutal terror of armed police and company thugs, the Fansteel Corp. discharged a long list of militant workers. The N.L.R.B. investigation disclosed—what was known to every worker in the North Chicago area—that the Fansteel Corp. had been guilty of every sort of criminal and illegal "unfair labor practice." It ruled that the company should re-hire the discharged workers.

Azana Reveals War Given Up as Lost Long Ago

A communiqué was issued in Madrid on Wednesday announcing that Diego Martinez Barrio, head of the Spanish Cortes, had "assumed" the Spanish Presidency, but Barrio, still in France, did not confirm it.

On Tuesday Martinez Barrio had informed the press that he

BARRIO NAMED PRESIDENT, BUT HE PLAYS SAFE

Reporting a speech made by Georges Bonnet, French Foreign Minister, the N.Y. Times on March 2 said: "United States was among the countries that had declined to admit Spanish refugees. He said France had requested various governments to make offers to give asylum to certain numbers of refugees. Great Britain had declined, but had offered liberal contributions to the Red Cross. Russia had refused also, but had sent 5,000,000 francs, a sum insufficient to care for the refugees now in France for a single day, as they are costing 7,000,000 francs a day."

U.S. AND RUSSIA REFUSE TO ACCEPT SPANISH REFUGEES

Boss Legality

The company, however, was not in the least impressed with the N.L.R.B. ruling. In the eyes of the bosses, "legality" is never more than a useful tool to serve their purposes. Aided by the police and overwhelming force, they had beaten back the workers on the battlefield of the class struggle, and they had no intention of giving up their victory at the request of a namby-pamby governmental board.

They refused to accept the ruling, and turned matters over to their high-power lawyers, confident of the final outcome in the courts since they knew that the courts, like the police, exist for the purpose of guarding their property and their profits.

The Supreme Court, highest deity of capitalist property, did not disappoint them. As a matter of fact, all of the Supreme Court justices simply took for granted that sit-down strikes are "illegal"—this was assumed by the two dissenting justices, Black and Reed; in the same manner as by the majority.

"Without Shadow . . ."

Chief Justice Hughes, who wrote the majority decision, sliced his chops and put it this way: "Nor is it questioned that the seizure and retention of respondent's property were unlawful. It was a high-handed proceeding without shadow of legal right."

The crux of the decision turned, not on the point of the illegality of sit-downs—which was thus taken for granted, but on whether, assuming the illegality of sit-downs, the company was nevertheless compelled under the Wagner Act to reinstate the discharged employees. The Court decided that it was not.

Under the general theory of this decision, therefore, any company may avoid any provision of the Wagner Act merely by framing up any kind of "unlawful acts" against the workers, from the all-inclusive "disorderly conduct" upward.

Wagner Act Stripped

The other two decisions remove the remaining guts from the Wagner Act. In the Sands case, the company had, as shown by N.L.R.B. hearings, fired workers for union activities. The Board ruled that the company should reinstate the workers. Again the Supreme Court upheld the company.

In this decision the Court based itself upon a denial of the facts discovered and shown by the N.L.R.B., and the inferences drawn by the Board from these facts. The important point here is that the (Continued on Page 4)

British Overlords Sole Gainers In Palestine Conference Plan

BY FELIX MORROW

While the Arab world joyously celebrates and Zionists in and out of Palestine cry out against betrayal, the fact of the matter is that the Palestine conference in London has benefited the British government most of all.

What do the Arabs actually have to show, to justify the jubilation in Palestine and the neighboring Arab states? Upon close scrutiny, apart from whatever private promises were made to the Arab delegates and which as so often before will not be carried out, the official British text of "sug-direction of Britain, and must gestions" as a basis for further discussion provides:

1. A "transition period" in which Britain would continue to rule much as before. The "many questions" which Britain proposes to settle during this period mean worked out—at a time when all India is up in arms against this British diplomatic ingenuity can drag it out.

Guards British Interests

2. The Constitution to govern the "independent Palestine state" which would follow the transition period will be written under the "as in the case of the Indian

round-table conference."

The document contains no commitments concerning provisions for democratic elections of any legislative body, or even for proportional representation according to population which would ensure an Arab majority.

In a word, perfidious Albion has given nothing away that can mean anything to the Arab masses.

Arab Backwardness

That this document is received so joyously by the Arab population, both in Palestine and the neighboring Arab states, testifies to the immature development of the Arab nationalist movement as compared, for example, to the Indian struggle for independence. Whereas the rulers of the native states in India are correctly hated and despised as puppets of British imperialism and receive not the slightest measure of conf-

(Continued on Page 3)

In the Trade Unions

By B. J. WIDICK

(Concluded from last issue)

The C. I. O. convention in Massachusetts performed a remarkable feat in the anti-war resolution it approved. Remarkable not in the content of the resolution, but in the amazing "compromise" worked out by the majority of the delegates against the protests of a small progressive minority.

The resolution, as passed, said in the resolves, "that this convention records itself as being unalterably opposed to imperialistic war, to militarism . . ." but the last clause of this same paragraph, "and to the preparations for war," was deleted!

Strike Out Anti-War Paragraphs

This is no accident of confused workers thinking one way and voting another. For two other paragraphs in the resolution were also rejected. And they are extremely significant because they characterize the war.

They read: "in all the wars the working people make all the sacrifices at home and at the front in a cause not their own, while the employers reap all the profits," and, "the same arguments are now being used for preparation for the coming war as were being used in 1918, such as making the world safe for democracy, government by consent of the governed."

These paragraphs were stricken out by the resolutions committee after the resolution was submitted to them. On the floor, a small minority fought to have the original resolution passed but failed.

Compared to the stand of the national C. I. O. convention on another "war for democracy" the Massachusetts C. I. O. is far to the "left" in words but the failure to get specific and serious about fighting imperialist war by fighting war preparations reduces the convention stand to nothing.

The value is solely that it gives progressive unionists a legal argument for continuing their anti-war propaganda within the unions basing themselves on the "stand" of the state C. I. O.

The Stalinists voted for the ambiguous and chopped up resolution. Salvatore Camello, of the JURWA, gave the cue for the Stalinists when he spoke against fighting war preparations. "We may be forced within a short time to defend ourselves against the fascist nations," he declared in Daily Worker style.

Knife Unemployed Organization

The customary job of knifing any serious organization of the unemployed was done by the Stalinists. The organization committee of the convention unanimously approved a resolution calling for the organization of the unemployed into federal workers unions chartered by the C. I. O. on the basis of the following program. A federal works job for every worker not employed by private industry; union scale of wages and hours on WPA work.

The report of the committee was not brought to the floor until a half hour before adjournment. There, Don Carson and John Poulos, Lynn labor leaders, put up a fight for passage of this vital resolution. The Stalinists attacked it as "stepping on the jurisdiction of the Workers Alliance," and "changing national C. I. O. policy."

We've often wondered who gave the Workers Alliance its so-called jurisdiction? Earl Browder? As for national C.I.O. policy, David Lasser has moved heaven and earth to get a C.I.O. national charter and John L. Lewis has cold-shouldered him. Both arguments of the Stalinists are completely phoney. Well, the resolution was referred to the incoming executive board which is supposed to kill it, if the Stalinists get their way.

"They're Trotskyists"

Better cooperation beforehand by all progressives could have brought a different result. It takes more than indignation to smash the influence of the Stalinist wrecking machine.

Of course, Michael Widick, of the United Mine Workers who was re-elected chairman of the state organization, can hardly be called a friend of the Stalinists. Quite the contrary; and this should assist in putting the dampers on their ambitious plans to capture the entire state organizations.

Perhaps one of the surprising to the delegates involved—lessons of the convention was to discover that they were "Trotskyists!" Each time dozens of delegates voted for a progressive idea of any kind, the Stalinists passed the rumor around, "They're Trotskyists!"

Stalinists Seek To Break Auto Union WPA Division

W.A.A. Is Dangerous Substitute for Great Auto Union Achievement

(Continued from Page 1) W.P.A. workers over to the Stalinist Workers Alliance. For months, they resisted, with might and main, all attempts to organize the W.P.A. workers of Ohio, Indiana and other industrial states in the mid-west.

Now with Martin committing har-kiri, the C.P. is beginning to control the International Executive Board of the U.A.W. It is already proceeding to ditch the W.P.A. organizations, and dump them, if possible, into the Workers' Alliance.

The Cleveland C.I.O. Council voted the W.P.A. auxiliary an illegal body and expelled it out of the C.I.O. The Toledo C.I.O. Council voted to disband the W.P.A. auxiliary to promote spurious reorganization plan.

The progressives gathered their forces in the council and succeeded in postponing the measure, however,

until a further meeting. The South Bend C.I.O. council ordered the W.P.A. auxiliary to disband and the members to join the Workers' Alliance. All three of these councils are under the control of the Communist Party hatchet gang.

The militants of the U.A.W. as well as the whole C.I.O. have got to stop the wrecker's cold—reorganize the unemployed and W.P.A. workers; help weld them into one solid, loyal union organization that can march forward with the necessary solidarity and strength to smash all of labor's traitors and foes.

Move to Ditch W.P.A. Men

Driven out of Detroit, the Stalinists began their burrowing and disruption in Toledo, Cleveland, South Bend and other auto centers.

Richard Reisinger, Paul Miley and Ellsworth Kramer, Regional Directors of Ohio, claimed that the U.A.W. auxiliary only applied to Michigan.

In Ohio they were going to organize the W.P.A. workers on a craft basis and charge the workers \$1.00 monthly dues. The Workers' Alliance would organize all the "unorganized workers" and charge only 50¢ monthly dues—a transparent trick to turn all of the

members.

Dissolution Voted By Inland Steel Outfit

(Special to the Socialist Appeal)

CHICAGO, Feb. 27.—A mass meeting called by the company dominated Steel Workers' Independent Union Inc. of the Inland Steel Company was turned into a complete rout last Monday evening when a packed hall of militant Steel Workers Organizing Committee men "captured" the meeting. This event marked the complete collapse of the scab Independent Union.

The Independent Union, Inc. was formed at the Inland Steel Co. just prior to the Little Steel strike in an attempt by the company to head off the strike and break the S.W.O.C. During the strike this scab outfit attempted to lead a back-to-work movement by hiring thugs and gangsters to break the picket line. Only the size and militancy of the S.W.O.C. picket line prevented them.

Proved a Company Union

During the National Labor Relations Board hearings into the case of the Inland Lodge of the S.W.O.C. after the strike, it was proved conclusively that the Independent Union was a company union. In its ruling, the Labor Board ordered the scab union disbanded on the grounds that it was an illegal union.

Many notable speakers have appeared before the Forum: James P. Cannon, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party; Nathan Gould, National Organizer for the Young People's Socialist League (4th International); Kermit and Genora Johnson, leaders of the Flint auto workers' strikes of 1937; Felix Morrow, noted authority on Spanish questions; Vincent R. Dunne, nationally known labor leader and organizer for the militant General Drivers Union Local 544 of Minneapolis; Dr. Grace Carlson of St. Paul; Workers Defense League national committee member for this area; Max Goldman, organizational secretary of the militant unemployed movement of Minneapolis; the Federal Workers Section of Local 544; W. W. Norris, noted writer and speaker on Spanish questions; and Julius Geller, well known St. Paul militant who was the S.W.P. candidate for mayor of St. Paul in the last election.

Forums to Continue

The forums will continue until the advent of warm weather, which will be sometime in early April. Until then additional authorities in the various fields of the labor movement will be brought before the forum audiences.

The Party has won many new members, and hundreds of workers have been brought nearer to our revolutionary position as a direct result of the forums.

\$1.25 SALE

Russia Twenty Years After—Victor Serge

A History of National Socialism—Konrad Heden

Portrait of America—Diego Rivera

Portraits and Pamphlets—by Karl Radek

Not Guilty—Final Verdict of the Commission of Inquiry into the Moscow Trials

Are the Jews a Race?—by Karl Radek

At the LABOR BOOK SHOP

28 East 12th Street, N. Y. C.

Add 3¢ per book for postage

Tanner, Bates Charges Dropped

(Special to the Socialist Appeal)
SAN FRANCISCO—The police of this city have dropped all proceedings against the six persons arrested for picketing the recent pro-Franco rally.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

LIBERATION SEEN NEAR FOR FRAMED HARLAN MINERS

Frame-Up Was Part of Anti-Union Terror

By MARTIN HARVEY

The prospect of freedom for four Harlan miners, serving life sentences for conspiring to kill three company gunmen, is brighter than ever before. Herbert Mahler, Secretary-Treasurer of the Kentucky Miners Defense Committee, has learned of the records of these gentlemen reveals how such a decision is possible less than two months after the freeing of Tom Mooney, who was convicted on the same charge.

Enemies of Labor

Earl Warren, as District Attorney of Alameda County in 1936, engineered the conviction of leaders of the Marine Fireman's Union on a false murder charge and by this act gained the dubious fame that elected him Attorney General.

Plummer is a former Los An-

Billings Again Denied Pardon by Calif. Board

By NORMAN MINI

(Special to the Socialist Appeal)
SACRAMENTO, Feb. 24.—The campaign to free Warren K. Billings from Folsom Prison today received its first serious setback when the California Advisory Board, by a vote of 3 to 2, refused to recommend a pardon for him.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student meetings were held to protest the arrests. A petition asking for the release of the pickets secured 900 signatures on the campus.

The case, involving Myra Tanner and Roland Bates, Y.P.S.L. members, aroused the indignation of various trades unions and liberal organizations. At Berkeley University, student

OFF THE RECORD

By Dwight Macdonald

In a story about the next world war, printed in a recent issue of the English literary magazine, *Seven*, there is a marching song which today especially has a certain grim point to it. The author of the story is G. S. Fraser, and he introduces the song thus:

"As they marched, they sang a song which had become popular during the war now known as the 'dress rehearsal'—the Spanish Civil War. A singularly ribald composition, it was said to be the work of a young English communist who had fought in the International Brigade. For obvious reasons (it was coarse, brutal, unorthodox), it had not been included in his slim, posthumous volume.

"The song went like this, to a good marching tune:

"Many the skies and the omens above
But few the defenders and feeble the love:
As I passed by Lerida, I heard a man moan:
The beggars, the beggars won't let us alone!

"They regild the saints, they reopen the church,
By our fine-spoken friends we are left in the lurch.

Our cause was most moral, of words we had tons.
But the beggars, the beggars, who gave them the guns?

"We went to old Stalin until we were sick,
He said we would beat them with dia-lec-tic!
He said that pure logic would see them in hell!
But the beggars, the beggars maneuvered too well!

"We went to old Blum, and he spoke very high,
But he thought of Herr Hitler, and left us to die.
There'll be weeping and wailing in Paris cafe.
But the beggars, the beggars, they're well on their way!

"We went to Old England, her heart is of oak.
But she soon made us feel we were sorry we spoke.

She wrote us some verse, but blockaded Bilbao
For the beggars, the beggars to give us the keyo.

"O, all you fine rebels, whose guns go rantan,
I am a poor sod of a Government man.

I fought till I blistered, I walked till I bust.
But of all the damned beggars, you aren't the wust!

Gas Masks and the Class War

All over England these days the ominous letters, A.R.P., are blazoned on billboards, sprinkled through the news columns, discussed over tea tables. A.R.P. means "Air Raid Protection"—a series of measures which have so far been put into effect with neither efficiency nor enthusiasm. A certain Sir John Anderson recently stated publicly: "People write as if we ought to aim at making war safe for civilians. My opinion is that we cannot make war safe for civilians." Sir John's opinion was heard all over England; he is Chamberlain's Minister for National Defense. The reason for Sir John's apathy is the simple fact that in England, as in the other great democracies, nine out of ten citizens are not "people of importance," i.e., people of enough property to make any difference—except to themselves—whether they are blown to bits or not. Those who can pay for it have all the A.R.P. they want, and of the very best quality. Even in the

MEN AND WOMEN OF LABOR

Out of the Past

BY EMANUEL GARRET

IRA STEWARD

(March 10, 1831—March 13, 1883)

Connecticut-born, Ira Steward at the age of nineteen went to work as an apprentice machinist, working twelve hours a day. One year later his bosses fired him for his peculiar views, to wit: twelve hours a day was too long a working day.

What is more, Ira Steward was outspoken about his views to which he added the additional "peculiar" twist that eight hours a day was more than enough for a working man. And that, in the 1840's and 50's, was indeed a "peculiar" proposal.

Steward and the 8-Hour Movement Were One

To the cause of the shorter work-day, Steward devoted the rest of his life. Indefatigably, he pressed the shorter day, sparing himself not at all, with the result that the movement in the United States for the ten and eight hour days was, properly speaking, one and the same with his life and activity. During his lifetime he served as organizer and president of the Boston 8-Hour League and the National 10-Hour League, as well as active participant in other labor organizations.

A delegate to the convention of the International Union of Machinists and Blacksmiths which met in Boston in 1863, he proposed and obtained the passage of a resolution calling for the 8-hour day—the first such resolution adopted in the United States by an important labor body. Thereafter, constantly agitating, speaking, propagandizing, his proposals secured an ever widening basis of support.

It was largely through his efforts that the first effective 10-hour law was passed in Massachusetts. And later, when the 10-hour day had by no means yet become established practice even formally, it was through the tireless efforts of Steward and his co-workers that the 8-hour day was accepted by various localities and industries, only in limited application.

Shorter Work-Day Not An End in Itself

Eventually, the fight for the shorter work-day became part of the program of every trade union and social reformer. With Steward, however, the shorter work-day was not an end in itself. For him it was the focal point of an attack on the whole system of capitalist society. Shorter hours would result in higher wages; higher wages would compel improvements in technique, and would give the workers an ever increasing share

of the national income of the country; the progressive reduction of working time would allow for the absorption of all unemployed workers, thus keeping wage levels high; and in time the workers would be in a position to buy out the capitalists and institute socialism.

Today, in the light of working class experience and the teachings of the great socialist leaders, Steward's program was, to say the least, inadequate. As a program for overthrowing capitalism it bordered on the ridiculous; it nowhere fully considered the process of capitalist overthrow, and certainly overlooked the detail of boss unwillingness to yield power.

But, in a general and very one-sided way, it did nevertheless posit the absolute necessity for the working class to fight for better economic conditions and indicated the trend of capitalist society towards concentrated production and improvement of technique—essential economic bases for the future socialist society. These are now accepted facts; in those days they were novel and significant. Especially so, since at the time he worked, it was a popular opinion among many of the so-called socialists that it was futile to ask for higher wages because these could not be won under capitalism.

A delegate to the convention of the International Union of Machinists and Blacksmiths which met in Boston in 1863, he proposed and obtained the passage of a resolution calling for the 8-hour day—the first such resolution adopted in the United States by an important labor body. Thereafter, constantly agitating, speaking, propagandizing, his proposals secured an ever widen-

ing basis of support.

In a day when the trend of labor organization was directed towards the skilled workers, he urged the organization of the unskilled. With members of the First (Marx's) International in the United States he founded in 1876 the International Union of Labor—the first really sizeable move towards organizing the unskilled workers.

Steward's writings were few. Works that he planned remained unfinished at the time of his death. But in his speeches, in the articles he wrote for various journals, above all in the movements he created or helped build, we have a record of an important period in American labor's fight for better conditions and emancipation—one in which Ira Steward served as leader and teacher.

British Sole Gainers In Palestine Scheme

(Continued from Page 1)

ence from the Indian masses, the rulers of the Arab kingdoms, whose delegates are working hand in glove with the British in London, are still trusted by the Arab workers and peasants. While in India the native capitalists have lost the leadership of the independence movement to the Congress Socialists, in Palestine a clique of reactionary landowners and capitalists still hold undisputed sway over the mass movement.

It must be said bluntly that the main cause of this backwardness of the Arab nationalist movement is that the struggle, instead of being centered against British imperialism, has been diverted to the conflict with the Zionists.

Want Deal With Britain

The present reactionary leadership of the Arab nationalists have welcomed this diversion. This clique neither desires nor would benefit by independence from Britain. It wants only what the ruling caste in Egypt and Iraq have: a juicy junior partnership with Britain as senior partner, in the common exploitation of the Arab masses. Its basic interests are, therefore, in conflict with those of the Arab workers and peasants, whose miserable living standards can only be bettered by putting an end to Britain's blood-sucking of the wealth of the Arab world, by putting an end to the monstrous taxes and rents paid for the back-

breaking privilege of tilling the soil, etc.

This basic conflict between the Arab leaders and the masses who still follow them has been cleverly obscured by a deliberate policy of turning Arab wrath away from Britain to the Jews. Not British rapacity and the vicious landowning and taxation system, but Jewish immigration and land purchases have been held up by the Arab leaders as the cause of the masses' misery and poverty.

Zionist "Ulsterites"

This policy could never have fooled the Arab masses so long, however, had it not been facilitated by the insane policy pursued by the Zionists of every hue. Staking everything on proving their usefulness to Britain, the Zionist leaders sought to build a "loyal Jewish Ulster" amid the revolting Arabs, and as a result have brought down upon themselves a hatred among the Arabs as deep as that of the Irish Republicans against the "loyal"—to Britain—Ulstermen. The Arab masses do not discriminate between the Zionists and Revisionists, who propose to use "physical force" against the Arabs, and the regular Zionists, bourgeois or "socialist," who propose to establish a Jewish majority under the protection of British bayonets—and the Arab masses are right, for every wing of Zionism is hostile to Arab freedom from British rule.

The Zionist policy is particularly reprehensible because it has been clear for decades that no amount of servility toward Britain would secure in return a Jewish state in Palestine. The Zionist leaders cry, "We are betrayed," because the British document proposes to wipe out the League of Nations mandate of 1922 which directed Britain to establish a "Jewish National Home." But—to mention none of its previous moves against the Zionists—on October 20, 1930, the Passfield White Paper which Zionists then correctly described as a complete annulment of the Balfour Declaration of 1918 pledging England to aid the establishment of a Jewish Homeland. Stephen S. Wise described it as designed "to oust and eventually destroy the Jewish National Home."

Passfield White Paper Stands

At that time, the Zionists declared that withdrawal of the White Paper was the minimum condition of restoring Jewish faith in British intentions. But the paper was never withdrawn. Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald gave the Zionist leaders a face-saving letter, on February 13, 1931, which Weizmann and others hailed as "modifying" the White Paper, but the plain truth was that Zionist fund-raising had collapsed after the issuance of the White Paper and MacDonald's letter, which he himself declared in Parliament did

not modify the Passfield document, was "interpreted" by the Zionists to revive the stream of contributions from American Jewry.

It simply never occurred to the Zionist leaders to reorient away from Britain: "The tragic aspect of our situation is that though a Government has failed us, we dare not court irretrievable failure by failing the British," wrote a leading Zionist, Gershon Agron, sky, then.

But irretrievable failure has come precisely on the road of courting Britain.

Great Opportunity

A magnificent opportunity awaits any section of the Jewish labor movement in Palestine which would, once for all, recognize that collaboration with Britain is hopeless, and turn boldly toward collaboration with the Arab workers and peasants. Such a step would enormously speed up the process of separating the Arab masses from their present reactionary leadership.

Accepting the minority status which the Arabs demand, such a Jewish group could thereupon submit the British proposal to sharp exposure of its imperialist and anti-independence content, and thereby speed the crystallization of an Arab worker-peasant leadership. Only an alliance between the Jewish workers and the Arab masses can save the Jewish community in Palestine.

HOLLYWOOD MERRY-GO-ROUND

Nothing is more suited to the purposes of a capitalism bent on war than the popular art mediums. Commanding the popular avenues of entertainment, capitalism is wholly able to pervert their use to its own diabolical ends. In a period when mass unrest is widespread and when war is offered as the only solution to mitigate its woes, capitalism makes every possible effort through the facilities at hand to head off the gathering discontent and to enoble its macabre adventure on the battlefield.

Great Opportunity

A magnificent opportunity awaits any section of the Jewish labor movement in Palestine which would, once for all, recognize that collaboration with Britain is hopeless, and turn boldly toward collaboration with the Arab workers and peasants. Such a step would enormously speed up the process of separating the Arab masses from their present reactionary leadership.

Accepting the minority status which the Arabs demand, such a Jewish group could thereupon submit the British proposal to sharp exposure of its imperialist and anti-independence content, and thereby speed the crystallization of an Arab worker-peasant leadership. Only an alliance between the Jewish workers and the Arab masses can save the Jewish community in Palestine.

Academy Award Is Case In Point

The best symptom of what is yet to come out of Hollywood is revealed in this year's awards of the Academy of the Motion Picture Industry. For the first time since it started making its annual awards, the Academy this year introduced an award for the best pictures dealing with patriotic subjects. Naturally, almost needless to say, the award went to Warner Brothers.

A glance at the production schedule reveals that Warners has for immediate action before the cameras another service picture while Universal announces a cadet picture featuring its child stars. Nor are the other studios asleep. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer has all but clinched the rights to "The American Way," which can only mean that with its usual super-slavishness, Metro will do the Kaufman play in those celebrated technicolor pastels: Red, White and Blue. Functioning independently, no less a person than Chaplin is engaged in shooting the "Dictators," from which farce, it is safe to assume, will emerge another long yell for Yankee Doodle Doo and Democracy.

Foreign Films

In Same Key

As for the foreign cinema, it too is not so slouch in the matter of patriotism, nor any the less aware of its responsibilities to the Fatherland. Most recent of the French films is a *Sasha Gulya* crumpet entitled "Champ Elysees," a sentimental, nostalgic, not very droll, historical cavalcade which ends just short of a waving tricolor. The much renowned and acclaimed "Grand Illusion," despite the blurb that goes with it, is anything but anti-war. Although we have come to expect a higher level of cinematic excellence from the French films, the acute situation that prevails in Europe cannot but result in a degeneration to panegyric and flag waving on the screen.

In short, it will become more and more difficult to enter a theatre without having a national anthem thrown at you. So that the best that one can do on entering is to check one's faculties with the usher and dig in for a noisy evening of bang-up bunting, bunting and bugles.

Nat Levine.

"national interests" against the narrower interests of British capitalists. British Labor Party spokesman Attlee shouted at Chamberlain in the House of Commons:

"What does it mean to the government if Gibraltar is in danger if we get the Rio Tinto dividends?"

(The reference is to the copper mines in the Basque country.)

The hero of the Stalinists and other Popular Fronters, Anthony Eden, rushed to Chamberlain's defense, declaring that "national interests" required immediate recognition of Franco.

CARIBBEAN NAVAL MANEUVERS AIM AT INTERVENTION

(Continued from Page 1)

and larger in the business and military speculations of Uncle Sam. The Lima conference, the addition of some twenty-odd military attaches to Latin American consulates, the increase of the Military Intelligence force in the lands of our good Southern neighbors—all these, and more, attest the determination of Wall Street's agents to step into the South American picture with an armed show-down in mind.

Afraid of Masses

Germany and other countries have for some years been gradually increasing their business hold in various of the South American nations. England has for long been a potent factor. And for as long a period the U.S. has tussled with these different competitors for control of the markets, and consequently politics, to the south.

But Roosevelt is more afraid of a peasant and proletarian uprising in South America than of any amount of business competition. One is a death thrust at American boss-dom; the other injures it, but leaves it breathing. Hence the particular character of the "games"—to determine what the U.S. would do in the event of a revolution. And it is quite obvious that "good neighbor" Roosevelt not only has in mind the trumped up "revolutions" which are financed by one or the other of the powers, but a real and bona-fide revolt of Latin America's deeply persecuted masses against all the imperialist powers.

A four-page leaflet in the Yiddish language, calling upon the Jewish workers to unite with all militant labor in the struggle to smash fascism, has just been issued by the Socialist Workers Party in connection with the huge counter-demonstration it called to picket the recent Madison Square Garden meeting of the Nazis.

The Jewish capitalist and social-democratic press, it will be recalled, took a cowardly position towards the Nazi mobilization, calling on its readers to stay at home and refrain from attending the counter-rally. The S.W.P. leaflet attacks this attitude, as well as the sabotaging position taken by the Stalinists.

The leaflet has already been distributed in thousands of copies in the city of New York and is also available for distribution among Yiddish-speaking workers throughout the country. Branches are requested to order bundles of leaflets from the National Office of the party. They are priced at \$2.25 a thousand copies.

UNITED STATES: IT NEED NOT HAPPEN HERE!

Speaker:
James Burnham
Auspices:
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY
Fourth International

Sunday, Mar. 12--8 P.M.
IRVING PLAZA
Irving Place and 15th St.
Admission 25¢ — Ticket for sale at the
LABOR BOOK SHOP, 28 East 12th St.

SOCIALIST APPEAL

March 7, 1939

Published twice a week by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASSN
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
orders: 2 cents per copy in United States; 3 cents per
copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 3 cents.
Bronx and Manhattan subscriptions are: \$1.50 for
six months; \$3.00 for one year.

"Reentered as second class matter February 16,
1939, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under
the Act of March 3, 1879."

Editor:
MAX SHACHTMAN
Associate Editors:

HAROLD ROBERTS **FELIX MORROW**
Staff Members:
EMANUEL GARRETT **JOSEPH HANSEN**
Business Manager:
S. STANLEY

FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY FOR:

1. A job and a decent wage for every worker.
2. Open the idle factories—operate them under workers' control.
3. A Twenty-Billion dollar Federal public works and housing program.
4. Thirty-thirty! \$30-weekly minimum wage—30-hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
5. Thirty dollar weekly old-age and disability pension.
6. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
7. All war funds to the unemployed.
8. A people's referendum on any and all wars.
9. No secret diplomacy.
10. An independent Labor party.
11. Workers Defense Guards against Vigilante and Fascist attacks.

They Fear A Referendum

A year ago when the Ludlow amendment was being debated in Congress, Secretary Hull opposed the bill on the grounds that if it was first necessary to hear the decision of the people before sending them to war it would tie the government's hands in the conduct of its foreign policy.

In plain language, the government's foreign policy means war and a popular referendum would put a crimp in starting that war.

This year when a similar referendum is proposed in Congress, Hull opposes it again on the grounds that it would be an infringement on the system of representative government handed down by the founding fathers.

In plain language, Hull's conception—the conception of the entire capitalist class—of representative government, is a government by a minority with power to hurl the nation into war at will—and they don't want anything to obstruct that set-up no matter how fimsy the obstruction might be.

That's what the bosses really mean by "democracy"!

Rip The Veil Away!

The dark veil of lies, hypocrisy, and silence covering the secret conference between President Roosevelt and the Senate Military Affairs Committee over purchases of airplanes by France was once again slightly lifted during Senate debate last Thursday.

"If the American people ever learn what was said there, and if Senators want to hear it," said Senator Lundeen of Minnesota who was present at the secret conference and should know what he is talking about, "the nation would be shocked and stunned at the secrecy and at the conference we had."

Why would the nation be shocked and stunned?

What did the President tell the conference members under oath of secrecy about his war plans?

Senator Bridges of New Hampshire declared to the Senate during the same debate that the confidential record of the testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee tells a different story from the expurgated testimony made public by the committee.

The testimony actually published by the committee, then, is a fraud and a lie on the American public, a brazen bare-faced maneuver to cheat an aroused and wrathful public opinion.

Why did the committee expurgate this testimony?

"We may some day give publicity to the secret conference," Senator Lundeen told the Senate.

Are the real plans of President Roosevelt too damning to stand the light of day? Why? Must the war come first? Why not give publicity to the secret conference now?

"I happen to know that the notes of that conference in the White House are in existence," Lundeen continued.

Why aren't those notes published?

If Roosevelt has hidden them in his secret archives, why don't the members of the Senate Military Affairs Committee make public what Roosevelt told them?

Where the lives of millions of farmers and workers are being bartered like herds of swine for profits and colonies and spheres of influence and the guns are now being loaded that will kill the voters who trustingly put them into public office, why are these "representatives of the people" who attended the secret conference too cowardly to speak out?

Is a secret oath given to a butcher worth more than the lives of millions of innocent people? Honor has a strange ring in Congress!

Why are these cowards and cheap careerists afraid to tell the American people of the fate that sinister forces back of the White House have planned for them?

Senator Bridges gave the answer to that question: "It is best for America and for the rest of the world (read international capitalism) that all the details of that White House conference never become known."

Senator Bridges fears that if the American people ever find out what was revealed in that secret conference the repercussions would sweep him, Roosevelt,

and the whole rotten system they represent forever out of power.

The people of the United States have a right to know what their representatives know.

The people of the United States have a right to decide whether they shall follow the commitments made by the ruling class down the bloody horrible pathway to war.

We demand that the genuine testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee be published in full.

We demand that the whole veil of secrecy be ripped away from President Roosevelt's secret treaties and foreign commitments.

Let the American people see and judge!

Stalin's Closed Doors

Soviet Russia has refused to provide asylum for refugees from Loyalist Spain, according to a statement attributed to French Foreign Minister Bonnet, in the New York Times, March 2.

Bonnet also pointed out that the sum sent by the Soviet government for refugee relief, five million francs, is insufficient to care for the Spanish refugees now in France for a single day.

What possible justification can Stalin find for closing the doors to the Loyalist soldiers and their families?

When it became impossible any longer to remain silent on the question why Stalin did not open the doors of Russia to the refugees from Germany and Austria, the Stalinist press finally told us that those refugees were predominantly "bourgeois and petty-bourgeois" and hence would not fit in in Russia—in the 22nd year after the victorious revolution!

The Stalinist press has, however, never explained why German and Austrian workers, technicians, doctors and dentists, etc., were not permitted to find asylum in the Soviet Union. Nor have Stalinist apologists been able as yet to find an explanation for the horrible fact that Communist party members seeking to flee the Nazification of Czechoslovakia, have been refused passage to go to the Soviet Union.

To these unanswered questions is now added the latest: why will Stalin not open the doors of the Soviet Union to the flower of the Spanish proletariat, now hungering and freezing in the open-air concentration camps of France?

It is understandable why capitalist France should want to be rid of these proletarian fighters, and why capitalist England, America, etc., should want no part of these workers and peasants. We shall have to arouse the working class everywhere to win asylum for the Loyalist refugees.

But why does Stalin bar them from the Soviet Union—the Workers Fatherland?

"Many officials of the Federal Bureau of Investigation have long advocated universal finger printing as a means of identifying people who are killed in accidents, dogged by impersonators and forgers or who are suffering from amnesia," says Dr. George Gallup in reporting the results of his poll which indicate that 84 per cent of the people favor such finger printing. Damned handy too, in putting the finger on militant workers in strike struggles.

An End To Zionist Illusions!

During the preparations for the anti-Nazi demonstration of Feb. 20 a group of Yipsels called at the East Side headquarters of one of the Zionist youth organizations, the Hashomer-Hatzair, to ask these Jewish boys and girls to join us in the demonstration.

"Sorry, but we can't join you," said their leader. "Our Zionist policy is to take no part in politics outside Palestine."

In that incident is summed up the crime of the Zionist leadership. Since 1918 it has devoured the energies and minds of millions of Jewish men and women and boys and girls—not to speak of the hundreds of millions of dollars it took—in an enterprise which revolutionary socialists predicted from the first could come only to its present end: punctured by the British imperialists on whose favor the Zionists staked everything.

An end to this criminal waste! It is an immediate task of our party to get those boys and girls out on the picket line with us next time, to awaken the Jewish people to the realization that the fight against anti-Semitism, which is the fight against fascism, is here and now, and that all the real fighters against fascism belong in the ranks of the Socialist Workers Party!

A bill by Senator Rufus C. Holman (R. Oregon), to limit exports of Douglas fir and Port Orford cedar logs, is designed to protect American lumber manufacturers from Japanese competition. Now if someone will present a bill to protect us from the lumbermen, all might be well,—maybe.

Any Dirty Boots Around?

How high is up? Nobody knows.

How low is down? Here's how low it is:

Commenting on the Supreme Court's Fansel decision, Stalinist Sam Wiseman, secretary of the Workers Alliance of Greater New York, declared, according to the N. Y. Herald-Tribune (Feb. 28):

"The Workers Alliance will obey the law. We have never cherished sit-down strikes as such. Whenever the workers on relief sat down they did so because of intolerable conditions or to protest some injustice by the relief administration. The Alliance will continue to lead the unemployed in their fight for their just demands."

Oh no, it won't, any more than it has in the past couple of years. It won't because, thank God, it's a law-abiding organization, with a law-abiding Stalinist leadership.

The Nine Old Men of Capitalism say no sit-down strikes. Okay! say the Stalinists, we never care for sit-downs anyway.

Tomorrow, the Old Men will say no strikes at all, and that's the law. Okay! the Stalinists will repeat.

Now we know how low "down" is. It's as low as the Stalinist leadership. It's so far down that not only the Supreme Court, but anybody else who has some dirty capitalist boots hanging around, is invited to send them to the Wiseman and Co. to be licked clean and shiny. Satisfactory work is guaranteed by past performances.

Thomas Jefferson's Strange Return to Life

The Stalinists Do Violence To The Whole History Of Early America In Order To Present Jefferson As One Of The Patrons Of "Twentieth Century Americanism"

By CHRIS ANDREWS

When in 1935 Moscow gave orders to its Communist Parties to make friends with the bourgeoisie, the interpretation of American history entered into a new period of agony. Stalinist speakers, glowing with their new and self-styled titles of 20th Century Americans, began to make halting but determined references to Patrick Henry, Paul Revere, and Daniel Boone. Meanwhile the party hacks burrowed into the volumes of the liberal historians—to return rejoicing with the unhappy shade of Thomas Jefferson, of Monticello.

ive alike can be honest about it)—much eloquence and many fine pledges were needed to call them to battle for their local exploiters against their foreign.

Workers Begin to Revolt

The colonial bourgeois were not unskilled in this task. In the war propaganda of the day, Thomas Jefferson, who had a genius for resounding phrases, played a well-known part. Among other things, he wrote the Declaration of Independence; its moving and haunting promises have been interpreted differently by the various classes and interests of our society ever since.

In the course of the revolution war the embattled masses showed traits most alarming to the businessmen and property-holders who had called them to revolt. After the fashion of agrarians with arms in hand, they burned mortgages, destroyed the estates of the Tories and divided them, and issued paper money with the intent of wiping out their status as debtors. In the cities, the workers that had previously fought British Customs Officers and soldiers showed equal lack of respect for wealth and property. After the Peace and before the Constitution—1783 to 1789—they continued revealing a capacity for violence, a contempt for rights of wealthy creditors and speculators, their lawyers, and their courts. The bourgeoisie observed and drew the indicated conclusions, in the same manner that the property-owner has always faced the problem of enforcing respect for his property right—from the days of Rome and Greece to those land-holders and financiers who backed General Franco.

A Little Bit of History

The American Revolution was waged between the ruling class of England, and the ruling class of the 13 colonies—merchants, bankers, shippers, planters. Resourceful and intelligent men who dominated economic, political, and social life, their victory got them most definite material gains—commercial freedom, the right to develop industry at home, the cancellation of the planters' debts to English creditors, the right to expand to the West—in other words, the power to exploit the untapped resources of a virgin continent and its corresponding right under capitalism, the right to exploit the labor of the workers and farmers who lived and were to live in the new nation.

A most handsome prize—and not to be confused with the Rights of Man or the Pursuit of Happiness—except as those phrases applied first and foremost to the above-mentioned bankers, merchants, shippers, and planters.

Minority Engineered Constitution

The capable American bourgeoisie accomplished its task without war. There was no city proletariat ready to oppose it. The restless and bitter agrarians were confused and divided among themselves. Quite illegally, having gathered together their best leaders in a closed conference, they organized their power, presented it to the nation, and forced through its acceptance. Of a population of some 4,000,000 it is estimated that about 120,000 were allowed to vote on the question.

As Charles Beard has ably shown, the Framers were bankers, shippers, merchants, and planters, men who had financial gains to make from the Constitution they created. Small farmers and workers there were none.

The Marxist, of course, draws certain grim conclusions from these revealing facts—conclusions about the class character of the government which has been developed through the years, having as its basis a Constitution created in such a manner. And that Marxist analysis was once understood by many of the present Stalinist hacks. The hard facts of History have not changed—but the Party Line has, and has produced those monstrous distortions of History which now litter the dreary pages of the Daily Worker, and the dull minds of our Twentieth Century American Morons.

Masses Must Be Rallied

It is a commonplace of Marxism that human beings erect above the economic basis of their society—which is the final and determining source of their conduct with one another—a superstructure of religion, law, politics, and so on. In the decades of preparation for the break with England, the colonial bourgeoisie had written and argued eloquently and well; they had a remarkable group of leaders. Not only did they have to organize themselves for the dangerous task in hand—they were staking their heads—but it was necessary to rally behind them the masses. They were needed to face the British Grenadiers.

Even the bourgeois historians will admit that in the Colonial period a class society existed here.

To win these poverty-stricken workers and farmers, indentured servants, debt-ridden men and women pushed off the best lands to eke out a living in the back country, kept by poll taxes, religious qualifications, property requirements from any political activity—the record of their misery can be found in the books; it is far enough back in our history so that liberal and conserva-

tive scholars have not changed—but the Party Line has, and has produced those monstrous distortions of History which now litter the dreary pages of the Daily Worker, and the dull minds of our Twentieth Century American Morons.

Role of Jeffersonian Democrats

This Constitution, conceived in the class interest of the bourgeoisie, was written and supported by most of the men who were later leaders of the Jeffersonian Democracy. Jefferson him-

self from France wrote to inquirers, "I approved from the first moment, of the great mass of what is in the new Constitution."

Taking a position of independence from politics, he avowed, "I am not of the party of Federalists," but hastened to add, "But I am much further from that of the anti-Federalists."

Workers Begin to Revolt

The colonial bourgeois were not unskilled in this task. In the war propaganda of the day, Thomas Jefferson, who had a genius for resounding phrases, played a well-known part. Among other things, he wrote the Declaration of Independence; its moving and haunting promises have been interpreted differently by the various classes and interests of our society ever since.

A Little Bit of History

The American Revolution was waged between the ruling class of England, and the ruling class of the 13 colonies—merchants, bankers, shippers, planters. Resourceful and intelligent men who dominated economic, political, and social life, their victory got them most definite material gains—commercial freedom, the right to develop industry at home, the cancellation of the planters' debts to English creditors, the right to expand to the West—in other words, the power to exploit the untapped resources of a virgin continent and its corresponding right under capitalism, the right to exploit the labor of the workers and farmers who lived and were to live in the new nation.

Minority Engineered Constitution

The capable American bourgeoisie accomplished its task without war. There was no city proletariat ready to oppose it. The masses observed and drew the indicated conclusions, in the same manner that the property-owner has always faced the problem of enforcing respect for his property right—from the days of Rome and Greece to those land-holders and financiers who backed General Franco.

A Little Bit of History

The American Revolution was waged between the ruling class of England, and the ruling class of the 13 colonies—merchants, bankers, shippers, planters. Resourceful and intelligent men who dominated economic, political, and social life, their victory got them most definite material gains—commercial freedom, the right to develop industry at home, the cancellation of the planters' debts to English creditors, the right to expand to the West—in other words, the power to exploit the untapped resources of a virgin continent and its corresponding right under capitalism, the right to exploit the labor of the workers and farmers who lived and were to live in the new nation.

Workers Begin to Revolt

The colonial bourgeois were not unskilled in this task. In the war propaganda of the day, Thomas Jefferson, who had a genius for resounding phrases, played a well-known part. Among other things, he wrote the Declaration of Independence; its moving and haunting promises have been interpreted differently by the various classes and interests of our society ever since.

A Little Bit of History

The American Revolution was waged between the ruling class of England, and the ruling class of the 13 colonies—merchants, bankers, shippers, planters. Resourceful and intelligent men who dominated economic, political, and social life, their victory got them most definite material gains—commercial freedom, the right to develop industry at home, the cancellation of the planters' debts to English creditors, the right to expand to the West—in other words, the power to exploit the untapped resources of a virgin continent and its corresponding right under capitalism, the right to exploit the labor of the workers and farmers who lived and were to live in the new nation.

Workers Begin to Revolt

The colonial bourgeois were not unskilled in this task. In the war propaganda of the day, Thomas Jefferson, who had a genius for resounding phrases, played a well-known part. Among other things, he wrote the Declaration of Independence; its moving and haunting promises have been interpreted differently by the various classes and interests of our society ever since.