

Just Remember The War Labor Boards Of 1917

By MICHAEL CORT

War labor boards? Well, we've had them before. William Green and Phillip Murray aren't the first to "demand" such boards. Samuel Gompers, first President of the American Federation of Labor, not only demanded but received such boards during the first world war. Those boards were used to lead the workers around by the nose for an entire decade. Let's look at those boards and see just how they contributed to making the "world safe for democracy" twenty-two years ago, before Green, Murray and Hillman succeed in fastening the ring in labor's nose this time.

The National War Labor Board, with jurisdiction over all disputes arising in fields of production necessary for the conduct of the war, was established by President Wilson in March, 1918. But that was only the second act in a three act tragedy that opened in the Spring of 1917 with Gompers' capitulation to the War Department, and ended with the anti-strike legislation of 1920.

So, our story really opens in the Spring of 1917. At that time the War Department, through its war production contracts, was the dominant factor in the industrial and labor scene. Its functions and activities in the field of labor included adjustments of disputes, fixing of wages and hours, and direct action on housing and the cost of living. There was no aspect of the labor problem which it did not enter; the War Department was in the process of becoming the largest single entrepreneur in America. Just as today.

In the Spring of 1917 the War Department let contracts for the construction of 16 army cantonments throughout the country, and set completion deadlines that were all but impossible to meet. Under cover of "national defense," the contractors came into head on collision with the unions by stretching hours to 10 and 12 per day, cutting wages on unskilled labor to 30 cents and skilled labor to 45 and 50 cents, and filling the jobs with scabs and finks when ever union men protested. Enter Mr. Gompers.

Gompers Gets What He Wants

Samuel Gompers walked onto the scene with his mouth full of phrases about saving Democracy by blood and the sword, and pledged labor to this crusade. "What labor desires," he said, "is that it have a voice on any board set up by the government to deal with labor and war production." Wilson recognized Gompers' proposal as an easy way of dealing with labor. If Gompers wanted a few pats on the head... fine. If his ego required easy access to the office of the President of the United States... better yet. If his soul yearned for labor boards... excellent. Labor, bound and delivered, was cheap at twice that price.

In June, 1917, Gompers appointed John R. Alpine, vice-president of the AFL, as labor's representative on a three-man labor board set up by the War Department. The other two men on the board were appointed by the Secretary of War. This board was to have jurisdiction over the 500,000 workers employed under War Department contracts. Its decisions were binding and there was no appeal.

Thus Gompers calmly gambled labor's destiny in a game where the cards were stacked against him two to one. As it turned out, the cards might just as well have all been in the bosses' hands, for the majority of the board decisions were by unanimous vote. Alpine's servility was such that, according to War Department records, seldom did both of the boss representatives attend the sessions. They were so certain of Al-

(Continued on Page 2)

ON THE WAR FRONTS

by GEORGE STERN

From all indications the military time-table of the war is not going to wait upon the seasons this year. The British appear to expect the postponed Nazi invasion sometime in February. Meanwhile either for purposes of a grandiose feint or because he is actually contemplating a totally different strategy, Hitler is moving considerable forces southward, through Hungary into Rumania.

In anticipation of either of these moves or of both, Roosevelt's speech last Sunday served notice on the Axis that U. S. "non-belligerency" was moving rapidly into a more active phase. In shrewd, deceptive language, Roosevelt launched an attack on the Nazis that was worth a dozen bombing raids to the British.

Meanwhile, however, Europe is being covered over with that fog of rumor and speculation which we have come to associate with the Nazi method of preparing military moves.

First of all, it is a notable fact that all the reports of the German troop movements southeastward have come from German-controlled points—mainly Budapest. In place of the normal secrecy that would accompany such movements, these have been surrounded with ostentatious public notice. The Hungarian railway authorities announced revision of train schedules to accommodate the German troops and material. In Rumania, likewise, entirely under German control, arrival of these forces has been acknowledged.

Only after their arrival in Rumania has the cloak of real military secrecy descended upon them. All kinds of inspired reports speak of German troop dispositions along the Bessarabian Frontier. Stalin's gingerly-held southwestern outpost. Others re-

fer to preparations for German action against Greece via Bulgaria. Still others regard the forces mainly as forces for occupation of Rumania. Their actual numbers have ranged in these reports from 60,000 to 600,000.

Even if the latter figure is correct and even if all three of the reported purposes of their movement were more or less accurately reported, it still would not mean that Hitler is not concentrating his main forces along the Channel for an invasion of Britain.

Certainly there is every reason to expect that Hitler plans this Spring—and early this Spring—to attempt reduction of the British Isles. Hitler knows that Roosevelt's threats are by no means empty but that they will take time, precious time, to carry out. Before U. S. aid to Britain can assume sufficient proportions to tip the scales of aerial predominance, Hitler will certainly stake his present superiority on a single, gigantic drive.

American aid to Britain cannot assume decisive proportions this spring and summer. And precisely this spring and summer will witness collisions of decisive importance. Bourgeois military experts shift their views on the chances of a successful Nazi invasion of England. They now believe Britain can withstand it. The Kremlin's military specialists appear to share this belief. Before, long before another New Year rolls around, events should have provided the answer.

Whatever the outcome, the battle will only have been another in a long and widening series yet to come. It will decide nothing final, that decision rests ahead, and rests with the victimized peoples of the earth.

Socialist Appeal

Official Weekly Organ of the Socialist Workers Party

VOL. V—No. 1

NEW YORK, N. Y. SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1941

267

FIVE (5) CENTS

AUTO UNION ISSUES CALL FOR GENERAL MOTORS CONFERENCE

Grace Carlson In Chicago, Flint, Detroit This Week

Grace Carlson's national tour includes the following lectures during this coming week:

CHICAGO: "Roosevelt vs. Hitler—The Struggle for Empire in Latin America." Hamilton Hotel, 18 South Dearborn St. Friday, January 3, 8 p.m.

FLINT, Mich.: "The Right To Life." Carpenters Hall, Pengeley Building, Tuesday, January 7, 8 p.m.

DETROIT: "War By Spring?" Arcadia Building, 3513 Woodward Avenue (Hall 5). Thursday, January 9, 8 p.m.

(See complete schedule of Comrade Carlson's tour, on page 2 of this issue.)

Labor Defends Ousted Minn. Educator

Red-Baiters Attack His '35 Appointment Of Grace Carlson

ST. PAUL, Dec. 27—Grace Carlson, candidate for U. S. Senator from Minnesota on the Trotskyite Anti-War Party ticket during the last elections, became the storm center of the ouster proceedings initiated by the reactionary state administration against John G. Rockwell, suspended state commissioner of education.

During a hearing on Rockwell's suspension held by the State Board of Education yesterday before a crowd of 350 people in the State Office building auditorium, M. Ted Evans, assistant attorney-general representing the state board, quickly turned the inquiry into an investigation of Rockwell's appointment of Dr. Carlson in 1935 to a post in the state educational department.

Comrade Carlson recently resigned the post to take up full-time work for the Socialist Workers Party.

Evans opened the attack with a question as to whether Rockwell knew that Grace Carlson had attended a "Socialist" meeting in New York.

"Yes," answered Rockwell, "I knew she was going to a Socialist meeting."

When Evans appeared to be planning to open another line of questioning, Rockwell wheeled on him and demanded:

"Why don't you go ahead with that? I would like to see some semblance of procedure."

Evans returned to this line of questioning, asking whether Rockwell had recommended Dr. Carlson's appointment.

Rockwell answered that he had, and described her as "the most superior and capable employee in the department."

The ouster of Rockwell, instituted by the four-man board majority who are appointees of the reactionary Governor Stassen, is an effort to retaliate against Rockwell for his pro-labor sympathies. Rockwell served under the previous Farmer-Labor party administration.

Top Leaders Of Auto Union Hemmed In From Two Sides

While UAW Board Honeymoons With "Defense" Commission, Bosses Make Hay, And Workers Press Board For Action

By JOHN ADAMSON

DETROIT—Much to the embarrassment of its leadership, the United Automobile Workers of America is beginning to play the most important role of any of the CIO unions in the unfolding "national defense" program. Like the top officialdom of the CIO, the UAW Executive Board is growing uncomfortable under the conflicting pressures of the Morgan-DuPont "Defense Commission" whose war program it supports and of the automobile workers, whose union the war program undermines.

Against its own wishes the UAW leadership stands today at the head of the two biggest labor organization drives: Ford and the aircraft industry.

The Ford drive, tossed and bandied about for over two years, was finally thrust on the UAW leaders by an indignant membership.

The drive in the aircraft industry, officially launched almost a year ago, has been vegetating all this period. But the Vultee strike changed all of that. It came like a flash on the scene and in one day accomplished more than the union officials had accomplished in one year. From coast to coast the aroused aircraft workers, inspired by the example of the Vultee men, are demanding union organization.

These organization campaigns face today more formidable opposition than even the General Motors workers or the workers of "Little Steel" encountered three years ago. We are living in a war period. Besides the ordinary hazards of union organization when challenging industrial giants, these drives, if pushed to the very end, lead to a direct head-on collision between the union and the entire Roosevelt war machine. The Vultee strike, involving one of the smaller and less important aviation companies, gave labor grim warning of this ominous condition.

And it is not only a question of organizing the unorganized workers and raising the present standards. Like beasts of prey, the manufacturers are in full cry against the present conditions: the 40-hour week, the right to strike, etc. The manufacturers' campaign to house-break the labor movement is hitting on all eight cylinders.

The UAW Executive Board feels

(Continued on Page 2)

Hillman Groggy In 2nd Round

By OUR SPORTS EDITOR

A short hard-travelling body blow had Sidney Hillman, so-called "labor representative" on the Defense Commission, hanging on the ropes at the end of the second round of Hillman's non-title bout with the War Department over the awarding of war orders to labor law violators.

Our readers will recall that, in the first round, "Canvasback" Hillman peddled the bike all over the ring, keeping well out of the way while billions of war orders were granted to Bethlehem Steel, DuPont, and other open-shop Wagner Act violators, including a \$123,000,000 contract to Ford.

When the second round opened, however, Hillman appeared nettled by the taunts of the ring-side labor spectators, who kept yelling: "Stand still and fight, you bum!" Hillman therefore attempted to carry the fight in the second round, opening with a light left tap to the face: a protest to the War Department against a new Ford contract for \$1,367,500.

Infuriated by the temerity of its opponent, the War Department opened up with a volley of right hooks that drove "Canvasback" to the ropes. The final mighty belt, which had Hillman laying half out of the ring, was the following announcement of

the War Department, issued December 27:

"After careful consideration of the protest against the award previously made to the Ford Motor Company of a contract for the production of 1,500 light reconnaissance cars, the War Department announced today that the award would be allowed to stand."

While his handlers were working frantically to revive the semi-conscious Hillman in preparation for the third round, he was heard to murmur through puffed-up lips: "Don't that guy know this fight's supposed to be fixed?"

Hillman looks in bad shape. Betcha his seconds throw in the towel. Well he was only a set-up for the War Department, from the start.

NEW CAFETERIA LOCAL OFFICERS ARE INDUCTED

Leaders Of United
Ticket Pledge To
Carry Out Program

New York's Cafeteria Workers, Local 302 of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers (AFL), appropriately celebrated the holiday season Monday night, when they inducted into office the united front slate which made a clean sweep in the local's election recently.

In victorious mood, the crowd of union members which packed Palm Gardens celebrated the defeat of the red-baiting right wing. Their high spirits produced some unexpected and amusing results, as when they vigorously booed the "impartial arbitrator," Ben Golden, who was an invited guest. One of the planks in the united front slate's program was a pledge to hold a referendum of the membership on the abolition of the arbitration set-up. The celebrants made clear how they were going to vote!

The four speakers of the evening were the General Officers just elected: Costas Dritsas, President (United Rank and File Club); Sam Kranberg (same group); Secretary-Treasurer; Larry Phillips, General Organizer (United Progressive Group); and Juan Aviles, Labor Chief (United Spanish Workers Club).

Dritsas struck the keynote when he spoke of the fight for a better contract for the 10,000 members of the union. The present contract expires in April.

Kranberg declared that the victory of the United Union Ticket showed that the workers were prepared to struggle in defense of their rights, even in these days of "national defense" hysteria. "Labor will never give up the right to strike," he said.

Juan Aviles declared that he realized his responsibility to do all that can be done to aid the unemployed by equitable distribution of jobs.

Larry Phillips began his speech by honoring those foreign-born militants, who justly belonged on the platform as elected officers, but had been deprived of the right to run for election by a technicality which ruled them out because they were non-citizens.

Phillips laid special emphasis on the task of the union in raising the wages of the miscellaneous (unskilled) workers in the April contract. The militant tradition of Local 302 was certain to produce rousing shop struggles for a decent contract.

Local 302 could now struggle as never before, Phillips pointed out, for the new officers had been elected on a program seeking the abolition of the artificial division of the union in separate branches—a division deliberately created by the racketeers to keep the new members in the chain cafeterias separated from the old militants in the independent stores. Now the members could really join hands for common struggle against the bosses.

It was clear from the speeches and the splendid morale of the audience that the bosses are in for a fight when the new contract negotiations begin.

Follows Demand Of Flint Locals

Conference Will Convene In February;
May Initiate A New, Militant Policy

FLINT, Mich., Dec. 28—Repeated pressure from the ranks of the Flint auto workers, who refused to accept the decision of the GM Council and Walter Reuther denying a request for a General Motors conference of the UAW, has forced the International Executive Board to reconsider its position and to grant the membership its demand. A GM conference will be held the first week in February.

Members of the leading bodies of all Flint locals of the UAW attended the International Executive Board meeting last week in Cleveland, and insisted there that they grant the conference as a democratic means of thrashing out the many problems now facing the GM workers, and to find a way out of the present impasse. These officers refused to accept the offer of the Reuther-Thomas-Addes-Frankenstein leadership to hold a conference based on representation only from local union officers. They insisted on a delegated conference based on per capita, and this also was forced through the Executive Board meeting.

The February conference should give the progressive militants in the GM locals a good opportunity to voice a demand for a policy of militant action as against the ultra-respectable policy of Walter Reuther, who is so busy playing the role of Knudsen's "little helper" in an attempt to land himself a job in the defense set-up, that he can't find time to fight for union conditions in GM.

WHY BOARD ACTED

The International Board as is well known, is split into two cliques. On the one hand there is the Reuther-Thomas group, which is loyal to Hillman and Roosevelt, and on the other hand there is the Addes-Frankenstein clique, which thus far has followed a policy dictated by John L. Lewis and is definitely leaning on Communist Party support. Both groups voted for the infamous "outlaw strike" policy, and both groups were instrumental in putting over the miserable sacrifice of the 17 militants in the Flint Fisher 1 lockout several weeks ago.

On the question of the GM conference, however, the Addes-Frankenstein group saw an opportunity to get at Walter Reuther, and therefore supported the demands of the Flint locals for a conference.

The truth is, however, that neither of these cliques have offered a program of action. They will attempt to use the conference for their own clique interests. At the least sign that the rank and file is getting up on its hind legs and heading for militant action, these clique bureaucrats will unite against the rank and file.

CONFERENCE TASKS

For the progressive unionists in GM, this conference means much more than the petty politics of the Reuthers and the Frankensteins. It is an opportunity to make heard their many grievances against the company, and against the do-nothing policy of the leadership.

The conference, first demanded by Buick Local No. 599, is called primarily to consider proposed changes in the GM contract. This demand of the Buick local has highlighted the many faults of the GM agreement, which was sold to the membership and forced upon them against their better judgment, but at the insistence of Reuther and the whole executive board.

The main questions involved in the needed changes in the GM contract are the following:

1. THE STEWARD SYSTEM

This demand has been a constant desire of the rank and file, who

realize that in the steward system they would have the most adequate method of representation of the rank and file, and provide a sound basis for the settlement of grievances in the huge plants of GM. This demand has always been shelved by the leadership with vague promises about the future.

2. THE "D" LIST. In the GM contract the company is still allowed to employ out of seniority a bunch of scissorbills and relatives. These are used as a buffer against the union, and give a place of special privilege to a company dominated group. The rank and file demands this "D" list be abolished and all employees hired and laid off according to seniority.

3. WAGES. Wages in GM have not increased in proportion to the needs of the workers. Today rising prices and cost of living demand higher wages. GM profits continue to pour in by hundreds of millions. The workers can and must get at least a 10 cent an hour blanket increase. The Chrysler increase in wages shows it can be done.

4. THE SIX-MONTH CLAUSE

The GM contract provides that an employee's seniority does not begin until he has been in the plant six months. This makes it possible to hire a man, work him five months and three weeks, and then lay him off, preventing him from acquiring seniority. To make it possible for new workers to get the protection of seniority, the militants in the union are demanding a 30-day clause, so that a new man acquires seniority after 30 days employment.

These are the main problems of the GM contract. Many other questions related to the contract will of course also be discussed at the conference.

Progressive unionists are preparing, in addition, to voice questions at the conference concerning union policy in general. Especially important will be the question of the action of the Executive Board in the Fisher Body 1 dispute with the company, in which the Board, represented by Reuther, Thomas, Frankenstein, and Addes, agreed to a vicious solution with the company which forced four key militants out of the plant, took away their seniority, and applied extreme penalties on all the other men involved in the dispute.

There will undoubtedly be demands to oust Walter Reuther as GM director of the UAW. Frankenstein and Addes will, of course, look favorably on this for factional reasons. Progressive unionists will have no hesitation in bouncing Reuther if possible, but for other reasons. To them Reuther represents the cowardly policy of inaction which has typified the whole board during the last year and more.

Whether Reuther is ousted or not, the rank and file delegates at the conference are determined to throw out his policy.

(The text of the resolution adopted by UAW Local No. 581, Fisher Body, appears on page 2 of this issue.)

WORKERS' FORUM

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

Thinks We Don't Realize Importance Of Italian Events

Editor:

The article on Italy appearing in the *Socialist Appeal* of Dec. 14, 1940, belittles the significance of the collapse of Italy's imperialist armed forces. Not only did the attack on Greece fail miserably, but Italian imperialism now faces the loss of Albania and her African empire. The collapsing imperialist power of Italy, due entirely to the defeatism of the masses, puts on the order of the day the overthrow of the regime and the fight for the socialist revolution.

The defeatism of the Italian soldier masses explains the victory of the Greek armies over a numerically and technically superior foe. The English recognized this (the *Appeal* did not), and launched a hastily prepared and successful offensive in Egypt. The regime of Mussolini and Co., proceeded to change the general staffs and purge the bureaucracy; Gayda raised the cry of "Fifth Column inspired by the British," not only against the masses but against opponents among the ruling stratum itself. The further development of this tendency of disintegration of the summits of Italian society is inevitable and can only result in collapse of the regime—a regime which can neither satisfy the needs of the masses nor the desires of the imperialist capitalists. The mass basis of the heretofore imposing regime of Mussolini is crumbling.

Even if Hitler should come to the aid of his ally, bolstering up the Italian imperialism, it would offer the Italian regime not more than a short respite. To be effective, the German ally must take over the entire military burden of Italian imperialism: primarily because the Italian army will not fight; secondly because the Germans will soon be infected with the virus of "Italian defeatism." Even should the Germans take over the entire job of fighting the English in Africa, can one conceive of German imperialism turning back to Italy the colonies she has to defend from the English with German armies?

In your treatment of the de-

velopments of the Greco-Italian war you have not seriously considered the nature of the Italian military collapse. In my opinion the fascist regime is just waiting for the proletarian undertaker. He is not very far off.

If you consider the estimation of the situation as expressed in the *Appeal* a correct one you will yet have to analyze the character of the defeatist moods of the masses, the split among the ruling stratum of the Italian bureaucracy and you will have to state the direction in which events are moving. I consider the coming Italian revolution as inevitable in the very near future; its realization will fundamentally alter the entire direction of the antagonistic social currents of world history if it can survive the combined assaults it will face from Germany, Britain, and the rest of the capitalist world.

Detroit, Mich.

RAYMOND RICE

(The article of which Raymond Rice complains was George Stern's column, *On the War Fronts*, which that week limited itself mainly to raising the question: "How far will or can Hitler let his Axis partner slip down into the bog of military reverses which is rapidly engulfing the Italian military machine?" He concluded Hitler would have to move soon.

After giving a number of signs of "an astonishingly wide fissure in the Italian totalitarian facade," Comrade Stern said: "One cannot yet by far deduce from these signs that Italy is close to a complete breakdown. But they do show how quickly reverses in the field can expose the internal weaknesses of a totalitarian regime." The role in these reverses of the revolutionary defeatism of the Italian masses has been dealt with by the *APPEAL* in previous articles and again in an article in this issue. We confess, however, that unlike our complaining correspondent we aren't ready to set the date for the Italian revolution. Our program is the revolution, now as always; that, however, doesn't blind us to the fact that Italian imperialism has not yet shot its last bolt, and may temporarily be extricated from its difficulties by German intervention.—EDITORS.)

Even if Hitler should come to the aid of his ally, bolstering up the Italian imperialism, it would offer the Italian regime not more than a short respite. To be effective, the German ally must take over the entire military burden of Italian imperialism: primarily because the Italian army will not fight; secondly because the Germans will soon be infected with the virus of "Italian defeatism." Even should the Germans take over the entire job of fighting the English in Africa, can one conceive of German imperialism turning back to Italy the colonies she has to defend from the English with German armies?

In your treatment of the de-

TROTSKY MEMORIAL FUND

Payments made this week are as follows:

Chicago & Indiana Harbor	\$40.00		
Pittsburgh	1.00		
Flint	39.00		
Minneapolis & St. Paul	100.00		
New York	25.00		
Texas	5.00		
Newark	26.50		
Buffalo	3.00		
Reading	5.00		
New Haven	2.00		
San Diego	8.50		
Allentown	2.00		
TOTAL	\$257.00		
Branch	Quota	Amount paid	%
BOSTON	\$ 100.00	\$ 131.00	131%
PORTLAND	10.00	10.50	105
TOLEDO	50.00	51.00	102
Pittsburgh	10.00	10.00	100
Allentown	15.00	15.00	100
Chicago & Indiana Harbor	200.00	200.00	100
Milwaukee	5.10	5.10	100
Reading	5.00	5.00	100
Baltimore	10.00	10.00	100
San Diego	8.50	8.50	100
Rockville	7.00	7.00	100
Texas	5.00	5.00	100
Detroit	200.00	200.00	100
Newark	150.00	150.00	100
Hutchinson	10.00	10.00	100
St. Louis	5.00	5.00	100
Flint	150.00	138.00	92
San Francisco	100.00	85.00	85
Lynn	100.00	85.00	85
Los Angeles	150.00	123.70	82
New Haven	20.00	16.00	80
Buffalo	25.00	19.15	77
Rochester	15.00	10.00	67
Minneapolis & St. Paul	1000.00	630.00	63
Philadelphia	30.00	19.00	63
New York	1000.00	556.00	56
Quakertown	7.00	2.50	36
Akron	10.00	3.00	30
Youngstown	50.00	6.00	12
Cleveland	70.00	0.00	00
Individual Contributions		2.30	
TOTALS	\$3517.60	2618.82	72%

UAW Fisher Body Local Blasts Top Board's Rotten Settlement

FLINT, Mich.—The following is the text of the resolution adopted by Local No. 581, Fisher Body, in protest against the action of the International Executive Board in the recent dispute between the UAW-CIO and the Fisher management:

WHEREAS: 17 men, members of Local 581 UAW-CIO, were unjustly suspended by the Management of Fisher No. 1 on September 9, 10 and 11, 1940, and

WHEREAS: Upon proper notification of this action by the Fisher No. 1 to the International Union, Walter P. Reuther with one other of the staff of the G.M. Department and Local 581 officials conferred with the Management. Further conferences were held with G.M. Officials in Detroit and Corporation officials without Local 581 Officers being present,

and these G.M. officials did agree with the Company to the guilt of 17 men causing them to be fired by the Corporation, and

WHEREAS: The Officers of Local 581 and the 17 men affected were offered the alternative of accepting this Union-breaking agreement which was arrived at after nine long weeks of half-hearted negotiations on the part of the G.M. Department or face the possibility of a strike which the International stated they would fight publicly, and

WHEREAS: Eleven of these men under the settlement, accepted by the G.M. Department, are back to work in Fisher No. 1 under a six month's probation period and a year sentence of not being able to obtain the benefits of the Contract for Union activities. Six men were not allowed to return to Fisher No. 1, but would be placed in some other

unit of G.M. as new men, and at the expiration of six months might apply, personally, as new men to the Manager of Fisher No. 1 for employment. If accepted, they would have to serve an additional probationary period, the length of which to be decided by Fisher No. 1 Management. If their services were satisfactory for the probationary period, to be determined only by the Management, they would have their seniority restored to its original date, and

WHEREAS: In no part of the International Constitution does it state that the International Union can remove without trial Committeemen or Stewards, and

WHEREAS: This settlement has the effect of causing dissatisfaction, disagreement, and disillusionment among our Membership, and

WHEREAS: The welfare and perhaps the very existence of the

Union, depends upon the reversal of the now existing policies of the G.M. Department as practiced by the G.M. Director, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the International Executive Board be requested to remove immediately the present G.M. Director from the position he now holds and select a man for the position who is not a member of the International Executive Board so he may be held responsible for his actions by the Membership in the G.M. Plants, and be it finally

RESOLVED: That copies of this Resolution, letters of explanation, and copies of the settlement on the 17 men be given to all members of the G.M. National Council convening in Detroit Dec. 7, 1940 for their information and action.

LOCAL 581 UAW-CIO

TRADE UNION NOTES

by Farrell Dobbs

THESE WORKERS PICKED THEIR OWN PROGRAM

The recent strike of 7,000 CIO aluminum workers in New Kensington, Pennsylvania, was settled by the removal of a fink as demanded by the workers, and a two cent raise in pay.

While the strike was on, every peanut politician around the Pittsburgh industrial area took the opportunity to sound off against the "reds" in the union, to demand laws forbidding strikes in the "defense industries," etc., etc.

Shortly after the strike ended an election was held in this union. Local 2 of the Aluminum Workers of America. One of the slates in the election ran on a "More pay and less speed-up" platform. The following paragraph appeared in the Pittsburgh Press which viciously attacked this slate:

"On the heels of a public warning by N. A. Zonarich, international president of the Aluminum Workers, that Communists were backing a slate of candidates in the Local 2 election, Rev. Charles Owen Rice (chaplain of the Pittsburgh Association of Catholic Trade Unionists) predicted a 'black day' for the union if the slate is victorious." One of the newspaper articles on this election carried this headline: "Reds in Unions Attacked As Peril to U. S. Defense."

When the votes were counted the "More pay and less speed-up" slate had won by a wide majority. Only one of the candidates endorsed by Father Rice was elected. A similar red-baiting campaign was carried on during the election in the East Pittsburgh Local No. 601 of the UERMW (CIO). Despite the intensive press campaign, none of the candidates endorsed by Father Rice were elected in this local.

If there were members of the Communist Party on the progressive slates which were elected in these two unions they were in a minority. But this is entirely beside the point. A majority of the workers were obviously in favor of "More pay and less speed-up." They were not at all impressed by the dire predictions of a "black day" in the union, and the "peril to U. S. defense" if the exponents of this platform were elected.

A BOSS' TEARS AT CHRISTMASTIDE

As the result of strike action, a contract was signed on the Friday before Christmas between the Transformer Corporation of America, a New York City concern, and Local No. 430 of the UERMW (CIO). The workers won an increase in wages, plus a vacation provision. Just before Christmas a letter of "Christmas greetings" from the president of the company was handed to all manufacturing employees. The following are extracts from the letter:

"Normally, the management would hail an agreement of this type with the same enthusiasm as has been evidenced by the majority of the men... Unfortunately, these gains place an additional hardship upon the company... The TCA Management has... repeatedly called the attention of the Shop Chairman to the lax attitude of a number of employees in the shop... it is your job to recuperate the losses which TCA has incurred and is sustaining as a result of employee activity... It will be impossible for us to successfully compete in the open market unless some unusually efficient methods and attitudes are created in the TCA shop... You can't squeeze blood out of a turnip... If TCA is unable to compete... This will mean only one thing to you... either loss of employment or greatly curtailed working hours... It is unfortunate that these sad facts have to be brought forth at what is normally a joyous time of the year... I sincerely trust that every employee will put his shoulder to the wheel in an effort to earn his job and salary..."

"Forgetting business for the moment," the letter concludes, in a two-line paragraph after 447 words of complaint against the workers, "I take this opportunity to wish each and every one of you a very Merry Xmas and a Happy New Year."

The question is, what turnip is being squeezed? The workers squeezed a few concessions out of this boss and now he is trying to put a double squeeze on them. Yes, "forgetting business for the moment," he wishes them a "very Merry Xmas," indeed.

Join the Socialist Workers Party

Grace Carlson's Speaking Dates

Have you carefully noted when Grace Carlson is speaking in your city on her national tour for the Socialist Workers Party? Here's the schedule of the tour:

Day	Date	Place	Day	Date	Place
Thurs.	Jan. 2	Milwaukee	Fri.	Feb. 14	Pittsburgh
Friday	Jan. 3	Chicago	Sat.	Feb. 15	Indianapolis
Sat.	Jan. 4	"	Sun.	Feb. 16	Louisville
Sun.	Jan. 5	"	Mon.	Feb. 17	St. Louis
Mon.	Jan. 6	"	Tues.	Feb. 18	"
Tues.	Jan. 7	Flint	Wed.	Feb. 19	St. Louis
Wed.	Jan. 8	Detroit	Thurs.	Feb. 20	"
Thurs.	Jan. 9	"	Fri.	Feb. 21	Memphis
Friday	Jan. 10	Toledo	Sat.	Feb. 22	"
Sat.	Jan. 11	"	Sun.	Feb. 23	New Orleans
Sun.	Jan. 12	Cleveland	Mon.	Feb. 24	New Orleans
Mon.	Jan. 13	Akron	Tues.	Feb. 25	Houston
Tues.	Jan. 14	Youngstown	Wed.	Feb. 26	"
Wed.	Jan. 15	"	Thurs.	Feb. 27	"
Thurs.	Jan. 16	Buffalo	Fri.	Feb. 28	Los Angeles
Fri.	Jan. 17	Rochester	Thurs.	March 6	and vicinity
Sat.	Jan. 18	Syracuse	Fri.	March 7	"
Sun.	Jan. 19	Boston	Sat.	March 8	San Francisco
Mon.	Jan. 20	"	Sun.	March 9	"
Tues.	Jan. 21	"	Mon.	March 10	"
Wed.	Jan. 22	New Haven	Tues.	March 11	"
Thurs.	Jan. 23	New York	Wed.	March 12	"
to Feb 3			Thurs.	March 13	"
Tues.	Feb. 4	Newark	Fri.	March 14	Portland
Wed.	Feb. 5	"	Sat.	March 15	"
Thurs.	Feb. 6	Allentown	Sun.	March 16	Seattle
Fri.	Feb. 7	Reading	Mon.	March 17	"
Sat.	Feb. 8	Quakertown	Tues.	March 18	"
Sun.	Feb. 9	Philadelphia	Wed.	March 19	Plentywood
Mon.	Feb. 10	"	Thurs.	March 20	Williston
Tues.	Feb. 11	"	Fri.	March 21	Fargo
Wed.	Feb. 12	Baltimore	Sat.	March 22	"
Thurs.	Feb. 13	"	Sun.	March 23	Twin Cities

Top Leaders Of Auto Union Are Hemmed In From Two Sides

(Continued from Page 1)

G.M. management, but they are not reconciling themselves to it. The wave of the workers' resentment against the corporation, and even more bitterly against their own union G.M. department, is the first sign of the rising revolt against the whole rotten mess that is being sold them under the name of "National Defense."

UAW BOARD MEETING

The UAW International Executive Board held its quarterly meeting in Cleveland last week, the first meeting since the Atlantic City CIO convention. It proceeded to the union's pressing problems with customary brilliance. The G.M. hot potato was gingerly disposed of by tossing it back into the laps of the local unions. Henceforth the top negotiating committee is abolished. All negotiations will be conducted right at the plants between the local union bargaining committees and the plant management. If no agreement is reached, the dispute may then be placed in the hands of the "impartial umpire." Program of action for G.M.? The Board did not have any, and what is more was considerably annoyed with having its time wasted over these paltry details.

The Executive Board of the UAW is not a homogeneous body. One part, the majority, is lined up with the Lewis, Stalinist-backed group; another 40% of the Board supports the Hillman-Reuther group. The conflict between the two groups is growing sharper. Personal relations are becoming more embittered, threatening at times to lead to an irreparable break. Despite all this, the fact remains that the two groups stand on the same principled position. Both favor 100% support to the Roosevelt war machine and its executive agency, the Morgan-DuPont "Defense Commission." The only thing Lewis and his friends

have against Hillman is that he is such a piker and perfectly willing to sell Labor down the river for a few measly jobs. Lewis, on the other hand, demands, as he says, "recognition." He is holding out for the same price that the English capitalists paid. He wants an assortment of cabinet posts and a voice in the management of the war drive. That is what the differences between Lewis and Hillman amount to and that is all they amount to.

THE FORD DRIVE

How is the Board solving the pressing tasks of the "organization drives"? With the same brilliance and tactical wisdom displayed in the G.M. situation. In the case of the Ford drive, the Board acted with complete frankness. Acknowledging its bankruptcy in black and white, it voted all questions concerning the Ford drive, its policy, selection of personnel, etc., out of its own hands and into the hands of William Ford, the CIO-appointed Ford Director.

The campaign is in a crucial stage. Thousands of Ford workers have joined the UAW. Now the drive must be pushed to its natural climax: either the opening of negotiations with the company for the purpose of signing a union contract, or preparations for the calling of a strike. Unfortunately no such perspective seems to exist in the mind of the Ford Director. He is depending on the National Labor Relations Board, on Hillman and Roosevelt to do the job for him. It was proper to demand an NLRB election at Ford's in order to give the union time to consolidate its position and strengthen its defenses. But to depend on the NLRB or Roosevelt, to depend on anything but the fighting strength of the union itself, is a terrible mistake and unless corrected, might well lead to the same disaster that overtook the "Little Steel" strike.

With the Vultee strike still ringing in their ears, the Board hastened to wash its hands of all responsibility in the aircraft situation. They abdicated their authority here as they previously had abdicated in the case of the Ford drive. The CIO will appoint a director who will have full authority.

One might ask, of course, why the Board exists altogether, if the most pressing and important union tasks are planned and executed by other people. But only an ignoramus would ask a question like that. Everybody knows the Board is weighed down at the present time with the awesome responsibility of how to manufacture 500 "Spitfires" a day and naturally has not the time to worry about petty shop grievances or cavilling demands for wage increases.

The Vultee strike reminded everyone that the mass production workers are unbeaten. They served notice on the plutocrats that the workers have not yet had their say in the matter of the coming war. That fact is brought home even more forcibly today at every important union gathering where one meets young local leaders and plant stewards, burning with a crusading zeal for the union and constantly demanding more action, a firmer, more realistic and more aggressive policy of their International leaders. These militants, still scattered and unorganized, are being drawn together by their common aspirations and aims. That is why the bosses, in spite of all the belly crawling of Hillman and Reuther and the others, fear the union as the plague itself.

The UAW has a job to do. It must launch a whirlwind campaign to sweep into the union fold the hundreds of thousands of unorganized workers of the automotive, aircraft, steel-fabricating and parts industries. It must use

its organized strength to cut deep into the swollen profits of the manufacturers. It must do all of this and constantly march forward—or go under in the coming war period as the auto union and the rest of labor went under in France.

The auto workers, it must now be said plainly, cannot depend on their present leadership to push through this job. The present leaders, shortsighted, bewildered and stunned by the rush of events, have already sold themselves to the Roosevelt war government. They have taken on the job of Ed McGrady of NRA days and of Sidney Hillman today—the job of a fireman putting out strikes and "labor trouble."

The auto workers still believe in Roosevelt today. They support the "National Defense" set-up in the mistaken notion that they thereby help defend "democracy." But they are learning fast. This is indicated by the growing unpopularity of Hillman. This is indicated by the auto workers' contempt for Walter Reuther's furious efforts to land a cushy government job. The auto workers are bound to learn even more rapidly in the coming period of rising prices and growing repressions.

The auto workers must complete their education. They must fling away the hypnotism of the company-inspired "National Defense" propaganda. They must break openly and without equivocation from the Roosevelt war government. They must cut loose from the capitalist politicians and take the lead in launching an independent party of labor. Once on this road the auto workers will find no difficulty in building a new union leadership out of the ranks of its militant shop stewards and uncorrupted local union officers, who will lead the union forward on lines that give every assurance of success.

The Negro Struggle

By ALBERT PARKER

In an interesting series of articles in the *Pittsburgh Courier*, W. Robert Ming, Jr., Professor in the School of Law at Howard University, has dealt with the legal and technical aspects of the case of the S. S. Philadelphia sailors who were kicked out of the U. S. Navy because they signed a letter protesting intolerable Jim Crow conditions.

After demonstrating that the Philadelphia case shows how freedom of speech has been stolen from those in the Army and Navy, Professor Ming goes on to point out how much power this puts in the hands of the "brass hats." If the public outside can't get information about conditions in the armed forces from the only possible source—that is, from those inside—how can it possibly do anything to correct or improve those conditions? This means that if the soldiers can't speak about conditions to the public, the officer caste can do just about anything it wants.

Professor Ming goes on to show that the officer caste has still another weapon to keep the mouths of conscripted soldiers shut, in addition to the power to discharge those who speak up. The right "ephemeral thought it be" of a conscript to his former job depends on his getting a certificate from the Army "indicating satisfactory completion of the training course." Under the present conscription set-up, a worker who would protest to the world outside, would certainly not get such a certificate. "This possibility of dual punishment places in the hands of the officers of this great peace-time army tremendous power without adequate controls and safeguards for the protection of the selectees."

Where the Criticism Falls Down

But these articles in the *Pittsburgh Courier* are at their weakest point when the writer attempts to indicate how full rights for Negroes may be obtained and the right of freedom of speech and other civil liberties restored. For in his discussion of this, which is the key question, he limits himself to legal procedure and ignores the actual character of the courts and other institutions of the government.

How is the power of the officer caste to be limited? Operating under the Articles of War, they do just what they please, replying to criticism from the ranks with arrests and discharges, and to criticism from the outside with haughty contempt (the Philadelphia mess attendants were kicked out "in the best interests" of the Navy and themselves, says Rear Admiral Nimitz).

Says Professor Ming: "Practical solution of this problem created by the conflict between Army regimentation and civil liberty is possible. One simple device to secure the desired end would be to provide for review by civil courts of actions by court martials or punishments inflicted on members of the armed forces by officers..."

What are these civil courts anyhow? Fair and impartial; or the instrument of the ruling capitalist class? If Professor Ming doesn't know from his own personal experience, let him ask workers who have been out on strike. Let him ask a poor man who has tried to sue a rich corporation. Or let him look up the decisions of the courts with regard to the Negro people, the courts' approval of segregation in education and on trolley cars, their approval of the poll tax and the white primary laws and the other legislation aimed at maintaining "white supremacy."

If we consider here not the words about "justice" that are written into the laws, but really understand how they work, then we can understand that workers in the armed forces, colored or white, would get no better treatment from the civil courts than they do from the military. In fact, the consistent refusal of the civil courts to interfere with military decisions, is proof that they approve segregation, discrimination and denial of freedom of speech as practiced by the officer caste, and don't want to interfere with it.

If you really want to abolish Jim Crowism, if you really want to protect the rights and improve the conditions of the soldiers and sailors, there can be no half-way measures: the officers want either have the power to do what they want, or they won't. Either you go the whole hog and take control of military training away from the officer caste completely—or you waste your time and bat your head against a stone wall. Any program which falls short of military training under control of the workers themselves is one which leaves the reactionary officers with full power, and is therefore completely ineffective and useless.

A Correction

In our pamphlet on the Philadelphia men, issued before their discharge, we feared because of the silence that surrounded the case that the boys would be framed-up in a court martial. We said, "The court martial, when it takes place, will be conducted behind closed doors. (The men) will not be permitted to use lawyers from the outside..."

According to Professor Ming, however, this is not legally correct. His explanation not only clears up this point, but shows why the boys escaped court martial and even worse punishment than they received.

"Public opinion was aroused (after news of the arrests leaked out) ... You know what the Navy did in the face of this public outcry. They turned down the recommendation (of court martial) of the captain of the Philadelphia. That was dangerous—if these men had been subjected to a general court martial they would have been entitled to the assistance of outside counsel, and a public hearing, a statement of charges, and the other protections which our legal system has devised for the safeguard of the defendants, even if they are members of the armed forces."

"Instead the 'brass hats' decided that these men should be discharged from the Navy—not 'honorably' ... but rather, they were to be given 'undesirable discharges.'"

The War And Coming Revolutions

The Germs Of Workers' Uprisings Infect All Warring Nations

By ART PREIS

The first symptoms of a new wave of workers' revolutions are appearing in Europe and, in the first instance, in Italy. Churchill and the "democratic" ruling class have been quick to label it the "Italian disease"—as if this penetrating germ can be exorcised by incantation and prevented from spreading.

The hasty reassurances exchanged among the "democratic" capitalists concerning the peculiarly Italian character of the coming revolution remind one of nothing so much as what happened in Europe when, in the 14th and 15th centuries, the ravages of syphilis spread. The French termed it the "Italian disease"; the Spanish, the "French disease"; while the Italians were

spirit of defeatism which preoccupies the ruling regime. On December 10 the leading fascist newspaper, *Il Popolo di Roma*, admitting heavy Italian losses, increasing vicissitudes and hard days ahead, stated:

"These gentlemen who smell of defeatism are those who read our war bulletins with the air of being fed up, those who know everything, incorrigible rumor-mongers who always have something to add when a communique is read. It seems to us the hour has come to beat them up so it will leave a mark that will not soon be forgotten."

The violence of this campaign against defeatism is in itself an admission of the discontent with the war so wide-spread among the Italian masses. The same *Il Popolo di Roma* on December 13 cries against the defeatists:

"We know them. We have identified them for some time now. Soon we shall catch them and make them swallow all their sinister prophecies, all stupid anticipations of their idiotic defeatism which has not and never will have any hold on the granite mass of the Italian people gathered close around their Duce."

FASCISTS TRY TO APPEASE MASSES

Mussolini's regime, unable to gloss over the appalling living conditions, makes haste to lament with the masses. A campaign suddenly blossoms forth against the "hoarders and profiteers." Not the fascist regime and the capitalists it serves, but anonymous hoarders and profiteers, whose presence had up to this time eluded the all-seeing eyes of the secret police, are held responsible for the plight of the Italian people. *Regime Fascista*, newspaper edited by Roberto Farinacci, former secretary of the Fascist party, declares—but without naming names—that these profiteers should be shot.

"We do not live by bread alone," says *La Vita Italiana*. "There are many other things of prime necessity. With things increasing at this rate, are wages and salaries to remain unaltered?" *La Vita* of course offers no answer to its own question, but hopes to mollify the masses by echoing their feelings.

But most of all, it is the increasing

in the cause which his arms are supposed to uphold.

Leland Stowe, in a dispatch to the *New York Post* of December 26 describing an interview with Italian prisoners of war in Greece, writes:

"There is an enormous difference between the attitude of officers and common soldiers. Virtually all the officers profess confidence in and loyalty to Mussolini, and most of them attempt to justify the invasion of Greece. The higher ranking professional military officers show obedience to the regime and unquestioned patriotism. Young lieutenants, aggressively fascist, are frequently defiant and arrogant, sometimes sneering and discourteous."

On the other hand, the Italian soldiers are mostly a spiritless, pitiful assortment. They are ragged and miserable, and only a few have a vestige of self-assurance left. Again and again, they say frankly, 'We've had enough.' 'They seem to have no shame over having thrown down their weapons. They want nothing except food and for the war to end and to get back to Italy.'"

But it is mere wish-thinking, when the Churchills brand it an "Italian disease."

It is precisely the knowledge that this is not an exclusively "Italian disease" which brought forth Churchill's recent incitement of the Italians against Mussolini—against Mussolini and not against the entire ruling class of Italy. Churchill calls for the spread in Italy of a "mild" "non-infectious" form of the revolutionary "disease," one which would leave intact the Italian Royal family, the army generals, the police apparatus, the fascist machine, the profiteers and capitalists—and the hunger and misery of the Italian masses. Above all, a "disease" which would contain no danger of spreading beyond the Italian borders into the British Empire.

For while Italy at the present moment appears most susceptible to revolution, conditions in England also indicate no great immunity to this contagion. The British ruling class fears this more than a thousand military defeats.

STRIKE STRUGGLES IN BRITAIN

One of the indicative symptoms that the workers of England are not too ready to "sacrifice" in the interests of British imperialism, is the persistence of strikes in vital British industries. The news of these strikes has managed to trickle through the rigid British censorship. And they are particularly significant because they are waged in defiance of the dictatorial law against strikes.

The *New York Times*, December

20, inconspicuously carries the following tiny item:

"LONDON, Dec. 19 (UP)—Minister of Labor Ernest Bevin told the House of Commons today that there had been stoppages of work in British munitions factories contrary to the legal procedure of settling disputes. Some of these, he indicated, were due to a 'settled policy' of the Communists."

Bevin, on December 17, reported 844,000 workdays lost in the first ten months of 1940 due to strikes, in a nation in which Sir Walter Citrine, speaking before the APL convention last month, declared the workers had "voluntarily" given up the right to strike.

The *New York Post*, December 17, in a London dispatch quotes the *London Daily Express* as alleging that the "Liverpool docks were working at two-thirds capacity due to labor agitation and lassitude."

This same dispatch reveals that the English workers are not so willing to "sacrifice" as Citrine states. Two of the largest British trade unions, the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, with 450,000 members, and the Amalgamated Engineering Union, with 400,000 members, are both making insistent demands for wage increases to offset the enormous price increases.

A six-day strike of 5,000 garment workers in Lancashire, England, ended on December 27. The strike was ostensibly over the employment of a non-union worker; but the fact that it was conducted in defiance of a law exacting penal sentences, shows that the source of the strike was much more deep-rooted.

BRITISH "DEMOCRACY" PUTS THE SQUEEZE ON

We can expect that Churchill, like Mussolini, will shortly be forced to denounce the "hoarders and profiteers." On December 26, the British press announced that Lord Woolton, Food Minister, is expected to introduce a further reduction in the food rations in January, 1941. Even the cheapest, poorest meat scraps are to be rationed, under the new regulations, and the present allowance of one shilling ten pence (about 35 cents) worth of meat per person per week, is to be reduced to one shilling six pence (about 25 cents) worth. This, for the first time, will also affect the soldiers, sailors and airmen, who up to now have been permitted a much larger allowance than civilians.

More and more, the British ruling class is introducing those extremes of exploitation which they have hitherto condemned on the part of the Nazi and fascist regimes.

The following item appeared in the *N. Y. Post*, December 19:

"LONDON, Dec. 19 (AP)—Be-

tween 30,000 and 40,000 British women will have to work in the fields next year to keep agricultural production up to present standards, Minister of Agriculture Hudson said today. There are now 9,000 British women land workers."

The compulsory toil in the fields invoked against the working women of Nazi Germany is here forecast for "democratic" England.

A Columbia Broadcast correspondent, Larry Lesueur, in a broadcast from London, December 12, stated that Liverpool shipowners "complain that the young dockworkers have been drafted into the army and they are asking that the workers return in the form of flying squads of soldiers to unload ships under military discipline."

"Ship owners also would like to have about 3,000 more workers around the ports to create a reserve of men and competition for jobs, but naturally the unions are against this."

These representatives of the British ruling class are asking, in other words, for slave workers, toiling at the point of a bayonet, and for permanent unemployed reserves to hold as a threat against the employed workers. In this is revealed the real "war aims" of the British capitalists,—aims which differ not a whit in kind from those of the German capitalists.

GLARING EXTREMES BETWEEN RICH AND POOR

While the Lancashire garment strikers were whipped back to work with prison threats, the *New York Times* on December 22, published the following:

"MANCHESTER, England, Dec. 22 (UP)—Corporate profits of Lancashire's cotton spinners this year will be the largest since 1921, a *United Press* survey disclosed today."

Milo M. Thompson, chief of the Associated Press London Bureau, who has just returned from England, describes the luxury and comforts of the bomb shelters for the rich in London, such as that of the Savoy Hotel, and contrasts it with those for the ordinary people. The rich sleep in "the beds of luxury you read about in the mattress advertisements." They have dance floors, orchestras and bars. There is no crowding; all the comforts of home and aristocratic club are there.

"The ever present nurses and physicians in such places add to the feeling of security. It is easy there to forget the hundreds of thousands cramped in their chill Anderson shelters, the millions who sleep in ordinary basements, and the great army of those who are glad to have concrete subway platforms or the cobblestones under the arches below them if only they are safe from the death and dismemberment rained from above." (*New York Post*, Dec. 23).

POVERTY FOR NOW; PROMISES FOR LATER

It is a sign of the complete degeneration and incapacity of the British ruling class that it permits this fantastic spectacle to go on. Future historians will record that not all the previous contrasts between rich and poor drove the British masses toward revolution as much as did the luxurious underground play-ground shelters of the rich.

Nor is it that the British ruling class is unaware of the danger. Every week Harold J. Laski, Raymond Postgate and other "labor" supporters of the war wait in *The Tribune*: "We wonder if Mr. Churchill is aware that, in spite of all the talk, there is no evacuation scheme ... no improvements of shelters ... The outcome of the war may well depend on the speed and efficiency of adequate sheltering ... But to no purpose. The ruling class continues to rumba at the Savoy."

However, the ruling class is perfectly willing to make promises.

Churchill, on December 18, speaking at Harrow, exclusive school for the British upper classes, declared that "the advantages and privileges which hitherto have been enjoyed only by the few shall be far more widely shared"—when the war is over.

Hitler, a few weeks ago, stated that he will introduce the "perfect socialist state"—when the war is over.

Thus it is, that each in turn, offers the benefits of a mild inoculation of "socialism," to offset the dread "plague," the workers' revolution.

But the inoculation will not work. The "Italian disease" will spread.

War and revolution—they were inextricably connected in 1917.

It took three years, the last time, for the first rumblings of revolt. It will not take that long this time!

Why Browder & Co. Now Yell For U.S.--USSR Amity

Stalin's general staff appears now to be convinced that Germany cannot successfully invade Britain. This is the conclusion to be drawn from the latest article estimating the military developments signed—like most of the previous ones—by "Colonel Vasilyev," published in *Truth*, and cabled from Moscow to the Stalinist press here.

Had Germany launched an invasion last Summer, immediately after the French defeat, says the article, (*Daily Worker*, Dec. 29) "there is hardly any doubt that they (the Germans) would rout England's armed forces in comparatively short time. However, Germany at that time evidently considered herself unprepared for the operations against English territory with the aid of land forces..."

As for the present situation, the article says: "Lately the question of invasion of England has again been the subject of lively discussions. Estimating the situation in the Anglo-German theater of military operations, one draws the conclusion that irrespective of the methods of conduct of the war by Germany, the struggle will retain a protracted character."

Which is a cautious and diplomatic way of saying that Germany cannot succeed, in the estimation of Soviet military experts.

German aerial warfare, says the article, "did not achieve decisive results."

Neither is Germany succeeding in her attack on British communications lines: "In spite of the fact that the losses of the British merchant fleet are 'severe,' the total tonnage of British merchant vessels nevertheless exceeds the required minimum."

"But British successes," the article concludes, "cannot yet be called the turning point in the course of the war." It is clear, however, that this Soviet article considers that that turning point is likely.

In this estimate of the war by Soviet military authorities we have the clue to the suddenly-launched campaign of the Communist Party and its front-men for American "friendship with the Soviet Union." A letter by Corliss Lamont to the *New York Times*, urging a Soviet-U. S. rapprochement, speeches by Browder and Foster cautiously launching the same line—this is preparation for a new turn by Stalin back toward the "democracies." But as long as Hitler has his teeth, Stalin will remain respectfully ready for new deals like the partition of Poland.

Stalinist preparations for a possible new turn in the United States are already evident in the slogans raised here on military questions. In Britain and its colonies the Stalinists are ultra-radical. For example, in Canada the Young Communist League recently issued a manifesto which says to drafted men: "Trainees, form camp committees, to protect your daily interests ... Fight against the fascist officers' clique in the army..." (*Daily Worker*, Dec. 15).

In the United States, however, no slogans remotely resembling this are raised. Here there is not a whisper of soldiers' committees from the Stalinists. After all, the United States is the unquestioned dominant figure among the "democracies," and the one which Stalin will have to court, if Germany loses the initiative in the war.

One Sabotage Case They're Not Pushing

There's been lots of talk about labor's "sabotage" of the war program, but here's one story of sabotage that they haven't been yelling about.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma, was for a few years the home of the Army's Field Artillery School. The site was considered unsatisfactory as the years went by. It was an area of subnormal rain fall, and the water shortage was getting worse with the years. But the school had a normal garrison of about 3,400 men, their water supply could be supplemented by bringing in water, and the usual inertia of the army kept the school there. But the situation was conceded to be bad.

Yet, in September, when the Forty-fifth National Guard Division, comprising Oklahoma, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Arkansas, was ordered to active duty, an astonishing thing happened. Fort Sill was selected as the site for the Division's tent camp! Every army officer who knew his business knew the trouble with Fort Sill—but nevertheless it became the site for the tent camp which was eventually to house some 30,000 to 40,000 men.

A total of 8,500 men and officers were sent into camp. Construction was started on hospital buildings, recreation halls, utilities, etc. The camp was prepared with much labor to house more than 21,000 men in short order. Work went on. Soon the number in camp reached 14,000 soldiers. To make a long story short, the tent camp—its cost is estimated at \$5,000,000—was well on the way to completion, and many additional projects connected with it were completed.

Finally, in mid-December—i. e., nearly three and a half months after the camp was selected—the water situation became so bad that the camp had to be abandoned. The Division will be transferred to Abilene, Texas—as soon as a tent camp has been constructed there.

A crew of Oklahoma businessmen are at the bottom of it. They stood to gain and did gain from the selection of Fort Sill. They had friends among the officers who had a say in it. They're not weeping about the "mistake," they made plenty out of it.

There are no indignant articles in the press about Fort Sill. Nobody is pointing the finger of indignation at those Oklahoma businessmen.

Can you imagine what would happen if a trade union made an honest mistake which cost one per cent of what this Fort Sill spree cost?

Women And The Class Struggle

They Play A Decisive Role In The Labor Movement

By MARY DANTE

The role of the woman worker has always been a decisive factor in the history of the trade union movement. At first the boss utilized her as a source of cheap labor and later to replace men who were engaged in union activities. He used every means available to create hostility between men and women workers. It was not long before women recognized the fact that they had a serious economic problem to solve. Some effective means of resisting the boss was necessary. The only answer was organized unions such as those the men had.

So we have the daughters of native New England farmers in Dover, N. H., 1828, organizing one of the first walkouts by women, against wage reductions and monthly payments. These textile workers organized street parades and protest meetings to publicize their demands. Women textile workers of Lowell published a paper in 1845 called the "Voice of Industry." This newspaper was devoted to publicizing conditions of women workers in the textile industry. The militant organization of textile workers gave an impetus to the women workers in the printing, shoe and tobacco trades. Social and educational gatherings were initiated by groups of organized women workers. These groups became centers of hundreds of workers where they spent their free time.

For many years women were organized into separate local unions with no national or international affiliations. This was only because they were refused entry into the international unions of the men workers. Recognizing the significance of the self-organization of the women workers and

the role they began to play in the labor movement, the Knights of Labor, in 1881, admitted women into their organization. Years later, 1918, the AFL admitted women into all their national and international unions.

Women, united with men, have contributed their share of hard work and sacrifice to the organization of many unions, some of which today are among the strongest in the American labor movement.

The ten hour day, then the eight hour day, labor legislation, higher wages and better conditions enjoyed by workers today, are the result of the militant struggles of men and women workers. Women alongside of the men faced tear gas and machine guns of the bosses' police on the picket lines. Others were sent to prison because of their militant action during strikes.

Through such experience the working woman also began to take an active part in politics. Increased exploitation, continuous struggles with the boss, seeing the armed forces of the government in action against the workers, opened her eyes to the real meaning of this so-called "democratic" system of government. Such material forces as these impelled her toward the working class political parties and away from the "democratic" parties of the boss.

The importance of the woman in the home to the working class movement, is no less than that of the woman in the factory. Marriage is no escape from the problem of earning a living. Gone are the days—if they ever existed—when a woman can say that she is going to be married and will not have to worry any

more because she is secure. Whether as the wife of a worker or as a woman in the factory, she is just as much an integral part of the working class. In it her interest lies and she must fight for its emancipation. More than ever, as a wife, she constantly finds herself affected directly or indirectly by the successes and failures of the trade union and labor movement as a whole. She and her children will always be affected by the wage cuts and working conditions of her husband.

During a strike in which her husband is involved her role is doubly important. The morale of the striker depends much on the understanding and cooperation of his wife. She must stand firm behind the striker-husband and give him courage to carry on his struggle against the boss in order to give her and the children a better life.

The boss doesn't care one bit about the welfare of the worker's wife and family. During a strike he will suddenly display a pretended interest in them in order to persuade the wife to make her husband return to work, thus using her as a means to break the strike. The movies, church, schools and even personal contact are the instruments available to the boss to use in contacting workers' families.

Every wife should understand and have confidence in what the striker is fighting for. Her place is with him on the picket line and at the union headquarters. At strike headquarters there are many number of things the wives can do. Arranging mass meetings, money-raising affairs, organizing food and clothing committees, are only a few of the

things the housewife can do in a strike.

We cite a few examples of the militant work of housewives during past strikes: In Passaic Textile strike, 1926-7, the housewives organized into the "Council of Working-class Housewives," to which members belonged and contributed from all over the nation. These women set up children's kitchens from which 500 children a day were fed. On picket lines the wives took their share of picket duty.

In the great steel strike in Gary, Indiana, the wives and daughters of strikers organized and marched en masse to the steel mills and helped persuade the non-strikers to join the strike. They organized house-to-house groups to contact wives of these men and gained sympathy for the strike from many of their wives. In Mother Jones' autobiography she tells of the valiant work of the wives of miners during strikes.

In a society of class conflicts, women in the factories and in the homes must take their place in the ranks of the working-class. They must recognize the unions as the most effective ECONOMIC weapon of the workers.

Tomorrow she will stand alone, that is why today the woman must learn. Tomorrow she will be the worker in the factory, supporting her family trying to earn a meagre living while the boss squeezes every ounce of energy from her. Because tomorrow the men will be taken from their homes and families, thrown into the armed forces of the bosses government and sent out to die once again on the battlefields.

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. V—No. 1 Saturday, January 4, 1941

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

Editorial Board:
FELIX MORROW **ALBERT GOLDMAN**
General Manager:
RUTH JEFFREY

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

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

FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

ON THE WAR FRONT:

For:

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

AT HOME:

For:

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

Roosevelt's Speech

President Roosevelt's "fireside chat" last Sunday night was the equivalent of a military engagement of considerable magnitude. Roosevelt, proponent of measures "short of war" to aid Britain, in this speech went up almost to the final point short of an actual declaration of war in aligning this country on the world war front.

Roosevelt dropped all diplomatic pretenses as far as the fundamental issues were concerned. He served notice on the Axis that U. S. imperialism regards itself as the prime object of the tripartite Axis alliance. He ruled out any question of a "negotiated" peace and in doing so accepted on behalf of American imperialism the gage thrown down by German imperialism, which has already indicated that it likewise regards this war as an "all-or-nothing" affair.

To the American people, the president offered only the thinnest of pious hopes that this country will be spared from war. He made it clear that when he talks about "peace" he actually means the "peace" that will ensue only when the German forces have been defeated by force of arms. His speech was, in effect, a call for expediting U. S. industrial mobilization in preparation for the approaching, greater battles of the war.

He said he wanted to keep us, our children, and our grand-children "out of a last-ditch war." Firm alliances now to Britain, he implied, would enable us to fight that war one ditch removed, rather than at the last ditch.

"The United States," he said, "has no right or reason to encourage talk of peace until the day shall come when there is a clear intention on the part of the aggressor nations to abandon all thought of dominating or conquering the world."

It is clear that these "aggressor nations" will be brought to such abandonment only by the pressure of superior military force. It is equally clear that Roosevelt is declaring that either Germany dominates the world or the United States dominates the world. He quoted Hitler as declaring there could be no compromise in this struggle, and he definitely accepted the challenge. It is now merely a question of the tempo at which the country can be prepared and finally plunged into the conflict.

Roosevelt, representing the real masters of this country, has thus told us several things as plainly as he dares at this stage:

1. This country is before long to plunge into a war that has world-domination as its stake.

2. Even now this country is no more neutral than Italy was before it entered on Germany's side last June. The New York Times found a phrase to describe our present position: it is not merely "non-belligerence." It is now "dynamic non-belligerence." In plain language this means

we are one brief step removed from the status of an out-and-out belligerent.

3. Roosevelt warned in plain language that American labor is to be yoked, and yoked right now, to the war wheels of the bosses. He expects the war arms drive to proceed, he said, "without interruption by strikes or lockouts." He also, it is true, chided industrialists who are extracting dollar for dollar against plant expansion. With them, as we know, the government deals in terms of concessions. But with labor, it will increasingly deal with an iron hand.

4. Finally, Roosevelt warned that the arms drive will of necessity involve a lowering of our standard of living. This is the real meaning of his remark that industries producing consumer goods will yield, if need be, to conversion of their plants into war material producing units.

The United States is no longer merely on the road to war. The United States is at war. This is the premise from which all thought, all action must now proceed.

We are for an irreconcilable struggle by the labor movement in defense of its rights and its needs, in wartime as in peacetime. Precisely for that reason, we don't want to hear any more muddled and cowardly speeches from labor "statesmen" about the unfairness of the government doing this or that to the labor movement "in peacetime." No, it's not peacetime. Let us face this fact openly, and go on from there.

Stalin's New Life

One of the first fruits of Stalinist pamphleteering for the new year is a little pamphlet entitled "Soviet Jews—A New Way of Life," issued by ICOR, the Stalinist "mass" organization which, since Biro-Bidjan was created in 1928, has been singing its virtues. Incidentally, it is not accidental that the cover of this new pamphlet shows an idyllic picture of happy Jewish collective farmers in the Crimea. For, after thirteen years of state-sponsored Jewish colonization in Biro-Bidjan, even the Stalinist statistics of this pamphlet claim only a Jewish population there "in the neighborhood of 50,000." During that period, ICOR has raised in the capitalist world on behalf of the Jews of Biro-Bidjan, enough money to buy a collective farm for each of those "in the neighborhood of 50,000."

Never mind how few Jews live in Biro-Bidjan. It is more important to appreciate the "new way of life," which this pamphlet describes so warmly. Such breadth, such universality of culture! Take, for example, the sub-section of this pamphlet entitled, "German Refugees and the Soviet Union." The interlocutor is speaking to representative Soviet Jews, and asks them, "But don't you think you Soviet Jews should appeal to your government to allow the German Jews to come in?"

"We don't want them here," was the answer. Then, just to make sure you get the point that this is not just an individual's answer, nor merely a Jewish answer, the interlocutor goes on: "Do you Soviet Jews oppose their admission?" That provides the springboard for an authoritative declaration:

"When I say 'we,' I mean all of us, not just Jews. The German Jews are almost all bourgeois or bourgeois-minded. They hate us. After they got here they'd only make trouble for us and for themselves. Let them go to Palestine or America."

And even that isn't enough. The interlocutor again speaks: "I'm sure after what they've gone through they'd be grateful for a haven." Whereupon the voice of the Soviet "new way of life" answers:

"Only until they've had a hot bath and had their bellies full... We can do without them."

So this is how they talk in "a new way of life." And this horrible, swinish outlook is brazenly peddled by Stalin, satellite of Hitler, in the name of the Soviet Union, that is to say, in the name of the October Revolution!

Halifax Is Real

There has been a quite-understandable awkwardness in the press comment on the appointment of Lord Halifax as Britain's ambassador to the United States; an awkwardness which, in the case of the labor and liberal press has turned into downright embarrassment. For no editorial agility can successfully fit Lord Halifax into the current myth of a "transformed," "socialist," "labor-led" England. When editorial agility attempts the task, you get some really weird results, as witness these unbelievable sentences from *The Nation*:

"Until his unfortunate appointment as Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax had enjoyed a reputation as an enlightened Tory, and as Viceroy of India he had shown an unprecedented breadth of imagination. We hope the American atmosphere will assist the resurrection of the Halifax of the twenties." That is to say, of the Halifax who was ruthless dictator over four hundred million unwilling inhabitants of India. If you want the details, just look up *The Nation* of the twenties.

The liberals might as well reconcile themselves to many an embarrassed moment, when Lord Halifax gets here. The lovely haze created by reading Harold J. Laski and listening to Sir Walter Citrine is apt to be rudely rent in many spots, for Halifax, true representative of the British ruling class and not of its labor flunkies, is as real as hell. As real as those subway "shelters" in which the workers of London are packed in, while their betters dine, dance and sleep in luxurious underground palaces.

How Stalin Celebrated The 23rd Anniversary

Not One Mention of the Fight Against Fascism Was Included Among the 43 Slogans Issued For the November 7th Ceremony

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

On the occasion of the Twenty-Third Anniversary of the October Revolution, Stalin prohibited the raising of a single anti-fascist slogan in the Soviet Union. Likewise taboo were any and all anti-war or anti-imperialist slogans. As a matter of fact, the mere mention of fascism, war, imperialism, victims of fascism, colonial peoples, class-war prisoners, refugees, was proscribed. In the 42 official slogans issued by the Kremlin for the November 7th celebrations, capitalism itself, let alone the bourgeoisie, is not referred to directly.

The sole mention of the world situation was contained in the following slogan: "Long Live the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Government! The policy of Peace Between Peoples and Assuring the Security of Our Fatherland!" In other words: Long Live the Hitler-Stalin pact!

Even such a ritualistic slogan repeated for years as "Long Live the Soviet Power in the Whole World!" was omitted in 1940.

In 1935, at the beginning of the "People's Front" policy—remember?—the slogans issued by Stalin for the Eighteenth Anniversary included: "Our Flaming Greetings to the Proletarians and Toilers of France, the Vanguard Fighters Against Fascism, Against Imperialist War!" In 1940—silence.

Also, in 1935, "Bolshevik Greetings to the Revolutionary Proletariat of Germany! Long Live the Heroic Communist Party of Germany! Long Live Comrade THAELMANN! Let Us Tear Him From the Clutches of the Fascist Hangmen!" In 1940, the Kremlin was too busy shaking the hands of Fascist diplomats to worry about Thaelmann, the German Communist Party, the Spanish people, or any other victims of Stalin's treacherous and fatal policies.

In 1935 the Kremlin, while selling oil to Mussolini, still remembered to send greetings to the "Popular Masses of Abyssinia, Courageously Defending Their Independence." China then received two greetings: 1) "Fraternal Greetings to the Heroic Working Class and all the Toiling Masses of China. Long Live the Communist Party of China!" 2) "The Imperialists are Dividing and Enslaving China! Greetings to the Chinese People Fighting for Their Emancipation and Independence!" In 1940, the colonial peoples are beneath the Kremlin's notice.

In 1935 so many slogans against Fascism were launched that to really do them justice we would have to reprint entire issues of *Pravda* (not to mention the *Daily Worker*). Let the following suffice: "Fascism is the Most Savage Offensive of Capitalism Against the Toiling Masses!"; "Fascism—this Means War of Aggression!"; "Fascism—this Means Hunger, Poverty, Misery!"; "Down With Fascism! Down With Capitalism!"; "Fuse Into a Single United Front For the Struggle Against Fascism—The Bitter Enemy of All Peoples!"; and so forth, and so on. In 1940—silence.

What, then, was the content of the 42 slogans of the Kremlin in 1940? It was mostly "greetings." Thus, the workers, engineers and technicians of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metallurgy received greetings with an injunction: "Fight to Increase the Production of Metal! Fight for its Quality!" The workers, engineers, etc. of the Machine Building Industry were greeted:—More and Better Machinery! Workers, etc. of the Fuel and Electric Industries—More and Better Fuel! More and Better Electric Energy! Workers, etc. of the Chemical Industry—More Chemicals! Workers, etc. of the Building Trades, Build More and Better, and Cheaper! Workers, etc. of the Light and Textile Industries—More Calico, Silk, Cloth, Knitgoods, Footwear, and Clothing for the Citizens of the Soviet Land! Workers, etc. of State and Cooperative Trade Network—"Better Service to the Soviet Consumer!" "Fight For Cultural Soviet Trade in City and Country!" Etcetera. (*Pravda*, November 4, 1940).

Nor were the collective farmers forgotten. They got greetings, too, with orders for bigger and better crops, and, in particular, more meat.

A FEW STIFF DEMANDS ARE INCORPORATED

Another set of slogans dispensed with greetings and simply raised "demands": 1) "Create Mighty State Labor Reserves for Industry and Transport!" In other words, Long Live the October 2nd Laws Instituting Child Labor in the Soviet Union! 2) "The Struggle Against Laggards and Disorganizers of Production is the Struggle for Strengthening the Might of Our Fatherland and Its Red Army. Long Live Labor Discipline and Exemplary Order in the Enterprises of Our Fatherland!" In other words, the work-

ers were told to give three cheers for the June 26 labor laws which enslaved them, and which they are bitterly opposing.

The list of "Long-Live" slogans is too long to exhaust. A few will suffice:

- 1) Long Live the Soviet Trade Unions! (*purged in July*).
- 2) Long Live the Komsomols! (*purged in July*).
- 3) Long Live Our Working Class! (*chained to the factories*).
- 4) Long Live the Collective Peasantry! (*failed to fulfill quotas of grain deliveries to the state*).
- 5) Long Live the Soviet Intellectuals! (*now being purged*).
- 6) Long Live the Communist Party of the Soviet Union! (*now being purged, with the mass purge scheduled to be consummated by February 15, 1941, when the Eighteenth Party Conference convenes*).

TWO SIGNIFICANT SLOGANS TO EXAMINE

There are, however, two slogans among the 42 that merit special notice. First, there is the rather unexpected and sudden reference to "Our Socialist Espionage Service—the CHEKA," in connection with a slogan which calls for the strengthening of the Red Army. The *Cheka*, as is well known, was originally organized in the period of the Civil War. The Kremlin's secret police were first labelled the GPU and then renamed the NKVD because the other name had become so abhorrent. Why this return in 1940 to the *Cheka*? Is it to strike greater terror among the populace? Or is it a direct threat that police-terror is to be intensified and supplemented by martial courts? Undoubtedly, both the one and the other.

The second slogan follows verbatim:

"Let Us Unfold the Criticism of Our Inadequacies! Let Us Strengthen Still More the Might and Organized Power of Our State!"

Now, on the surface this may seem only an innocuous incantation of Stalin's "Bolshevik Self-Criticism"—but it is nothing of the sort. This ominous slogan quite clearly demands a greater centralization of power, and a further "strengthening" of the totalitarian apparatus. All "criticism" has been "unfolding" precisely in this direction. The coming weeks will reveal just how Stalin proposes to reinforce in his own two hands the "Might and Organized Power of Our State."

They Honor John Reed-- And Suppress His Book

CAMBRIDGE, Mass. — William Z. (Zigzag) Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, spoke at a Memorial Anniversary meeting for John Reed, Harvard alumnus and American revolutionist, author of the great eyewitness chronicle of the Russian Revolution, "Ten Days That Shook the World."

Following Foster's eulogy of the great John Reed, several people took the floor for questions. They inquired how the speaker could praise John Reed, and bask in his tradition, when John Reed's book is banned in the Soviet Union and suppressed by the Stalinists everywhere else.

Another question put to Foster was: "Isn't it also true that you wrote an extensive work in 1921, following a visit to the Soviet Union, entitled 'The Russian Revolution'? And isn't it also true that you went John Reed one better by failing to mention Stalin's name even once, while writing a special commendatory biographical sketch of Trotsky?"

Foster answered briefly: "the atmosphere was getting too warm to prolong the meeting. It was true, he opined, John Reed had overestimated Trotsky, as had others (i. e. himself).

Foster "forgot" to add that Reed's book bore an introduction written by Lenin—who also seemed to have shared Reed's "errors."

In 1937 the London News Chronicle sought permission from the Communist Party of Great Britain to reprint serially John Reed's "Ten Days That Shook the World." What happened was reported as follows in the London Evening Standard, Nov. 12, 1937:

"This contemporary account of the Bolshevik uprising was written by John Reed, the

American Communist, who was a close personal friend of Lenin. When he died in 1921 he left the British copyright in his book to the Communist Party.

"When the News-Chronicle approached the copyright owners for permission to serialize the book it was gladly given.

The Communists asked no fee, and made only one stipulation—that all reference to Trotsky should be eliminated from the text.

"Confronted with this modern version of Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark, the Liberal organ abandoned the project."

SWP PROTESTS JAILING OF PIERRE FRANK

The imprisonment of Pierre Frank, French revolutionist, by the British authorities, was protested to the British Embassy in Washington this week by the Socialist Workers Party.

The text of the S.W.P. communication was as follows:

Charge d'Affaires

British Embassy
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

We have received word from London that Pierre Frank, a well-known French revolutionist, has been sentenced by a London police tribunal to six months at hard labor.

The charge was that Pierre Frank had failed to register, as a foreigner, with the authorities. Frank, however, explained to the tribunal that he had been condemned in absentia as a revolutionist by the French government and felt that, had he registered with the British authorities in the usual way, he would have been turned over to the French government, despite the fact that

he was in England as a political refugee.

Frank's explanation appears to us as an eminently reasonable one for his failure to comply with a technical procedure required by British law. An explanation which should certainly have been accepted since he was being accused of nothing more than a mere technical violation. Instead, however, the explanation served only to harden the prejudiced tribunal against him. We are informed that the judge, upon hearing Frank's explanation, utilized it to denounce Frank as a "subversive person." Prejudices alone can explain the vindictive sentence of six months at hard labor for a mere technicality.

We protest this sentence and call upon the British authorities to release Pierre Frank and to accord him the democratic rights of a political refugee. Hounded out of France by the "democrats" who preferred Hitler to a resurgence of the French people, Frank now finds himself hounded by a government which claims to stand at the opposite pole to the Petain government which still seeks to imprison Frank. Elementary justice demands that this fighter for French liberty be given his liberty by the British government.

Very truly yours,
JAMES P. CANNON
National Secretary

The New Revelation According To Saint Norman Thomas

Conscientious objectors to draft registration, members of the Young Peoples Socialist League (Second International), recently argued their case before Federal Judge William Bondy.

Study the statement of Howard Schoenfeld, member of the Socialist Party, as printed in the pamphlet, "Why We Refused To Register":

"I respectfully submit that I am a Socialist, a firm believer in democracy, and, by training and belief, a pacifist, and that, as such, I cannot conscientiously take part in war, training for war, or in the surrendering of liberty, or in registration for such purposes."

Further, "It (Selective Service Act) forces the citizen to study the methods of war and murder, which is in direct contradiction to the law of God and the commandment: THOU SHALT NOT KILL."

And still further, "Although I am a pacifist, I am not a member of any religious sect. I believe in God, the Kingdom of God on earth, and that we are all sons of God, and that, therefore, there is a common Brotherhood of Man. The Socialist Party of the U. S. A. is a group of people working in a practical manner toward the establishment of what I believe to be the Kingdom of God on earth..."

The Philosophy of Slaves

As a pacifist, a disbeliever in violence regardless of the class employing it or the cause which it upholds, Schoenfeld and his colleagues advocate a philosophy which would condemn the German and Italian workers, indeed all the oppressed masses of the world, to a perpetual slavery. It means submission to the armed force of the ruling classes and the complete disarming of the working classes.

When God and the Ten Commandments are invoked to give added weight to this conviction, these conscientious objectors find themselves in the realm of the capitalists entirely. The bourgeoisie have a virtual monopoly on divine revelation; the ruling class also argues the justice of imperialist war, and its naturally attendant evils such as conscription, on the basis of supernatural mandate. And the churches of all varieties lend a thousand times more impressive authority than even the most vehement conscientious objector can command. In either case, the workers can only take their word for it. Neither side can show any direct testimonials from the Lord.

Nowhere in the statements of Schoenfeld and his colleagues is there an awareness of the class struggle, of the class character of imperialist war, nor even the beginnings of a realistic program which the workers can utilize in an effective fashion against the boss war.

While a handful of conscientious objectors can afford to bask in self-righteous martyrdom, the billion-headed masses of the world cannot simply sit down and say, "We won't fight." And for the same reason that they cannot say, "We won't work."

So long as the workers cannot overthrow the system of war and exploitation, they cannot be simple "abstainers" from the system. Their wives and children must live. Mass suicide cannot change the hearts of the master class, which has waded through oceans of blood and mountains of slaughtered flesh in its rise to power and in the maintenance of its rule.

Pacifism, fortunately not a disease of the American working class, hasn't a leg to stand on.

In the end, it is precisely such pacifism which lends itself to the support of capitalism and the war system when the workers, who are not so pacifist, turn against the oppressors. This was amply proved by the conduct of the pacifists during the last war and, especially, during the Russian workers' revolution.

Norman Thomas Speaks His Piece

We see the implications of this in the statement of Norman Thomas in *The Call*, Socialist Party weekly, for December 14.

Thomas takes his stand on the U. S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights. In commending the constitutional case presented by the defense lawyers for Schoenfeld, and the other young Socialists, Thomas states:

"There is a difference between peace-time conscription and the war-time conscription upheld by the U. S. Supreme Court. It is amazing to what extent the peace-time draft law delegates power to the President and breaches the defenses of individual rights contained in the first ten amendments to the Constitution.

"Granting that the temper of the times makes it likely that the courts will sustain the constitutionality of the draft, it is a service to all of us to know where we stand constitutionally..."

"This is not and should not be just a Socialist Party cause. It should have wide-spread support from all opponents of PEACE-TIME military conscription..." (Our emphasis)

This Revelation according to Saint Thomas does not, in its logic, argue against conscription—just against conscription until war is declared, or until the U. S. Supreme Court puts the final seal of approval on peace-time conscription.

According to this, the worker youth dragged into the armed forces by the draft can now console themselves that it is really all very unconstitutional; as they can draw comfort from the thought, when they are actually under shot and shell, and the court has acted, that their situation has the full backing of the U. S. Supreme Court—and Norman Thomas.

What farcical figures the Norman Thomases cut, whether in the garb of parsons or constitutional lawyers! Not content with violating the jurisdiction of the capitalists in the domain of theology, the Thomases want to instruct the ruling class on the meaning of its constitution, interpreted and enforced by its courts and laws.

Meanwhile, the workers will continue to undergo the military training, and wear the uniforms and carry the arms which the ruling class thrusts upon them; for pacifism is alien to them, fortunately. In their own way and in their own good time they will find means to put a stop to war, irrespective of the opinions of divines, Supreme Court justices, or that amalgam of the best qualities of both these groups, Norman Thomas.