

LABOR HAS ANSWER TO CONSCRIPTION!

WORKERS CANNOT AGREE TO CONTROL BY DICTATORIAL ARMY OFFICER CASTE

The bi-partisan Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill has the approval of the dominant sections of the capitalist class: that is expressed by the formal approval of the bill by the Roosevelt administration through its War and Navy Departments, by the capitalist press of all shades of opinion, by the bi-partisan Senate Military Affairs Committee, etc.

Speedy passage of the bill is not, however, a burning necessity for the capitalist class and its government. Much must be done in the way of technical preparations before even the first contingent of 400,000 conscripts can be inducted into the armed forces. The present Army and Navy must be transformed into an instrument for training the conscripts, uniforms, guns, camps and camp facilities must be made ready. In addition the White House thinks that much of the National Guard will have to join the Army and Navy in training the conscripts, and therefore first wants the National Guard called out for a year's active duty.

There is a little time, available, therefore. And the powers that be have very cleverly decided to use that time as a period of reducing the steam-pressure of the anti-war forces. They're going to open the safety-valve of discussion; that's what democracy is: "free" discussion, but with the decision remaining as firmly in the control of the ruling class as in a fascist regime. When they don't have time, we don't even have the semblance of discussion: we saw that in the speedy passage of the fourteen billion dollars' armament bills.

Furthermore, the discussion on the conscription bill is going to be carefully regulated and limited. The "voices of the opponents" are hand-picked. Just look at them! Mountebanks like Senator Wheeler and hard-eyed demagogues like Senator Vandenburg! They will "lead" the opposition, precisely in order to mislead it.

WHEELER IN ANOTHER COME-ON ACT

Anybody who is taken in for one moment by Wheeler must have a very short memory indeed. For about a month or so before the Democratic Convention, they let the leash hang loose, and Wheeler ran around denouncing the interventionists, declaring he would stand for president in opposition to Roosevelt, even making coy threats about a third party, appearing on one platform with fuming John L. Lewis, etc. Then the Convention convened, the leash was pulled tight—and Wheeler announced the phony "anti-war" plank was just what he wanted, he wasn't standing for nomination, he was backing Roosevelt. Now they've loosened the leash again and Wheeler is out digging up some cheap publicity—and will, of course, fold up obediently again as soon as the leash is tightened again.

The spectacle of Republican Senators Vandenburg and Taft playing "opponents" to the conscription bill scarcely requires comment. Since time permits it, they are out to make a little easy and safe capital against the administration. Enough Republicans in both houses will vote for the bill anyway, so Willie's party will be playing both ends against the middle. Vandenburg's main complaint against Roosevelt's war plans for a long time was that Vandenburg wanted first the war against Japan: he was the author of the Congress-

ional resolution abrogating the trade treaty with Japan and thereby making relations with Japan a day-to-day crisis.

All the Congressional "opponents" of the conscription bill, to a man, voted for the armament appropriations. Logically, therefore, they must go on to provide the manpower to handle those armaments. As a matter of fact, they accept that logical conclusion. All that they're saying is that the manpower should be recruited by another method. Thus, Vandenburg proposes that the army enlistment period should be reduced to the one-year term provided in the conscription bill, and is certain that adequate numbers of men would be gotten by that method, making conscription unnecessary.

ENLISTMENT NO MORE DEMOCRATIC

What, then, is the difference between mass enlistments and conscription? The Vandenburgs claim that the first is more democratic than the second. Is it? Just imagine a national campaign to secure the enlistment of the 1,400,000 men whom the administration wants in the next fifteen months. Every propaganda agency of the government and the capitalist class, movies, schools, radios, press, minute-men speeches, pounding away at the young men of the country. No contrary voice could be raised, opposing enlistment, without being immediately strangled by the penalties against opposing enlistment. If enlistments lagged, the pressure would get stiffer: stop-work meetings with employers and recruiting sergeants needling the workers; quiet agreements whereby employers agree to get a given percentage of their men to join the army or lose their jobs; debutantes cruising the streets and pinning white feathers on young men who won't enlist—every fiendish ingenuity would be resorted to for gathering up the necessary victims.

And if all that wouldn't work? Why, then, of course, as the Wheelers and Vandenburgs would agree right now, then they would vote for conscription. So where in blazes is the democratic difference between the two proposals? Either way the necessary millions will be dragged into the armed forces.

None of these scoundrels, therefore, is offering a serious and progressive alternative to conscription. Nor are John L. Lewis and other CIO and AFL leaders offering such an alternative. Lewis' proposals are completely identical with those of Wheeler and Vandenburg. One might think that Lewis would have a little more dignity than to be directly associated with Wheeler again, so shortly after Wheeler left him holding the bag on Lewis' demand that Wheeler be nominated by the Democrats; but no, Sunday night Lewis conferred with Wheeler and then announced himself "in full agreement with Senator Wheeler on this thing." And on Monday, in a separate but coinciding statement with that of Vandenburg, Lewis

also urged mass one-year army enlistments as the alternative to conscription.

We have already seen how fraudulent is the Vandenburg case for enlistments being more democratic; and that goes for Lewis too. In addition, two other basic aspects of the Vandenburg-Lewis proposal, not worth mentioning apropos of Vandenburg, become extremely important when Lewis makes the proposal; for Lewis is the head of the CIO and hence speaks for the most important workers' organization in the country:

1. By proposing mass enlistments as an alternative, Lewis commits himself to unqualified support of a campaign for mass enlistments. If his proposal were accepted, he would be obligated to make it a success. He would go up and down the land using his prestige and organizational power to pull them in, those millions of young workers whom the ruling class wants as soldiers. Lewis would be the chief recruiting sergeant for the bosses' government!

2. Lewis is proposing, yes, actually proposing, that millions of young workers shall willingly deliver themselves into the hands of the officer-caste of the Army and Navy, an officer-caste to which, under the regulations governing the armed forces, these young workers must render unquestioning obedience. It is an open secret that by training, by class composition, by professional bent, the officer-caste is the most reactionary group in the country. It has the mentality of a military dictator, if not of a fascist. If the officers did not already have this by virtue of coming from the most hide-bound and reactionary sections of the capitalist class, and from their choice of a profession, they would develop it in the barracks-regime of the army.

An army under capitalism has not a trace of democratic procedure within it; whatever democracy still exists outside stops at the barracks doors. We have to go back in history to the relation between master and serf to get an analogy to relations between officers and men in the army of "democratic" America. The army has been that way throughout the history of capitalism and will remain so as long as capitalism is permitted to last.

It is into the keeping of such a reactionary institution and into the control of such a reactionary caste of officers, that Lewis and other labor leaders propose to deliver several million young workers. Has Lewis forgotten how the National Guard smashed the "Little Steel" strike in 1937? How many workers in uniform, under pain of court martial if they disobeyed, drove back at bayonet-point the Ohio steel workers' picket lines? Doesn't Lewis know that the armed forces of the state, under capitalism, are always used against the labor movement? And yet he proposes mass enlistments into these armed forces as a "progressive" alternative to conscription!

WE HAVE NO USE FOR PACIFISM

A genuinely progressive alternative to conscription and enlistment must and can be found. The opposition of the Fourth International to conscription has nothing in common with that of the whining pacifists. We are as irreconcilably opposed to the pacifists of whatever variety as we are opposed to the Wheelers, Vandenburgs and Lewises. As a matter of fact, you will find that the pacifists are simply hypocritical supporters of enlistment as against conscription; their argument, like Vandenburg's, being that conscription is "unnecessary" they accept unquestioningly all the other evils of this capitalist chaos that we live in, then balk at the last link in the chain: war. And always, history testifies, the pacifists knuckle under when war actually comes, and deliver their followers to the war-makers.

Negative protests against conscription and war are of no avail whatever. The working class requires a positive program which takes the facts of war and militarism, which are the basic features of decaying capitalism, as the starting point for practical actions. The workers require, to begin with, a positive, progressive alternative to capitalist conscription.

FOR MILITARY TRAINING — BUT UNDER WORKERS' CONTROL!

We don't want the workers to receive their military training under the reactionary regime of the army. But the workers do believe that military training is necessary in this warring world, and we agree with them; for in this epoch of universal militarism all questions will be decided on the military plane. Therefore we propose universal, compulsory, military training of the working masses, but under the control of the trade unions. The government says it wants the masses to undergo military training? Then let it provide the funds, facilities and technical instruction, but let the workers' own organizations be in charge of the training camps. Not the regime of the barracks but the internal life of the trade union movement is the appropriate atmosphere in which the workers shall learn the military arts.

Nor should the bourgeois officer-caste, with its fascist-minded contempt for the ranks, its callous disregard for the lives of those under them be in control of the worker-soldiers. Let their own leaders whom they have chosen lead the workers in military matters, just as they lead them in industrial matters. Their union officials, and especially their shop stewards and the men who speak the voice of the rank and file from the union floor, are infinitely more experienced in leading the workers than is the officer-caste. Let these union leaders, then, be given the special training necessary for officers, likewise under control of the trade unions.

Universal, compulsory, military training under the direction of the trade unions, and creation of a corps of worker-officers from the outstanding workers to whom the unionists look for leadership! That is our positive, progressive alternative to conscription and enlistment!

That alternative can and must become the program of the labor movement!

Auto Union Convention Opens; Dull Beginning Is Symbolic

Union Leadership Very Much Satisfied With Itself; But Stagnation Of The Union Doesn't Please Delegates

ST. LOUIS, July 29—The fifth Convention of the United Automobile Workers of America concluded its first day's session today after listening to an Invocation by an Archbishop, a long meandering speech by a local Baptist pastor and a couple of speeches by some local politicians who promised two chickens in every pot and two cars in every garage. The convention also conferred an honorary life-membership in the UAW to Allan Haywood, National Organization Director of the CIO, and sang the Star Spangled Banner and God Save the King. This evening many of the delegates are going for a boat ride up the Mississippi river.

The convention proceedings thus far are an accurate reflection of the present apathy of this union and the lack of clear perspective of what the union is to do. The leadership—R. J. Thomas, Walter Reuther, George F. Addes—are satisfied with present conditions. They are officers of a large, important union. Their salaries are coming in quite regularly, and moreover they are now becoming big-shots in the governmental apparatus.

Thomas is on the Advisory Committee to Sidney Hillman, Labor Director of the National Defense Council. Walter Reuther has just been appointed a member of a special committee which will make plans for the training of young workers. Thus, according to the leadership, everything is progressing marvellously.

The officers' reports are filled to the point of nausea with self-praise. "Thomas reports 'sensational gains on all fronts.'" Addes, by some peculiar system of mathematics, finds the membership has increased by 93%. Obviously as far as the officers are concern-

ing, everything is on the up and up.

Delegates Dissatisfied

The convention delegates, most of them fresh from the shops, know full well what rot these reports are. They are, however, temporarily confused bewildered and disoriented.

They grumble and express their dissatisfaction, but they do not yet know how to set the union aright, to restore the marvellous spirit of militancy which characterized the UAW two years ago and which succeeded in smashing through all obstacles to build one of the most important industrial unions in this country.

Elections An Issue

President Thomas in his short address to the convention today asked the auto workers to support his stand to back Roosevelt for a third term. John L. Lewis, who is due in town tomorrow or Wednesday, is expected to state his position on the current presidential elections. Some of the delegates are preparing to make a sharp fight against the present

policies of supporting the boss parties and for a clear cut program to have the unions build their own political party representing the workers and their interests.

Numerous resolutions have also been submitted on the 30 Hour Week, the organization of Ford and opposition to conscription and the war drive of the government. The Resolutions Committee is expected to begin its report tomorrow and thus open up the debate on the key questions facing the auto workers.

AIRCRAFT PLANT WORKERS VOTE FOR AUTO UNION

LOS ANGELES—The United Auto Workers (CIO) won the Labor Board election at the big Vultee aircraft plant in Downey near here, by a vote of 1439 to 512.

Union officials estimate a total of 50,000 aircraft workers in southern California.

The election victory in Vultee, the first in a long time, offers a new opportunity to renew a drive to win these 50,000 workers to the UAW.

Court Upholds FBI's Frameup of Teamsters

7 Midwest Drivers Union Leaders Must Serve 2-Years Terms For Union Activity

ST. PAUL, Minn., July 27—Seven teamsters union leaders from Sioux City, Des Moines and Omaha must enter a federal penitentiary and serve prison terms of two years each, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals here decided last week, when it denied the union leaders an appeal from a conviction in the lower federal courts.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation's "G-men" engineered the conviction. The sensational growth of the drivers' union movement during 1937 in the mid-West, when the 10-state North Central Area Committee of drivers unions was formed with Farrell Dobbs of Minneapolis as secretary, centered all eyes there—including the FBI.

The successful fight for the unionization of the area found its focal points in Sioux City, Des Moines and Omaha, which the employers looked upon as weak links in the chain of drivers unions, and that's where the FBI moved in.

Moines and Omaha. Scores of FBI agents and untold sums of money were used—for "higher ups" were determined to get those unions.

W. K. Stultz, president of the General Drivers Union of Omaha, Louis Miller, Omaha organizer, and E. L. Carpenter, member of the same local; Jack Maloney, organizer of the Sioux City drivers, and Ralph Johnson and Howard Fouts of the same local; and Francis Quinn, organizer of the Des Moines drivers, were the victims of the FBI frameup.

The seven will probably be confined to the Sandstone (Minnesota) federal prison, where Minneapolis WPA strike leaders and Illinois union coal miners are serving their terms.

ATTENTION MEMBERS OF NEW YORK LOCAL

There will be a special membership meeting Tuesday evening, August 6, 8.15 p.m. at Irving Plaza to discuss plans for the coming Campaign election.

A report will be made by the City Organizer, Murry Weiss, on the situation in trade union work.

All other assignments for this evening are cancelled.

U.S. Gets Latin-America's OK On Seizing British Colonies

Seizure Of Latin-American Investments Of British "Ally" Is Main Discussion Point Of Secret Sessions At Havana

By SAM MARCY

Yankee imperialism has succeeded in putting the Latin American countries on record against a transfer of British and French colonies in the Western Hemisphere to Nazi Germany if the latter is victorious.

What the status of these colonies should be in the event that Great Britain is defeated was vaguely formulated as a "provisional administration", instead of a mandate or trusteeship of the possessions, as Hull originally wanted it. The difference in the terminology, over which the delegates are reported to have haggled for hours and hours, was not merely one of form, but of substance, since a mere "administration" signifies a lesser degree of control by the American imperialists, than would a "trusteeship", Hull's new word for a protectorate.

At any rate, the U.S. delegation expects this "administration" of the colonies to serve as a bridge for full control by the United States when she is in a better military position to do so. As a writer in last Sunday's New York Times puts it, the Latin American countries were heartened in their stand against the United States by the testimony of "Army and Navy officers before Congressional committees to the effect that their forces are inadequate...to undertake far-flung operations at a considerable distance from our bases."

Big Stick Threat

But lest the Latin American countries take too much courage in their opposition to the designs

of the United States and, back in the days before the First Imperialist War, British imperialism was the dominant creditor and capital exporter into Latin America.

British Investments Discussed
It is the fate of these billions of dollars of British investments in Latin America which caused the conference to be held in secret, behind closed doors. Secrecy could not have been necessitated by the Hull-Berle cartel plan, or the plan for taking over the European colonies in the Western Hemisphere, as these were widely discussed in the American capitalist press long before the convening of the Havana Conference. That also explains in part why Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay showed extreme reluctance in attending the conference, and then only confined themselves to sending mere delegates with limited authority to enter into binding agreements, and not their foreign ministers. These three countries together with Chile, contain the bulk of British investments.

What action do these countries contemplate taking with regard to British property, in the event Britain is ultimately defeated? "To smoke them out" with regard to these investments, "to get the lay of the land" as the United States News puts it, was one of the main reasons for calling the Conference.

(Continued on Page 4)

New Jersey in the 1940 Elections

By THOMAS MAYES

I. THE HAGUE TICKET

Frank Hague, boss of the Democratic Party of New Jersey, went to Chicago to get a third term nomination for Roosevelt.

This was only natural: Hague needs someone popular, someone with prestige as a "friend of labor", to cover up the rottenness and corruption of the machine he rules over. He needs "the best he can get" to take the nasty taste of his regime out of the mouths of the people, if he is to have any chance at all against the high-riding Republicans in the November 5th elections.

But the job of the Hudson County Hitler will not be an easy one. It will take more than a few smiling, hypocritical speeches from the White House this year to make workers forget that —

HAGUE'S CANDIDATES ARE OPEN WAR-MONGERS: James Cromwell, candidate for U. S. Senator (appointed Minister to Canada by Roosevelt early this year to make him a prominent figure), was the first to come out into the open with Roosevelt's intention to follow the shipment of arms to England with American soldiers, and the first to approve this step. Charles Edison, candidate for Governor, was in direct charge of Roosevelt's preparations to build a big enough Navy to lick the world for Wall Street's profit, and as Secretary of the Navy viciously attacked the strike of the Kearny shipyards workers who had gone out on strike for a much needed improvement in wages and hours.

Both of them, like Roosevelt, are realistic men who know what's necessary for themselves and their fellow millionaires, and they show by their words and actions that they look on the resolution against war adopted at their convention as so much paper.

HAGUE'S MACHINE STANDS FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF WORKERS' RIGHTS. Most sensational of all the events in Hague's career was his attack on the organization drive of the CIO to unionize the sweat-shops that Hague has brought to New Jersey under his slogan of "Everything for Industry" (and nothing for labor). Even though Hague found it more expedient last year under the pressure of public opinion and because the bureaucrats of the CIO (including the Stalinists) were willing to make a deal with him) to tone down on his anti-CIO drive, he is waiting only for the first good opportunity to resume and extend this attack on the organized labor movement.

The war, Hague knows, will give him this opportunity, and workers can expect him to apply with pleasure, vigor and efficiency the M-day provisions banning strikes and other labor activities.

HAGUE'S MACHINE FIGHTS AGAINST PROGRESSIVE LABOR LEGISLATION. Candidate Cromwell, in his book, "In Defense of Capitalism", has given the theory on

labor legislation which sums up the views of the Hague machine. Cromwell says that when the bosses are making huge profits, the workers benefit from it by getting a share; but when the bosses can't make high profits, workers have to suffer too. From this he concludes that labor legislation which is not aimed at making more profits for the capitalists cannot help the workers, and that they are fools to fight for any other kind!

Hague has on many occasions drawn support from workers by having his stooges in the Legislature at Trenton declare for such things as anti-injunction bills, because in most years the Democrats have been in the minority in the Legislature. When they were in the majority, they just forgot about it. When they had the chance in 1937 to pass it, they didn't and Hague supplied the "reason": he didn't want to scare employers away from the state!

HAGUE'S MACHINE IS AN ENEMY OF THE UNEMPLOYED. In recent years, the Republican majority of the Legislature has steadily whittled away the appropriations for direct relief, while they have carried on maneuvers to wipe out the unemployed unions by locking them out of the relief stations. Although Hague has fought with the Republicans over control of the Racing Commission and the patronage of the State House, he has never fought them over questions of relief for the unemployed. While he has not had control of relief, he has had complete rule over WPA and has run it with two main policies: build his machine through control of these federal funds, and prevent the organizing of the project workers into unions.

HAGUE'S MACHINE DISCRIMINATES AGAINST THE NEGRO PEOPLE. Hague knows how to gain votes from the Negro people by throwing them a few crumbs of representation on campaign committees and the like. In the Legislature, however, bill after bill of a mild and modest nature intended to penalize discrimination in civil service and public places died a quiet death with Hague's underlings never rising once to defend them. Hague's tool in the State House, Governor A. Harry Moore, has on three or four occasions vetoed a bill appropriating a few thousand dollars to set up and continue a Commission to investigate conditions of the Negro people in New Jersey (not do anything about them, just investigate).

It is only workers with short memories or a lot of indifference to what happens to them, who will cast a vote for Hague's ticket this year. Behind all the beautiful phrases and promises there is this naked truth:

A vote for Hague's ticket will be a vote for war; a vote for brutal suppression of workers' rights to organize, strike and bargain collectively; a vote for oppression of the unemployed; a vote for continued discrimination against and segregation of the Negro people.

(A second article on the New Jersey elections will appear next week.)

FOOD WORKERS' PAPER WARNS THAT CRY OF "FIFTH COLUMN" IS PRELUDE TO UNION-BUSTING

"The Spotlight", organ of the United Progressive Group of the Cafeteria Workers Union of New York (Local 302), carries a strong warning in its current issue against the use of the term "fifth column," pointing out that the term is being used by the "government and employers' group to divide the workers and weaken unionism."

If the United Progressive Group had permitted itself to be opportunistic, it would not have issued this sharp warning. For the chief sufferers at this time from the epithet of "fifth column" are the vulnerable Stalinists, who as the corrupt administration of Local 302 over a period of years, have fought the progressives with every dirty weapon they could contrive.

The progressives have, however, successfully fought the Stalinists on clear-cut issues of unionism. The very same issue of the "Spotlight" reports the election of William Kincheloe, member of the progressives, to the key post of president of the union, in a special election. His victory means that the Stalinist administration is now a "lame duck," no longer representing the membership, and certain to be ousted at the December regular elections.

Undoubtedly many workers, not understanding the consequences, have been tempted to vent their hatred against the corrupt Stalinist bureaucrats by denouncing them as "fifth columnists." The "Spotlight" article is a timely warning against this.

Tronically enough, the article points out, the present Stalinist victims of the "fifth column" drive were the first to use that vicious phrase.

"The phrase 'Fifth Column' was first used in our union by the Kramberg Clique to divide the opposition and defeat their opponents. During the Spanish civil war they called all their opponents 'Franco's Fifth Column.' This type of unscrupulous slander has become a much-used system of the Communist Party. Now that their master, Stalin, is allied with Hit-

SELLING THE APPEAL

"SUMMER SLUMP"? NEVER HEAR OF IT!!

We were warned that "summer slump" would set in the moment the mercury began to mount into the 90's. But the thermometer has remained at 90 degrees and above for more than a week, and we herewith instruct all calamity-howlers to go stand in a couple of corners.

Newark has increased its bundle order to the sensational figure, for a local of its size, of 1000 papers per week!!! (And says to the last cent regularly, "Come Wednesdays").

New York City has risen to the challenge of Minneapolis, and now Newark's standing order of 1000—and has surged above the thousand mark with a regular weekly order of 1,250! (Despite the terrific heat and humidity, mind you). The city organizer even talks confidently of 2,000 papers weekly, by Labor Day!

New York is another center which pays on the line, as—we might add—do Minneapolis, St. Paul, Los Angeles and Chicago. Boston and Detroit have fallen a little behind, although their credit is still good with us. San Francisco is making a valiant effort to clear its name financially with this office.

SMALLER BRANCHES JOIN IN DRIVE

The smaller branches are beginning to react enthusiastically to the large-scale Appeal work being done by the bigger locals. Without even being solicited by this office, the comrades of Reading, Pa. this week wrote:

"Please send 100 extra copies of the August 3rd issue. These will be used for the Norman Thomas picnic to be held August 4th near Reading."

"Comrade A. and I have also planned to make a house to house canvass. Plans are slowly being developed which if properly systematized will result in a precipitate increase in our bundle order."

CLEVELAND ANALYZES SALES GAINS

Cleveland has presented us with a valuable account of the reaction of workers to the Appeal as experienced by the Cleveland comrades in their mass Appeal work. Comrade Alex Morgan, their forceful literature agent, writes:

"The proletarian population in Cleveland, as in the country at large, is in a very confused state. But unlike the petty-bourgeois, whose minds leap from one position to another, and ends up in hysteria, the worker's mind when it meets with a crumbling of its illusions develops a taciturn apathy. But one must remember that apathy is a result of confusion. "A markedly positive side of this state is that the workers

Meet Your Comrades at

International Billiard Academy

141 Third Ave.,
betw. 14th & 15th Streets.

Ladies Also Welcome

Analysis of Conscription Bill Shows Anti-Labor Aims

Bill Gives No Guarantees For Return Of Jobs; Rewards Finks With Exemptions; Sets Up Strikebreaking "Home Guards"

The Senate Military Affairs Committee released its draft of the peacetime conscription bill last Saturday, July 27—only four days before debate on the bill was to take place in the Senate. Before the full significance of the various provisions of the bill could become clear to the people, who first had a chance to see the involved language of the text in their newspapers last week-end, their "representatives" in the Senate were taking a stand on the bill on Wednesday.

The key points of the bill may be summarized as follows:

SECTION 2 sets up compulsory registration for all males between 18 and 64—in effect an internal passport system. It makes all men between 21 and 45 available for service in the regular army and navy; while all men between 18 and 21 and 45 and 64 are made available for "home defense units" of the army and navy—the latter apparently similar to the "home guards" used against strikes during the last war.

SECTION 3 authorizes the President to "select" as many men as in his judgment are required for the armed forces. The War Department has announced it will call, if the bill passes, 1,400,000 men in the first fifteen months, but the bill contains no limitation of the number of men who may be called. The men are to be in the armed forces for a period of twelve months BUT may be required to continue in service indefinitely if, during that year, "the Congress shall declare that the national interest is imperiled". Each man after completing his training period shall serve ten years in the reserves, during which period he "shall be subject to such additional training as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law." Base pay for active service is the regular army pay of \$21 a month.

SECTION 4 gives the president full authority to induct as many men as he sees fit into the "home guard" units.

SECTION 5 provides that from 78 to 87% of the men to go into the active service provided under SECTION 3 shall be between the ages of 21-31 and 10 to 15% shall be between 31-38.

Exemption Weapon Against Unionists

SECTION 6 authorizes the president to exempt from immediate service those men whose civilian work at that time "is found" to justify exemption. These exemptions are to be determined "under such regulations as he may prescribe," says the bill.

Those regulations have actually, however,

been drawn up since 1926 by the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee. To enter a claim for exemption, a worker will have to submit two affidavits, one by his immediate superior, another by the executive head of the company by which he is employed. Militant trade unionists will be gotten rid of by the simple device of their employers refusing to sign their affidavits, while finks will be rewarded with affidavits. It's the chance of a lifetime for union-busting bosses!

No Guarantees of Getting Jobs Back

SECTION 9 ostensibly provides that upon completion of their service men shall get their previous jobs back without loss of seniority, BUT gives any boss enough loopholes to refuse to take his men back. Men shall get their jobs back "unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to afford such re-employment". The boss is the sole judge of that, since neither the Labor Board nor any other body is named and empowered by the bill to determine whether an employer's refusal to re-hire returning men is or is not an "unfair labor practice" nor are any penalties of any kind provided against employers refusing to rehire returning men.

The weasel words of the bill on this point are best shown up by comparison with the clause contained in numerous contracts recently signed by Minneapolis and other mid-West drivers' unions. The usual clause reads: "Employees shall not suffer any loss in their seniority standing by reason of their induction into any branch of the military or naval service of the U.S.A." That means that, if a man is No. 20 on the seniority list, he will be the twentieth man to be employed by the company no matter how the employer's circumstances have "changed." In contrast to this, the provision in the conscription bill is just pious eyewash.

STATE OF THE NATION

The World Peace Car, a dilapidated 10-year-old vehicle, now lies in an Atlanta junkyard.

Says J. P. Seiberling, president of the Seiberling Rubber company of Akron: "The United States must protect the Dutch East Indies from seizure by Japan because if Japan is permitted to grab the East Indies our supply of rubber will be cut off." Why, Mr. Seiberling! We thought wars were fought for ideals. We never knew raw materials had anything to do with it!

Lehman Plans New Police System to Replace Guard as Anti-Labor Body

Transference of the National Guard into active service as part of the regular armed forces, scheduled shortly, is the clue to an understanding of Governor Lehman's plan, outlined by him Wednesday, July 24, to chiefs of police of 200 New York state communities, providing for coordination of 30,000 police on a statewide scale.

Under Lehman's plan the 30,000 policemen in the state, who ordinarily function under 1,600 separate commands, will be organized under eight central commands. With state police captains as "mobilization coordinators," this set-up would provide ways and means for transporting any or all the police to any part of the state for action.

"When requested by a (local) police official, the mobilization coordinator shall, with the approval of the Governor, assemble sufficient resources to assist the authority requesting it," says the plan.

The considerable scale on which this apparatus is expected to operate is indicated by the elaborate tabulation which each coordinator is required to make of all possible serviceable men and equipment in his district. In addition to a tabulation of all police personnel, he is required to tabulate all possible transportation facilities, with a specification of the passenger capacity of each vehicle, including patrol cars, motor cycles and sidecars, squad cars, horse-drawn wagons and prison vans, ambulances, trucks, sound cars, horses, emergency vehicles and airplanes; similarly detailed tabulations of radio communication facilities, and of all available rifles, shot-guns, machine guns, gas-guns and other gas ammunition; detention facilities, etc., etc.

What is all this for? Lehman calls it a "state defense" plan. Obviously, however, this special set-up isn't going to be repelling Nazi parachutists, or invaders from Canada.

The explanation is the forthcoming mobilization of the National Guard into regular service. The coordination of the police forces is designed to create a substitute for the previous functions of the National Guard.

What functions? The average simple citizen thinks of the National Guard as a means for train-

ing civilians and thereby to expand the potentially-needed military forces of the country for use against external enemies. That's where Mr. Citizen makes his mistake.

The present system of National Guard armories, built in quarters of the city where they can act as fortresses commanding industrial quarters, and as points of vantage from which punitive expeditions can sally forth, date from the great railroad strikes of the 1870's. Notably during the great "riots" of 1877, the capitalists found themselves relatively helpless against the strikers. They remedied that by creating the modern type of armory and National Guard regiment.

Since then scarcely a year has passed in which the National Guard did not play the role of suppressor of strikers. The most important recent instance was the

use in 1937 of the Guard to smash the "Little Steel" strike. Local police are usually too few in number to smash completely a big strike, and the fact that they are local men complicates the problem. A National Guard regiment, brought under governor's orders from another locality, is much more efficacious.

If the Guard is now to join the army in the field, something must take its place as a weapon against the labor movement. That is the purpose of Lehman's "coordination" of police forces. What local police cannot do will be done by police brought from other parts of the state.

Unlike the AFL and CIO leaders who have laid down for the duration, the capitalists keep right on pressing relentlessly the class struggle. For they're class-conscious as most labor "leaders" are not.

Where You Can Buy The "Appeal" At New York City News-Stands

- LOWER MANHATTAN:**
University Place and 12 St.;
store; Modern Bookshop, Univ. & 8 St.; 8 St. and 6 Ave., north-east; 7 Ave. & Christopher, south-west; 75 Greenwich Ave.; 14 St. & 6 Ave., north-east; 14 St. & 6 Ave., south-east; 14 St. & 5 Ave.; 14 St. and Univ. Pl.; 14 St. & E'way; 14 St. and 4 Ave., south-east; 14 St. & 4 Ave., south-east; 14 St. & 3 Ave., north-east; 14 St. & 3 Ave., south-east; 14 St. & 2 Ave., north-west; Rand School; 28 St. & 3 Ave., north-west; 23 St. & 4 Ave., south-west; 23 St. & E'way., south-east; 23 St. & 5 Ave., north-east; 38 St. and 7 Ave., north-west; 42 St. & 7 Ave., south-west; 42 St. and 6 Ave., south-west; 42 St. & 6 Ave., south-east; 42 St. opp. Stearns; 42 St. and 5 Ave., south-west; 12 St. & 2 Ave.; 339 E. 10 St.; Biedermans-2 Ave., between 11-12 St.; 10 St. and Ave. B; 2 Ave & 9 St.; 2 Ave & 4 St.; Delancey and Essex, south-east; Delancey and Suffolk, north-west; Knickerbocker Village Stationery.
- HARLEM**
Wigderson - 396 W. 145 St.; 116 St. & Lenox Ave., south-west.
- YORKVILLE**
85 St. & 3 Ave., Southeast.
- EAST BRONX**
Prospect Ave. & 160 St.; Simp-son St. Station; Freeman St. Sta-tion; 174 St. Station - Cand-Store; Allerton Ave. Station.
- WEST BRONX**
167 St. & Jerome Ave., south-east; 170 St. & Jerome Ave. south-east; Mt. Eden Ave. & Jer-ome, Candy Store, north-east; 176 St. & Jerome, south-east. Tremont near Davidson Ave., candy store near southwest corner; Burnside Ave. & Jerome, south-west; Burn-side Ave. & Jerome, south-east; Sedgwick Ave. & Jerome; 3889 Sedgwick Road.
- BROWNSVILLE**
Eastern Parkway & Utica; Sut-ter & E. 98 St.; Straus & Pitkin Ave., Rockaway & Pitkin Ave.; Rockaway and Livonia Aves., Van Sinderen & Sutter Aves.
- BORO PARK**
Brighton Beach Ave. & Ocean Pkway; Brighton Beach Ave. & Brighton 5 St.; 1510 Kings High-way; 86 St. & Bay Pkway; Dit-mas St. & McDonald Ave.

SENSATIONAL SUMMER OFFER!!

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

At prices never before seen

1 yr. Appeal sub, reg \$2) both for
1938 bound volume, reg \$3) \$3.00

1 yr Appeal sub, reg. \$2) both for
1st or 2nd half-year 1939)
bd volume, reg \$2) \$2.50

1 yr Appeal sub, reg \$2) all for
1939 complete in two vol-)
umes, reg \$4) \$3.50

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

ORDER IMMEDIATELY — SUPPLY LIMITED!

Socialist Appeal
116 University Place
New York, New York

Bill me for (check 1 in each column):

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

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____

The Negro Struggle
by Robert L. Birchman

By H. WILLIAMS

Anyone interested in the Negro question will be eager to study and learn the contents of the 30th annual report of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, for 1939, just issued. However, after reading the forty-page document, one must surely be struck by its almost pathetic futility—a record almost barren of successes.

Readers of the report have the right to expect to learn of some definite achievements of the association. The NAACP, one must remember, is a respectable organization, supported by such notables as the Hon. Frank Murphy, Hon. Arthur Capper, and the Hon. Charles Poletti, and is able to report an annual income of more than \$60,000.

The first section of the report describes the activities of the NAACP to stop lynchings. The Gavan-Fish anti-lynching bill introduced in Congress at the beginning of 1939, still had not been acted on by the end of the year. As no program, other than further conferences with legislators, are contemplated in the report, there does not seem to be much ground for optimism for the passage of the bill.

The report lists four lynchings for 1939. In none of them, were the lynchers apprehended, or any serious investigation made. However, the report does not tell the full story, since lynchings in the South are done now in the new manner—i. e., without any fanfare or mobilization of the whole county. We can be quite sure therefore, that far more than four lynchings took place. In addition, the report makes no mention of the beatings and lynchings handed out to labor organizers in the south.

The second section tells of the efforts of the Association to secure equal educational rights for the Negro people in the South. In this field too, the NAACP can report only dubious success.

In the best known case, that of Lloyd Gaines vs. the University of Missouri, the U. S. Supreme Court ruled that Gaines was to be given equal opportunity to attend the state law school with white students—whereupon, the state legislature countered with the appropriation of \$200,000 for graduate study for Negroes at Lincoln University, a Negro college.

The NAACP again took this Jim Crow action to court, but Gaines, the subject of the case, disappeared and the case was dropped. No mention of an investigation into Gaines' disappearance is made in the report.

This case represented the high point of NAACP action for equal educational rights and was typical of the manner in which these cases are fought—almost solely through court action.

Little About the Fight For Jobs

The third section, "Economic Opportunity", which should logically be the most important phase of the Association's activities, is given less space in the report than any other section. It merely reports:

(1) Unsuccessful efforts were made to have some responsible agency conduct a survey on the relative costs of living in various parts of the U. S., particularly "with respect to alleged (!) differences between the North and the South."

(2) Investigation by the association's economic committee revealed the fact that Negro workers in Fayetteville, N. C. and Cheriton, Va., factories, were being paid less than white workers.

(3) The rest of the section reports a few ineffective protests by the association against discrimination in Civil Service, discrimination against Negro policemen, etc.

The fourth section deals with "legal defense", in most cases growing out of false confessions extorted from Negroes. Unfortunately, the Association cannot report much success in its attempts to secure justice for the Negroes through the courts.

The report concludes with a summary of organizational progress. The NAACP consists of 324 active branches, as of Dec. 31, 1939. No indication is given as to how many members this represents, or how many states are covered. The fact that the Detroit branch is reported as having enrolled more than 5,000 members in 1939, would indicate that the Association is to some extent a mass organization.

The NAACP supports a total of 137 youth groups in different cities, with a full time youth director, the Rev. James H. Robinson.

The report's omissions define the character of the NAACP. One might imagine that, in the year 1939, Negroes were not suffering from unemployment, starvation, disease or the threat of war.

These vital problems are not mentioned by so much as a syllable. This is not surprising, since to seriously raise these questions means immediately to come into conflict with the capitalist class and the capitalist government. The NAACP attempts to restrict itself to the smaller issues and ignore the great fundamental problems that face the Negro masses.

Unfortunately for them, however, these "smaller" questions are also full of dynamite—a serious struggle against lynching, and for equal educational opportunities means a fight not only against certain reactionary Bourbons, but against the entire capitalist system which must keep up discrimination against the Negro as one of the methods to separate the black and white workers and maintain the rule of the capitalist class.

We'll Never Forget August 4, 1914

THAT WAS THE DAY WHEN THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL FIRST DELIVERED THE WORKERS TO THE WAR-MAKERS, LENIN TAUGHT US THE LESSONS OF THAT DAY

Tomorrow is August 4th. That date probably does not evoke an immediate response from the younger generation; but they should learn to feel as deeply about it as did the war and post-war generations of revolutionists. For on that day, 26 years ago, the Reichstag fraction of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, the leading party of the Second International, cast its votes in favor of the war budget presented by the Kaiser.

It was a day of great rejoicing for the ruling class. "I do not know parties anymore," orated the Kaiser in his joy, "I know now only Germans." The same horrible scene was repeated, in Paris by the French Socialist party, and in London by the British Socialists; even in the prison-house of Czarist Russia there were men who called themselves Marxists who called for support

of the Czarist regime in the war, among them the founder of the Marxist movement in Russia, Plekhanov.

The masses of Europe, tens of millions of whom were directly enrolled under the leadership of the Labor and Socialist International, in the parties, the unions, the fraternal organizations, the consumers and sports organizations, were thus delivered over to the war-makers. These masses could not but have been bewildered at the turn of events. For during that same week the socialist leaders of Europe had apparently been making all preparations to stand up against the war.

APPARENTLY ANTI-WAR UP TO THE LAST MOMENT

The weeks since June 28, when the assassination of Austria's Archduke Ferdinand at Sarajevo occurred, had been weeks of anti-

war protest meetings, demonstrations and strikes. The Sarajevo incident was branded by the socialist leaders in Austria and Germany as well as in France and England, for the mere pretext that it was.

The real causes of the war, the conflicts between the great powers over control of world markets, sources of raw materials and fields for capital investment, were well understood by tens of millions. The events of that summer of 1914 were merely corroborating down to the last detail the analysis of the coming war which had been unanimously adopted as its Manifesto by the International Socialist Congress at Baste in November, 1912. That Manifesto had warned: "The Congress views as the greatest danger to the peace of Europe the artificially cultivated hostility between Great Britain and the German Empire."

And it had reiterated the stand previously taken by the Stuttgart Congress (1907) and that at Copenhagen (1910), that the proletariat would not be content merely with opposing war in time of peace. "In case the war should break out anyway," said the three Manifestos, than it is the duty of the working class and their parliamentary representatives "with all their powers to utilize the economic and political crises created by the war to arouse the people and thereby to hasten the downfall of capitalist class rule." This formulation—dictated by very stringent press laws—is not a perfect one; but it clearly means only one thing: answer the war of the bosses with the war of the workers against the bosses.

At least for seven years, then, the nature of the coming war had been understood and the necessary strategy of the working class movement had been indicated. And it seemed during the weeks preceding the outbreak of war that the socialist leaders were continuing the course set during those seven years.

The arrival of President Poincare of France in St. Petersburg in mid-July to prepare a joint action of France and Russia against Germany was appropriately answered, July 19-25, by strikes of 300,000 factory workers in St. Petersburg, by barricades, by street riots, and the spread of the strikers to Baku and other cities.

Before that, on July 14, the French Socialist party had met in convention and pronounced in favor of a general strike for the prevention of war.

On July 29 in Brussels the International Socialist Bureau met and issued an appeal to the international working class to intensify the demonstrations for peace. Symbolizing international solidarity, a great mass meeting was held on July 30 in Brussels, at which the principal leaders of all the big socialist parties in Europe participated.

On that day and the next, the appeal of the Bureau was answered by protest meetings and demonstrations of the proletariat against the war in all important industrial cities of Europe.

And the next day—August 1—H. Mueller, member of the Leadership of the German Social Democratic Party, arrived in Paris to open negotiations with the leaders of the French Socialist Party for joint action against the war. That day, too, the Kaiser declared

THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

The next day, August 2, when the German ultimatum came to Belgium, the first gaping hole in the proletarian dike against war was revealed. The General Council of the Belgian Labor Party directed the socialist members of Parliament to vote for "appropriations required for mobilization." The next day, August 3, the German Social-Democratic deputies met to discuss their stand on war appropriations—and a majority of 78 against 14 decided to vote for the appropriations. The next day Hase read their chauvinist statement to a wildly cheering Reichstag—and the 14, including Liebknecht, remained silent, obeying party discipline. That same day the war bills were voted unanimously in the chamber of deputies. The Socialist International had collapsed in national chauvinism.

Even the Russian Bolshevik Party did not remain untouched by the terrific force of the pressure of bourgeois public opinion. The Bolshevik group in the Czarist Duma joined with the Mensheviks in a joint declaration which was nothing more than patriotism diluted with pink pacifist internationalism. And though they soon took a more revolutionary position, they relapsed again at their trial, when four out of the five Bolshevik deputies categorically differentiated themselves from the defeatist theory of Lenin.

And when the Czar fell and Russia became a "democracy," in February, 1917, a large part of the Bolshevik party looked like the parties in Western Europe; there were fusions of Bolshevik and Menshevik organizations in many cities, the central party organ under Stalin and Kamenev took a social-patriotic direction, etc. Only after Lenin returned was the party's internationalist outlook recovered. And this in the best, most revolutionary and tested party!

August 4th showed that all previous analyses of the terrific power of bourgeois pressure upon the workers' organizations had been inadequate. That is best indicated by the fact that Lenin, then in Austria, at first believed that the August 4th issue of the central organ of the German party, *Vorwaerter*, was a forgery. He could not believe the evidence of his eyes!

Thanks to Lenin, we have been forewarned during these years since 1918. Thanks to his analysis of the way in which the capitalist class exerts its pressure to force the masses into line, we have not been taken by surprise. He taught us to understand the various types of "left" socialists, labor leaders and pacifists who inevitably grovel to the side of the war-makers—the Norman Thomases and John L. Lewises—not to speak of the cruder varieties like the William Greens. Lenin taught us to understand that those who are not irreconcilable, revolutionary enemies of capitalism in peacetime cannot possibly oppose war, which is an integral part of capitalism.

We live in days very similar to those following August 4th, 1914. The situation seems even more complicated, for now the degenerated Third International plays a reactionary role even more cleverly than the Second International.

And yet, if we compare the revolutionary anti-war forces of to-

day with those of 1914, the comparison is all in favor of today.

In Germany in 1914 the revolutionists had no party. The first public voice to be raised was old Franz Mehring's, and all he was able to do that first time, September 14, 1914, was to protest in a letter to the press against the distortion by Social Democratic papers of Engels' views on proletarian tactics in war-time. Liebknecht's first public act against the war within Germany was at the December 2, 1914 Reichstag session when he made a statement against war appropriations. On May 31, 1915—ten months after the war began—there appeared for the first time, to be circulated illegally, Liebknecht's famous appeal, "The Main Enemy Is in your own Country." Only by ones and twos did the revolutionists begin to gather together, and it was long, still, before they had a party. In France, Britain and the rest of Europe, it was the same story.

In Switzerland, in September, 1915, the Zimmerwald conference of anti-war socialists seemed pathetic in its lack of representative character; and only its left wing was revolutionist. There was no international organization of the revolutionary socialists until after the February and October revolutions in Russia, and after the German and Austrian revolutions of 1918! Yet it was those revolutions, and the gathering elements of revolution in the other warring countries, that really put an end to the war.

WE STAND ON THE SHOULDERS OF 1914!

A comparison between the anti-war forces of 1914 and those of today gives us confidence in the future of the revolutionary struggle against the war. Today we have a world party of revolution. As the Manifesto of the Fourth International has said:

"The Fourth International in numbers and especially in preparation possesses infinite advantages over its predecessors at the beginning of the last war. The Fourth International is the direct heir of Bolshevism in its flower. The Fourth International has absorbed the tradition of the October Revolution and has transmuted into theory the experiences of the richest historical period between the two imperialist wars. It has faith in itself and its future."

We recall the black day of August 4, 1914, therefore, only to make clear that the process of "anti-war fighters" turning into "betrayers and faint-hearts," a process now being repeated, is in reality part and parcel of the process of capitalist war. It is part of the capitalist machinery and will exist so long as capitalism is permitted to exist. Their present arguments—"war for democracy," "for civilization," etc.—are but a stale rehash of the stuff their predecessors peddled in 1914. Lenin coined a word to name those of 1914, and the name still holds: "social-patriots"; socialists in words, patriots, chauvinists in deeds.

If they seem strong, today, so did their predecessors in 1914. But in the crucible of war apparent strength melted away, and the isolated handful of internationalists ended the war by revolution. We stand today on the shoulders of those revolutionists of 1917 and 1918. That is why we shall do what must be done so much better and enduringly!

Behind the Lines

U. S. Embargo Move Against Japan A Bargaining Move For Indies Tin

by GEORGE STERN

By its embargo on oil and scrap metal proclaimed on July 25, the U. S. government served notice on Japan that it still had weapons to use in the Far East even if it can no longer contemplate use of its fleet to enforce American Far Eastern policies. It indicated that Washington is embarking upon a policy now designed primarily to improve its bargaining position with respect to coming Japanese moves in the Orient. The embargo was the first reply to the formation of the Konoye government, whose announced policy is the exploitation to the fullest of the prime opportunity presented to Japan by the development of the European war.

It is an illuminating commentary on imperialist international relations that such an embargo comes after years of a combined policy of diplomatic opposition to Japan and of economic aid in the form of virtually unlimited supplies of vital metals and fuels. Last year the U. S. supplied 65 percent of all of Japan's oil imports and 85 percent of its scrap metal. In 1938 the percentages were similar. Business, after all, is business.

But now the prospect of early establishment of Japanese control over the vital rubber and tin supplies of the Dutch East Indies, at a time when the U. S. cannot offer forceful resistance to such a move, has led to the drastic embargo policy. As the New York Times frankly stated on July 26: "With power over petroleum and scrap exports now in executive control, the United States is in a position to bargain oil and scrap against rubber and tin should the Administration be so disposed."

Some of the newspaper commentators have also seen in the embargo move a reflection of a changing attitude in Washington toward the perspectives of the war in Europe. It is claimed now that there is more confidence in British ability to hold off the German assault, that the war may last longer than was expected, and that therefore the U. S. can afford to take a stronger attitude toward Japan. This interpretation, at any rate, will soon be subjected to the test of events.

Even relatively more successful British resistance to the German attack, however, cannot greatly change Britain's own situation in the Far East at the present time. The Konoye government is greatly increasing the pressure on British—even arresting leading British businessmen in Japan—and quite obviously does not intend to permit any stalling on the part of the British, to delay Japanese action in the vital British spheres in the Orient, in China particularly.

In this situation the U. S. interests there come equally under attack. The embargo forms part of the preparation to meet that attack as best possible in the present circumstances. It may be quite significant in this regard that while blasting Moscow for the absorption of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, the State Department granted a permit for an oil shipment to Vladivostok right after refusing like permits for shipments to Japan and to Spain. Washington will more and more seek to preserve what it can of a U. S.-Soviet-Chinese tie-up in the face of further Japanese moves.

'Fourth International' Out For Aug., Features Story of Attempt on Trotsky

"The Attempted Assassination of Leon Trotsky," an authoritative report and analysis of the attack of May 24th on Trotsky's house and the murder of Robert Sheldon Harte, is the main feature of the Aug. issue of "Fourth International," the monthly magazine of the Socialist Workers Party, just off the press. This article is written from Mexico by Joseph Hansen.

The latest issue of the "Fourth International" is noteworthy for its informational articles and analyses of the most important aspects of the American situation. Farrell Dobbs writes on "Labor and the Elections." Carl O'Shea covers recent union activity (and lack of it) in "National Defense Hits Labor." William F. Wardle analyzes the reorientation of the government recently in an article entitled, "Roosevelt After the Battle of France."

The new developments in Asiatic waters provide the subject matter of an authoritative article by George Stern on "Changes in the Pacific."

Burnham's Resignation Letter An interesting item in this Aug. issue of the "Fourth International,"

is the publication of the complete text of James Burnham's letter of resignation from the "Workers Party," the group which he led into a split from our movement. His letter makes clear that he has now drawn the final conclusions from the petty-bourgeois line in which he indoctrinated his group of splitters, and has therefore deserted the movement openly and altogether. An analytic comment on Burnham's letter is provided by Jack Weber.

This is the first time that Burnham's letter is published. His group, which used to cry for conducting all discussion "before the public," developed an underground complex when they got his letter.

Other articles in this issue of the "Fourth International" include an editorial analyzing the way in which the Manifesto of the Fourth International has stood the test of events subsequent to its publication; and the first of a new series on "Elements of Dialectical Materialism."

This 32-page issue is an excellent introduction to our movement and should be used particularly to secure new subscribers to the "Fourth International."

PRIVATE ARMIES ARE GROWING TOO FAST, SAYS JERSEY GOV.

TRENTON, N. J.—The rapid growth in the number of private military training groups in New Jersey caused Governor Harry Moore this week to caution that they were becoming too numerous for effective coordination in the "home defense" plans of the State.

Though many of these outfits have been formed by hysterical individuals who expect German parachutists to descend on New Jersey in the next twenty-four hours, some of the larger ones have a more serious and sinister motive. These are aimed at suppressing labor and combating strikes under the slogan of opposing "industrial sabotage."

The formation of private military associations under the leadership of "safe" businessmen and professional patriots has had the unofficial blessing of government officials who have often supplied them with arms and instructors. Significantly, not a single one of these private army outfits is pro-labor.

ATTACKER OF TROTSKY, HIDING SENDS "STATEMENT" TO PRESS

MEXICO CITY, July 25—"El Popular," Stalinist-controlled daily, yesterday published a peculiar item, ostensibly a statement received by mail from David Alfaro Siqueiros, who is being sought by the authorities as one of the leaders of the attempted assassination of Trotsky and the murderer of Trotsky's secretary, Sheldon Harte.

"The statement" says: "When I shall be sure that Almazan (reactionary presidential candidate) is not plunging the country into civil war nor assaulting the President of the Republic, I shall publicly explain my attitude in the very justified assault at Trotsky's house, pointing out the grave political responsibilities that made it possible and inevitable. I do not wish to nullify in a jail my humble support of the

legal and extra-legal, civil and armed struggle of the revolutionary people against a reactionary coup."

When it became clear that the evidence against Siqueiros was complete, the Stalinists abandoned defending him, and sought to picture him—a man associated with them for fifteen years, a colonel in their armed forces in Spain, head of their Spanish veterans' organization in Mexico, etc.—as in no way associated with them. In line with this, the "statement" would have the function of laying the attempt to kill Trotsky to a question of Mexican politics instead of being the work of Stalin's GPU.

Is Siqueiros perhaps already dead, executed by the GPU? It seems difficult to believe that he himself sent the "statement."

More Evidence On the French Capitulation

Louis Levy, a leading member of the French Socialist Party, diplomatic correspondent of its daily *Le Populaire*, sends "a message to the workers of America", as "one of the few French Socialists who have managed to reach London since the capitulation." His article published in the *New Leader* of July 27, makes very interesting reading, indeed.

"In May it was clear that important tactical mistakes had been committed," he points out. "Why, then, between May 10 and the month of June, were concrete works not erected in front of the Seine and the Loire? Why was the Maginot Line not evacuated and its defending forces withdrawn intact toward the Southwest?"

"But it would have been necessary to galvanize the country, to have appealed for complete cooperation. An appeal could have been made to the mass of the population to put anti-tank obstacles in the streets and to mine the roads. A bugle call was needed to stir the spirit of a great people which did not want to die.

"But this, General Staff, which did not wish to defend Paris, the great city of revolutions, was no doubt frightened of anything that looked like a 'people's war.' A call on the revolutionary spirit could not be expected to appeal to General Weygand, a Fascist of foreign origin.

"The truth which all should know is that there were many French capitalists who preferred Hitler to that which they call Communism but which is in fact nothing more than democracy.

"Fascist propaganda had completely undermined everything. One may safely assume that these French Fascists were not without contact with their counterparts abroad. . . . And German and Italian Fascism did not flourish only in the press. It was active in Parliament and in the governments. Everywhere it had its conscious or unconscious accomplices.

"Of course, it is difficult to distinguish between the real traitors and the dupes. What is unbelievable is that good Frenchmen, good Social Democrats, did not understand their danger.

"I have no wish to reproach friends for the past. But one may well ask why it was thought necessary to introduce into the Reynaud Cabinet men who were bound to show their hands at the very moment when defeat began to assume catastrophic proportions.

"What faith could anyone have in Jean Ybarnegaray, one of the leaders of the Croix de Feu and an intimate friend of Fascism? In Paul Baudouin, representative of the banks who never hid his hatred for democracy, his sympathies for Fascism, and who only last year was employed as an emissary to the Duce?"

"The workers of France, you can be sure, learned with shame and pain of the armistice conditions which, until the last minute, were hidden from them. Their anger is now great."

France Mirrors All "Democracy"

Levy's testimony, it is plain, is very useful. Not that he himself understands it. That is plain from one prosterous sentence: "Persons in a country (he means America) where all classes of society are united against the Nazi aggressor cannot understand how far the Fifth Column had penetrated into the French bourgeoisie." Even now, this incorrigible reformist thinks that what happened in France is somehow a chain of circumstances peculiar to France.

He cannot for the life of him understand that what happened in France was merely the unfolding of the class struggle; that if the socialist and trade union leaders were successful in stifling the class struggle of the workers, the bourgeoisie nevertheless continued the class struggle on its part; that when the bourgeoisie chose to capitulate to Hitler rather than to risk being overcome by the aroused workers, they were merely doing what the capitalists in any "democracy" will do in the same circumstances.

Now Levy remembers that General Weygand was really a fascist, and Ybarnegaray, and Baudouin. All that was, however, sufficiently well known to Blum and the other socialist leaders when they consented to sit in the same cabinet with these men. Levy is absolutely wrong when he says that "good Social Democrats did not understand their danger"; that danger was pointed out by the Trotskyists, not as advice to Blum but as a warning to the workers, and for pointing it out the Trotskyists were clapped into jail—with the approval of the socialist cabinet ministers.

The Social Democrats committed no "mistakes" in France. A mistake implies something which can be rectified if detected in time. Something, that is, which is not organically part of one's entire outlook. But "national unity" with Ybarnegaray, Weygand and Baudouin was a fundamental tenet of the theory of the Social Democrats. That is why Levy's testimony does not cause the American Blums and Levys to change a word of their howls for unity of "all classes of society against the Nazi aggressor." There is a grotesque instance of this in the same issue of the *New Leader* that carries Levy's article. In it Ross B. Willis says:

"The Government calls in a Stettinius and a Knudsen . . . to coordinate our industrial mobilization for defense. They are brought in because they are proven industrial experts, and not because of their political beliefs. But what happens? A great roar goes up on the Left. 'They! Capitalists! War-mongers! They! They! . . . No matter, of course, that the fortunes and destinies of the Knudsens and Stettinuses are bound up inextricably with those of us all, in a crisis that menaces the whole nation, the obscure as well as the well-known.'"

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. IV, No. 31 Saturday, August 3, 1940

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

Editorial Board:
FELIX MORROW ALBERT GOLDMAN

General Manager:
GEORGE CLARKE

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

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

Fight with the Socialist Workers Party for:

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

Arming the Workers

"British Miners Ask Arms" was the head on a story which you may have missed, for it got into only one paper that we saw, the New York Times, July 18, and there it got the smallest head-type that the Times uses, and was buried away in an obscure corner.

It tells that a miners' convention at Blackpool unanimously adopted a resolution asking that miners be armed to meet a possible invasion.

We should like to see every union in this country adopt a similar resolution. The government tells us that fascism, the mortal enemy of the labor movement, is threatening to invade our shores? Then let the government provide arms for the mortal enemies of fascism everywhere—the trade unions. Let the government also provide technical instructors to teach the unions the military arts. Let the unions, on their part, see to it that every physically able member is required to participate in this military training under direction of the unions.

If this were to be done, we predict in advance that for every young worker who has enlisted in the army or navy, a hundred will devote not only the time for military training required by their union but will concentrate their spare time on becoming military experts. The master and servant relationship existing between officers and men in the armed forces, the anti-democratic atmosphere of the barracks, can inspire few, and least of all workers who, as union men, are accustomed to stand up as equals—and better—to their bosses. But organize a program of military training around the union hall and it will inspire every vigorous young worker to become adept in the military arts.

And we can also predict in advance that, if the organized workers of this country were thus armed and trained, what happened in France could never happen here. No "democratic" government could ever turn fascist with impunity.

We propose that what the British miners are now asking should become a central demand upon the American government by the trade union movement of this country.

J.P. Morgan's Refugees

"J. P. Morgan Host to Refugees", was a front-page headline in Monday's issue of the New York Post. In spite of our notorious bias against the banker, we were prepared to be touched. We have never been among those who found it irrelevant that a murderer was good to his mother. On the contrary, we have always been anxious to find a redeeming feature in anyone, even in a banker.

Our hopes were quickly dashed, however. It turned out that the refugees to whom Mr. Morgan has opened his home are young Lord Primrose, son of the British magnate Lord Shrewsbury, and two children of Hugh Vivian Smith, partner in Mr. Morgan's London banking house of Morgan & Grenfell. The refugees arrived accompanied by a tutor and a governess.

They came on a boatload of such refugees. All told there were 272 such refugees on the Cunard liner *Britannic*. The passenger list consisted of a half-dozen pages from Burke's *Peerage*. Other such boatloads have come and still others are coming. In many cases the parents come with the children.

These boatloads give us an insight into the real situation in Great Britain. To believe the "democratic" and "socialist" press, there is utter

equality today in England, now that the Labor Party is in the government. Wealth is being conscripted, etc. etc. And British law, in its majestic equality, permits both the rich and the poor to send their children out of the country to a safe haven.

But the poor insist on keeping their children where bombs will rain down upon them, while the rich pursue the more intelligent course of purchasing expensive steamship tickets and paying all other expenses necessary for transporting and maintaining their children in America or Canada (and not forgetting to send along governesses and tutors).

Well, dash it, do you expect the British government, amid its preoccupations, to take time out to arrange for transporting the poor children out of the country? No, that's not the task of British "democracy". We agree. That's not the kind of task for which the Labor ministers were taken into the government.

Which Is the Crime?

Dan W. Tracy has resigned as international president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) to accept the post of Second Assistant Secretary of Labor. The War Deal has need of men like him. The capitalist class found out nearly forty years ago (the French bosses tried it first when they got the "socialist" Miller and to sit in the same cabinet with General Gallifet who had massacred the Communards of Paris after they surrendered) that a "labor leader" can commit more crimes against labor than an ordinary bourgeois government official. As the workers resist the anti-labor consequences of the War Deal, more and more labor leaders of the stripe of Tracy will be handed government portfolios.

An ironical touch in connection with Tracy's appointment is the fact that, as president of the electrical workers, he was gathered in by Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold's "anti-trust" dragnet, and was indicted along with other union leaders on December 18, 1939. That indictment, involving a jail sentence, still "hangs" over him. Six months after it was handed down, however, the government which indicted him finds him more useful to it in the government than in jail.

It is characteristic of this servile type of labor "leader" that he does not even have the dignity to demand that the unjust indictment against him and his fellow-unionists be quashed before he will enter the government service.

The members of the electrical workers' union may well ask themselves: when did Tracy commit a crime? When, in maintaining union conditions, he incurred the wrath of the capitalist government?

Or when he joined that capitalist government? Tracy's anti-labor role as an integral cog in the government machine will, we confidently predict, bring to the members of his union the realization that union officials who enter the government can thereby serve only the capitalist class and never the working class.

Conscientious Objector

The Quakers and other pacifist sects are singing the praises of the government because the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill, with the consent of administration spokesmen, contains a clause providing that conscientious objectors who for religious reasons wish to do so may be assigned to non-combatant work instead of military training.

Stop and consider what a weird conception of democratic rights these pacifists and civil libertarians have. They are not troubled about the fundamentally anti-democratic character of the army, the utterly reactionary relationship between officers and men, the fact that unions or any other form of collective organization of the rank and file soldiers for protection of their rights is forbidden by army regulations as mutiny. They are not, therefore, worried about the rights of the great masses of workers and farmers who, willy nilly, are dragged into the armed forces. All they're worried about is that handful of "conscientious objectors" who lay claim to a special dispensation for themselves, regardless of what happens to the millions who will go into the army.

Being a "conscientious objector", it has been claimed, constitutes a form of resistance to war. That is false. Anyone who has read some of the proceedings of the conscientious objectors' tribunals in England cannot but realize that it is not a form of resistance; it is a form of exemption from war.

Our British comrades, who have seen these conscientious objectors' tribunals at work, have adopted a strong resolution, categorically forbidding any member of our movement from appealing to these tribunals, no matter what his purpose. So seriously do our British comrades view this question, that they have suspended a branch in London which refused to agree that no revolutionist shall appeal to the conscientious objectors' tribunals.

We agree wholeheartedly with our British comrades. No class-conscious worker in America should attempt to utilize the provision for conscientious objectors, which the conscription law may contain. We are irreconcilably opposed to capitalist conscription and capitalist war, as we are opposed to all that capitalism stands for. But we seek no individual way out. The only way out that we want is the way out for all the workers and soldiers—the way of the socialist revolution.

Those are the real heroes of the struggle against war, the nameless soldiers of socialism who, abhorring war as only those can who understand the war, nevertheless take their place beside the masses who do not yet understand.

War Deal Easy on the Rich; Doesn't Try to Draft Wealth

By W. F. W.

Easy on the rich and tough on the poor. That's the way the War Deal works. Under the Compulsory Military Service Bill every man from 18 to 64, aliens included, is made liable to military service and everyone from 21 to 45 may have to serve for at least one year. At first the sponsors of conscription proposed to pay the conscripts five dollars a month but now the government, "to avoid dissension between the professional soldiers and the draftees," is going to pay them equal wages—twenty-one dollars a month!

One might suppose, as a matter of equity, that capital would be called upon to make similar sacrifices. If the government is going to take millions of workers away from their jobs and draft them for military service, why not also billions of dollars? Far from drafting wealth and imposing any comparable sacrifices upon it, however, Congress and the administration are wooing the capitalists and making every possible concession to them.

On July 25th, for example, the *N. Y. Times* reported that "the Treasury has approved a method by which corporations undertaking defense contracts may, over a short period of time, charge off to depreciation the cost of new plant and equipment necessary for defense orders." While the workers are being coerced into military service and asked to refrain from making further demands or striking, the big armaments firms are being relieved of taxes and are extending their properties at government expense.

This is how a capitalist government prepares for an imperialist war. The workers are compelled to sacrifice their material interests and risk their lives but the administration protects the material interests of the capitalists by seeing that their investments take no risk. Money, you see, is more important than lives.

Roosevelt has repeatedly promised that no one is going to get rich from the armaments boom. Congress is making sure that the draftees won't be rolling in

wealth at twenty-one dollars a month. But let's see what's happening to the arms-manufacturers. Eugene Grace, President of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, made a report to his stockholders last week. "The first 10 percent of the expansion program of the U. S. Navy," Grace announced, "has increased the unfilled orders of the corporation to nearly 500,000,000!" Operations for July were at 99 percent of full capacity, orders booked during the month have been at nearly 140 percent of basic productive capacity; and earnings of \$3.07 a share were the second best for the second quarter of the year in the history of the company!

This is one of the corporations which continues to violate the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act that prevailing union scales should be paid on government work. And what is its reward? Not only is it a principal beneficiary of the arms program but, as Grace incidentally revealed, the government is making additions to its plant. "The Government already is paying for certain extensions of Bethlehem's facilities and owns these extensions outright," Mr. Grace said, declining to reveal the nature of the additions," according to the *N. Y. Times*. Where the government made such additions in the last war, the capitalists were able to buy them later at bankruptcy prices.

On behalf of his stockholders Grace issued the following ultimatum to the government. "I believe that where the facilities to be created have no commercial value, we are not warranted in spending our stockholders' money for the added plant. The Government must either purchase and own the facilities, or it must finance the construction of the new plant which is to be operated by private industry, or permit private industry to create the facilities needed to get sufficient business and make sufficient profit to compensate them for creating these facilities."

Why should these labor-sweating corporations amass wealth and increase their properties at the expense of the workers? Why

shouldn't the government take over and operate all the arms industries, as it already does in the case of certain shipyards? The government could begin this program of nationalization by taking over the three leading violators of the Walsh-Healey Act among the arms-manufacturers, Bethlehem Steel, Douglas Air-Craft, and Electric Boat Company.

MAKE THE RICH PAY FOR THEIR WAR!

The War Dealers hope to make the poor pay for the war-preparations by imposing heavy hidden taxes upon the necessities of life, thus boosting the cost of living; by driving down wage-scales and doing away with union standards; and drafting labor into government service at coolie wages. The workers should not let the War Dealers get away with this. They ought to insist upon trade union wages on all defense work and defend the full freedom of the unions to exercise their right to strike, if necessary, to gain their demands.

We are just as much in favor of conscripting capital as we are opposed to the conscription of labor. During the hearings on the Conscription Bill, Senator Lee of Oklahoma introduced a bill which would empower the President to draft the use of money according to each individual's ability to lend. This bill is not a real "Draft-The-Wealth" measure. It would do no more than enable the government to get money at low interest rates.

But the idea of drafting wealth is a good one.

The corporation owners, the coupon-clippers and all the spokesmen for America's 60 Families will doubtless howl to the heavens against such terrible measures of expropriations. But a government that is getting ready to expropriate millions of men from their jobs and their lives, should at least be forced to do the same in regard to capital. The National Association of Manufacturers may consider their property interests more valuable and their profits more precious than human life, but the workers and their families do not think so.

U.S. Makes Hay at Havana

(Continued from Page 1)

The matter of transferring British and French colonial possessions located way up above the "bulge" could only be of secondary importance to Argentina and Brazil; the Falkland Islands is the only British possession near Argentina. Thus one of the main reasons for the opposition of the bloc of countries led by Argentina was fear of new designs of American imperialism with regard to British investments. It was one of the main preoccupations of the conference, if not the main. It is plain why a British representative was not welcome at such a conference.

Cartel Plan Shelved

The Hull-Berle cartel plan seems temporarily to have been shelved by the conference or at least to have been relegated to a secondary position.

Powerful sections of American finance capitalism immediately realized major defects in the Hull-Berle scheme. They particularly pointed out the tremendous capital outlay involved and questioned the feasibility of the plan in the light of the ever-increasing acuteness of imperialist contradictions raging in the agrarian countries south of the Rio Grande.

In the decades when capitalism was progressive the United States exported millions of commodities to Latin America and reaped huge profits from them. Later in the epoch of monopoly capitalism (imperialism) the U. S. began to export capital (in the form of loans and machinery) and reaped fabulous profits through the super-exploitation of the Latin American masses. Since the crisis of 1940, however, successive capital loans, private as well as to governments, and investments in general, whenever made to Latin America, have sunk like into a bottomless well, never to arise.

Today, \$674,000,000 worth of South American bonds, representing 70% of the total bonded debt, is in default. Only Argentina, Haiti and the Dominican Republic regularly meet their interest payments. Hence the most powerful sections of American finance capitalism oppose the further pouring of millions of dollars into the economic pores of Latin American economy. They see in

it merely an extension of New Deal pump-priming and not a source of profit.

Force Has Its Drawbacks

The Birmingham News, sums it up: "We can no longer expect the profits and privileges of a generation ago". Perhaps they think that military force, would be cheaper. But that too, has its draw-backs. A glance at the map will easily convince even one not well versed in military and naval affairs that to "protect" the stretch of territory from the St. Lawrence River to the southernmost part of Patagonia would require at least as much as the cost of the Hull-Berle cartel scheme.

The posing of the problem in this manner has prompted a considerable section of the bourgeoisie of the United States to ask whether it is entirely in the interests of American imperialism to include within its orbit of military and economic "protection" the southern countries of Latin America, namely, Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay and countries in their lati-

tudes. The spokesmen for this section of the bourgeoisie have suddenly discovered that the Latin countries south of the "bulge" are not really democratic countries, that culturally and ethnically they are far apart from North America.

"Appeasement" is Considered

Behind this plethora of deceptive phrases there emerges the real issue facing American imperialism immediately, with ever greater persistence: In view of the fact that the countries south of the "bulge" (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay) are really agrarian and raw material "supplements" to larger, competing parts of imperialist economy, would it not be wiser for U. S. imperialism temporarily to allow these southern countries of Latin America to trade with Nazi Germany, while the United States builds its two-ocean navy? That raises one of the most crucial points of American imperialist diplomacy. In a word it is: Temporary appeasement or immediate aggressive resistance to a Nazi-dominated Europe.

Difference Between Imperialisms? Yes, But Not Decisive

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

Practically up until the war started and, even for a while after that, many people who were on the fringe of the revolutionary camp recognized the truth that whatever differences there existed between capitalist democracy and fascism, those differences would not be involved in a war. Everyone who claimed to be a revolutionary Marxist agreed that the struggle would be one for raw materials, for markets, for colonies. That is, it would be purely and simply an imperialist struggle.

The war came, and now many who formerly swore allegiance to the revolutionary phrase have begun to discover differences of such a nature between Hitler Germany and England as to justify a change in their attitude. A Marxist analysis that holds good in time of peace does not seem to hold good in time of war when the pressure of the ruling group becomes really terrific.

In a series of articles written by Lovestone and in another series written by Herberg, the difference in the situation of the working class that would result from a victory of Hitler as against a victory of Great Britain is presented as the fundamental argument calling for a change in the position of the Independent Labor League (Lovestoneites) on the question of the war. Both Lovestone and Herberg now prefer the victory of British imperialism. And judging by their arguments they not only prefer the victory of British imperialism but are in favor of actively supporting it against Hitler.

It is true that they refuse to draw all the logical conclusions from their position. Somehow or other they stress the necessity of keeping this country out of the war as the primary consideration. To any intelligent worker who refuses to be bamboozled by sophistry it would seem that if a victory of the democratic imperialists would mean so much to him he would do his utmost to achieve that victory.

The attitude of Herberg and Lovestone is the same as the sickening one of Norman Thomas—semi-pacifist, semi-isolationist and semi-socialist.

Personally as between Thomas and open chauvinism, I prefer the position of the Social Democrats who are at least logical. They want the victory of British imperialism and they do not beat around the bush, they openly state that the United States should do everything to assure that victory—and they omit the "short of war" business that is Roosevelt's stock-in-trade.

And why not? If a victory of British imperialism would further the cause of the working masses, as the Lovestoneites indicate, why not give wholehearted support to Great Britain? It is characteristic of the Norman Thomas type of socialist to say "yes and no" at the same time.

We must admit of course that there are differences between "democratic" British imperialism and fascist German imperialism. But only he who looks upon those differences as purely static and fails to see the underlying forces at work both in the so-called democratic and in the fascist countries will determine his attitude on the basis of those differences.

No Differences in The Colonies

Those differences cannot be of very great importance to the five hundred million slaving under the yoke of British imperialism in the colonies and it is hardly conceivable that they would willingly sacrifice their lives to preserve those differences. It must never be forgotten that any party supporting British imperialism thereby loses the support of a half billion colonial slaves.

But let us confine our consideration to the privileged English workers and see whether the differences existing between British and German imperialism should determine the attitude of a revolutionary Marxist. It is in the first instance obvious that the difference between English "democracy" and German fascism becomes ever narrower as the war progresses. The British worker enjoys precious little democracy at the present moment. He will, however, regain all his rights after a British victory, insist those who advocate supporting British imperialism.

And here we come to the heart of the problem. Not that there is any use arguing as to whether the British worker will or will not regain his rights after the war. He undoubtedly will not, but that is not the major point at issue.

A revolutionary party must consider as fundamental, in addition to the fact that it is impermissible to support one imperialism as against another, that we are living in the period of the decline of capitalism, when all tendencies favor the victory of fascism unless the victory of the socialist revolution intervenes.

A victory of the fascists will bring fascism, say Lovestone and Herberg and a victory of the "democracies" will still give us some lee-way. Even granting that, the disadvantages for a revolutionary party resulting from support of an imperialist war outweigh by far the advantages of a problematical short period of very limited democratic rights that might be granted to the workers as a result of a victory of the "democracies".

For by supporting any imperialist government a revolutionary party is bound to lose the support of that section which is most exploited by the imperialist regime. In supporting an imperialist war a revolutionary party must inevitably make compromises on the home front, discouraging and demoralizing the workers and making impossible an effective struggle against fascism.

A Marxist party, to preserve its revolutionary integrity, must under no circumstances assume a share in the responsibility for capitalist war or capitalist peace. In the period of the decline of capitalism it must show its bitter hostility to the capitalist order by an uncompromising struggle against its own capitalist enemy.

It must stress the fundamental idea that to defeat fascism, foreign or domestic, it is necessary to destroy the capitalist system.

It dare not stress the fleeting differences, but only the essential identity between "democratic" and fascist exploiters.

YOU CAN HELP!

Buy A Set of

Trotsky's Historic Speech (In English)

Made for the New York mass meeting celebrating the Tenth Anniversary of the founding of the Fourth International

Recorded on two 12-inch discs 78R

Specially Priced—\$3.50

Full Proceeds to:
TROTSKY'S DEFENSE FUND

Pioneer Publishers

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK, N. Y.