

By FELIX MORROW

(The following chapter is taken from a pamphlet which will be published this week, for mass distribution, to be sold at 2 cents a copy.)

Why The Government Wants Conscription

The light-minded way in which the AFL and CIO officialdom have agreed to support the conscription measure as soon as enlistments don't work shows that the trade union movement has failed to understand the fundamental meaning of the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill. If the workers did understand, they would never permit their leaders under any circumstances to support conscription.

Why is the conscription bill introduced at this time, and with the backing of the government, the dominant sections of the two capitalist parties, and of the capitalist class generally? Neither Lewis nor Green attempt to answer this fundamental question.

About three years ago, the present chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, then ambitiously aspiring to reach the post he now occupies, got a brilliant idea. Thought Senator Sheppard: why not enact into law some of the provisions of the M-Day plans? Forthwith, together with his friend Congressman May, he drew up and introduced the notorious Sheppard-May Bill.

Senator Sheppard "represents" Texas, thanks to the help of a poll tax law and a Jim Crow system whereby the black and many white workers and farmers have no vote. He is therefore not very sensitive to the problem of not offending the masses. But other Senators have that problem. Finally an informal committee took Sheppard aside and told him the facts of life. He and May were arousing opposition to the M-Day plans by their crude insistence on enacting them into law at that time. Why do that when laws like that are not yet needed? Sheppard and May saw the light. They retired their bill into the background.

The moral of this story is that the hard-headed and cold-blooded leaders of the Republican and Democratic parties who have now united in advocating immediate execution of the main M-Day plan, conscription, know just what they are doing. They have thought this thing through with about as much emotion as an adding machine. They need conscription now and they therefore demand a law far more frightful than that which they correctly called Sheppard and May fools for trying to get in 1937. Because then they didn't need it and now they do.

When a demagogue like Senator Wheeler calls the conscription proposal a product of "war hysteria," he is lying, and he knows he is lying. He knows the gentlemen who have commanded the passage of conscription, and he knows they are not hysterical; they are too calculating a crew for that. When a hypocrite like Senator Vandenberg says that conscription is "unnecessary," he is only throwing sand in the eyes of the masses. Unnecessary for the workers and farmers who would be the victims of conscription? Of course! But a desperate necessity for American capitalism and its political agents.

Why We Oppose The Bill

Conscription, like the gigantic arms program already voted, is called for at this time by the capitalist class because it is preparing for military aggression in the near future on a world scale.

The question whether German imperialism, having conquered Europe, can or cannot "attack" the United States has nothing to do with the real issue. The very existence of one great imperialist power in the modern world is an "attack" on the others. The United States, as an imperialist power having its foundations throughout the world, is "attacked" anywhere a rival power attempts to seize a market, a piece of territory, or a sphere of influence. The very existence of two imperialist powers in this capitalist world means that they "attack" each other and hence must settle the issue from time to time by war. That is why war is inevitable under the capitalist system.

The conscription measure is, therefore, a result of the very nature of American imperialism. John L. Lewis puts the cart before the horse when he says (in his speech at the Auto Union convention) that "by that act (conscription) our Congress is planting the seeds of destruction of democracy and is paving the way for the rise of a new imperialistic nation within the confines of the U. S. A." No, Brother Lewis, the seeds of destruction are already planted, they were planted before the last World War, when the United States was already an imperialistic nation. Because they are imperialists by their very being, the American imperialists want conscription.

Precisely for that reason the workers must fight against conscription by the capitalists not only when it is "unnecessary" but also when it is "necessary." Because it is never necessary for the workers. Any war undertaken by the capitalist government of the United States will be an imperialist war, undeserving of the support of the working class.

Because they fail to answer as we do the question why the capitalist class now seeks conscription, the CIO and AFL fail to put up a consistent, fundamental fight against the conscription bill.

To our analysis, Lewis might retort: "You are a Marxist, a revolutionary socialist, interested in overthrowing capitalism. I am not. Therefore we cannot agree on one approach to conscription."

Very well, then, let us examine the conscription measure from a "Simon pure" trade union point of view. Even from that limited outlook Lewis and Green fail to criticize the Burke-Wadsworth bill deeply enough.

Why Unionists Should Oppose The Bill

Perhaps the most glaring example of the superficiality of AFL and CIO criticism of the bill is their complete failure to explain to their members the meaning of that provision in the bill which empowers the president to exempt from immediate service those men whose work in industry "is found" to justify exemption. These exemptions are to be determined "under such regulations as he may prescribe."

Green and Lewis know exactly what that means. For the regulations in question are not a matter for future elaboration by Roosevelt; they have been in writing since 1926 when they were drawn up by the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee to await just such a moment as this.

Why weren't they put in the conscription bill, in place of the blanket power given to the president to prescribe the regulations? Because if those regulations were part of the bill, millions of workers who are now not thinking too much about the bill one way or the other, would be aroused to an understanding of what a reactionary anti-labor weapon it is.

The Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee

(Continued on page 3)

Socialist Appeal

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

TRADE UNION WAGES ON ALL DEFENSE WORK!

VOL. IV—No. 33.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, AUGUST 17, 1940

FIVE (5) CENTS

DRAFT DEBATE IS A SHAM!

Senatorial "Opponents" Are Yelling For Millions of Enlistments As "Alternative"

OHIO UNIONS CLASH OVER AUTO PLANT

Fight Between CIO And AFL Pleases Toledo Bosses

TOLEDO, Ohio—Belated repercussions of the old Homer Martin fight in the Auto Workers Union, plus the tragic division in the American labor movement, has bloomed into a minor civil war here.

The AFL Central Labor Union, with the aid of the bosses of the City Auto Stamping Co. and city officials, mobilized hundreds of Building trades members armed with hammers and other improvised weapons and prevented members of the CIO-UAW from entering the plant during a jurisdictional fight between the AFL and CIO locals of the auto workers.

About 25-30 CIO workers have just been laid off from the plant, for a period of 5-30 days as a measure of company intimidation, since the CIO has elected not to engage in what might prove to be a very bloody fight between union men.

During the Homer Martin faction fight in the UAW, the City Auto Stamping local entered the AFL. This was largely due to the reaction of these workers to the vicious policies of the Stalinist wing of the UAW leadership of that time.

Most Workers Indifferent

Since then the CIO, now the dominant union in auto, has had the opportunity to regain the local by demonstrating a fighting progressive policy in the interests of the workers. But the do-nothing, indifferent policy of the leadership, a mere duplicate of that of the AFL officials, led the workers to apathy. Most of the workers in the plant are indifferent to the outcome of the battle, seeing no difference in the union program of both groups.

The local AFL reactionaries are gloating over their costly victory, costly to the workers themselves. They boast that the Building Trades workers sacrificed over \$250,000 in lost pay to go on the jurisdictional picket line and goon-squads. The prestige of the UAW-CIO here has been struck a heavy blow as a result of the capitulation of the leaders to this attack. They could only pass inane resolutions and fulminate behind closed doors.

A Bosses' Victory

The bosses, of course, have won the real victory and, by playing up this fatal division with the connivance of the AFL leaders, have succeeded in smashing for the time being an effective union in the plant, plus the fact that they have penalized the best union fighters.

An appeal to the National Labor Relations Board is being made by the CIO, while the AFL leaders, who can't find a dime for a fight against the bosses, continue to rook their membership for a bigger and better war-chest to destroy all unionism by their suicidal onslaught on industrial unionism.

New UAW Executive Reflects Lewis-Hillman Split in CIO

ST. LOUIS, Mo., August 5—As the fifth convention of the United Auto Workers closed here tonight, it had become quite clear that the union's leadership has divided, taking sides in the sharpening conflict developing between Sidney Hillman and John L. Lewis.

Walter Reuther, Ex-Stalinist fellow traveller, ex-Socialist Party member, has now become the official spokesman inside the auto union for Hillman and his policies. He has in the past few months conferred many times with Hillman in Washington, has been appropriately rewarded with a post in the new Defense Council setup, and was the cheering squad captain for Hillman and for Roosevelt during the convention sessions.

Grouped around Reuther are at least seven or eight other board members, thus giving Reuther the largest single bloc of votes on the new Executive Board elected by the St. Louis convention.

The Lewis men on the Executive Board are grouped around Richard Frankensteen. After the Stalin-Hitler pact, the Stalinist machine began crumbling. The unprincipled opportunistic vote-grabbing machine that the Communist Party had organized got out of its creator's control, until today it has come into the hands of a loose grouping of Lewis men, with the Stalinists definitely pushed into the background.

Differences Still Unclear

Both the Reuther and Frankensteen groups voted at the St. Louis convention to support Roosevelt for a third term. Both groups are in favor of giving support to the Du Pont-Morgan "National Defense Council." Both groups are riding the bandwagon of the Wall Street war machine.

They are divided merely in the kind of support they wish to give to Roosevelt. The Lewis men think that Hillman is selling too cheap, and they go along with Lewis in trying to get an extra few crumbs from the administration. On all major issues in the Auto Union the two groups have voted solidly together.

R. J. Thomas and George F. Addes were both reelected to their respective posts as President and Secretary-Treasurer of the Union, by acclamation at the convention. Both of them have attempted to steer a middle course between the Hillman and Lewis groups in the CIO, as well as in their own union, and to keep the friendship of both groups.

Stalinists Decimated

The Stalinists, who two years ago, and even as late as the Cleveland Convention, were a major power in the UAW, are today on the decline. Their machine is only a fraction of its former self. They lost many rank and file members as well as a whole group of secondary lead-

ers in the union. Their numerous alliances and vote getting deals collapsed the day after the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact.

Today, they are bearing the full brunt of the pressure of capitalist propaganda inside the union, but bearing also the hatred, mistrust and opposition of all genuine militants.

Isolated on the floor of the convention, without any real influence on the basic decisions of the union, they are today more isolated than ever before on the International Executive Board.

Their full-blown election campaign to put Travis on the Board as the Toledo Regional Director failed miserably. Out of a total of 17 board members, the Stalinists are reduced to two supporters, Michner of the West Coast, and Leo LaMotte of Detroit, and rather chicken hearted supporters, at that. (Both voted for the Roosevelt resolution on the last Board.)

Intermediate Groupings Disappear

The St. Louis convention further revealed the complete disintegration of all "centrist" and "intermediate" political groupings in the union. The Lovestonites are of course nowhere on the scene. Their smelly alliance with Homer Martin has finished them forever in the Auto Union. The Norman Thomas Socialists, who considered themselves a force a year ago, are now out of the picture. All of their leading people have forgotten about radicalism or Socialism or even plain militant trade unionism in their scramble for jobs and their seeking for respectability. Norman Thomas's boys are all lined up behind Roosevelt.

Victor Reuther, the "radical" of the Reuther family, took the lead in opposing the fight for the 30 Hour Week at 40 Hours Pay. Emil Mazey, President of the Briggs local didn't do anything; just kept his mouth shut, except to make a few meaningless innocuous motions. (He thought he would get on the Board that way, but Leo LaMotte beat him out.) Joe Ditzel, Norman Thomas's bright light of Toledo in former days, brought in as Chairman of the Resolutions Committee the proposal to unconditionally support Roosevelt for a Third Term. Nordstrom, Chairman of the Constitutional Committee, a former Wisconsin Socialist, brought in and pushed across the infamous "subversive clause" amendment to the union constitution.

Things are thus clearing up in the Auto Union. In place of the welter and confusion of dozens of different groups and political tendencies, there is arising a clear cut division. On the one side is the present union administration, trying to uphold the status quo. On the other side is a still small but determined group of union militants who are fighting to lift the union out of its stagnation.

See detailed auto convention story on page 2 of this issue.

Capitalist Army No Place For Workers' Military Training

We Are For Military Training—But Only Under the Control of the Trade Unions

The first days of Senate debate on the conscription bill have already demonstrated that, if the workers depend on the "anti-conscriptionists" to save them from service in the army, they might as well pack their bags and get ready to be called.

The "anti-conscriptionists" have spent their time trying to prove that by "voluntary" enlistment they can get as many men into the army as by conscription. And if enlistment doesn't work, they are ready to support the conscription measure quickly enough. All the "anti-conscriptionists" are supporting the Maloney amendment, providing for automatic use of conscription by January 1 if enlistments prove insufficient by then.

This same reactionary bilge is being spouted by John L. Lewis and William Green. An army of 1,500,000 can be raised by the "American way" of enlistment, swears Green, and no doubt he'll be the most energetic recruiting sergeant to raise it. Likewise John L. Lewis calls for shorter enlistment terms and "increase the pay of the army at least until it equals that of the boys in the CCC camps"—\$30 a month—and then the necessary manpower will be forthcoming.

The imperialist role for which this army will be used, and the fact that this army will be run under the same viciously anti-labor set-up as all capitalist armies are run—of this nobody in Congress or in the AFL and CIO leadership says one word.

On the contrary, John L. Lewis tries to find some sympathizing ears among prosperous taxpayers by whining that conscription means to "train our millions of young men in the arts of war at the public expense?"

WORKERS NEED TRAINING
What is wrong with training millions of young workers in the arts of war? Nothing! We would like nothing better than to see every trade unionist in the country become an expert in the military arts. In a world dominated by militarism and war the working class must become adept in the arts of war—unless it wants to be the slaves of those who are skilled in military matters. And what, Brother Lewis, is wrong with training the workers "at the public expense"? Why

NOT IN THEIR ARMY

Lewis' semi-pacifist clap-trap fails to touch the real objection to the Burke-Wadsworth bill. Which is that it is a scheme to put the young workers into the straitjacket of a capitalist army, to deliver them into the hands of bourgeois officers who will have the power of life and death over them. Lewis' enlistment proposal would do just what the Burke-Wadsworth bill does.

Instead of whining about the Burke-Wadsworth bill, the AFL and CIO leadership should be demanding passage of a Labor bill to provide universal, compulsory military training UNDER THE DIRECTION AND CONTROL OF THE TRADE UNIONS.

The AFL and CIO leadership weren't worried about public expense when they supported the huge armament program already voted by Congress. Let them now raise a demand that the material be put into the hands of the labor movement to equip training camps to be run by the trade unions. Military appropriations? Yes—but only for the establishment and equipment of such workers-controlled military camps!

AGAINST ALL ARMY BILLS

The reactionary consequences of voting for armament bills providing equipment for the capitalist army was graphically brought out in the Senate debate when Senator Lucas mockingly asked the "anti-conscriptionist" Senator Danaher: "why had Senator Danaher voted in favor of billions of dollars for defense equipment for the army and now would not vote it the necessary manpower?" Danaher spluttered, helpless to answer—because there was no answer. He who votes for armament appropriations for the army must, logically, vote also for the manpower that goes with the armament. The conscriptionists have all these "anti-conscriptionists" over a barrel with that argument.

That's why the labor movement must put a halt to any further endorsements of army armament bills by the AFL and CIO leadership. The only military appropriations the labor movement should vote for are those providing the trade unions with funds and equipment to launch Labor's own military training camps!

US Imperialism Made Gains at Havana

BUENOS AIRES, Argentina, Aug. 1 (by airmail)—"The greatest conference in the history of Pan-Americanism," according to the correspondents, has just closed at Havana, having been according to the same correspondents, "the greatest diplomatic victory in Cordell Hull's career."

As seen from Buenos Aires, the following demonstrate clearly the results obtained at Havana:

1. The road is prepared to seize the European colonies in the Western Hemisphere; that is the purpose of the so-called "Declaration of Havana", which gives continental effect to the recent resolution of the United States Congress.

2. Elimination of the perspective of a renewal of German commerce in Latin America, which (prior to the war) had become a serious adversary of U.S.

commerce; this to establish what Roosevelt has called "economic defense."

3. Concerted measures to be planned and taken to destroy the Nazi "fifth column", the instrument of penetration in Latin America of German imperialism.

4. To assure U. S. commercial and financial penetration by means of such measures as the Inter-American Bank, advancement of credits by the Export and Import Bank, the purchase of surpluses, etc.

5. Creation of a regional understanding, virtually a League of American Nations, which prepares the road to a future military alliance that drags our countries behind the United States into the coming war with Germany and Japan.

6. Coordination of police methods to repress the national liberation movements of the Latin

American peoples under the pretext of repressing subversive "fifth column" activities.

Prudence made it advisable that the military plans for "continental defense", which include the ceding of air and naval stations which will permit Yankee imperialism to go on to take military possession of Latin America, were not directly handled in the Havana conference.

But nevertheless one can anticipate that this will be the principal theme of the next conference which we can expect, will reveal still further progress in the importance and audacity of the proposals which will be made by the United States.

Workers Indifferent

Meanwhile, the Argentine working class, and I believe that could also be said for the South American workers in general, watch these conferences without

understanding them and, even more, with indifference. They see them solely as reunions of governments—governments which are as distant from them as the resolutions which are adopted appear abstract and far away. If, on the one hand, the workers do not believe in the genuineness of the friendship of the United States, on the other hand they have scarcely arrived at the point of penetrating into the significance of the U. S. moves and trying to combat them.

The main struggle here continues, each time more acute, between the pro-English and pro-German camps of the bourgeoisie. The atmosphere is propitious for Wall Street to continue its moves calmly. Nothing is lacking for it. The "democratic" press of the continent repeats endlessly, the better to convince its public, that the United States is going to "defend us from Nazism."

WORKERS' FORUM

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

On The Ladies Who Now Own The 'Daily Worker'

EDITOR: So without a shot being fired or a command to surrender being uttered, the *Daily Worker* has gone underground—behind three skirts! And no ordinary skirts, either! I refer to the *Daily Worker's* announcement of its sale to three ladies.

There's Ferdinanda, who's 63; and Susan, still going strong with a camera and lecture notes at 71; and Caro, delving daily deeper into research despite her 81 years. And lest you think that years be the most notable of their assets, be assured that these three venerable dames began collecting background decades before they popped into the world singing the Star Spangled Banner.

Take Ferdinanda, for instance. Hers is a Wesselhoef skirt, flouncing in and out of America, Europe and the USSR these six decades, sweeping in its wake a collection of artistic accomplishments covering sculpture, music and classical literature. Reeking with tradition, it walks in the noble memory of such names as Harriet Beecher Stowe, Martin Van Buren, John Calhoun, Horace Greeley and Carl Shurz, some of whom in their weaker moments put themselves trustingly in the hands of Grandpapa Wesselhoef and his "famed Brattle Sanitorium." Ferdinanda learned about the class struggle from a book called "Through the Eye of a Needle" by William Dean Howells.

Susan is a D.A.R. and veteran of the back-to-the-land struggle. Her 71 years of historical reminiscence include the thrilling rescue of "two wagon-loads of priceless archives from the Navy Department and the White House" by her great grand-father who seems to have been around when Dolly Madison needed help. She was practically born into the staff of the *Bankers Magazine*.

And Caro has had 81 years of Puritan inheritance complicated with a degree from Vassar. Most of her life has been spent in research. If she is responsible, not the least of her research contributions to the Communist Party has been the digging up of three such fossils as herself and her two associates in this democratic bingie they are out on—buying up

newspapers to insure "freedom of expression" in a cock-eyed and decaying society. It's only too bad they should right crack out of the box get stuck with the *Daily Worker*.

Imagine Earl Browder though, grooming himself for the historic moment when the forces of reaction pounce upon his erstwhile official organ. He is probably at this very moment standing before a pierglass declaiming with heroic gestures the lines which ring through the corridors of every little schoolhouse (out of consideration for his feelings, we left out the adjective "red") in this country:

"Who touches a hair of you gray head Dies like a dog! March on!"

Contemplate if you will the impenetrable bulwark of defense the brain trust of the Comintern has thrown around their press: three females; three almost or actual octogenarians; three members of the first families. One can see capitalism cringing before it!

We should like to be allowed a few friendly words of advice to the new owners of the *Daily Worker*. To Ferdinanda: If you want to know how really little the eye of a needle can be quit staring at the veracity record of the *Daily Worker* for a while and try smuggling a few copies of the *Russian Bulletin of the Fourth International* over the Russian borders. To Susan: Why not really emulate your illustrious ancestor and tear over to the Kremlin with a couple of wagons while there are still a few "priceless archives" of the Russian Revolution still undestroyed by Stalinite vandals.

And with Browder and company we should like a word too. If the Communist Party, trembling before the possibility of imminent illegality, wants to save its press by a legal transfer of ownership we have absolutely no objection. Even if it has in mind only the avoidance of payment on judgments against it for libelous statements we still say all right with us. But why the monkey-business with octogenarian skirts of good family? Who the hell do you think you're kidding—us, yourselves, the capitalists or the three old ladies?

Chicago
LYDIA BEDEL

Auto Convention Failed to Solve Any Of the Union's Pressing Problems

ST. LOUIS, Mo.—The delegates to the Auto Workers Union St. Louis convention have concluded their fifth convention without solving the pressing problems facing the automobile workers today and without giving any leadership to the rest of the industrial workers of the country.

The United Automobile Workers of America, like its parent body, the CIO, stands today without real leadership, without perspective and without program for the future. Harsh words, but true, unfortunately.

PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYED STILL UNTOUCHED

The convention delegates applauded John L. Lewis when he stated at the convention that "On the first of May, 1940, there were still 10,748,000 unemployed Americans in this country," and the unemployed question is still a major domestic question that confronts this nation.

Cleveland Local 88 proposed a resolution to help solve the unemployed problem, demanding "That the UAW immediately launch a campaign through union and legislative action in order to establish a 30 hour week at 40 hours pay in the automobile industry."

The resolutions committee, however, completely nullified the meaning of this resolution when they declared the "30 hour week at 40 hours pay" program as the "ultimate goal" for the automobile industry.

The convention delegates, by supporting by approximately two thirds vote the stand of the Resolutions Committee, gave their approval to the do-nothing policies of the Thomas Leadership since the Cleveland Convention and deprived the union of the only realistic, practical program to fight unemployment.

REPEAT SAME GESTURES FOR ORGANIZING FORD

The convention discussed at great length and passed numerous resolutions for the immediate organization of the unorganized workers of Ford's and of the aircraft industries. The convention went further and voted to recommend to the membership a \$1 assessment to put these organization drives across.

But resolutions and even assessments are no longer sufficient to guarantee results. The books and records of the UAW are literally cluttered already with dozens of resolutions of this kind.

A \$1 assessment to organize Ford's was voted at the Milwaukee convention two and half years ago. Approximately one quarter of a million dollars was collected for this purpose. Yet there are about one quarter of the Ford workers in the UAW today as were in the union at the time of the Milwaukee convention.

AIRCRAFT HARDLY SURVEYED YET

The report of President Thomas on the aircraft industry states that the union has contracts with only three corporations, covering a total of less than 4,000 workers. It is a fact that the convention made absolutely no analysis, as to what was wrong in the past and what to do now to remedy the situation.

All Thomas proposed in his report, insofar as he proposed anything, is reliance on the National Labor Relations Board. But that is exactly what has been wrong in the past year.

Two great organizing jobs, like Ford's and the aircraft industry, cannot be accomplished by mere leg work or by reliance on the Labor Board. What is needed is a bold clear cut program of union demands, coupled with an aggressive, organization drive to sweep the thousands of unorganized workers into the union fold.

But that is precisely what the convention failed to do. Even the convention resolution which demanded "a militant organization campaign at Ford's" and called for "mass demonstrations at the Ford gates, huge picket lines, sound cars and the same militant tactics that succeeded in establishing unionism in General Motors" was deleted by the Resolutions Committee!

CHEER LABOR PARTY HINT BUT VOTE ROOSEVELT

The convention delegates applauded John L. Lewis' attacks on the government's conscription bill and the granting of government contracts to violators of the Walsh-Healey Act. They gave Lewis a veritable ovation on his carefully vague suggestion that "Some day in this country the people are going to lose confidence in the existing political parties to a degree that they will form their own party."

Yet the Resolutions Committee disregarded the proposal of one local "that the UAW favors the calling of a great national conference of CIO and AFL unions to establish an independent party of Labor in the United States to fight for a militant program on behalf of the common people of this country," and later the convention voted by an overwhelming majority to back Roosevelt. By this action, the convention made a public declaration that the great UAW is going along with the war drive of the Roosevelt-Wall Street crowd, that this powerful union is supporting the Morgan-DuPont 'Defense Council'.

This support of Roosevelt rendered doubly meaningless the anti-conscription stand and the innocuous "anti-war" resolution of the convention, to the effect, "that this convention goes on record opposed to any involvement of the U. S. in any war on foreign soil!"

"SUBVERSIVE CLAUSE" A BLOW AT THE UNION

The convention definitely showed the union one big step backwards when it passed, by a slim majority, despite the energetic opposition of numerous rank and file militants, the "subversive clause" to the union constitution.

It provides that "No member of any local union, located in the U. S. of America shall be eligible to hold any elective or appointive position in this International Union or any local union, if he is a member of any organization which is declared illegal by the government of the U. S. of America through constitutional procedure."

One delegate asked a very appropriate question: "What is going to happen...if a reactionary Congress decides that the CIO is a subversive organization?"

The Chairman of the Constitution Committee seemed to think that was the same as the end of the world. "If we should happen to be declared illegal, then I say, what is the use of worrying about anything? If the CIO is declared illegal, where are we going?"

The adoption of this constitutional proposal signified nothing but that the majority of the convention delegates had buckled under the pressure of capitalist public opinion. Their action was, in the words of delegates Johnstone of the Pontiac Yellow Truck plant, a tip-off to the bosses here in America to move against many of our members.

Thus it is seen, the fifth convention approved in all major aspects the timid, conservative and even cowardly policies of the present union leadership and gave the go-ahead signal to the leadership to continue along the same lines.

Does this mean that the UAW membership and the convention delegates were satisfied with the progress of the union? No!

DELEGATE MEMBERS DISSATISFIED BUT DON'T KNOW WAY OUT

For months, large sections of the membership have been complaining and grumbling about the lack of progress, the lack of fighting spirit and militancy in the union, about the mounting number of unsolved grievances, the unemployment, the rotten GM contract, etc.

This dissatisfaction sharply came to the surface in many ways at the convention: the bitter, critical speeches on the Ford drive;

on the 30-hour week; the motions telling the International to hire some decent, competent organizers; the warning to the Regional Directors to stop wasting the union funds; the rejection with great irritability of Constitutional Committee recommendations on secondary questions, and peremptory instructions to the committee to have the International Executive Board send minutes of its proceedings to all local unions.

All of these actions testified to the suspicion of the membership about the leadership, a pale reflection of the widespread dissatisfaction of large sections of the union membership.

Why did the delegates, then, approve the policies of the leadership on all major questions?

That is a paradox of the St. Louis convention. It reflected the gap between the instinctive dissatisfaction of the majority of the auto workers to the present set-up and policies, and the political backwardness of the delegates which made them support the very policies and leadership responsible for the lack of progress.

The coming period in America with its rising prices, regimentation of labor and the attempted hamstringing of the labor unions will deepen the understanding of thousands of auto militants and will help them formulate more consciously the present dissatisfaction of the union membership.

There was a clear-cut program enunciated at St. Louis, but it was smothered in the gap between the delegates' dissatisfaction and their conscious understanding of the union's needs. But the small band of union militants who unflinchingly and fought for this program nevertheless left St. Louis confident of the future. They had seen with their own eyes that the delegates from throughout the industry were groping toward a solution.

Clear-cut indeed are the tasks to be achieved by the union:

1. Whirlwind organization drives at Ford's and the aircraft industries.
2. For the immediate launching of a campaign to establish the 30 hour week at 40 hours pay.
3. Fight against the war drive of the Roosevelt government. No support to the Morgan-DuPont "Defense Council"—all union leaders, including Hillman and Lewis must cut loose from the Wall Street outfit.

TRADE UNION NOTES

by Farrell Dobbs

First Costs To Labor of "National Defense"

The city of Buffalo has suspended five repair men on charge of "non-cooperation in the national defense program." Municipal employees at Niagara Falls are being "mugged" and finger-printed "to forestall possible sabotage." The National Association of Manufacturers is pressing harder than ever to emasculate the National Labor Relations Act "in the interests of the defense program."

Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins told the annual convention of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor that strikes will not hamper the national defense program as they did in 1917 because "labor now has decent working conditions." Falling right into line with the Madame, the national AFL representative to the convention told the gathering that negotiations must be the process rather than strikes. "Make a legitimate strike" he said, "will have to be avoided by the self-discipline of labor unions."

A CIO union in Jamestown, New York, voted to send two of its members into a struck plant to crate 143 airplane struts for shipment at the request of the War Department. A taste demanded a meal. The War Department will next claim that the strike itself is "against the interests of the national defenses."

Boeing aircraft workers, AFL, have just been shunted away from strike action and into the morass of arbitration. Sidney Hillman did the job for the bosses.

Two regional directors of the UAW-CIO rushed into South Bend, Indiana to investigate reports of a slow-down demonstration at the Bendix Aviation Corporation plant. The company demands that the union rid its ranks of "a group of agitators." UAW secretary-treasurer, George M. Addes, has said that the International officials "will not tolerate such an interference with production." FBI agents swarmed through the plant, "investigating reports of sabotage."

The bosses and their government are moving rapidly in their campaign to curb trade union action and force the workers to submit helplessly to war regimentation. The trade union officialdom is making an inglorious retreat in the face of this attack.

What the bosses and their government really have in mind "in the interests of national defense" is made plain by recent dispatches from abroad. Agreements covering working hours and labor conditions in the metal trades in some industrial districts of New Zealand were suspended by government order on August 3. Six days later, a government decree was issued banning all strikes in Northern Ireland for the duration of the war.

The Philippine National Assembly has voted President Quezon authority to prohibit strikes. This latter action occurs on United States territory. Since the Philippine government is a puppet

of Washington, that means that Washington is trying this scheme out there.

Gallup Poll Must Have Reached Scissor-bills

The Gallup poll has released statistics showing the results of a survey on the question, "Should the government forbid strikes in industries manufacturing material for our national defense?" 83% of the persons questioned in the upper income group are reported as favoring the prohibition of strikes. If anything, this is an understatement of the prevailing opinion in that group. It is also reported, however, that 73% of the persons questioned in the lower income group favored the strike prohibition. We have no way of knowing who was questioned to get this "sample" of public opinion. But we have every reason to doubt its accuracy.

It seems that the peregrinations of the Gallup inquirers led them to the door of three scissor-bills for every trade unionist that they interviewed. Stand up before any group of trade union workers, whether it be a meeting of a local union or a convention of an international union, and ask them this question. They will give you a quick and decisive answer. They do not favor the prohibition of strikes "in the interests of the national defense," or for any other reason. And there are about ten million organized workers.

Defense Council Deals Blow To CIO

The AFL building trades unions have been granted jurisdiction over all construction work under the gigantic armament program. The decision of the National Defense Council was handed down by its "labor coordinator" Sidney Hillman, a vice-president of the CIO. This action is a vital blow to the hopes of the CIO to organize in the construction industry through its United Construction Workers Organizing Committee.

The CIO has made very little headway in the industry and the methods which it employed in its organization efforts were some times not in the best interests of the construction workers. There has been, however, one positive side to the CIO campaign. It brought direct pressure on the AFL Building Trades Department to take a more reasonable attitude toward the question of labor unity.

The AFL Building Trades unions are in the best position to protect the interests of the construction workers in the rapidly expanding building program which can be anticipated in the next period. But this jurisdictional victory can only tend to stiffen the hard-nosed attitude of the AFL building trades craft unionists towards the industrial unions.

Seafarers Int'l Makes Gains

NEW YORK, Aug. 7.—More than ten coastwise shipping companies have granted increases ranging from \$10 to 7.50 per month to the Seafarers International Union (A. F. L.) and 10 cents per hour increases in overtime pay. Negotiations for similar increases are in process with the New England Steamship Company and the Robin Line, after flat refusals by the operators resulted in strikes by the union.

The S. I. U. tied up N. E. S. S. Co. ships plying between New Bedford and the fashionable summer resorts of Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard for four days before the shipowners agreed to talk turkey. Similar action had recently been taken on the S. S. Algic, of the Robin Line. Both lines have now submitted the demands to arbitration, after reinstating the strikers under closed shop contract without any discrimination.

The gains made by the S. I. U. and the spirit of militancy attend-

ing the demands are in sharp contrast to the actions of the National Maritime Union's Stalinist leadership. The NMU officials proposed a demand of only \$2.50 monthly increases, in an effort to scab on the rival union, without any demands for an increase in the overtime rate. The firm insistence of the S. I. U. upon its demands, backed by a militant membership, defeated this scabby effort of the Stalinist stooges in the NMU, the shipowners granting a \$5 monthly raise even on NMU ships.

SIU Way Ahead

Wages on S. I. U. ships are anywhere from \$20 to \$17.50 higher per month than on NMU vessels. Overtime pay is 80 cents as against 70 cents on NMU ships. Working conditions are likewise beyond comparison.

Join the Socialist Workers Party

GET YOUR COPY!

Manifesto of the Fourth International

The Imperialist War

and the

Proletarian World Revolution

A 48-page pamphlet on—
CAUSES OF THE PRESENT WAR
ROLE OF U.S. IMPERIALISM
WHAT NAZI WAR SLOGANS REALLY MEAN
RESPONSIBILITY OF 2nd & 3rd INTERNATIONALS
WHAT TO DO NOW!

**A COMPLETE PROGRAM!
A CALL TO ACTION!**

3¢ per copy to all branches of the S.W.P.
5¢ per single copy.

Published by the:
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY
116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK, N. Y.

SELLING THE APPEAL

GOOD NEWS FROM THE WEST COAST

SAN FRANCISCO — "Circulation of the SOCIALIST APPEAL has been proceeding very thoroughly and systematically. We get out all the current issues weekly, and are rapidly disposing of a stack of old copies. For the first time now we are able to reach a sizeable number of trade unionists and from reliable sources we learn that many C. P. members surreptitiously take copies, carry them home and read them."

Even more indicative of the determined spirit of the Frisco comrades to make their Appeal work highly successfully (to the hard-headed business office), is the statement: "We do not think it optimistic to state that we shall probably be able to send in the sum of our back bill soon..." This from the branch which we have come to term our black-sheep—with its back bill of more than \$100!—sounds like the dawn of a new day! Comrades, the party thanks you and offers all possible cooperation in your work.

LOS ANGELES—"I can state that the increased bundle has certainly deepened our roots in the workers' organizations and unions

here. Workers read our paper carefully. Even at C. P. and Stalinist stooge organizations the paper is carefully read. We are covering three of the rubber plants. By next week almost all will be covered, union meetings primarily."

Excellent work, comrades! And we might add, our gratitude and congratulations for your fine financial standing, with no back bill at all!

OAKLAND—"The only way to place our small branch on the political and trade union map of the industrial Oakland is to get out a minimum of between 100 to 125 copies of the APPEAL each week. This work is imperative. We owe it to our movement, and the branch has unanimously voted to start this work immediately."

This branch, like the Reading, Pa. branch has undertaken this work entirely of its own volition, with no prodding whatsoever from the office. We are 100% agreeable to getting this work under way, Oakland, and are glad to cooperate with you. We look forward to your reports, and know now that with such determination, they are going to sound a lot like the live-wire communications from Frisco and L. A.

New Jersey in the 1940 Elections

III. Workers Need Their Own Party

The record has shown that the old parties in New Jersey are the tools of the banks, big business, corporations like Public Service and the railroads, and the large agricultural interests. This has been understood for some years now, not only by political students, but by large numbers of workers as well.

In the 1937 elections, when Hague's Moore defeated Clean Government's Cleo for Governor, this understanding, that whichever won, labor would lose, spread rapidly through the union movement into the demand for the formation of a labor party.

A month later a wildly cheering, enthusiastic convention of Labor's Non-Partisan League met in Newark and voted to set up a labor party. The rank-and-file unionist who took the floor expressed the views of the great majority of the delegates when he said:

"Bitter experience taught us we couldn't use company unions led by bosses' agents, but have to build our own unions, to fight the bosses in the factories and on the picket line. In the same way we've learned we can't use parties led and controlled by agents of big business, but have to build our own party, to fight the bosses in Congress and Legislature and City Hall."

Although no one spoke up, there were strong forces at the convention opposed to this viewpoint. They kept quiet so they could be elected to the important state committee picked by the convention to report back with a proposed constitution within six months. They were silent in the same way labor fakers sometimes "go along" with a militant strike so they will be placed at its head in a position where they can stifle it better later on.

The Communist Party at that time wanted above everything else a pact between the Soviet Union, this country and the Allies for a war against Germany. To show Roosevelt and the bosses they could be trusted if they got that pact, they played a conservative, disruptive role in the labor movement. At this LNPL convention they were therefore against the formation of an independent party because they were afraid it would get out of control, break cleanly with capitalist politics, and thus compromise them in the eyes of the bosses whose good will they were courting.

Carl Holderman, LNPL state chairman, with many

friends in the old parties and no confidence in labor's strength, found the Stalinists' idea fitted in with his own, which he did not express at that convention. So an alliance to block the formation of a labor party was formed between Holderman and the Stalinists, who between them controlled a majority of the State committee.

"We're too weak to win any elections...We'll only make enemies of the 'liberal' politicians who are still in the old parties...We'll only show our weakness."

They spread these arguments throughout the movement, and by the May, 1938, convention, the ranks were thoroughly disheartened. With their own leadership telling them nothing could be done, what could they do? Many unions just stayed away in disgust, and the Holderman-Stalinist machine ran things their own way; they authorized the state committee to endorse "progressive candidates" (which meant: no labor candidates), and their constitution changed the name to "Labor's Non-Partisan League For The Formation Of A Labor Party" (which meant: some other time).

In the November U. S. Senate elections, Hague's Ely opposed Barbour. Hague was extremely unpopular that year, and Barbour had a poor labor record too. LNPL endorsed neither, did not run an independent candidate, and "compromised" by issuing the slogan "Defeat Hague—at all costs." How the workers were to defeat Ely without electing Barbour they did not say, and the WPA cutter, Barbour, was elected with this left-handed support.

This procedure, which brought labor no gains at all, so discredited the League that its membership dropped from the 150,000 claimed in 1937 to less than a fifth of that who pay dues today, and its influence fell to almost nothing. In 1939 it played no role at all.

Holderman broke with the Stalinists after the Stalin-Hitler Pact, and today Holderman, still state chairman, is still playing the same game: he is whooping it up now for Hague's candidate, Edison.

That is why labor is still unorganized politically this year, and why it feels helpless, with no program and no candidates to oppose to the program and candidates of big business.

The lesson is clear: labor needs its own candidates, but it can get them only by breaking sharply with the old parties and the practice of supporting so-called "friends of labor" and "lesser evils", and setting up its own party.

(Another article next week)

British Give Way to Japan On Asia Front

By GEORGE STERN

The British retreat in Asia is taking on the semblance of a rout. On August 8 the British Viceroy of India announced a new and slightly more precise promise of dominion status for India... after the war. On Aug. 9, the War Office in London announced withdrawal of all British forces from Peking, Tientsin, and Shanghai. The entrenched positions of a century and more are being given up. The power of imperial Britain, so long in decline, is visibly dissolving.

The new promise to India is no less empty than all those that have gone before. But it is clearly tinged with the desperation of an imperial regime that knows its end is drawing near. Lord Linlithgow's statement was clearly an appeal to the native ruling classes of India, promising "free partnership" in the British Commonwealth in return for support against the threat of complete submersion of British power implicit in the German march of conquest. As a gage of this "partnership," the Viceroy graciously offers to accept "representative Indians" as members of his Advisory Council and to establish in addition a "War Advisory Council" which is to comprise representatives of the Indian states and "other interests" in Indian national life. Finally, he promised that after the war the Indians would themselves be permitted to draw up their own constitution.

That these pitifully meager offers should be regarded in London as substantial "concessions" on Britain's part is an indication of the wholly dictatorial and autocratic nature of Britain's present rule over the 350,000,000 people of India. As the pressure on the British Empire increases and draws closer to India itself, we may expect still broader promises, wider concessions. Britain, after all, has nothing to lose but the chains with which it has held India bound.

Meaning of Retreat in China

In China the retreat is necessarily more precipitate. There Japanese pressure has increased in proportion to the scope and immediacy of the German threat to Britain. The British were first compelled to close the Burma Road and now, aware of their total inability to resist further incursions, are pulling out of North and Central China altogether.

The actual forces involved are small—a few battalions. But they represent the entrenched power of more than a century, measured in investments totalling about one billion dollars. This power was asserted in the course of a series of bloody wars waged against the almost totally defenseless Chinese. The withdrawal from Shanghai ends the British reign in the Yangtze Delta established by the Opium War of 1842 and "legalized" by the Treaty of 1843, signed, symbolically enough, aboard a British warship at Nanking. The withdrawal from Peking and Tientsin terminates the period ushered in by the bloody Anglo-French invasion of North China in 1858 and 1860, and again in 1900.

It is not the passing of British power in China that is to be mourned, but the manner of it. Thirteen years ago the Chinese peoples rose in their scores of millions in a movement that threatened for a time to drive the British and their imperialist rivals together into the Pacific whence they came. It was then, in 1927, that the Powers rushed troops to Shanghai to defend the wealth of the International Settlement against the threat of Chinese nationalism. That's how 1,200 U. S. marines happen to be there. The Communist International of Stalin allowed that great movement of the Chinese workers and peasants to be yoked to the landlords and capitalists, represented by Chiang Kai-shek and the Koumintang. For crumbs from the imperialist table, Chiang beheaded the movement and established an imperialist puppet regime over the dead bodies of thousands of slaughtered militants.

The New Slavemaster

The Koumintang regime naturally could do nothing to release China from the imperialist stranglehold. It served only to deepen the chaos in Chinese economic life and laid the country open to the depredations of the Japanese imperialists which were renewed on a large scale in 1931.

Now the turns in the wheel of imperialist politics have placed Japan in a position to attempt to displace the British Empire as prime power in Asia. The British are going down, not before the overwhelming onslaught of slaves in revolt but under the blows of rival slavemasters. Britain's passing in this way from the scene is no augury for a freer China. It becomes rather an episode in a new stage of Chinese enslavement.

Hongkong, French Indo-China, Singapore, the Dutch Indies all lie now at approaching stations on the Japanese march of conquest. Up until the collapse of France it had been generally understood that U. S. imperialism stood ready to challenge these advances and to fight for its own "right" to succeed to the mastery in Asia. Now instead the lords of Wall Street and Washington have to look to their holdings in the Americas. The 1200 U. S. marines in Shanghai must soon follow the British in retreat. There may not be much of a future in it, but the present belongs to Japan in Asia.

William Knudsen is seen talking to Hugh Johnson, vociferous New Deal opponent, and is warned by a reporter that President Roosevelt's personal secretary, Marguerite Lehend, has observed him. "Calm yourself," says Knudsen, "this is the United States, not Germany. They don't fire or shoot people here for talking to opponents of the head of the government." Minneapolis WPA strikers know otherwise.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE LIE

The Morgan-DuPont Defense Council Is No Partner To The American Workers

By SAM MARCY

Opportunity, we've often heard, knocks only once. For the bankers and industrialists, for the steel kings and motor magnates, for the munitions makers and stock exchange speculators,—for all imperialist vultures who feast on the bloody business called War,—opportunity to coin billions out of human carnage has struck again!

For this, the second time, they have waited for years. They have prepared for it in advance. In their hearts they secretly wished for it, hoped for it. Only in public, before the broad masses of the toiling people, who yearn for peace, who have nothing to gain by imperialist war, do they cloak themselves in the guise of "angels of peace."

Only production of materials and instruments for war can now lure the bankers and industrialists into investing in industry again. Only production of bombs, shells, cruisers and destroyers can bring back fat profits again. The gearing of the whole economic system to the production of armaments is the one choice now left open to the capitalists whereby they can send idle men back to idle factories; idle billions resting in the coffers of the banks, back into the process of circulation.

The bankers and bosses know this. They have known this ever since the economic collapse of October, 1929. That is why they have contemptuously cast aside every other method proposed to rehabilitate the tottering capitalist system by other means than production for war.

First Hoover attempted to palm off his cynical plan to solve the

unemployment problem by urging the unemployed to sell apples on the street corners. Then came the crack-pot technocrats who urged upon the capitalists a plan to salvage the profits system "scientifically". Then followed the grandiose schemes of the NRA and the AAA and the mushroom growth of the Townsends and "Ham 'n' Eggers".

For all these schemes and panaceas, the capitalists had only fear and contempt. At most these efforts were calculated to raise the purchasing powers of the millions of starving masses whose incomes were liquidated by the depression; but that could temporarily revive only light industry. The gigantic productive forces which constitute heavy industry remained stagnant through all the years of Roosevelt's New Deal experiments.

Even powerful shots in the arm like slicing the value of the dollar virtually in half, and the millions of dollars pumped into the W. P. A. construction projects, could not do more than act as a mere temporary short-lived stimulant injected into the corroded and decaying body of capitalism. Only the prospect of large scale armaments, of transforming the country into a titanic factory for the production of the instruments of death could hold out the possibility of high profits on the classical scale.

That is why the so-called National Defense Program has been greeted with such enthusiasm by all layers of the capitalist class. That is why the prospect for war orders has been greeted with such applause from the topnotch down to the small-scale manufacturer of khaki suits.

Gone are the days when the capitalist press pictured the Roosevelt government as a "Communist front". Gone are the days when the New Deal President lashed at the capitalists with the epithet of "economic royalists".

For now the top-most layers of the economic royalists occupy the mighty seats on the National Defense Commission, the body which has charge of dispensing the billions of dollars for war orders.

Gone are the days when disgustingly hypocritical cartoons depicted the sorrowful figure of the humble tax-payer bearing the brunt of the government's expenditures for feeding the millions of unemployed. No longer do we see the caricatured figure of F. D. R. priming the pump in an extravagant effort to make his New Deal agencies work. That figure has vanished, and that too, in the very heat of a presidential election campaign. At least the fervent prayer of the upper middle class, "that government and industry should learn to cooperate", to save the decaying capitalist system, is finding realization.

Now the droves of capitalists and their lobbyists, who are swarming into Washington in order to solicit war orders, greet the War Deal officials with smiles and congratulations.

NATIONAL DEFENSE IS A LIE TO FOOL US

The National Defense Program is the program of the biggest bankers, industrialists and munitions kings. It is their great adventure in plundering the millions of masses under the false and deceptive slogan of National Defense.

The slogan of National Defense

is being paraded more and more by hirelings of the capitalist press, the radio and the movies as the all-national task of one big family, of one large partnership, all striving unselfishly to accomplish one great common end, the defense of the nation against a dangerous outside enemy.

Nothing could be more false! The mask of hypocrisy and deception can easily be torn from the face of the capitalist apologists even by the most cursory examination of the elementary facts involved in the so-called program of National Defense.

ARE WE PARTNERS WITH J. P. MORGAN?

"You are a partner in the great task of National Defense," shout the hirelings of the capitalist press to the workers, farmers and poor middle class. Very well then, let us see what this partnership amounts to.

The National Advisory Commission was appointed by Roosevelt to take full charge in executing the program of National Defense. Its chief power lies in the fact that it can purchase and order all the machinery, materials and armaments necessary in the building of the war machine. Thus Edward R. Stettinius, "resigned" head of J. P. Morgan's U. S. Steel Corporation, is in charge of the production and purchase of raw materials. William S. Knudsen, "furloughed" head of General Motors Corporation, is in charge of production and purchase of all the manufactured goods necessary for the equipment of the armed forces. Ralph G. Budd, a Morgan man who operates many of the railroads controlled by Morgan, is in charge of transportation.

These are the men in whom is vested the full power to dispense the 14 to 25 billions of dollars which will be appropriated by Congress. These men are the very top of America's Sixty Families, the real rulers of the United States. It will be noticed that these are the men who have the full power to purchase all materials and equipment. The power to purchase is the greatest that can be conferred upon a body which is responsible not to an electorate but merely to the one who appointed them.

The other members of the National Defense Commission are merely advisors, whose powers are extremely restricted if they have any at all. They are: Chester Davis, supposed representative of the farmers, but in reality representative of the big agricultural capitalists; Harriet Elliott and Leon Henderson, "representing" the consumers, whose main task will be to explain the constantly rising cost of living and to demonstrate the utter impossibility of stopping war profiteering. And last but not least, Sidney Hillman to "represent" labor. With regard to his job we shall have occasion to speak later at greater length.

HOW THE DEFENSE COMMISSION PURCHASES

Now the purchasing of materials and the placing of war orders works in somewhat the following manner. The Defense Commission finds it necessary to order the purchase of 2,000 railroad cars to transport troops and equipment.

The Defense Commission has no power to walk into the offices of the railroad magnates, set a fixed price and command the delivery of the cars within a stipulated period. No, these would be construed to be dictatorial and arbitrary powers and regarded as regimentation of industry.

What really happens when the defense commission wants to purchase 2,000 cars is as follows: The railroad magnates submit a price. Since the railroads are to a very large extent in the hands of a few millionaires such as the Morgans, Vanderbilts, etc., the price is jacked up to a greater extent than it would ordinarily be, since it is easy to arrive at an agreement among the big railroad magnates who can easily shut out any serious competition.

The price is then submitted to the proper purchasing agent in this particular case Ralph G. Budd.

It would pull a real laugh from anyone who knows the ins and outs of the relationship between the capitalist government and the capitalist class to believe that when Ralph G. Budd in the capacity of an agent of the government, meets his railroad colleagues at the negotiating table, that a real, bona fide sale takes place.

Take the case of a humble munitions manufacturer like DuPont de Nemours. This dynasty has had a complete monopoly even prior to the last war, in the manufacture of gun-powder. This dynasty controls the entire state of Delaware and owns lock, stock and barrel the city of Wilmington and all the suburbs where its munitions plants are located.

Perhaps it has not many friends among the broad masses of people and particularly among its own workers but it certainly can find a warm-hearted friend in the person of J. P. Morgan whose vast holdings in the company are too immense and intricate for us to recount here.

Suffice it to say that E. R. Stettinius, who represents Morgan, will not fail to recognize Morgan's close relation in the person of the duPonts. The duPonts do not merely dictate their own price for the products, they also ask that the government present them with a gift in the form of new munitions factories, to be paid for by the government and kept by the duPonts after the orders are filled.

THEY CALL IT "AMORTIZATION"

To camouflage the real character of this merciless plundering and unprecedented pilfering of the people's pockets, the bankers and bosses have termed these shady transactions "amortization" of plant expansion, "coverage of assumed risks" and other high-sounding but nevertheless, deceptive phraseology.

Such is a rough but mild sketch of the standing of the first partner—the capitalists—in the so-called program of national defense. Now let us turn to the other "partner", the broad masses of toiling people without whose labor not a wheel can be turned.

(A second article in this series appears next week)

An Anti-Labor Clown Tries Red-Baiting

By MARK KNIGHT

LOS ANGELES—Claiming the discovery of a "Communist murder plot and widespread 5th column activity," Buren Fitts, District Attorney of Los Angeles County, candidate for reelection in the approaching elections, hit the headlines with the arrest of longshoreman Britt Webster of San Pedro, on charges of having been implicated in the five year old killing of John Riley, member of the Sailors Union of the Pacific.

Fitts charged that the murder of Riley was committed by members of the Communist Party who were attempting to take control of the S. U. P. Leading off with these charges Fitts began a Grand Jury investigation of all communist activities, promising to prove the existence of "a plot to kill Henry Ford and other prominent industrialists."

Britt, arrested on Friday, was kept incarcerated for three days and was finally produced in court after his attorneys secured a writ of habeas corpus.

Using the charges against the longshoreman as a curtain opener, Fitts began to parade before the Grand Jury witnesses who played a prominent part in previous "anti-Red" investigations. The first was John Leech, renegade member from the C. P., witness in the Bridges hearing and before the Dies committee, who began with his now familiar story about communist activity.

Also called as a witness was Rena M. Vale, another renegade from the C. P. who had previously testified before the state assembly investigating committee and before the Dies committee, where she also made claims to knowledge of Trotskyite activity.

Making certain that his "investigation" would continue to be publicity material, Fitts claimed to have subpoenaed movie comedian Lionel Stander, actress Gale Sondergaard, movie director Herbert Biberman, playwrights Clifford Odets and Samuel Ornitz.

This, according to Fitts, is but the beginning of a long and detailed expose. More than 50 witnesses have already been called before the Grand Jury.

So far Fitts has made two plays; one, the San Pedro killing. The second play was the testimony of Leech about "communist" infiltration into the State Relief administration. This same story was produced by another politician, Assemblyman Yorty, about a year ago, using many of the same witnesses. At that time the entire expose served only one purpose. It proved that Yorty, who had been playing about with the Stalinists, was no longer one of Stalin's boys but was trying to make good with big business, trying his best to prove that he was now violently anti-Red.

Fitts Notoriously Anti-Labor

Fitts' problem is not to prove he is anti-labor. His record is proof enough of this. Los Angeles county has witnessed some of the crudest labor frame-ups in the country. Fitts' office has issued complaints of thefts, kidnapping, pickpocketing, assault and battery, conspiracy, extortion, and almost every other felony defined in the penal code against trade-unionists. Many of these were dismissed at the preliminary hearings.

It was this official who directed the Douglas sit down strike case in 1937, causing the arrest of over two hundred aircraft strikers of whom 23 were finally convicted after two lengthy trials. As a District Attorney Fitts has proved to be a typical politician. Round about election time he has always kept a weather eye on the political winds and on watch for opportunities for publicity. During the recent 5th column scare he attempted to leap on the band-wagon of the witch hunters by raving about his secret information on the "Red Danger."

He started a grandiose plan of organization against the 5th column and was finally squelched by the F. B. I., which saw the danger of this mountebank by his antics exposing their plans to whip up enough hysteria to smoke-screen their careful moves to hogtie labor.

Why He Needs It

Buren Fitts has not only exposed himself completely before labor for what he is, an agent of business, but he has fallen into disfavor with an important section of industry in Southern California. Several prominent politicians are opposing him in the coming elections.

There is Dockweiler, member of a powerful political family in California; Bonnell, a powerful official in the influential State Board of Equalization, who was recently subjected by Fitts to a lengthy trial on grounds of official misconduct and was finally acquitted; and Judge Taplin, with strong support, is running for this office.

With this opposition Fitts has desperately sought an issue on which he can again propel himself into office.

We Don't Want Fitts' Help

Labor itself is aware of the real crimes of the Communist Party; it is becoming more conscious that the danger of Stalinism is not to capitalism but to the working class. We shall deal with these people without assistance from the agents of capitalism.

The tricks of Fitts must be exposed. But the only real lesson we can draw from this political burlesque is that labor must step into politics independently of all capitalist parties and candidates and step in with a labor program. Only a labor party with labor candidates can begin the task of defending labor's interests and putting an end to such miserable tomfoolery that clowns like Fitts continue to parade before us in an effort to continue the domination of capital over labor.

Labor's Answer to Conscription

(Continued from page 1)

drew up regulations laying down the one method of exemptions of this type which the army and navy and those they speak for—the capitalist class as a whole—will use for any bill they vote for. Under these regulations, to enter a claim for exemption (deferment), a worker will have to submit two affidavits, one by his immediate superior, one by the executive head of the company by which he is employed.

These affidavits will be the sole method of determining whether that worker is or is not entitled to exemption because of his indispensability in the work he is doing. Militant trade unionists will be gotten rid of by the simple device of their employers refusing to sign their affidavits, while flinks will be rewarded with affidavits. It's the chance of a lifetime for union-busting bosses!

These regulations are known to every student, even a casual one, of the conscription system. Yet not a word about them has been said by either the AFL or CIO officials. Is it because they are afraid to scratch too deep in making their criticism of the conscription bill, since they know that these regulations are designed to be used in connection with any conscription bill, no matter how "liberal" it sounds? Yet deep they must scratch, if they are to be considered loyal to the interests of the many millions of union men for whom they speak.

We have now seen what will happen in industry, where the conscription regulations will help employers to weed out militant unionists and hold that threat as a club over the organized workers. That will be the regime in the factories.

... And now let us ask a question, (still from a "Simon pure" union standpoint) which Lewis and Green do not even hint at. What will happen to the workers who are drafted into the army? What kind of regime will they live under?

The Army's Open Shop Regime

Lewis and Green are able to escape raising this question because most workers, unfortunately, are not thinking about this problem. These workers do not give thought to the nature of the regime in the army because they take the present nature of the army for granted. As if to say: "That's what armies have been, are, and will be". But they are profoundly wrong; and they must change their mind on this key question, if the working class is not to become the slave of military dictatorship and fascism.

There was a time when there were no trade unions. The open shop was all that workers knew. The boss had virtually the power of life and death over the workers. And since they had no experience of any other kind of regime in the factory, many workers did not think of the possibility of any other kind. They were in the same state of mind as most union men today are about the possibility of a different kind of regime in the armed forces. It took a vanguard of class-conscious workers to arouse the mass of workers to realize that the open shop was not an immutable law of nature. The same kind of vanguard is needed today to arouse the mass of workers to realize that the open shop in the armed forces is neither a law of nature nor the only way to train millions in the military arts.

There is, of course, an explanation why the open shop in industry has given way to the unionization of many millions of workers, while the open shop has remained in the army. Unionization of industry is not a direct and immediate threat to the power and property of the bosses. Not so long as they retain the open shop in the army. Whenever union demands become too intolerable to the bosses, they use the open shop army (which in this sense includes the police and the National Guard) to drive back the unions.

But the army could not be used for these anti-labor purposes if the officers did not have the power of life and death over the ranks of the soldiers. Only under that power can the

officers drive young workers and farmers in uniforms to smash picket lines.

If simple democratic rights existed in the army—the right of the rank and file to gather and discuss without the supervision of officers, the right of the rank and file to publish a newspaper of their own, their right to elect committees to present their grievances to the officers, etc.—it would become impossible for the army to be used as an anti-labor force. Just for that reason the army remains an open shop, i.e., a place where the workers have no rights at all.

If Lewis and Green were really representing the interests of the labor movement, their criticism of the conscription bill would include a denunciation of the open shop regime in the army. And this denunciation would, of course, prevent them from advocating mass enlistments into the open shop army.

If Not Conscription, Then What?

If Lewis and Green were really leading the workers, instead of leaning on the most backward layers they can find among the workers, they would not be letting capitalist demagogues like Wheeler and Vandenberg "speak for Labor" in Congress on the conscription question. Instead they would say:

"The quarrel in Congress is a difference of opinion between two sections of the bosses over which is the best method of getting an open shop army which will be used for the benefit of the capitalists and against the interests of the workers. We don't take either the side of the pro-conscriptionists or the side of the 'volunteers'. Those two alternatives are not the only ways to train the workers in the military arts.

"There is another way, one which is in the interests of Labor. And that way is through our trade unions! Just as our unions make possible our very existence, giving us the ability to lift our heads like men in the factories and to live like human beings at home, so our unions can enable us to undergo military training in the atmosphere of the union hall and not in that of the barracks. Compulsory military training? Yes! But only under the direct control of the trade unions."

That, in short, would be a working class answer to the question of how the workers of this country should receive training in military arts.

Moreover, it provides a common ground on which all sections of the labor movement should be able to agree. We, the members of the Socialist Workers Party, have a fundamental disagreement with Lewis and Green on the war question; they will support the capitalist government of the United States in any war it undertakes, while we say that the working class should answer such a war by taking over governmental power, and then defending a Workers' United States. But let all sections of the labor movement agree on one thing: that for all eventualities it is well for all able-bodied workers to undergo military training—under the control of the trade unions.

Labor's Military Program

Along this line, Labor has a clear and unambiguous answer to make to the government's demand that the masses undergo military training:

"Yes, we are for military training. We don't want to see worker-soldiers go into battle without proper training and equipment. Nor do we want worker-soldiers in the hands of capitalist officers who have no regard for the treatment, the protection and the lives of the men under them.

"Therefore we demand federal funds for the military training of workers and worker-officers under the control of the trade unions. Does that mean we want military appropriations? Yes—but only for the establishment and equipment of workers' training camps!

"Does this mean compulsory military training of workers? Yes—but only under the control of the trade unions!"

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. IV—No. 33 Saturday, August 17, 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:
RUTH JEFFREY

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

Reentered as second class matter December 4,
1933, 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.

Somebody's Lying

On August 9 the New York Times reported the following:

"Of the money made available by Congress on July 1 to pay for the projected air armada of the army and navy, 45 percent of the army's share has been contracted for and 75 percent of the navy's has been committed in contracts formally awarded, William S. Knudsen (head of the National Defense Advisory Commission) said in a radio program tonight (August 8)."

Next day, August 9, Col. Henry L. Stimson, the Secretary of War, appeared at a Congressional tax hearing and made, according to the Associated Press, the following statement:

"Congress made available to the army during the month of June approximately \$400,000,000 for airplanes, engines and accessories. Yet, today, almost seven weeks later, we have been able to sign contracts for the construction of but 33 planes of the 4,000 and more for which these appropriations were made."

On August 10 President Roosevelt came away from taking a look at the Boston and Portsmouth Navy Yards and the Army Arsenal at Watertown, Mass., and in a statement headlined by the Times, declared: "Defense Program Hitting Its Stride, President Asserts."

"Things are going along awfully well. I'm very well pleased with all I saw today and it shows we are really getting into our stride."

Compare Stimson's with the other two statements. Somebody's lying!

Who is doing the lying? And why are they lying?

The answer is that all these gentlemen are sitting on the proverbial sharp horns of a dilemma and have to tell us two violently contradictory things at the same time.

They've got to say that everything is going along swimmingly in order to avoid pointing the finger right at the cause of the breakdown in the arms drive—the unyielding demand of the big capitalists for virtually unrestricted profits.

At the same time they have to put the fear of the lord into the Congressional committees now being asked to take the lid off all profit restrictions.

But above all they have got to cover up the fact that the big bosses of the country, the steel magnates and shipbuilders and plane manufacturers, are holding a gun at the country's head—"Inure us our profits or to hell with your defenses."

Appearing before the same committee as Stimson a day after his radio appearance, William Knudsen complained that he "had been unable to give contractors assurance their expansion costs could be amortized (i.e. written off out of earnings in computing tax returns)." Stimson, after making his startling revelation about planes, did not go on to denounce the actual saboteurs of the arms program but pleaded that the risk (!!) these manufacturers have to undertake "is one that is entitled to special consideration."

And while these hands are reaching into the public pocket, Roosevelt takes a squirt at a few government arms shops—government, not private shops—and says that "things" are going fine. Everything is hitting its stride. Roosevelt steers cautiously clear of saying how things are going in the private plants which have to produce the great bulk of the planes, ships, and guns for which these billions of public money have been taken. Roosevelt knows when to keep his mouth shut.

Because when the bosses come to Washington and demand bigger and bigger slices of the rich booty now being handed out, they are speaking for the real rulers of the country whose overwhelming interest is not that of the people but is only the interest in their own profits.

Out of this foul mess the lesson emerges with ever-increasing clarity: the American people will be able to organize their defense in a world torn by imperialist war only if they first wrest power from the hands of the capitalists who now wield it. This job can be done only by the workers who turn all the wheels, handle all the tools and will handle all the guns.

The old rotten system does not work anymore. It could not work in peace because out of its own womb it produced war and mass privation. And now we see that its guiding profit motive stymies even its own plans for participation in the war.

The Army's Politics

The kind of government for the United States which is desired by the U. S. Army's officers may be surmised from an article in the July 20 Army and Navy Journal on "Why France Collapsed", by Col. T. Bentley Mott.

With the usual professional solidarity, he has nothing but praise for the French Army's officer-staff. He blames it all on French democracy; his diatribe, indeed, reads like a Nazi indictment of democracy: "For ten years politicians eager for power and foreign agitators paid to disrupt the country preached war between the classes. . .None was more influential than M. Blum. . .French boys in public schools were being poisoned with pacifist doctrines and class hatred by teachers, in great part communists, organized into unions affiliated with subversive groups. . .During all this time of internal strife and external vacillation the army escaped contamination. . ."

He grows eloquent in praise of the new fascist government. Petain and Weygand took power because everybody "knew that the only hope of salvation lay in public servants such as these—men who had spent 50 years of sober living under modest circumstances, in silence, thinking only of serving France." Had France been under this Petain regime when the war began, "the result would have been different."

Nor does Col. Mott spare the obvious conclusion: "Foreign affairs in time of crisis cannot be conducted by newspapers and their readers. They have to be directed by a man."

The man on horseback—that's the kind of government that Col. Mott wants, and it is plain enough from the publication of his article in such an authoritative military officers' journal, that he speaks for the dominant section of the officer corps.

The first chance they get during the coming war, they will try to foist that kind of government on us.

Capitalist democracy is finished, repudiated by its own officer corps.

Either the revolutionary victory of the proletariat and the establishment of a Workers' Government, or a fascist regime—those are the only real alternatives of the coming period of militarism and war.

Lundeen's Party

Senator Ernest Lundeen of Minnesota last week issued a statement to the press declaring that "both" parties adhere to an interventionist policy and that, therefore, "a new national party" is necessary. The new party shall be organized by "Labor, the farmer, those who believe in cooperatives, those who believe in neutrality and placing our national interests before the interests of any other country." And "all good Americans who believe in absolute neutrality and America first" should rally in convention at Chicago sometime before September 1, "in order that red-blooded Americans who are not under European influence" shall make their influence felt in the elections.

A party that would include those who "place our national interests before the interests of any other country", "America first" advocates, etc., doesn't have to be formed; there are two such parties already, the Democratic and Republican. Lundeen's isolationist clap-trap, which would make the two parties out to be mere puppets of Britain, only serves to hide the fundamental truth that interventionism is being pursued precisely because of "our"—the capitalist class—national interests.

It is safe to predict that Lundeen won't get anywhere with his demagogic proposition. The times are hostile to backwoods bunk. Lundeen's own party, the Farmer-Labor Association of Minnesota, is falling apart, the remnants of it are seeking fusion with the Minnesota Democrats. It has been just such a party as Lundeen now proposes nationally—calling on Labor and the farmers for its main support but with no thought of a class program for the workers and the poor farmers.

If there was one place where such a loose-joined party might conceivably have been successful, it was in the predominantly agricultural state of Minnesota. But it didn't work. Because it was neither controlled by the trade unions nor did it fight on behalf of the trade unions, the workers in the cities did not look upon it as their party; the same thing happened with the farmers. It was neither flesh, fish nor fowl. Apparently Lundeen has learned nothing from the Minnesota experience.

The only kind of party that can arise, in this period of sharp conflict of class interests, to challenge the two capitalist parties, is a Labor Party, constituted by and controlled by the trade unions. No sensible worker will lift a finger to help Lundeen's venture. But many millions will be inspired to begin a new life when the trade unions call upon them to form a party of the masses. Lundeen sniffs the coming tidal wave and wants to ride it. But in a party directly controlled by the organizations of the workers the Lundeens should have no place.

GPU'S OWN AGENTS WILL "CONFESS" LINK WITH TROTSKY, HE PREDICTS

MEXICO CITY, August 7—Leon Trotsky warned yesterday, when he received representatives of the Mexican and international press, that the Stalinist leaders identified and arrested by the Mexican police as participants in the attempt to kill Leon Trotsky on May 24, will shortly "confess" that they were agents of Trotsky all the time.

Having failed to cover up the role of the GPU by any other method, Stalin's secret police must now resort to the desperate course of having their own principal agents label themselves "Trotskyists", it was predicted by Trotsky.

Serrano's Role

He emphasized particularly the role of David Serrano, member of the Political Bureau of the Mexican Communist Party, who was arrested by the police shortly after the attempted assassination and is still held. Another Stalinist under arrest, Mateos Martinez, named Serrano as the man who ordered him to arrange for some police uniforms (the assassins wore them in the attack). Serrano's former wife, Julia, is also held, having admitted that she had been employed as a spy on the Trotsky household, with the special task of becoming intimate with the police guard stationed outside.

"Serrano", Trotsky said, "spent six years in Moscow, from where he was sent to Spain (during the civil war) and nobody goes out of Russia without the authorization of the GPU. Serrano functioned in Spain as a GPU agent and then came to Mexico as an important functionary of that body, which is the reason why he soon entered the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party."

GPU Has Siqueiros

David Alfaro Siqueiros, sought by the police as the director of the actual assault, is hidden—in the hands of the GPU, Trotsky

believes. Luis Arenal, named by the police as the man who shot Robert Sheldon Harte, Trotsky's secretary, is somewhere in the United States now, having been seen there two weeks after the attempted assassination.

"Will not the GPU demand that Siqueiros—under threat of death—declare tomorrow that he has secretly been a 'Trotskyist'?" Will he not declare that they happened to kill Bob Harte in the course

of a fake assault? Will not David Serrano confess that he has been simply an agent of the Dies Committee for the organization of political assassinations? Isn't 'El Popular' (Toledano's paper) now preparing an article on this theme? We know in advance its style of patriotic indignation!"

The Stalinists have officially disowned Siqueiros now, but not Serrano. If Trotsky's prediction is correct, that comes next!

By Leon Trotsky

After Burnham--Macdonald

The following is from a letter to a friend by Leon Trotsky.

I don't know whether you have seen Dwight Macdonald's article in the August issue of his PARTISAN REVIEW.

This man was a disciple of Burnham, the intellectual snob. After Burnham deserted, Dwight Macdonald was left in Shachtman's party as the lone representative of "Science."

On the question of fascism, Macdonald serves up a poor compilation of plagiarism from our arsenal which he represents as his own discoveries and to which he characterizes as our ideas. The whole—without perspective, without proportion and without elementary intellectual honesty.

However, this is not the worst. Burnham's orphan proclaims: "We must examine again with a cold and sceptical eye, the most basic premises of Marxism" (Page 266). And what must the poor "Workers Party" do during this period of "examination"? What must the proletariat do? They should wait, of course, for the result of Dwight Macdonald's study. This result will probably be Macdonald's desertion himself into

the camp of Burnham. The last four lines of the article can be nothing but preparation for personal desertion. "Only if we meet the stormy and terrible years ahead with both scepticism and devotion—scepticism towards all theories, governments and social systems; devotion to the revolutionary fight of the masses—only then can we justify ourselves as intellectuals."

Revolutionary activity based upon theoretical scepticism is the most awkward of inner contradictions. "Devotion to the revolutionary fight of the masses" is impossible without theoretical understanding of the laws of this revolutionary fight. Revolutionary devotion is possible only if one gains the assurance that his devotion is reasonable, adequate; that it corresponds to its aim. Such assurance can be created only by theoretical insight into the class struggle. "Scepticism towards all theories" is nothing but preparation for personal desertion.

Shachtman remains silent; as "General Secretary" he is too busy to defend the "most basic premises of Marxism" from petty-bourgeois philistines and snobs. . .

What Will Happen to the Union Drive in Steel?

By FARRELL DOBBS

The CIO has launched a campaign in the ten mills and shipyards of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation. The plan of action was laid down at a conference of the CIO lodges involved, which was held in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania on August 11. The Steel Workers Organizing Committee and the Industrial Union of Marine and Ship Building Workers of America, both CIO affiliates, will participate jointly in the drive.

The Bethlehem mills are operating at top capacity with 200 million dollars in government contracts already received. This corporation is one of those which consistently violate the Wagner Labor Act and the Walsh-Healey Act. It refuses to pay the \$5.00 a day minimum on work on government contracts.

CIO Vice-President Phillip Murray announced before the conference that it would "lay the ground work to carry the fight to Washington." The conference itself announced, however, that failure by the company to bargain collectively will "compel the workers to enforce their rights by economic action."

This campaign, long overdue, can serve as the opening gun in a fight to correct conditions in the entire steel industry. The urgent necessity for the union to rise vigorously to the defense of its membership can no longer be denied.

SWOC UNDER FIRE OF BOSSES AND GOVT

The SWOC is under heavy attack from both the steel bosses and the government. The corporations are creating widespread unemployment and forcing down the earnings of the employed steel workers through technological change. They are violating the union contracts, stalling on the settlement of grievances, and practicing general discrimination against the SWOC membership. The bosses are undermining the union in every way possible.

The government, on its part, is fronting for the steel corporations "in the interests of national defense." Agents of the FBI are sent into the plants in an effort to intimidate the workers and try to put down any militancy among them. An undercover drive is being conducted against the alien workers. The finger of suspicion is pointed at militant workers who raise their voice in protest against the policy of the corporations.

The efforts of the AFL to organize the steel workers in opposition to the SWOC are more of an annoyance than a threat

to the CIO union. AFL propaganda is in large part based on the claim that it is "more patriotic" than the CIO. The AFL has nothing real to offer the steel workers. Its actions only serve to further disorient them.

SWOC LEADERS DON'T FIGHT BACK

The national leadership of the SWOC meantime shows an increasing tendency to subordinate the interests of the steel workers to the "interests of the national defense." Van A. Bittner, SWOC director, Western Region, has been appointed by Hillman to serve in one of the "national defense committees." The top officials are very jittery about the danger of being called "unpatriotic." They have gone so far as to warn the field organizers that if they are accused of "un-American activities" they cannot expect the SWOC to defend them, "even though they may be wrongly accused."

Grievances arising from contract violation and general discrimination against the union membership on the job are permitted to pile up. The complaints are tardily placed before arbitration committees or the NLRB and generally are not militantly pressed, even through these channels. There are very few sallies directly against the bosses. These occur only where pressure from the workers is most heavy.

Some cases of strike action by the steel workers are promptly labelled "outlaw" and a settlement is forced at the first opportunity. The national leadership sometimes follows up the settlement with an attack on the local lodge officials. The usual reason given is per capita tax delinquencies, a violation of the union laws, or some similar charge. Militant lodge leaders are being forced into the background. The most conservative, least class conscious elements are coming forward.

WORKERS WANT A FIGHTING LEADERSHIP

Although the fight for a six hour day at eight hour's pay was sidestepped at the Chicago convention, some sections of the officialdom are now using this slogan. They are motivated largely by the need for some means to halt the decline in dues payment which is becoming a serious problem. There is little indication that they mean business.

The steel workers have a much different attitude. They accept the fact that they are being pushed into the war but they are not enthusiastic about the idea. There is general indifference among

them towards the boss-made, artificial war hysteria. They do not as yet understand the real significance of the war preparations and consequently have not gone over to active opposition to the program of the government. The "Fifth Column" agitation is not taken seriously but it harasses and disturbs them to a certain extent. The steel workers are most concerned about the vital question of jobs and wages. Many thousands of them are already unemployed. Those who have jobs face the threat of reduced earnings and wonder who will be thrown out into the streets next.

They want to fight but the defeat in Little Steel and the timidity of their top leaders since then has undermined their confidence in themselves and their union. The rank and file is anxious to overcome the present apathy and inertia. They need and want a fighting leadership.

UNION'S SALVATION DEMANDS STRUGGLE

Every factor in the situation demands that the SWOC leaders abandon their attitude of subservience to the "interests of the national defense" and that they fight for the interests of the steel workers instead. The battle must be carried direct to the steel bosses through militant trade union action. A vigorous organization drive must be launched, on a program of action:

All union officials off the "National Defense Committees."

Enforce the union contracts. Settle the workers' grievances.

Fight for the 6 hour day at 8 hour's pay.

Join us in a
GAY BEACH PARTY!
SUNDAY
AUGUST 18th
ORCHARD BEACH, No. 10
Swimming,
Boating, Fishing!
Meet at Pelham Bay Station, IRT, 10:30 A.M.
Local N. Y., SWP

Answering A Query On Our Draft Stand

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

A sympathizer of our party, in a letter which he sent me very recently, takes us to task for our position on conscription. He believes that we should not have raised, at this time, the question of military training under trade-union control and should have confined our agitation purely to a struggle against conscription.

"Most of the young workers", he writes, "are opposed to conscription and it is only introducing confusion when you talk to them about the necessity of military training under trade-union control. Leave that until after the conscription bill is passed. It may be right then but for the present stick to an anti-conscription issue."

By inference our sympathizer indicates that every other group opposing conscription will have nothing to do after the conscription bill is passed. They must fold up and shut up. At best they will be limited to a futile movement to repeal the conscription measure.

Our agitation for military training under trade-union control, however, will continue. For that slogan is independent of the struggle against a particular capitalist conscription bill. As a matter of fact the thesis of the Fourth International on the Death Agony of Capitalism contains the following demands (among others):

Military training and arming of workers and farmers under direct control of workers' and farmers' committees.

Creation of military schools for the training of commanders among the toilers, chosen by workers' organizations.

... Before the Burke-Wadsworth bill was thought of, during the debate, before its enactment, and after its enactment, our basic demand was, and will be: military training for workers under control of workers' organizations.

Because that training is absolutely essential in the present period of war and militarism. Into the consciousness of every advanced worker must penetrate that primary and fundamental idea: military training for the working masses for the defense of their class interests.

It may be true that most of the young workers are opposed to conscription. I seriously doubt that proposition but I shall grant its correctness for the sake of argument.

That would not in the least modify our attitude. For we are not interested in concealing such a fundamental truth from any worker as the necessity for military training. We are interested in impressing every worker with the idea that a negative attitude to any fundamental question is not sufficient.

The capitalist class wants to take every worker into its military clutches for its purposes—our reply is NO! But every worker must have military training and we must demand that his own workers' organization furnish him with that training.

We Stand Alone On This Question

And right now is the time to raise the question. We would be committing the greatest error if we failed to raise it at this very moment when every worker is thinking about and discussing the problem of conscription and military training.

Every demagogue (in which category I include, of course, the Stalinists), every muddle-headed liberal, every well-meaning and not-so-well-meaning pacifist, is shouting against conscription, is trying to catch the support of those workers who are more or less naturally opposed to the idea of giving up their jobs and being drafted into the army.

Our party alone distinguishes itself from all of these shouting against conscription by saying clearly and definitely: Yes, oppose conscription by the capitalist government but fight for military training for the workers under their own control.

In the last analysis the difference between our attitude on conscription and the attitude of every other group is the difference between people who are simply dissatisfied with the existing order and we who see the problem of our epoch clearly and are determined to solve that problem in the only way possible.

It is the same difference that exists between those democrats who raise pitiful cries about the advance of fascism and offer nothing better to fight that advance than mere opposition to the undemocratic methods of the capitalist class and the revolutionary Marxists who see the necessity for the workers to organize and take over power in order to wage a victorious struggle against fascism at home and abroad.

We Do Not Stop Half-Way

Our party opposes every step taken by the capitalists and their government to limit the democratic rights of the workers in any way. Our party urges the workers to struggle for every immediate demand.

But our party teaches the workers that it is not sufficient to wage a defensive struggle against the capitalists or to try to gain a few advantages here and there. Fascism cannot be destroyed in that way. It can be destroyed only if the workers, in addition to fighting for their immediate demands, take power into their own hands.

Our attitude on conscription and military training reflects that positive and militant attitude which every advanced worker must be taught to accept.

It is the same attitude which Lenin took to the question of disarmament. Instead of giving in to the sentiments of some left-wing workers who favored disarmament, he fiercely attacked that attitude as incompatible with revolutionary Marxism. Instead of disarmament, demand, advised Lenin, the right of the "inhabitants of the country to form voluntary associations for the learning of the military arts, the free selection of instructors, their payment out of government funds, etc."

Instead of joining the pacifists of every type and description to fight conscription in general, our party says to the workers: fight against capitalist conscription; demand the right to bear arms and to have military training under your own control; demand funds from the government for such military training.

Our party will never regret the position that it is now taking on military training.