

Socialist Appeal

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

Vol. IV, No. 7

NEW YORK, NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 17, 1940

147

FIVE (5) CENTS

WHY IS SUMNER WELLES GOING TO EUROPE

Big Business Backs Newark Manager Plan

S.W.P. Backs Campaign of Organized Labor In Opposing Proposed City Changes

On Tuesday, February 20, a referendum is being held in the city of Newark, N. J., to determine whether the City Commission form of government shall be changed to a Council-Manager form.

The AFL, the CIO, the unemployed organizations and the Socialist Workers Party have called on the workers of the city to go to the polls that day to vote NO on the referendum.

Big Business For It

Big Business in Newark, headed by the Chamber of Commerce and the Broad Street Association, is behind the move to change the form of city government.

Big Business spokesmen say they can reduce the high tax rate of \$4., which is bringing ruin to the small home-owner and shop keeper, by installing a City Council of 9 and an "efficient" City Manager who would reduce waste and save money. They propose to replace the present City Commission of 4 (1 died recently) by an election, to be held four weeks after February 20, of a City Council that would be "controlled by business men." They claim also that this will put an end to "graft and corruption" in the City Hall.

Their Real Plan But it is clear that the real aim of Big Business is not to help the small business man, but to install a clique which will make certain that the tax burden hits Big Business even less than it does now. They want a government that will be friendly to the corporations and the real estate speculators, Public Service and Prudential Insurance and the like.

They want a City Manager who will cut relief, who will refuse to appropriate any city money for WPA projects, who will cut city services, who will reduce wages, who will cut appropriations for the library and the hospitals, who will cut wages of the school-teachers and the lower-paid city employees. In other (Continued on Page 3)

WORKERS JAILED AT JAMAICA RELIEF BUREAU

Refused To Leave Until Children Were Given Food

In desperation because of hunger and the cold-blooded refusal of the New York City Home Relief authorities to give them any relief whatsoever, seventeen men, women, and children sat down in the local Bureau at 88-83 Van Wyck Avenue, Jamaica, Thursday, Feb. 8, and refused to move. When the case supervisor, Miss Weinberg, ordered the demonstrators out, Mrs. Angelina Bruno, mother of six children, shouted defiantly, "You feed my children then I'll go home, not before." The Bureau authorities called the police. Then Miss Weinberg and her assistant, Miss Breslau, laughed and joked with the police while waiting to see whether the unemployed workers would get frightened of the police and go home. Not one person moved. All the demonstrators were then arrested and hauled (Continued on Page 2)

Lewis Blasts Roosevelt

C.I.O. LEADER AGAIN LASHES OUT AT F.D.R.

Challenges Him On Jobs and Chance For Youth

WASHINGTON, Feb. 11 — John L. Lewis was an easy winner over Roosevelt in that debate here yesterday. It was a pity that the two of them were not battling it out on one platform!

The president had bumptiously told the youth they weren't sufficiently informed to adopt a resolution against war loans to Finland. He had termed "twaddle" the proposition that such loans would lead to America's involvement in the war.

Lewis told him off: "It might interest the President to know that the recent convention of the United Mine Workers of America, with 2,400 delegates in a deliberative convention in Columbus, representing a membership of 600,000 members and more than 3,000,000 members of dependent families of those 600,000 men, adopted the same kind of a resolution on Finland. And I wonder if the president could call the resolution adopted by the UMWA 'twaddle.' "Those resolutions (against loans to Finland) are symbolic of what is in the hearts, not only of the young men and women of America, but of practically every citizen. They represent the constant and the conscious and subconscious fears that, in some way, the politicians and statesmen of this country and the warring world will in some fashion drag our country into their war, and it's a protest.

"It is a protest, and after all, who has a bigger, greater right to protest against war or any part of war, or the diplomatic intrigues of war, or the subtle politics preceding war, than the young men who, in the event of war, would become cannon fodder?"

Lewis was even more biting effective in commenting on the plight of the "4,000,000 young people without job opportunity," for whom Roosevelt had no answer.

"You listened to the president today, when you came away you didn't know where to get a job if you needed one; he didn't tell you that if you waited a year there would be a job for you, he didn't say that if you waited five years there would be a job for you. Because, apparently, he didn't know, and if he doesn't know, he finds himself in the same fix that you were on the Finnish question."

Again and again Lewis returned to the economic plight of the young generation of today: "He (Roosevelt) said also, by implication, that perhaps there is too much furor being raised about jobs for young people, because ten, twenty and thirty years ago young people also wanted jobs. Some answer!"

"How much does that mean to one of you who needs a job? . . . How much does that mean to those of you who have plans to get married and live the normal life of Americans? . . . And how many years of interruption to your normal plans will you enjoy? . . . How many years must you wander and hope that you will have an opportunity here in your native land to live the normal life of a normal citizen?"

His speech was, in rough form an accounting of the bankruptcy of the New Deal. He warned Roosevelt that the American people "will hold strictly accountable (Continued on Page 3)

Lewis Is Right-But What Is He Going to Do About It?

AN EDITORIAL

John L. Lewis roasted Roosevelt to a turn last Saturday. It was a good job of debunking the "New Deal." Lewis turned the spotlight on "America's Problem No. 1" — unemployment.

Halfway through his speech, Lewis asked the right question—the burning question: "Well, why not do something about it?"

But Lewis didn't answer that question. He didn't tell us what to do about it, or what he is going to do about it.

He did say: "Isn't it now apparent that the politicians' answers are not going to get you a job unless you force the politicians to get you a job?"

But how to force them — that's the question.

At the United Mine Workers convention, Lewis graphically described how, in the deal with Roosevelt, the labor movement got the dirty end of the stick. He made clear that he ruled out the Republican party. That's fine. But then he ended by projecting another deal with the Democratic party. Neither Lewis nor anybody else has given a single reason for thinking that another deal with the Democratic party won't turn out like the last one.

Lewis has gone half-way and then

stopped. What every militant in the labor movement wants to hear Lewis and the CIO leadership say is:

"Eight years of the New Deal have demonstrated that the working class of this country has nothing to gain and everything to lose by supporting capitalist parties: It's time to build our own Labor Party. The industrial and white-collar workers, and the agricultural workers and working farmers, together with their wives and sons and daughters, constitute the overwhelming majority of this country. They should run it."

That's what the working people of this country are waiting to hear!

A Labor Party that will fight for a job and a decent living for every worker — open the idle factories — operate them under workers' control — a Twenty-Billion dollar federal public works and housing program — a \$30-weekly minimum wage — a 30-hour weekly maximum — all war funds to the unemployed — a people's referendum on any and all wars — these are the kind of demands that a Labor Party should fight for today.

"Why not do something about it?" Lewis asked that question. Let him answer it as the workers want him to answer it!

WOMEN WPA STRIKERS ARE SENTENCED

Suspended Sentences For 13 in Mpls; 1 Gets 45 Days Jail

MINNEAPOLIS, Feb. 10 —The fourteen women strikers convicted in the third WPA trial were sentenced this morning in Judge Mathew Joyce's courtroom. Thirteen of the women received suspended sentences and were placed on probation for periods of one year to eighteen months. The fourteenth, Minnie Kohn, drew 45 days in the city workhouse.

The suspended sentences came as no surprise, after the government's retreat of last week, when it quashed the remaining indictments against the 125 WPA strikers who had not yet been on trial.

Those who were handed probationary periods of one year are Bertha Gates, Pearl Richards, Marie Morgan, Harriet Munson, Ida Dunlap, Lois Viens, Sigrid Asumma, Myrtle Squarcello, and Margaret Schoenfeld. Dorothy Green, Ann Wisdom and Stella Ross got fifteen months probation, and Nellie Waldron, eighteen.

As the court opened, Defense Attorney Tom Davis rose to point out to the judge that most of the defendants were mothers and grandmothers, that they had all suffered greatly, and suggested that probationary sentences be given. (Continued on Page 2)

Action Needed to Win 30-Hr. Week at General Motors

Company Is Trying To Wear Men Down With A War of Nerves and Words

FLINT, Mich.—The General Motors program of "action" announced by the tops of the United Automobile Workers (UAW), which gingerly places on the shelf all the real demands of the workers, reveals the usual trade union bureaucracy's error of placing faith not in the militant action of the ranks, but in some kind of legal machinations, in this case the National Labor Relations Board.

It is of course absolutely necessary for the UAW-CIO to wage an energetic campaign to win the coming NLRB elections in General Motors. But how can they be won?

Union and non-union men, acutely aware of their insecurity, of impending lay-offs, and of the imperative need of making strong demands upon the corporation, are not going to be satisfied with a merely verbal program, promised by the leadership "after the elections."

Militants who realize the imperative necessity of the CIO winning NLRB elections will press for action on the 30 hour week at 40 hours' pay, and the guaranteed shop steward system and related demands NOW and not in the vague future. A vigorous campaign TODAY would guarantee an election victory and a solid front against the huge General Motors Corporation.

Guerrilla Warfare While this game of delay and evasion goes on in the CIO leadership, the ranks are engaged in a war of attrition, wearing themselves out in a constant and widespread decentralized battle with the company.

In plant after plant union militants in various departments are fighting to secure and maintain seniority rights, struggling against speed-up, demanding a cut in hours from 40 to 30 before widespread layoffs begin, in order to keep a greater number of men at work over a longer period of time.

Company Provokes Flare-Ups The corporation, always aware of its opportunities, has not hesitated to provoke these little flare-ups. Cases of minor discriminations against well-known union men are quite numerous in the Flint plants. Usually the corporation backs down, after a fight has been waged, lays the whole matter at the door of some petty foreman, or administrative

error, and plays the part of the kind and righteous employer. But meanwhile these constant flare-ups are wearing down the men. They cannot keep this up forever. Their militant action must be organized into a corporation-wide offensive to achieve the demands which all agree are essential.

Serious organizational measures to prepare for a fight for a 30 hour week at 40 hours pay, for a systematic shop steward system, for a hard and fast seniority system, etc., would easily and rapidly rally the General Motors workers, guarantee first of all the NLRB election, and end in certain victory for the UAW-CIO.

Company Has the Money If union leaders fear that the 30 hours at 40 hours' pay slogan is not feasible, that GM cannot afford it, let them look at the facts. General Motors profits for 1939 will be about \$200,000,000. These profits now are poured into the coffers of the DuPonts and Morgans. If the UAW-CIO would conduct a militant fight, and demand the turning over of these profits to the men who produce them, they could provide jobs for 100,000 unemployed at a guaranteed \$1500 yearly wage, add almost \$500 a year to the income of all workers now employed by General Motors, and cut the hours in half at least, as a result of the additional employment of a hundred thousand workers.

It is possible that due to the inability or unwillingness of the Reuther - Thomas leadership to conduct a real offensive in General Motors, initiative for action (Continued on Page 2)

Envoy to Probe for Anti-Soviet Front

F.D.R. Sending Welles Abroad To Make Soundings Among Belligerents For New War Alignments

What will be the real mission of Sumner Welles in Europe? President Roosevelt has announced that he is sending his Under-Secretary of State to Europe to report "on present conditions in Europe."

Pressed to give more details, the President said that only he and his Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, would be privy to Welles' "findings." It is apparently none of the people's business. But within a few hours matters became a little clearer.

ANTI-LYNCHING BILL HEARINGS ADJOURNED

Anti-Labor Loophole Slipped Into House Version of Bill

After hearing eight witnesses, three of them from Texas and all favorable to the bill, the subcommittee of the Senate hearing testimony on the Anti-Lynching Bill adjourned sine die. Texas Senator Tom Connally, most vociferous opponent of the bill, presented no witnesses, though he had widely publicized his intention to have a large number testify in opposition to the bill. Some of the material he himself read into the record was supplied him, Connally said, by Mrs. Jessie Daniel Ames, president of the Southern Women's Association for the Prevention of Lynching.

Anti-Labor Loophole

The more progressive supporters of the bill are making an effort to keep in the bill the proviso that lynching "shall not be deemed to include violence occurring during the course of picketing or boycotting or any incident in connection with any 'labor dispute' ". As passed in the House of Representatives, the bill had this portion deleted, creating a loophole to turn the law against the working class.

With the bill pending in the Senate, Maryland state police acted with unusual speed Wednesday, to rescue two Negro women from a mob of 1,000 white men, who had broken into the county jail at Snow Hill and seized the women. The women were being held as material witnesses in the slaying of a farmer by unknown men. Statements of the governor, the county sheriff and state police concerning the rescue were obviously made with an eye to the effect on Congressional opinion.

Although both the Democratic and Republican parties have given the bill half-hearted support (this is election year and Negroes form the balance of power in more than a dozen states), the leaders of neither party have given an unequivocal statement on the bill. As a Pittsburgh Courier editorial puts it,

"Mr. Garner has been on the public payroll all his life and at least half his life has been spent in Congress. He MUST know how to talk, and if so, why doesn't he himself say the nice things about Negroes that his paid Negro henchmen say he says? . . . Like Mr. Roosevelt, he can be depended upon to say nothing definite and specific to encourage Negroes for fear of scaring off white support."

Only a workers' party that is based on class unity across racial lines, can afford to take a clear stand, need not be afraid of "scaring off white support." That's the Socialist Workers Party.

The most striking fact of the Welles mission—which was immediately commented on in Europe, especially in London — was the fact that he will go to Rome, Paris, Berlin, and London — not to Moscow.

Then when Roosevelt on Sunday addressed the delegates of the American Youth Congress on the White House lawn, he openly attacked the Soviet Union, declared that "98 percent of the American people" were supporting Finland.

Add to this the fact that Welles is sailing together with Myron Taylor, named as Roosevelt's personal emissary to the Vatican, and the fact that the Vatican's whole effort in the war is aimed at bringing about an anti-Soviet coalition, and one begins to get more than a glimmer of what is in the wind.

Welles—the evil genius behind the bloody regime of Machado in Cuba and the State Department's chief manipulator in relations with the totalitarian dictatorships of Latin America—is going to Europe to sound out the possibility of shifting the focus of the war from internecine conflict among the imperialists into a war of the powers against the Soviet Union. The infliction of a decisive military defeat upon Hitlerite Germany is a necessary part of this project.

Hull Chimes In

Simultaneously with the Welles mission, Secretary Hull revealed that the Washington government is already engaged in many-sided negotiations with the neutrals for the announced purpose of making "preliminary inquiries relating to a sound international economic system . . . and world-wide reduction of armaments," after the war.

America's Future Role

Behind these empty phrases stretches a grandiose picture of the future role that American imperialism expects to play the role of supreme ruler and arbiter of a war-exhausted world. These negotiations are undoubtedly one of the first phases of Washington's assertion of its dominant place in world politics. But at the same time they have a more immediate purpose: to introduce American pressure upon the neutrals in their policies toward the war at the present time, to force them into the war alignments with which Welles will be dealing primarily during his European tour.

Isolationists Collapse

Little opposition to Roosevelt's scheme is to be expected from Congress, as was to be seen this week when "isolationist" sentiment collapsed in the Senate and the bill to provide an additional \$200,000,000 for Finland was adopted. There was a round of applause when Senator King declared he favored the bill "because Communist Russia threatened to destroy this and all governments."

Stalin's invasion of Finland has given Roosevelt an "idealistic" pretext for moving against the Soviet Union, and he is making the most of it.

Behind the Lines

By GEORGE STERN

The veering vane of speculation over the war's next phase has turned to the Near East where large-scale Allied preparation for hostilities has become visible.

The Near East, in the language of world power politics, spells out oil—the oil of Iraq and Iran and the oil of the Soviet Caucasus.

War waged in the Near East would be war waged by the Allies against the Soviet Union, war waged for the oil that spurts from the ground between the Black and Caspian Seas.

Just as the war in the West represents a continuation of the conflict between Anglo-French imperialism and German imperialism, war in the Near East would be a continuation of the unsuccessful Anglo-French war of intervention against the Bolsheviks 20 years ago.

And for such a war the Allies, superficially at least, are far better prepared. Turkey, which fought with the Kaiser's Germany last time, is now on the other side. The sprawling desert and oil-rich lands of the old Turkish Empire are now in the hands of Britain (Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Palestine) and France (Syria and Lebanon). The British pull the strings of the puppets that rule Iran and Afghanistan, although in both these countries their power is not uncontested.

The principal indices of Allied war preparations in the eastern Mediterranean during the past week have been:

1. The arrival of a large expeditionary force of Australian and New Zealand troops, landing at Suez.

2. The visit of Gen. Maxime Weygand, French Near Eastern commander, to the British General Staff quartered at Cairo.

The outbreak of war in the Near East would not preclude, but would probably accompany, its extension on the European fronts. The Soviet-Finnish war would assume more clearly its essential place in the scheme of things as the opening phase of an imperialist attack on the Soviet Union.

What role Germany—and Italy—will play in the new turn of the war wheels—remains to be seen. To help shape this role may well be the prime purpose of the "informational" trip Sumner Welles is making to Europe.

A New Chapter Begins in American Labor History: What Is at Stake In the Fight on Labor Unity?

By E. R. FRANK
II.

John L. Lewis took a fall out of Roosevelt in their exchange on the question of labor unity. In Washington on Saturday, Lewis read with malicious pleasure the reply he had sent last October to the president's "peace" proposal; that took care of Roosevelt's assertion that Lewis had not deigned to reply. What is more, Lewis was able to repeat his proposal of last year: labor unity by the simple method of each CIO unit being chartered by the AFL, with all "questions of detail" settled within the joint organization—i.e., an organization in which the CIO forces would have a decisive voice.

Progressives in the labor movement, whether in the AFL or CIO, must clearly understand why the only worthwhile kind of unity for the labor movement is that in which the industrial unions will remain the leading tendency in the labor movement.

The split neither originated nor is it continuing today because of the personal hostility of Green or Lewis or any other individuals. Such an explanation is only for little children. The split originated on the basic question of organizing the unorganized industrial proletariat of America's mass production industries.

The split continues today over the question of which unions and which policies shall possess the hegemony of the labor movement; the industrial unions under Lewis, Murray, etc., or the old craft unions under the domination of the Hutcheson-Frey-Woll clique. A bitter personal antagonism exists between these two groups of men, to be sure. But this conflict originates from the different type of unions that the two sets of leaders control, the different interests involved, the different policies pursued, and not merely an expression of personal dislike or hostility.

THE KIND OF UNITY ROOSEVELT WANTS

Roosevelt is not interested in a united labor movement because of solicitude for the welfare of the American working class. His interest arises solely out of his war program. He fears that the continuation of the labor split makes more difficult the realization of his goal: to reach a definite understanding with the top officialdom on putting the unions into the strait-jacket of his war machine. Roosevelt is working for a united labor movement that will be headed by a servile and cowardly leadership, willing to act as the agent of the War Department inside the labor movement. That is why Roosevelt is today putting the squeeze on Lewis and through Lewis on the industrial workers who make up the unruly, the untamed, the aggressive type of unions, whose industries constitute the nerve centers of America's war machine. Roosevelt wants to mobilize public opinion against the CIO industrial unions in order to force them to subordinate themselves to the servile, house-broken bureaucrats of the Frey-Woll-Hutcheson stripe. This is the meaning and the aim of the Roosevelt Peace crusade.

THE MEANING OF

TOBIN'S UNITY DEMAND

Tobin's recent attack against "less than a dozen men" who are "responsible for the division of eight million men" and his call upon the rank and file to "rise up and demand" the complete cessation of hostilities between the two labor organizations, has an entirely different meaning and purpose than the Roosevelt peace campaign. Tobin's call-to-arms is an attack primarily upon the reactionary clique that runs the AFL Executive Council and was so understood and received by the entire AFL leadership. Tobin is demanding, in effect, that the

craft unions drop their stiff-necked attitude and give in to some of the demands of the CIO.

The Teamsters Union and Tobin have travelled a long way since the 1934 San Francisco convention, when Tobin denounced the "rabble and riff-raff" that were attempting to invade the AFL. Tobin today heads a powerful semi-industrial union of 400,000 men; he is, in a way subject to the same influences and pressures that operate on the CIO leaders. Because of the changed status of his union, Tobin's whole labor philosophy and approach is today much closer to that of Lewis than to the policies of Tobin's colleagues of the Executive Council. Tobin envisages today a united labor organization, stronger and more aggressive than the federation of the past, with the power divided somewhat evenly between the new industrial and semi-industrial unions and the old line AFL craft unions. Tobin

is a logical compromise candidate for the leadership of such a united labor organization and unquestionably so considers himself. Tobin remains an ardent New Dealer, but he is above all the president of an important labor union, and that is why his unity aims are so different from those of Roosevelt. That is why Tobin is putting the squeeze on the AFL Executive Council to "give in" and make peace with the CIO.

THE KIND OF UNITY GREEN WANTS

Green, who has the responsibility of the AFL national office and who has no base in any international union, fears even more than the other old line craft union officials, the eventual decay of the AFL unless the labor split is healed and the federation is allowed to absorb the young blood of the modern industrial unions. Just the same he, like the craft union clique, to which he has tied his fortunes, fears the new unbridled masses of proletarian workers as he fears the plague itself. The AFL leadership want unity, but unity with the assurance that the new unions will keep their place, pay their per capita taxes and not challenge the leadership of the Executive Council.

HOW LEWIS ESTIMATES THE COMING PERIOD

Lewis is convinced that the coming period will be marked by a huge expansion of all mass production industries, feeding both the American and European war

machines. He remembers the marvelous organizational union growth of the last war period of a decade ago, when the AFL, its membership. He is convinced with little effort, almost doubled that the CIO with its centralized authority, its industrial union structure and its modern and aggressive methods of organization will achieve huge gains in membership in the coming period and thus establish unquestioned hegemony over the trade union movement. Firmly convinced that the future is with the CIO, he is determined not to subordinate the CIO unions and their freedom of action to the majority of the AFL Executive Council, come what may. He wants unity and a united labor organization with the upper hand and the determining policy vested in the leadership of the industrial unions.

Progressives have the task of explaining to the membership the full meaning of the unity campaign. The progressives must fight for a united labor movement, achieved only by the action and the pressure of the rank and file itself. They must condemn unreservedly any interference into their internal affairs on the part of Roosevelt or any other capitalist politician. They will then, in every case, put pressure, first, upon the old line craft union officials, in order to force through a united labor organization, with the hegemony in the hands of the industrial unions and the industrial proletariat—the most advanced section of the American working class.

AFL Council Pettifogs While Major Issues for Workers are Ignored

By GEORGE CLARKE

The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor has finished its grave deliberations under the warm Florida sun. It labored and labored and produced — a mouse that even the rodent family would be ashamed to claim its own.

With good whiskey and mellow cigars plentiful, the punjabs of America's craft unions leaned back in their plush hotel chairs and pondered the state of the nation. They found conditions deplorable. The depression is still with us after ten years — lingering on like a bad dream. Capital lies idle by the billions in the banks. Business stagnates, there is no expansion, factories are idle. Ten millions are unemployed. And with it all, the nation teeters on the brink of war.

In other words, which no one can deny: America remains in the death grip of the most intense social crisis in its history. Patch-work schemes won't work any more. This is a time, obviously, for bold men with bold programs. The leaders of 4,000,000 workers, who are most seriously affected by the crisis, should call out the might of organized labor for immediate aggressive action.

They should, yes—but the old, old men of the Executive Council have another idea of what should be done and how. For them the proverb "discretion is the better part of valor" is a hoary principle frozen in their bones. To the waiting world they uttered solemn words:

"Unemployment still is the most acute domestic problem of the nation... the American Federation of Labor refuses to accept the idea of chronic or permanent unemployment..."

We believe that a democracy owes a basic obligation to its citizens to provide them with opportunity to work and achieve a progressively higher standard of living... The AFL calls upon both political parties to incorporate in their platform this year a constructive program for the elimination of widespread unemployment."

And what is this constructive program? "... find out the facts and face them courageously... Ascertain just how many men and women willing and able to work are unemployed through no fault of their own... Find out the extent of unemployment among our youth and among middle aged workers." In short: take a census. The government should easily comply with this demand as this is census year. Cut a notch in the Council's belt. The victory is already won.

But what then? "... provide jobs for the unemployed in private industry." Noble thought. But how, when in the words of the Council "... there are not enough jobs to go around?"

"We demand," the Executive Council whispers meekly after Tom Dewey and Senator Vandenberg, that those in authority take whatever steps may be necessary to restore business confidence. We urge that all government actions that tend to discourage business expansion cease..."

Yes, yes, we heard that before. The Republican National Committee, the National Manufacturers Ass'n, the American Chamber of Commerce has been dining that tune in our ears for a decade. But what about the unemployed, the jobs, the idle factories? "... we urge Congress to create a national advisory council on unemployment which would have representatives of government, business, labor and consumers. Such a council could bring about unity of purpose and unity of action on a constructive program."

But suppose the members of the council couldn't agree among themselves? Suppose labor is voted down by "business" and "government"? Suppose labor doesn't like the program? Suppose there is a lot of speeches and no program? Ah, well! A fine effort but perhaps the times are not auspicious for "unity of action" and "unity of purpose." Fatience! There is something positive. "Organized labor has

Women WPA Strikers Sentenced in Mpls.

(Continued from Page 1)

The judge summoned each defendant before him.

Labor Proud of Defendants

His observations were an unconscious tribute to the militancy and heroism of these women. This one, he said, still believed the arguments of the strike leaders were sound and convincing. That one believed herself to be persecuted. He couldn't see how a third could be so ladylike and yet so militant on the picket line.

When it came the turn of the Finnish woman Sigrid Asunma he commented that she was uncooperative. Skillfully bringing in the Soviet-Finnish war, Judge Joyce suggested that Mrs. Asunma must be glad she is living in the United States, not exposed to guns and bombs in her homeland. "Your boy, Archie, can march off every morning to Dunwoody school, he doesn't have to march to war."

The "better element" in the courtroom nodded approvingly. Mrs. Asunma stared unresponsively at the judge.

The courtroom, as usual, was packed with strike sympathizers. As Minnie Kohn was taken to the workhouse, friends showered her with cigarettes and money.

Presidential Pardon Possible
The Workers Defense League on February 2 called upon Presi-

dent Roosevelt to pardon all the convicted strikers. It is believed that the Central Labor Union's WPA Defense Committee is also pressing along this line.

Some labor leaders estimated that President Roosevelt would seize the opportunity with both hands, in the hope such a gesture would enable him to represent himself as the genial friend of the unemployed. New Dealers in the union movement are banking on the President coming through with a pardon, believing that such an executive act will arm them with an argument to protect Roosevelt against the bitter criticisms of the thousands of unionists and unemployed and will aid them in their drive to merge the Farmer Labor Party with the Democratic Party.

Men Start Serving Terms

Fifteen of the men strikers sentenced last Saturday were taken from Minneapolis Thursday morning to Sandstone where they will serve periods of from 90 days to eight months. Ralph Core and Charles Connors, who received lighter sentences, remain here to serve their time in local penal institutions.

Tuesday in Washington the Senate appropriations subcommittee held a hearing on confirmation of Glatzback and Stolte, the two strike-breaking WPA officials promoted by President Roosevelt following the WPA strike of last July. Roosevelt promoted the pair after they had aided in crushing the strike here. At that time, Farmer-Labor Senator Ernest Lundeen, acting at the behest of the Minneapolis Central Labor Union, was able to block confirmation of the promotions in the United States Senate.

Early in January the President again sent their names to the Senate. The line-up on the Glatzback-Stolte case is quite revealing. Governor Stassen, Democratic Congressman Ryan, Colonel Harrington and Senator Shipstead, renegade Farmer-Laborite, are all siding with Roosevelt against the Minneapolis union movement and Senator Lundeen.

Robley Cramer, editor of the Minneapolis Labor Review, Central Labor Union organ, appeared before the Senate subcommittee Tuesday to deliver the Central Labor Union's protest against the two.

Governor Harold Stassen had written to Washington charging that "unsound left wing labor leaders who were back of the WPA strike are behind the present opposition to Glatzback."

"Followed President's Orders"
Colonel Harrington, in announcing his support of Glatzback, said the man only carried out the instructions of himself and President Roosevelt in keeping the WPA projects open with the aid of the police.

Democratic Representative Ryan repeated Republican Stassen's charge that Glatzback's nomination was being held up in the interests of "labor agitators and radicals in Minneapolis in order to bring their political will to bear on the politics and personnel of WPA in Minnesota... Glatzback only stood by President Roosevelt's policy that WPA workers can't strike against the government."

Senator Shipstead, to whom the WPA Defense Committee had mailed a copy of Glatzback's strike-breaking record urging the senator to oppose his appointment, had the gall to say: "I have heard of no complaint against Glatzback. I think his nomination should be confirmed." The senate sub-committee waved aside the objections of organized labor and confirmed the two appointments. However, Farmer-Labor Senator Lundeen has announced he will take the floor in the senate next week to oppose the committee's report.

A Good Lesson

New Deal followers in the labor movement find themselves in a horribly embarrassing position in the case of Glatzback-Stolte.

Now this false policy and estimate has led them to the end of the road, where they find Glatzback and Stolte still supported by President Roosevelt, Colonel Harrington, Congressman Ryan, and Governor Stassen. The situation may be a bit amusing, to those who always understood Roosevelt's true role in initiating and supporting the attacks on the unemployed. But more important, the situation provides another air-tight argument for labor to ruthlessly reject both old boss parties and strike out on the road of an independent labor party.



Red Sundays are a sure-fire proposition for increasing sales of the Socialist Appeal. This isn't agitation—it's the gospel truth. Boston proved it to the hilt. Since they started on Red Sundays, they've increased their bundle order by 100 copies per issue.

Why can't every branch follow the example of Boston? Not a reason except that there is too much of that social democratic disease, — "it-can't-be-done-itis." That's what we think when a branch asks us to cut its bundle order because the weather is too cold. What an alibi! Would you say that to a group of striking workers as your alibi for not showing up on the picket line? Not if you had an ounce of rebel blood in your veins!

Can your attitude to the Appeal be any different than your attitude to striking workers? You answer that question for yourself. If the branches that have cut their bundles think it should be different, send us your reasons and we'll print it in big bold letters.

There are a thousand ways to sell the Appeal if it's too cold to sell it on street corners. Here are the contents of an attractive leaflet issued by the N.Y. Lower East Side Branch to the "Laundry Workers of the East Side":

"This is a free introductory copy of the Socialist Appeal, a working class newspaper. 'In it you will find the story behind the headlines—the news that the boss press doesn't dare to give—the news that's 'not fit to print.'"

"This week it contains a story on the laundry industry which will be of interest to you."

"Every week it contains stories direct from the picket lines and the fields of labor's struggles. It exposes the drive of America's Wall Street masters to take us into the Second World War."

"Read about labor's fight for better conditions, political rights and against war every week in the Socialist Appeal. 'Send us news of your shop and your union—your grievances and your victories. We will print it.'"

Action Needed to Win 30-Hr. Week at General Motors

(Continued from Page 1)
will come from locals of the UAW.

Strikes of a major character have been narrowly averted in every Flint plant, several times during the last few months. The corporation has been forced to recognize the CIO Committee as bargaining agents and representatives of the men, by local militancy.

Should the seething discontent of the ranks manage to break through at some point, in some important GM plant... the days of 1937 will be relived: the Spirit

"Our salesmen will be in front of your shop every Tuesday and Friday. Read the Socialist Appeal—five cents a copy."

Why should there be any drop in circulation when there are thousands and thousands of shops and factories throughout the country which have never seen a Socialist Appeal? Why?

We've received the following letter from a ship's delegate, from a ship in the Gulf:

"Enclosed find m.o. of \$1.00 for a six-month subscription to the Socialist Appeal. We subscribe to a good number of working class papers and at our last ship meeting your paper was added to our list upon a recommendation from C.W. at San Francisco who stated it was 'the foremost working class paper in the country'. Well, we may not agree with him but we are always willing to hear, read other workers' arguments."

We're sure that the Appeal will live up to the recommendation of the San Francisco worker. And we'll be glad to print any criticisms or comments our seamen friends may have on the paper. Meanwhile, how about our comrades, friends and sympathizers who are sailing the seas, following the example of the ship's delegate on the Gulf? Make this your motto: An Appeal subscription on every ship!

We don't like to print this record. But it's true. The only way we can change the copy is by you changing the facts. Appeal subs for the last two weeks:

Los Angeles	2
Philadelphia	2
San Francisco	1
Chicago	3
Boston	3
Kansas	1
Washington, D.C.	1
New York City	5
Akron	1
St. Louis	1
Youngstown	1
Toledo	2
Berkeley	1
Total	24

WORKERS JAILED AT JAMAICA RELIEF BUREAU

(Continued from Page 1)
off to the Jamaica Station House where they were booked.

Won't Feed Children

Bruno and his wife, Angelina, are the parents of six children. They applied for relief at the beginning of January and have been given a run-around by the Bureau ever since.

The Bureau refused to consider the case, unless the Brunos sold an old 1930 Chevrolet car they bought several years ago second hand.

Mrs. Bruno did as she was ordered, getting \$12 for the car. Now the Brunos and their children are still denied any relief and faced with an immediate eviction notice.

Others Arrested

Also arrested was Richard Hicks of 106-28 Union Hill Street, a life-long resident of Jamaica. Hicks is 63 years old, absolutely destitute and applied for relief two months ago. He is still being refused relief while the Bureau attempts to force him to live on his relatives.

Also arrested was Giuseppe Pace, a sick and penniless 64 year old shoemaker. Pace, a skilled worker, used to make shoes for the rich, costing \$25-30 a pair. Now he cannot get any work, the rich, through their agents in the Bureau, deny him even money for

food or medicine.

Also arrested was Massimo Di Bernardo, 49 years old, of 117-58 140th Street, Jamaica. He is unemployed, and has to support himself, wife and fourteen children. Two of his older children work, thereby providing for the family income \$16 a week between them. The Bureau is attempting to make this family of sixteen human beings, live, pay their rent, eat, and buy clothing upon the pitiful sum brought in by the two youngsters.

Support for these workers and leadership in their struggle for relief was given by the Unemployed and Relief Workers League 151-06 Beaver Road, Jamaica. Arrested at the Bureau in sympathy with the demonstrators were David Cowles, Organizer of the League, Harry Harrison, Chairman of the Grievance Committee, Gabriel Strouthos, Alfred Lynn, Gustave Galanos, Chris Andrews, and Anna Key.

"Disorderly Conduct" Charge

In the Brooklyn Night court, Magistrate Matthew Troy denounced threateningly "subversive elements" and "organized mobs" but was persuaded to release all defendants in custody of their lawyer. They will be tried in Queens Court Thursday morning for "disorderly conduct."

The Long Island Daily Press lied about the defendants in its account of the story. It attempted to cover up the brutality of the treatment given these workers by reporting that they were seeking a "larger relief allowance." The bitter truth is that the Relief Bureau has denied to all these unfortunates any relief whatsoever.

February New INTERNATIONAL

featuring

RUSSIAN QUESTION

Again and Once More Again on the
Nature of the U.S.S.R.

LEON TROTSKY

The Invasion of Finland, Editorial
Speech on the Russian Question,
James P. Cannon

also

Dialectical Materialism and Science
by Leon Trotsky

Twenty cents per copy; fourteen cents in bundles of
five or more.

NEW INTERNATIONAL

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK, N. Y.

Sensational Offer!!

(for month of February)

THE CASE OF LEON TROTSKY, single copy	\$.25
LIVING THOUGHTS OF MARX, single copy	.85
FASCISM and BIG BUSINESS, single copy	.75
WORLD REVOLUTION by CLR James, single copy	1.50
THE FOUR IN COMBINATION FOR	\$2.50
SPEECH by LEON TROTSKY—In English	\$6.00
A recording on two double-faced discs.	

IN COMBINATION

WITH THE FOUR BOOKS LISTED ABOVE . . . \$7.50

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK, N. Y.

The Negro Question

By J. R. JOHNSON

The United Mine Workers condemned the Scottsboro frame-up as an attack against the entire Negro race and recommended support of federal anti-lynching legislation to pave the way for extending the benefits of democracy to Negro workers.

The United Mine Workers have had it not a perfect—we live in a capitalist world—a long and honorable history in its dealings with Negroes. Both white and black workers need to study its history closely. Just after the failure of the 1919 strike the miners in the northern fields of West Virginia, making a drive for unionization, recognized that their only hope was the success of their brothers in the southern part of the state, who were then under heavy attack by the coal-owners. They formed an armed group of 8000 men, of whom 200 were Negroes, and marched upon the southern counties. The federal government interfered and stopped the march. But the unity in action, as a class, of these black and white workers is comparable to the tremendous class solidarity displayed by the black and white workers in the Chicago race riots of 1919. There were lynchings and race riots in 1919. But in that period of labor upheaval the militant workers of both races were getting closer together, foreshadowing the mass movement into the CIO, the greatest step forward the Negroes have made in this country since the abolition of slavery three-quarters of a century ago.

Negroes Early Played a Role

The UMW, from its beginning in 1890, encouraged Negroes to join. In northern West Virginia, Ohio, and western Pennsylvania, Negro miners held offices such as president and secretary, although greatly outnumbered by whites. Often the solitary Negro member of a local was president or secretary, this because he could speak and write English at a time when many of the foreign born could not.

In 1900, in the Flat Top Coal Fields, there were about 18,000 miners, 9000 white and 9000 black, all members of the union. In 1920 there were 25,000 Negro members of the UMW, though by 1927 the number had dropped to 5000. When Lewis began the drive for the CIO, the traditions and experience of the UMW in the Negro field were powerful factors in helping to bring the Negroes in. Today it is estimated that there are 80,000 Negroes in the UMW. In 1937 George Schuyler of the Pittsburgh Courier wrote that in Local 12068 of the United Mine Workers there were only four or five Negroes out of 68 members and yet all the officers were colored.

After a year and a half of work in the Alabama fields 23,000 miners were organized, about 14,000 of them Negroes. Whites and Negroes met in mixed meetings. Officers and committees were chosen equally from both races. The white usually had the more important places but this was due to the influence of the social system in the South. It would be easy to show that all has not been perfect in the relations between the races in the union. But one old Negro miner, a miner for 33 years, a union member for 25 and secretary of Local 2950, has said that "The United Mine Workers of America has done more to remove hatred and prejudice in the labor movement and to restore harmony and good will between man and man than any other agency in the country."

At the Columbus convention there were six official bands, one of which was the Logan County Band, composed of Negro high school boys and girls from Logan County, West Virginia. Lewis, pursuing his political maneuvers with Senator Wheeler, included the band among those who went to meet the Senator at the railway station and accompanied him to his hotel. Lewis stated that he specially wanted to honor the band, each member of which was a son or a daughter of a member of the UMW. Their expenses had been paid by the local unions in Logan County.

At the convention an important speech was made by William Dickerson, of Barkley, West Virginia. He asked for support to the passage of a Federal Mine Inspection bill to prevent such disasters as took place in Barkley on January 10, when 91 men were lost, 16 of them Negroes. Dickerson was a member of the rescue squad. Dickerson is a young man of 25, graduate of West Virginia State College. He studied business administration but was unable to find any opening. He went to work in the mines, identified himself with the working class and was soon elected recording secretary of Local 6420. In this lodge there are 480 members, of whom 25 only are Negroes.

Why There's Unity in West. Va.

Now what is the underlying cause of all this? Nothing less than the geographical construction of West Virginia. Yes, the geographical construction of West Virginia. Before the Civil War the states of Virginia and West Virginia were one. Eastern Virginia consisted of the rich flat plains, on which flourished the cotton plantation system. In the West, the highlands, the population consisted of small farmers who had no slaves and were oppressed by the rich Bourbons of the lowlands.

In 1861 the slave owners naturally went with the South. The farmers of West Virginia saw their chance, refused to go with them, organized a separate state, and fought with the North. White men all, they took sides not according to race but on account of their economic interests and the social and political ideas which flowed from them. Since that time the two states have had a steadily divergent history in regard to their attitude to Negroes. The hard life, the equalizing conditions of labor in the mines, have forged a unity, one of the most powerful in the never-ceasing battle against race prejudice in America.

When the fight for the CIO came, the UMW took the lead and has accomplished work of outstanding importance in the history of labor and of Negro labor in particular. Their support of the anti-lynching bill is a great gesture of solidarity to the Negro people. But it is more than that. It shows us that, along with our fight for the bill in Congress we must never lose sight of our main aim, the creation of such conditions as would enable whites and Negroes to work together in conditions from which will flow social and political equality. Those conditions are what we call the socialist society.

ON THE WAR IN FINLAND

Why We Should Defend the Soviet Union

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

Since its birth our party has stood for the unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against the capitalist world. And for many years before the existence of the Socialist Workers' Party, the Trotskyists considered that idea as absolutely essential to their program.

Our policy of unconditional defense is based on the fact that nationalized property constitutes the foundation of the Soviet state and for us nationalized property is a tremendous step forward in the development of mankind. Marxists considered the development of the productive forces as the basic criterion of progress. That the destruction of capitalism in its period of decay and the substitution of nationalized industry permits the productive forces to develop at a remarkable rate has been proved by the great industrial growth that has taken place in the Soviet Union, and this in spite of the Stalinist leadership. The unconditional defense of the Soviet Union means the unconditional defense of nationalized property against the capitalist world.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN STALIN AND U.S.S.R.

Through all the years that we have been insisting on the necessity of defending the Soviet Union unconditionally against imperialism we have been the most consistent and implacable opponents of the Stalinist regime, from the revolutionary point of view. Every important policy pursued by Stalin we attacked; but we never swerved from our policy of unconditional defense of the Soviet Union. Some people thought we were inconsistent; but they failed to understand that we make a fundamental distinction between the Stalinist bureaucracy and the Soviet Union as a "complex of social institutions" based upon the October Revolution. Just as a revolutionary worker makes a distinction between his trade union and its reactionary leadership.

Unconditional defense has never meant and could not possibly have meant that we support the Red Army in every engagement into which Stalin sees fit to lead it. If that army were to be used against workers in the Soviet Union who were striking for better conditions or struggling to overthrow the bureaucracy, we would naturally do our utmost to demoralize and defeat the army.

If the Red Army were to be used against the Ukrainian workers attempting to establish an independent Soviet Ukraine, we would fight against that Red Army.

When part of that Red Army, the G.P.U., was used in Spain to suppress the Spanish revolutionaries, we were in favor of exterminating that section of the Red Army.

It is only when the Red Army is fighting a capitalist enemy and thus protecting the Soviet Union from that enemy that we favor and work for the victory of the Red Army. Unconditional defense against imperialism means exactly what it says: whenever and wherever the Soviet Union is involved in any struggle against a capitalist enemy we are for the defense of the Soviet Union, regardless of the causes or circumstances that led to the war.

BUREAUCRACY AND NATIONALIZED PROPERTY

Is the Stalinist bureaucracy interested in defending nationalized property? It is a bureaucracy of the degenerated workers' state based on nationalized property, and the interests of that bureaucracy are bound up with the nationalized property, which it must defend in order to preserve its existence. Green and Lewis are "labor lieutenants of capitalism" in the ranks of labor; but they are compelled to defend the trade unions against the bosses because their very existence depends on the existence and strength of the trade unions.

It is undoubtedly true that neither the Stalinist bureaucracy nor the bureaucracies led by Green or Lewis defend the interests of the workers and their institutions effectively. Their policies weaken those institutions. But that is a reason why the workers should get rid of them, and not an argument for refusing to defend the workers' state or the trade unions.

A principle that our party has taught and shall continue to teach is that the workers must never turn over the task of removing the Stalinist bureaucracy to the capitalist enemy. They must reserve that privilege and duty for themselves because the destruction of the Stalinist bureaucracy by the capitalist enemy can lead to nothing but reactionary results.

It is only necessary to analyze

the war between the Soviet Union and Finland in the light of the general principles mentioned above and in the first article of this series, in order to arrive at a correct conclusion as to the policy which a class-conscious worker should follow. In other words, it is necessary to ask if the slogan of unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against the capitalist or imperialist world is applicable to the war in Finland.

WHO WAS "AGGRESSOR" DOESN'T DECIDE QUESTION

In the first instance it is essential to exclude the factor of who first attacked whom. The fact that in 1914 Germany began the actual hostilities by launching an attack on Belgium was a matter of indifference to Lenin in arriving at his conclusion that the war was an imperialist war and that it was necessary for the workers in both imperialist camps to follow the policy of revolutionary defeatism. The fact that Germany attacked Poland could not possibly lead any revolutionary Marxist to urge the workers to defend the reactionary Polish state. For Marxists the character of a war "is determined not by the initial episode taken by itself but by the main moving forces of the war, by its whole development and by the conse-

quences to which it finally leads". This is what the thesis of the Fourth International states and the statement can not be challenged successfully. Not the violation of neutrality or threats or an invasion by any particular country but the underlying economic and social factors and the probable consequences of the war should determine our attitude to it.

This does not mean that we condone the invasion of Finland by Stalin. I shall deal with this crime later. But in determining our attitude while the struggle is actually going on that factor is not the determining factor.

FINLAND AN OUTPOST OF IMPERIALISM

Once more we remind the reader that Finland was born as a result of a victory of the counter-revolution led by Mannerheim and supported first by the German and then by the Allied imperialists. It is this state which is at war with the Soviet Union. Simpletons of the Socialist Party and lackeys of the capitalists in the Social Democratic Federation will point to the fact that representatives of labor and the farmers are in the Finnish government. But Marxists understand that the real rulers of the country are the capitalists and landlords, and these are inextricably tied up with the imperialist world. Finland is a buffer state, an outpost of imperialism, and its struggle against the Soviet Union is, in the last analysis, a struggle of the imperialist world against the Soviet Union.

To convince oneself of that simple fact, it is only necessary to consider the reaction of the capitalist world to the invasion of Finland. It is certain that even in Germany the sympathy of the ruling class is entirely with Finland but this sympathy is muted for the present because Hitler needs Stalin's support. In the whole capitalist world, outside of Germany, all the "democrats", including the Pope, Franco and Mussolini, have not hesitated to show on whose side their sympathies lie and this fact alone should almost be sufficient by itself to indicate to a class-conscious worker that he should be on the opposite side.

When Hitler invaded Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the other imperialists grumbled a little because a rival of theirs had the nerve to do things in such a high-handed fashion. When Ethiopia was invaded by Mussolini there was also a tempest in a tea pot. But when Stalin invaded Finland the reaction was altogether different. For the simple reason that in a struggle between the

Soviet Union and any part of the imperialist world, imperialism as a whole feels threatened.

The League of Nations, dead as a dodo under ordinary circumstances, suddenly revived and expelled the Soviet Union in one day. The Spanish fascist press, echoing the Pope, called for a Christian army to fight the Soviet Union. The humanitarian, Herbert Hoover, took the lead in defending the "democracy" of Mannerheim. Roosevelt, who was responsible for the embargo against Loyalist Spain in its life and death struggle against Franco, is assuming the leadership in the movement to help the Finnish capitalist army defeat the Soviet Union.

IMPERIALISTS SEEK THE DEFEAT OF THE USSR

Conditions are such as to make inadvisable, at the present moment, an open declaration of war against the Soviet Union by France and England. Bolder imperialist voices in those countries are demanding just that; but more cautious counsel may continue to prevail. Nevertheless, the passing of every day, it is becoming more clearly recognized that the Finnish-Soviet struggle is one of the fronts of the war, in fact today the only active front. Daladier and Chamberlain have stated openly that much more help has been sent to Finland than the average citizen is aware of and that still more aid will be forthcoming.

And is there any revolutionary worker naive enough to believe that Chamberlain and Daladier are interested in saving democracy, Finnish or otherwise? Can there be the slightest doubt that the imperialist world looks upon Finland as its protagonist?

No matter what the results of the Finnish-Soviet war may be—whether Stalin succeeds in his designs (as seems more probable) or gives up his attempt to conquer Finland; whether the Allies will openly declare war on the Soviet Union or will refrain from doing that; or whether a peace can be patched up between Hitler and the Allied imperialists and a combined attack made upon the Soviet Union—no matter what may develop in the near future, it is certain that right now the struggle in Finland is essentially the beginning of a struggle of the imperialist world against the Soviet Union.

Let the revolutionary worker ask himself: what would be the reaction of the imperialists to a defeat of the Red Army by the Finnish capitalist army? Would not the counter revolutionaries the world over, including those still living in the Soviet Union, be overjoyed?

A class-conscious worker can be fairly certain that what will bring joy to the imperialists, to the Hoovers, Roosevelts, Chamberlains and Daladiers, has nothing in it that is good for the workers.

The only conclusion that the class-conscious worker can possibly reach is that, as between the Red Army connected with and, in its own way, defending the Soviet Union based on nationalized property, and the Finnish capitalist army connected with and representing the imperialist world, he must favor and work for the victory of the Red Army. Analyzing all the factors involved, the slogan of unconditional defense of the Soviet Union is applicable in the present struggle in Finland.

That is the conclusion that the Socialist Workers Party has arrived at, and that is the conclusion that every revolutionary worker who follows the principles of revolutionary Marxism will recognize as correct.

But the defense of the Stalinist-controlled Soviet Union requires different tactics from those followed in the days when the Soviet Union was led by Lenin and Trotsky. In the next article we shall consider and analyze exactly in what way revolutionary workers in the Soviet Union and in Finland should defend the degenerated workers' state.

ONE WEEK ONLY!

"History of the Russian Revolution" (three volumes in one) by LEON TROTSKY for only \$2.29 (regularly \$3.00)

Modern Bookshop 27 UNIVERSITY PLACE New York City

Big Business Backs Newark Manager Plan

(Continued from Page 1) words, they want an "efficiency expert" who will save money by taking it out of the hides of the people, thus making sure that the tax burden of the rich will be lowered.

Did It Elsewhere They want to carry out the same kind of policy in Newark that Big Business succeeded in carrying out in almost every other city where they installed the City Manager form. They want to put into effect what they put into effect in Trenton, Yonkers, Cincinnati, etc.

Incidentally, of course, they want to be able to get their share of the patronage, gravy and job control in Newark City Hall. Both the regular (Hague-Byrne) Democratic organization and the Clean Government Republicans (majority in Essex County) have practically no influence in City Hall, which is controlled chiefly by the Mayor Ellenstein (independent Democrat)-Public Works Commissioner Franklin (independent Republican) machines, together with Finance Director Murphy (State Secretary of the AFL). Unable in the past to shake these machines, they hope to get them out of the way by this maneuver.

Estimate of Incumbents The Socialist Workers Party has made it clear throughout the campaign that its opposition to the change in no way means support or defense of the men now in the saddle in City Hall.

The City Commission at present is made up of men who have not gone as far as Big Business would like to see them go, only because they can't put it over too bluntly without losing their support among the small business men and workers.

But, by themselves, they have gone pretty far. Franklin's man, Malady, the overseer of the poor, has already begun a widespread slash in the relief rolls which may go as high as 20%. The Commission has slashed hospital services in the last year, cut appropriations for the library, etc.

Most important of all, they are the ones who are responsible for the high tax rate which has enabled Big Business to get a strong following among the "small men." Last year, the Socialist Workers Party and other labor organizations put forward the only program to reduce the tax rate in a way that wouldn't hurt the "small man" and the worker. But Ellenstein-Franklin & Co. refused to accept it, because it would have meant a real fight against the big bonding houses and insurance companies. They preferred to take the easy way, the way that boosted the tax rate.

SWP Tax Program The Socialist Workers Party program on this point, which it is putting forward again this year, is briefly as follows:

1. Almost 1/4 of the \$40,000,000 in the city budget goes for debt services, the largest single item in the budget. That is, to pay for past bond issues, and to pay interest on bond issues.

We say: Let the banks and bonding houses go without some of that money this year! Call in

the city's bonds and refinance them at a lower interest rate, so that the bonding houses don't get so much interest! Declare a moratorium on debt services this year!

2. The assessments on property at the present time are aimed at the small businessmen and homeowners. This enables the real estate sharks to take over their property. At the same time the corporations and big businesses get their assessments reduced by \$100,000,000 in 1937. Murphy was willing, for example, to compromise for a half million dollars, the million dollar taxes owed by the N. J. Bell Telephone Co. We say: Reassess the property, raising the big business assessments, lowering the small man's assessments!

So the Socialist Workers Party declares that its opposition to the referendum is meant in no way as support of the present City Commission, but rather is made side by side with an unsparring criticism and attack on those now in the City Hall.

For A Labor Ticket

There can be graft and corruption under both forms of government. There can be high taxes and favoritism for the rich under both forms. There can be anti-labor legislation, there can be relief cuts, there can be library and hospital appropriation cuts under both forms—and there are.

What is important is the program that the officials represent. What is needed is labor candidates carrying out a strictly labor program, fighting against the bosses and their parties and machines in the interests of the workers.

The Socialist Workers Party calls on the workers of Newark to defeat the City Manager Plan, and to prepare to build a party of their own and run a straight labor ticket in their own interests.

The Socialist Workers Party has also announced that in the event the City Manager Plan is carried, it will immediately place in the field an independent workers ticket for City Council.

RUSSIAN BULLETIN OUT

The Bulletin of the Russian Opposition is out. The current issue contains several articles by Leon Trotsky including "Hitler and Stalin—Twin Stars" and "Again and Once Again on the Nature of the Soviet State."

The Bulletin is available in New York at the following book stores and newsstands: Modern Book Store, 27 University Pl.; Foreign News Depot, Times Sq. Bldg.; Biederman's Book Store, 2nd Ave. at 12th St.; Meisel's Book Store, Grand St.; Rand School Book Store, 15th St. and 5th Ave.; 3rd Ave. and 14th St. (NW); 6th Ave. and 42nd St. (SE).

NEW YORK PARTY MEMBERS, Attention!

There will be an important Party membership meeting on SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 18, at 8 P. M. sharp, at GERMANIA HALL, 160 3rd Ave. (near 16th St.), New York City. Admission for Party and YPSL members by card only.

C.I.O. LEADER AGAIN LASHES OUT AT F.D.R.

(Continued from Page 1) any politicians or any statesmen who undertake to involve this country in a war in Europe or a war in the Pacific.

Lewis' speech was, indeed, so definite an accounting of the Roosevelt regime that the question inevitably posed itself on Lewis' lips and was uttered by him:

"Well, why not do something about it?"

But He Gave None

His effectiveness in answering Roosevelt almost evaporated after he had asked that question. For to that key question Lewis had posed himself, he gave a faltering answer. After his dramatic description of the plight of the unemployed as "America's No. 1 problem" he proposed . . . "a family conference," such as he had already proposed at the UMW convention, of industrialists, financiers, government and labor.

The answer to this conference proposal was given by Lewis himself when he said, in this same speech answering Roosevelt:

"Isn't it now apparent that the politicians' answers are not going to get you a job unless you force the politicians to get you a job? You know, after all, you young people of this country, labor, the common people, are only going to get that degree of consideration from the politicians and from our public representatives that you force them to give you, by your organization, by your work, by your crystallized articulate voices and by the fact that you expect to fight for your rights as Americans."

Two different and mutually contradictory elements were mixed in that speech of Lewis, like two geological layers mixed together but representing two entirely different epochs of history—one, Lewis' position of these past years as a "left wing" of the Democratic party, the other, Lewis' voicing of the anguished demands of the masses at this stage of the permanent economic crisis.

It is significant that this speech was at least as sharp as his statement at the UMW convention, thereby committing Lewis still further to a fight against Roosevelt. Undoubtedly Lewis still wants to settle the issue within the confines of the Democratic party. But with each enthusiastic response of the workers to these statements, it becomes more difficult for Lewis to retreat. Thereby the road opens toward really independent labor political action.

ANNOUNCEMENT DOWNTOWN LABOR CENTER presents A NIGHT OF RED STARS. Professional Entertainment including dramatic skit, a group dance recital, chorus and Red folksong recordings on FEBRUARY 17. Dance Music, Refreshments. 51 East 7 Street Adm. 25c

The American Youth Congress--A Masquerade

It Was Packed With Dubious "Organizations" To Make Up An Imposing Body of "Delegates"

By ERNEST ERBER Here are a few of the pertinent facts and highlights of the February 9-12 "National Citizenship Institute" of the American Youth Congress:

1. REPRESENTATION: Some 4,600 "delegates" registered who, the AYC leaders claimed, represented over four million young people. About a thousand or so were delegates from various bona-fide national and local organizations in which members of the Young Communist League are active. Among these organizations were Stalinist-dominated AFL and CIO locals, Industrial Girls Clubs and Business and Professional Women's Clubs of the Young Women's Christian Association. Then there were delegates from the Stalinist peripheral organizations: American Student Union, youth sections of the Workers Alliance, the International Workers Order, the International Labor Defense, the Finnish Workers Federation, Armenian Workers Federation, etc. Then came delegates from hundreds of organizations with dubious names like the Modern Youth Group, the Williamsburg Youth Center, the Streamlined Dance Group, etc. In a word, the vast majority of the "delegates" were members or sympathizers of the Young Communist League.

2. PROCEDURE: The entire two-day "Institute" was controlled by the top leadership of the AYC with a firm hand. Neither speakers nor resolutions were permitted from the floor. "Discussion" was organized by having delegates submit a slip of paper with their name and organization to the platform. A "Trotskyite" delegate had as much chance of getting by the committee on the platform as a snowball in hell. Ushers and police took care of anyone attempting to speak from the floor.

3. PRESIDENT'S SPEECH: The delegates paraded down Pennsylvania Avenue in a drizzling rain on Saturday morning, displaying banners with all the slogans which the Stalinists are currently stressing, "The Yanks Ain't Coming," "For the American Youth Act," "Not a Dime for Mannerheim," "Keep America Out of the Imperialist War," and so on.

The parade ended on the White House lawn, where arrangements had been made for an address by the President. The delegates waited for a half hour in a rain that had become a downpour to listen to Roosevelt denounce the Soviet Union as a dictatorship in no way different than any other and call for American support to Finland. The speech brought slight response from the delegates. At one point the crowd began to boo, and the radio operators were forced to cut out all microphones except those into which the President was speaking directly.

The thousands of YCLers were a sorry sight as they trudged back, wet, cold and miserable after Roosevelt's tongue-lashing.

4. THE LEWIS SPEECH: John L. Lewis decided to address the Congress only on the day before he spoke. Speaking to the delegates only some three hours after the President, Lewis' speech was greeted with thunderous ovations. The bitter sarcasm he poured upon the President's remarks appeared as vindication to the delegates for the abuse they had suffered in the morning.

5. TREATMENT OF AUBREY WILLIAMS: Coming right after Lewis' eventful speech, the speech of Aubrey Williams, director of the National Youth Administration, received scant attention from the press. Williams devoted the first part of his speech to the economic needs of youth and surpassed any of the invited speakers in the "radicalism" of his demands. He referred to the \$500,000,000 appropriation requested in the American Youth Act as "insufficient" and called for billions of dollars to finance a program to "re-house America" and "put youth to work at useful occupations." However, when, at the close of his remarks, he sought to justify his action of turning over the NYA lists to the Army Recruiting Office, he was greeted with such a storm of boos and hisses that it became impossible to continue his speech. He explained that he had nothing against militarism as such but that "militarism must be subordinated to democracy." This brought forth renewed booing from the young Stalinists, who, only a half year ago, printed articles in the "Young Communist Review" on the advantages of life in the U.S. Army.

6. MRS. ROOSEVELT'S SPEECH: Visibly nervous and tense, Mrs. Roosevelt answered a series of questions at the session on "The International Scene" on Sunday night. Her remarks were the climax to participation in the previous sessions and an active support to practical arrangements. Over a hundred delegates were put up at the White House, in addition to other hundreds that she provided with accommodations at the homes of Mrs. Cordell Hull and other wives of government officials, at army barracks and a girls school, and through negotiations with the hotel managers association to lower rates.

Mrs. Roosevelt grimly sat on the platform through speeches by Frederick "Blackie" Myers, Communist Party whip in the National Maritime Union, an Indian "nationalist" named Luis Perez of the "Brotherhood of Cuban Youth," and other speakers who followed the political form of the current "Daily Worker" attacks upon Roosevelt. After the first speaker of what the chairman announced would be a panel of five youths on the subject of "How the War Affects Me" had concluded with a continuation of the attacks upon Roosevelt as a war-monger, Mrs. Roosevelt, without waiting to be introduced, strode to the rostrum and prepared to speak. The chairman solved the situation by simply announcing, "I present, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt."

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. IV, NO. 7 SATURDAY, FEB. 17, 1940

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

Editors:

WELIX MORROW MAX SHACHTMAN

General Manager: Assistant Manager:
GEORGE CLARKE SHERMAN STANLEY

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

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

FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY 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—\$0-hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
5. Thirty dollar weekly old-age and disability pension.
6. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
7. All war funds to the unemployed.
8. A people's referendum on any and all wars.
9. No secret diplomacy.
10. An Independent Labor Party.
11. Workers' Defense Guards against vigilante and Fascist attacks.
12. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.

Leon Sedoff

Tomorrow will be the second anniversary of the death of Leon Sedoff. To this day the circumstances of his death remain a mystery. He had gone to the hospital for a comparatively minor operation. Then he was dead, under extremely suspicious circumstances. All efforts to find out what had happened ran up against the resistance of the "democratic" French government; it was then still in the hey-day of the Franco-Soviet pact.

As Ignace Reiss, before being murdered by the Stalinist GPU in Switzerland, had revealed, the GPU was out to murder Sedoff. They succeeded, we believe, and succeeded, thanks to their relations with the French government, in blocking any investigation of their crime.

Our youth movement remembers Sedoff particularly as their first great contribution to the adult movement. He was, indeed, still a young man—33 at death. His father, Leon Trotsky, has commemorated him in an unforgettable pamphlet. But Sedoff, with his own brain and heart, built the monument by which he will be best remembered: the *Bulletin of the Russian Opposition*. He edited it and wrote for it and saw to it that it hit its mark, reaching not only Russian-reading revolutionists throughout the world but penetrating also past the GPU into Stalin's domain. Leon Sedoff fought Stalin and paid for it with his life; but his work will put an end to Stalin and the darkness which Stalin spread over the land of the October Revolution.

The Irish Martyrs

The hanging of Peter Barnes and James Richards, soldiers for Irish freedom, has been followed by a new heightening of the struggle against the British overlords in Ireland, and that is as it should be. The best way to honor these Irish martyrs, and the long line of those who died as they did at the hands of British imperialist murderers, is to free Ireland.

The British imperialists are trying to smear the movement for Irish freedom as instigated by Hitler. The great Irish revolutionary socialist, Jim Connolly, answered the same kind of slander during the last war, with an immortal slogan: "Neither King Nor Kaiser," and hung it across the Transport Workers Hall in Dublin. We can not think of an equally perfect slogan; but the thought, "Neither Chamberlain nor Hitler," is clearly a part of the real revolutionary movement in Ireland today.

Still Going Down

To pick up from where we left off, last week, in our comments on the development of the new "recession":

The New York *Times* business index showed last week an acceleration of the decline of production, dropping from 103.1 to 101.5.

The index of *Time* magazine, which attempts to estimate long-range factors rather than the week's production, was down below the figure for the same time last year!

Steel operations for the week were scheduled at 68.8 per cent of capacity, the fifth consecutive decline of the year, a drop of 200 per cent of capacity during the five-week period.

We're headed for a deepening of the economic crisis. These jobs in private industry that Roosevelt promised on January 5, when he brought in the budget with WPA slashes and PWA wiped out, haven't come into existence. Instead, more men are being fired each week.

And the same Democratic and Republican congressmen who are bent on passing Roosevelt's starvation budget, have the gall to appropriate money for "poor little Finland"!

Fascist Cops

After Mayor La Guardia had indignantly denied a number of times during the past year the persistent report that a large number of New York policemen were members of Coughlin's fascist Christian Front, pressure finally made it necessary to investigate. Police Commissioner Valentine ordered each policeman to fill out a questionnaire. New York papers carried on Tuesday "unofficial and incomplete returns": at least 1,000 of the 19,000 men in the Police Department were self-admitted members of the Christian Front. And for every one that admitted it, how many were members but didn't admit it? And for every member, how many were sympathizers of the fascist storm troops?

Yet, we are told, in the struggle between fascism and the labor movement, we should look for protection to . . . these policemen!

The labor movement will build its own Workers Defense Guards and smash the fascist gangs wherever they raise their heads—or it will go down under the boots of the storm troopers.

The Anti-Lynch Bill

(Statement of the National Committee,
Socialist Workers Party)

Once more the question of a federal anti-lynching law is before the Senate. The House of Representatives has already passed the bill and now the Senators from the South are prepared to filibuster it to death.

It is not because the bill in and of itself is so dangerous to the rule of the white aristocracy in the South that the southern Senators are determined to kill it. Its provisions are not so serious, even if enforced, to strike terror into the hearts of the lynchers and prevent all lynchings.

But the representatives of the southern ruling class, anxious to keep the Negroes under complete subjection, refuse to give up one particle of their "rights" to do everything and anything to the Negro masses. They are determined to retain those "rights" at all costs, including that of lynching the Negroes whenever they see fit.

An anti-lynching bill might constitute the first opening in the wall which the Southern ruling class has erected against any tampering with their right to exploit the Negro masses. Should this bill pass, Negroes might be encouraged to demand that they actually be given the right to vote, and that the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act be applied in the South as well as in the North. They might also demand the abolition of child labor in the South and the right to receive an elementary education. The southern ruling class fears anything that might improve the condition of the Negroes and consequently opposes any bill which may have that effect.

The Republicans and Democrats of the North have come out in favor of the anti-lynching bill. Every Negro and every white worker should understand that these Republicans and Democrats vote in favor of the bill only to use the Negroes as a political football and not actually to protect the Negro against the rule of the southern whites. If the northern Democrats and Republicans were really anxious to give the Negro his rights, they could find enough to do in the North.

The Socialist Workers Party is in favor of the enactment of the anti-lynching bill and calls upon all the workers, especially the white workers, to rally behind the movement in its favor. Workers should not depend upon the politicians; they should organize meetings, adopt resolutions in the unions, and flood every Senator with letters and telegrams, urging passage of the bill.

The Socialist Workers Party declares, however, that the problem of the Negro in the South will not be solved by the enactment of an anti-lynching law. There are no lynchings of Negroes in the North and yet the Negro continues to live under the most miserable conditions. The problems of the Negro workers, as well as of the white workers, will be solved only when they join in a common struggle against the white capitalist rulers of this country and when they succeed in taking over governmental power and establishing a socialist society which will guarantee equality and plenty for all, regardless of race or creed.

Until such a socialist society is established, the Negro and white workers should join in a struggle for every immediate gain. The anti-lynching bill represents a step forward. Organize to demand its passage!

In the World of Labor

By Paul G. Stevens

Purge in the Mexican Communist Party

The Mexican Communist Party is to hold an "extraordinary" convention next month. This convention is being called for the purpose of undertaking a thorough-going purge of the present leadership of the organization.

In the "theses" for the convention, entitled "The National and International Situation and the Tasks of the Party," we begin to get an inkling as to the why and wherefore of the purge. While the situation has been extremely favorable for growth, the "theses" say, it has not been taken advantage of "because of the sectarian-opportunist (sic) line of the leadership of the party which did not have sufficient vision to grasp the development of the revolutionary movement in our country and the possibilities of forming a mass party of the proletariat."

What is involved, obviously, is the sacrificing of a number of scapegoats in the leadership for carrying out the pro-"democratic" line which the Kremlin has now thrown overboard. From another paragraph in the document we are given the impression that this number is going to be quite large:

"Right now . . . there is proceeding a cleansing, from the top to the bottom, of our own ranks, eliminating from its midst all (underlined in the original) the wavering and alien elements from the party, who because of the false political line and the lack of revolutionary vigilance have infiltrated its ranks."

Among the leaders to be purged, we are informed, are Vicente Guerra, Arturo Ramirez and Manuel Lobato, all members of the Central Committee. Guerra was a member of the all-powerful secretariat and Lobato an alternate to it. Ramirez is the leader of the Mexico City district organization which forms the core of the party. They are charged with any number of crimes in the usual Stalinist fashion—from "facilitating and protecting the work of Trotskyist spies" inside the organization to making pacts with the Right Wing presidential candidate General Almazan. Even a group of free masons was allegedly under their wing. But their gravest crime, it seems, is an opportunist capitulation to President Cardenas.

Of all the charges made, the last one mentioned seems to be most significant. The contradictory character of the charges is quite in line with Stalinist practices and it is always necessary to wade through all the verbiage of these allegations and to sift them carefully for an indication of the real purpose. In this case it is quite apparent that all else outside of "capitulation to Cardenas" is just the usual dressing. In a pending break with Cardenas lies the essence of the purge.

Apparently, a large number of functionaries of the Mexican C.P. has been resisting the change of line in consideration of the rather comfortable positions that the backing of Cardenas and his pro-democratic orientation has afforded them. So that in reality, the convention will be a sort of a showdown between the pro-Cardenas and the pro-Moscow functionaries.

It is not excluded, however, that in the rank and file of the party a movement to break with Stalinism in a revolutionary direction may develop as a result of this situation.

Fruits of the "People's Front" in France

Among the lesser crimes of the "People's Front" in France was the Stalinist rehabilitation

of Leon Jouhaux, social patriotic leader of the General Confederation of Labor (C.G.T.) in the last war. Jouhaux was not only dressed up as a militant fighter but feasted as a staunch friend of Soviet Russia, in Moscow no less than in Paris.

But there is no gratitude in Jouhaux' heart at all. No sooner had the war broken out than he took up his old post as French imperialism's chief war-booster in the ranks of labor. Of course his C.G.T. denounced Soviet Russia and supports Daladier's campaign against it. That in itself is what was to be expected from the first. But the U.P.—and all other press agencies as well—is able to announce now that "the French General Confederation of Labor which for years has had a pronounced left wing tendency bitterly denounced Russia as well as Germany today."

The "pronounced left wing tendency"—that is the gilding of Jouhaux by Stalin's popular front policy. His denunciation of the Soviet Union is only the fruit of that policy.

German "Socialists" in the Service of Imperial France

We have become quite used to the abominable patriotic antics of the social democratic politicians of England, France, etc. They act no differently than they did in the last war. Only the German social democracy does not repeat its performance of 1914. But that is not through any change of heart on its part. Hitler has simply refused to give it a chance to do its part.

Somewhat ludicrously, the German social democrats do manage, nevertheless, to be true to color. They have remained social patriots—but are now on the side of the *Erfbeind*, the "hereditary foe" they helped fight in the last war. From France issues their miserable propaganda for a "socialism" that is to be introduced into Germany on the bayonets of French imperialism. In turn, they print at the masthead of their official organ, the "Neue Vorwaerts," an inscription in large type: *Journal Anti-Hitlerien*. Daladier's anti-Hitlerism, it appears, is just as acceptable to them as their "socialism" is to Daladier. They have become, to use the phrase of one of our German comrades, "social patriots in reverse."

But they are not alone in the ranks of "social patriots in reverse." Among them are to be found also the heroes of the centrist S.A.P. (German Labor Party), the erstwhile pride of the so-called "London Bureau" and—Willie Munzenberg, for a long time a pillar of German Stalinism and its foremost Trotsky-baiter.

Until long after the Moscow trials, Willie continued to condone every atrocity committed by the Kremlin butchers. It was only after Moscow cut off financial support and invited him for one of those visits which cost scores of other German Stalinists their lives, that Munzenberg became a violent anti-Stalinist. But Willie apparently knows how to make anti-Stalinism pay just as well as he knew in the old days how to work the Moscow racket. Now he publishes a paper in Paris called "Die Zukunft" (The Future), as the "organ of the Franco-German Union." It goes without saying that the paper's line is such as to gain only plaudits from the French general staff. Collaborators on it include half a dozen other German ex-Stalinists, old wheelhorses in the Munzenberg publishing schemes.

Business as usual, seems to be his slogan.

SPARKS IN THE NEWS

by Dwight Macdonald

Magistrates and Labor Laws

Among the states, New York is especially noted for its progressive labor legislation. In 1886 the first law regulating hours of work of New York women employees was passed. In the fifty-three years since then, largely because of the pressure of the workers themselves, a structure of labor laws has been slowly built up—laws limiting the hours of work of women and minors, laws providing for sanitary inspections of factories, laws providing for medical care and insurance benefits, at the boss's expense, in case of industrial disease and accidents.

The laws are fine—as far as they go, at least. But it appears that in New York City they are simply not enforced. The Consumers League of New York has issued a report entitled, *The City Magistrates and the Labor Laws*, which every trade union and labor organization should study. This covers all labor cases heard in the city's Magistrates' Courts over a period of three and a half years (January, 1934 through June, 1937).

Two out of every three of the employers who were brought into court charged with violation of the labor laws got off without any punishment whatsoever. The fines imposed on the remaining third averaged \$18. "In economic terms," the report notes, "this means that the profits accruing to violating employers were left virtually intact."

Why did two-thirds of the employers get off without even a fine? Was it because they were found not guilty by the magistrate? No, most of them were found guilty as charged. But they

paid no fine because they were let off with suspended sentences. One magistrate found guilty 46 employers in one session. He fined one of these \$20, two \$10, three \$5, and he let the remaining 40 off scot free with suspended sentences.

These are the same magistrates whose high salaries and political corruption have been a scandal for years, the same dispensers of "justice" who daily hand out heavy fines and jail sentences to strikers, pickets and left-wing demonstrators. It is time the unions did something about the perversion of justice in the city's Magistrates' Courts.

The First Step

As this is written, the War Deal's campaign to lend Federal funds to "poor little Finland" (what about "poor little WPA", now suffering aggression without any Mannerheim Line to fall back on?) seems to be on the verge of success in Congress. The liberal-isolationist bloc is meeting this first real test by—joining the enemy and whooping it up for war loans to Finland.

What is behind Roosevelt's Poor-Little-Finland line is bluntly expressed in the Kiplinger Washington News Letter for January 27: "Pressure for credits to Allies is increasing. Congress is sour on such credits now, but many sophisticated Congressmen privately admit that the move to expand Export-Import Bank and lend to Finland is a step towards some sort of financial aid to the Allies at some later period."

Poor Little Finland today means Poor Little British Empire tomorrow.

ANTI-WAR MEETING

How Close Are We to War?

Speakers:

JAMES P. CANNON

Nat'l Secretary, Socialist Workers Party

SARAH RICE

Former Yorkville C.P. leader

Friday Eve., February 16, 1940

AT 8 O'CLOCK

YORKVILLE CASINO

210 EAST 86th STREET, N. Y. C.

Admission: TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

Auspices: Local New York, S.W.P.

Their Government

by James Burnham

FDR Is Thinking Of Next November

It is a key principle of realistic political analysis that the foreign and domestic policies of governments are inseparably linked, that they are, in fact, for the most part simply two phases of the same policy. It could hardly be otherwise. The basic problem for each government is to run the state institutions, which it administers, in the interests of the ruling class of the given nation; to uphold against all enemies the social structure upon which the power of the ruling class rests. This problem confronts the government equally on the domestic and the international arena. Foreign policy (including war) is the attempt to solve this problem as it is posed externally, just as domestic policy is the attempt to solve the same problem internally.

Most liberals and reformists try to obscure the link between foreign and domestic policy. Up until recently some of them used to tell us that they "approved Roosevelt's New Deal" (his domestic policy) but disagreed with his "aggressive" foreign policy. Now many of them are reversing. They say that they object to his internal measures (cutting down of relief, drive against civil rights, prosecution of labor unions . . .) but are in accord with his "peace" and "neutrality" program in external affairs.

Social-patriotic support of wars is often founded upon a pretended separation between foreign and domestic policy. During peace, the social-patriot criticizes the government, even calls for ousting it and putting a labor government in its place. Internally, they admit, the government (Daladier's, for example!) run by bourgeois parties acts for the bankers and the industrialists, and against the masses of the people. But beyond the borders the government changes its spots: there it acts as the representative of "the entire nation." Consequently (as in France and England today) the social-patriotic parties vote unanimously for the government when it comes to prosecuting a war.

New Deal and War Deal

The general rule that foreign and domestic policies are linked applies, of course, to the Roosevelt government. Roosevelt was not a Dr. Jekyll when proposing New Deal laws to Congress and a Mr. Hyde when sending a note to Japan or intervening in Mexico. In both types of action, he proceeded from the same premise in the effort to solve the same problem.

The transition from New Deal to War Deal, which began in October, 1937, swung into high a year ago, and will be completed with the entry of the country directly into the war, can be understood as a shift in emphasis. During the New Deal the emphasis, the weighing, was on internal measures as the primary mechanism for solving the problems of American capitalism; the War Deal means the realization that the internal measures have failed, and the consequent shifting of relative emphasis to external measures.

The shift is symbolized by the difference in the way that Roosevelt is looked upon by most people. Until a year ago he appeared primarily as a national reformer on the home front. More and more he now figures as the bearer of the country's destiny on the international scene.

However, the linkage between domestic and foreign affairs does not stop merely because of the shift of emphasis. Major stress on external measures came about as a result of the breakdown of preceding internal measures; similarly the current external measures react upon the internal situation.

This is true for American society as a whole, and in relation to the government's basic problem of upholding capitalist rule. It is true also for Roosevelt's narrower problem as head of the governmental bureaucracy, as party politician and as an individual.

The enormous, swollen bureaucracy (Federal, State and local), the Democratic party and Roosevelt as a person have very important special interests of their own, in addition to and sometimes in conflict with the interests of the ruling class which they serve. Roosevelt knows that, just as formerly these special interests depended chiefly on the showing made internally, so now they depend first of all on the showing made externally. Roosevelt knows that his own political fate, and the fate of his wing of the Democratic party, and the jobs in the bureaucratic apparatus, are being decided by "foreign affairs."

I believe that this background must be kept in mind if we are to evaluate correctly many of the recent moves which Roosevelt has been making in foreign affairs—including his flirtations with the Vatican, the particular manner in which he has been handling the Soviet-Finnish war, and the junket of Sumner Welles.

If the war had not started, Roosevelt would, I think, have been washed up by now. He took an almost unalloyed beating from the regular Congress last year, and from the opposition wing of his own party. But the war put him back on his feet. His rating in the Gallup Poll made an unprecedented jump in September and October.

At first his advisers apparently thought that the United States would declare war within six or eight months, and that he and his followers would ride back into office as the only adequate war leaders. With the war developing as no one expected, they have become puzzled. Will they campaign, in the party convention and the election, on a "he kept us out of war" platform or with a "unite to win the war" slogan? They can keep both roads open provided (1) the war increases in seriousness and extent and (2) Roosevelt is made to seem the only man who can handle the war crisis, whether or not this country is formally a belligerent.

The first condition will take care of itself, without any pushing from Roosevelt. The fulfillment of the second is a congenial task for so accomplished a demagogue as Roosevelt. He and his publicity staff constantly reinforce the impression that he is indispensable; his war moves and his "peace moves" are alike presented with that twist.

Some of these moves, like the armament appropriations, the pressure on Japan, the drive in Latin America, the munitions sales to France and Britain, are altogether serious parts of the general war preparations and would be undertaken by any administration, Democratic or Republican. In the case of others (the overtures to the Vatican, the trip of Welles, and even the policy on Finland), we observe a great gap between the grandiose words and the insignificant actions. (With all the talk, Finland has got next to nothing that it needs from this country, and probably is never going to get much.) It is reasonable to suppose that in these latter moves, at least one of Roosevelt's eyes and maybe half of the other is on next summer's Chicago convention and November's election day to follow.