

We propose that the regular 1940 session of the Congress of the United States shall enact emergency legislation to put into immediate effect the following:

1. Appropriation of \$10,000,000,000 to provide, at once, jobs on housing and other public works projects for unemployed workers.
2. Amendment of the Wages and Hours Act to provide throughout private industry and public works a maximum work week of 30 hours and a minimum weekly pay of 30 dollars.
3. 30 dollar weekly old age and disability pensions.
4. Appropriation of \$3,000,000,000 to guarantee either maintenance at school or jobs for all youth.

Socialist Appeal

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

Vol. IV, No. 10

NEW YORK, N. Y., MARCH 9, 1940



FIVE (5) CENTS

14-STATE TEAMSTERS FIGHT BOSS FRAMEUP

Transit Men Denounce La Guardia Union-Busting

WARN THEY'LL FIGHT BAN ON STRIKE RIGHT

"Friend of Labor" Announces His Fink Plan

After weeks of stalling the union with promises, Mayor La Guardia has finally exposed his hand and openly announced his intention of destroying the Transport Workers Union of New York.

In a letter addressed jointly to Michael J. Quill, International President of the Transport Workers Union and John J. Donnelly, General Chairman of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Mayor stated that he would not honor the union contracts held by the union with the BMT and IRT transit systems, that the closed shop is to be done away with, that he will not recognize the union as spokesman and bargaining agent for its 27,000 members working on the two systems and, finally, that "the right to strike against the government is not and cannot be recognized."

In the December 30 issue of the *Socialist Appeal*, we warned that the demolition scheme of the La Guardia administration to raze the Second and Ninth Avenue elevated lines, which would throw some 3,000 members of the union out into the streets, was nothing but a step in a carefully planned campaign to destroy the union. We stated at that time: "It is plain as a pikestaff that the great 'friend of labor,' La Guardia, in collusion with the state officials

Behind the Lines

By GEORGE STERN

One of the factors making for American intervention in the war which has received least public notice is the effect on American foreign trade of the Anglo-French economic union.

This union has been made increasingly complete in the first six months of war through successive meetings and decisions of the Allied Supreme Council and trade and industrial representatives of both countries. Through a series of agreements on currency, tariffs, trade quotas, the French and British Empires have been joined into what is almost a single economic unit, with Britain, of course, the dominant party.

By the latest accord, signalized by decrees in London and Paris on Feb. 28, all wartime restrictions on trade between France and Britain and the French and British colonies were removed. Goods will move between the two empires without formalities, licenses, delays, or any of the red tape that now attends so much of strangled international trade. According to the Paris correspondent of the *Wall Street Journal* on Feb. 29, this system "ultimately may embrace certain British Dominions." The purpose, as described by this source, will be "that the two empires will be welded still further into one economic unit and that trade between the two will grow at the expense of business outside."

This is the real nub of the matter, this "business outside"—for this means mainly American business.

In another dispatch from Washington on the same day, the *Wall Street Journal* bluntly declared that "INCREASING EVIDENCES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CLOSED ECONOMY EMBRACING THE BRITISH AND

Bombay Workers Strike; Fight Against War Gains In India

Textile Operatives Again Take Lead In Struggle; Masses Pressing Congress Leaders to Take Early Action

By SHERMAN STANLEY

Again displaying their position as the vanguard of the Indian people, 135,000 textile workers of Bombay have declared a general strike, demanding a 25 per cent wage increase to make up for rising living costs since the beginning of the war.

These workers represent about 90 per cent of Bombay's textile mills and come from 45 different mills.

Meeting at Patna on March 1, the Executive Committee of the All-India National Congress has decided to prepare for the launching of a civil disobedience campaign against British imperialism. In a strongly worded resolution, nationalist India has openly disassociated itself from British rule and its war aims:

"Indian freedom cannot exist within the orbit of British imperialism, and dominion status or any other status within the imperial structure is wholly inapplicable to India."

The preamble of the resolution states that Great Britain is carrying on the war for imperialist purposes and that India cannot be a party to the war. It opposes the sending of Indian troops to parts of the British Empire for war purposes. The resolution concludes, "Nothing short of complete independence will be accepted by the Indians."

Final Action Postponed

Overriding the opposition of left-wing members of the Executive body, who demanded an immediate launching of the struggle for freedom, Gandhi succeeded in postponing final action until the plenary session of the Congress which is scheduled to convene at Ramgarh on March

hold in check the social forces of mass unemployment, hunger and unbelievable poverty. His latest move is undoubtedly aimed at stealing the thunder of his left-wing opponents, but such tactics have the dangerous habit of backfiring—that is, getting out of hand.

Gandhi well knows this. If he sees that a struggle is unavoidable at present, he will do all in his power to limit it, isolate it and take advantage of the distrust and demoralization that has resulted from six months of futile talks with the Viceroy.

Above all, Gandhi will endeavor to prevent a mass, revolutionary struggle in which the peasants will begin to take revolutionary measures by seizing and dividing up the land and the workers will begin to set up their democratic workers' control councils in the cities.

But one thing is certain. The first open, mass revolt against the World War and for peace is about to begin!

Hindu-Muslim unity can now be achieved on the battlefield of common action and struggle. The rallying cry of the Indian people is, "Forward to National Freedom," and "Long live the democratically-elected Constituent Assembly!"

ANTI-LYNCH BILL BACKED IN ST. PAUL

ST. PAUL, Minn.—The St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly, central labor body, approved at its last meeting the following resolution in support of the anti-lynching bill now before the Senate:

WHEREAS organized labor is continually faced with the threat to move industries into the South where coolie wages prevail, and

WHEREAS systematic terrorism has kept the workers of the South largely unorganized, and

WHEREAS lynching, an important part of this terrorism, has served to drive a wedge between the colored and white workers and to prevent either from bettering their conditions, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we, the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly, go on record as urging the passage of the Anti-Lynching Bill in the U. S. Senate, not only on the basis of protecting Constitutional human rights, but also with the hope that it will give some confidence and encouragement to the Negro workers and help break down the barriers that now stand in the way of a widespread union movement in the South."

Help Our Polish Comrades

Several weeks ago the *Socialist Appeal* published a letter detailing the desperate plight of our Polish comrades persecuted by both Nazis and Stalinists. Their escape to Y— has been little short of a miracle.

The response to the printed letter was most heartening. However, several weeks have passed and it is now necessary to make a further appeal. Enough money for only immediate needs was cabled to these heroic survivors. In order that life may be sustained, it is necessary to send another substantial sum. Copies of the original letter have been printed with stamps of various denominations attached to them. We feel sure that our friends will have no difficulty in the distribution and sale of these stamps.

SHOW YOUR SOLIDARITY with the cause of labor by immediately sending in your request for the letters.

THERE MUST BE NO DELAY! Life hangs upon your prompt action. Send your requests to American Labor Aid, 125 West 33rd Street, New York, N. Y.

OMAHA JOBLESS WIN OUSTER OF ADMINISTRATOR

Picket Six Weeks Against Vicious Policies

OMAHA, Neb., Feb. 28—After six solid weeks of day-and-night picketing of the courthouse, organized by the Federal Workers Section, the county board on Tuesday fired E. F. Magaret, county relief administrator notorious for his vicious starvation policies.

The county board voted 3-2 to oust the hated Magaret; even the two dissenters, the *Omaha World-Herald* records, "protested only mildly against the dismissal."

Seeking a face-saving formula to cover up the fact that the pressure of the organized unemployed forced Magaret's dismissal, the board said the county relief administrator was removed because it was feared his continuance in office would prevent the surplus commodity stamp plan from being introduced in Omaha. The truth, of course, is that the Federal Workers Section, backed by the General Drivers Union and the Central Labor Union, put so much heat on the board that it had to act as it did.

That labor pressure was indeed the reason for Magaret's removal is indicated by the fact that the commissioners immediately asked Jim Powell of the FWS: "Now will you get that picket line off?"

Is Only First Battle

The ouster of Magaret is just the first step in the fight for decent relief standards in this city. Getting Magaret thrown out of office is a great victory for the FWS and for all organized labor inasmuch as it was achieved by picketing in the face of Nebraska's infamous anti-picketing law, which has been under relentless attack by the General Drivers Union and by labor generally.

The prestige of the FWS has risen even higher since it has Magaret's scalp dangling in its belt. One third of the FWS membership is Negro.

"The Better Citizens"

Magaret's reaction to his ouster was typical: "It's the board's privilege. The better citizens of Omaha know what I have been trying to do."

All during his public life Magaret has drawn this distinction between the "better citizens" and the rest of the city. He has publicly admitted that he administered relief in such a way as to please the "better people."

In the 1938 strike of the General Drivers Union Local 554, Magaret played up to the "better people" like Al Gordon, despised owner of the fink Gordon Van & Storage Company, by telling relief applicants that if they wanted any relief they had better go scabbing on Local 554 by working at the Gordon Company. Gordon is Magaret's brother-in-law.

The fight for decent relief standards will be intensified in Omaha, FWS leaders stated today.

? Have You Seen?
the Special
Introductory
Subscription Offer
on Page 2

Unemployed Increase 10 p.c.

National unemployment rose 10.6 per cent in January. That terrible fact comes, not from radical or labor sources, but from the bosses' own statistics—those released last week by the National Industrial Conference Board.

The Board estimates the unemployed in January at over ten million.

But this accounts only for the plummet-like drop in production during January. The business index kept falling all the way through February also. Eight weeks of uninterrupted decline. Eight weeks of more workers tired and none hired.

That means that, even by boss figures, the unemployed army stands at about ELEVEN MILLION.

And the business index is still going down.

That's what has happened to those jobs that Roosevelt promised us, in his Jan. 4 budget speech, as justification for his slashing WPA and wiping out the PWA!

California Legislators Slash Relief Funds

Cut Weekly Allowance to \$2.60 For Next Twelve Weeks; 350,000 Affected

LOS ANGELES—After appropriating \$13,800,000 to feed the unemployed till June 1, the California Legislature recessed for ten weeks. \$13,800,000 divided among the present average of 350,000 relief clients, gives each person an average of \$2.60 a week for the next twelve weeks!

\$2.60 a week for those lucky enough to remain on the relief rolls! And absolutely nothing for those many thousands who are denied all assistance. THIS IS SACRAMENTO'S ANSWER TO CALIFORNIA'S HUNGRY!

The real meaning of this legislation has been quickly shown. Executive orders cut all relief checks 40%. Further orders curtain county - sponsored works projects, eliminate free lunches for undernourished children, abolish job placement services. These and other measures merely translate the lawmakers' aims into concrete terms of human misery.

The Assemblymen and State Senators claim that a recess is needed "to investigate the needs of the unemployed." As though the last ten years of starvation have not provided ample evidence of the needs of the unemployed! As though the report of the fact-finding Richards Commission, appointed by the Governor, is not available to every legislator! A report that condemns even the previous relief standards as giving "the family a mere subsistence diet and wretched shelter."

The lawmakers are not trying to discover how much relief the unemployed need—but how little they will accept. They do not wish to find out how many are in need of relief—but how many more can be cut off, without arousing overwhelming protest. They have not recessed to measure the number of unemployed in their districts, but to gauge the strength and ability of the unemployed to fight against starvation.

For only the fighting strength of the unemployed themselves will determine how much will be appropriated for relief.

It is true that Governor Olson and his supporters have asked for a larger appropriation—\$18,000,000 instead of \$13,800,000: about \$3.50 a week instead of \$2.60. But he is merely more sensitive to the pressure of the workers since he leaned so heavily on Labor's vote at the last election.

To avert the danger of independent action by the unemployed, the governor calls on them to leave the fight for adequate relief in his hands, to demonstrate only in his support, and against those whom he points out as the "real enemy." Then, with the unemployed safely corralled under his leadership, he dickers with the bankers for an appropriation that will keep the unemployed quiet, and yet avoid any further taxes on the wealthy.

Against this united front of Democrats and Republicans against the unemployed, the workers must present their own party—a Labor Party.

All trade unions, old age organizations, unemployed groups, workers, and farmers must unite in forming such a party, elect labor men to office, and oppose both the Democrats and Republicans and the capitalists behind them. They must unite on the basis of their own program; a labor program for labor's own interests against the bosses.

INTERSTATE GROUP, TOBIN MAP DEFENSE

Union Leaders Are Arrested In Sioux City

The 14-state North Central Area Committee of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters was convened in a special meeting with International President Daniel J. Tobin in Indianapolis, this Friday, to fight back against the latest employers' attempt to break a vital link in the teamsters' movement.

The meeting was called after the arrest, last week, of Howard Fouts, Ralph Johnson and Charles Cunningham, officers of Teamsters Local 383 of Sioux City, Iowa, on the fantastic charge of "kidnapping and holding for ransom."

Screaming extras, on the streets a few hours after the arrests, tried to scare Sioux City unionists with a statement by the authorities that the union leaders would not be released on bond because the maximum penalty for the offense was death by hanging.

Aimed At 350,000 Drivers

These arrests were only the latest of a long series of attacks, framed up, designed to smash the Sioux City teamsters' union and thereby break a link in the powerful chain of recently-organized teamsters in the 13-state area.

In the successful teamsters' struggle which culminated, in November, 1939, in the signing of a 13-state area agreement creating uniform conditions, a closed shop and substantial wage increases for 350,000 over-the-road drivers, the Sioux City drivers, were an important factor.

22-Week Strike

Resisting the over-the-road area agreement, trucking companies in Sioux City and Omaha locked out their men on Sept. 9, 1938. This strike, lasting over 22 weeks, became famous in the annals of the teamsters as the "Omaha strike." The unions won a general settlement on Feb. 8, 1939. But a minority of the employers in both Omaha and Sioux City refused to sign, and the strike was continued against them.

Since then most of them have signed up. But a few companies did not, and the strike is still on against them—and effectively. The struck companies are being variously subsidized not only by the local chambers of commerce and boss associations, but also by other groups in the North Central Area.

The important point is that the Omaha and Sioux City locals have had to fight many struggles, both directly against the bosses and against the authorities who are hand-in-glove with the area agreement and thus protect conditions throughout the North Central Area.

Some of the hardest blows of the employers' attack has been borne by the Sioux City local. Here, in this comparatively small city, located in a particularly reactionary farmers' area, the bosses hoped to find a weak link in the armor of the teamsters' movement.

Series of Police Frameups

The bosses' attacks have in the last year taken principally the form of police frameups against the officers of the union.

Last winter Howard Fouts and Ralph Johnson, Local 383 officers, were arrested on a charge of damaging a truck during the over-the-road strike, extradited and tried in a Sioux Falls, South Dakota court. A hand-picked anti-labor jury, composed of small businessmen and wealthy farmers, convicted them and they

(Continued on Page 2)

The Negro Question

By J. R. JOHNSON

The Republican Party has issued a statement on its policy for the election in 1940. It is not too early for the Negroes to begin a careful consideration of the programs and candidates at the coming election.

The Republican party for years masqueraded as the friend of the Negro. To quote Frederick Douglass' famous words, "The Republican Party is the deck and all else is the sea." People have claimed that the adherence of the Negro to this particular position for so many years is proof of the Negro's backwardness, stupidity, and ineptitude for politics. It was nothing of the kind. Here again the Negro has been vilely slandered.

Why Negroes Backed Republicans

After the Civil War, the Negroes, contrary to the general belief, flocked to the polls and lived an intense political life. Naturally they supported the Republican Party. The Republican party was the party of Lincoln; in it were revolutionary radicals like Thaddeus Stevens and Sumner who agitated for expropriation of the Southern landlords and "forty acres and a mule" for the Negroes.

Within their limits, the Republicans, anxious to crush their rivals, played a progressive role—small wonder that the Negroes voted for them. This they did in unusually large numbers.

Not that they were not tempted. In Virginia, for instance, the Southern landowners embraced the doctrine of Negro suffrage, and made an attempt to win the Negro vote. They posed as friends of the Negroes and in addition to promises they made threats: If the Negroes would not vote as their Southern employers wished, they swore to drive them from employment. This was a very real threat, carried out without mercy. But in those early days the Negroes would not be coerced. Some few Negroes were bribed, and even won elections against Republicans with the support of the Southerners. But the majority of the Negroes voted solidly for the Republican Party. In fact, far from being apathetic about politics, it was the political energy of the Negroes that drove the old Southern landowning class into suppressing the Negro vote at all costs.

In Virginia the whites outnumbered the Negroes. Soon after the Civil War they gained a political majority and controlled the government. They would not vote funds for public education and insisted on the full payment of the interest on a huge public debt. William Malone led a split from the government party and rallied the poor farmers and the middle-classes against the reactionaries. The Negroes voted in great numbers for Malone.

His party, the Readjusters, was returned with a majority and, backed by the middle classes, and the poor, white and black, Malone reduced the public debt and raised the appropriations for public education. The Southern landowners saw that this combination of the poorer classes, both black and white, meant death for them. They sought for the weakest link in the chain of their enemies and found it in the slogan against "Black Domination." With this slogan, and by intimidation and terror, they split the ranks of their enemies and regained power.

Active in Populist Movement

Near the end of the century, the Populist movement asserted itself. Once again the Negro farmers rallied to it. The reactionaries used the old tactics of "Black Domination" allied with violence. In vain the white farmers in the South protested that this new struggle had nothing to do with the conflicts of the Civil War. Once more their ranks were disrupted. It was then that in despair the poor and middle-class whites decided that to have the Negroes with them meant the ruin of their course and finally acquiesced in the exclusion of the Negroes from politics. Under the powerful pressure of legalized lynching, the Negroes gradually sank into political apathy.

The Southerners rallied round the Democratic Party. The Negroes, when they voted at all, were driven into the Republican camp. In the days when the Democrats were systematically excluding them from participation in politics, the Negro's only hope for salvation seemed the Republican Party. In many respects the Republican Party was indeed the dock, a very small and slippery deck it is true, but a drowning man catches at much less than the Republican Party, and the Negroes were drowning.

Broke with Republicans in 1932

With the coming of the New Deal, however, the Negroes sat up and took notice. A New Deal. If any group of people in this country need a New Deal the Negroes did! They rallied to Roosevelt in 1936 and carried consternation into the ranks of the Republicans. The Republican High Command appointed Dr. Bunche of Howard University to make a special investigation into the reasons for the desertion of the Negroes, though why they should have needed a special investigation to find out what everybody knew, passes ordinary comprehension. But the New Deal has failed. It is now a corpse. The Negroes have begun to realize that there is nothing in it for them. The result is the beginning of a swing back to the Republicans, as seen in a Philadelphia election some months ago.

Swing back to what, however? What have the Republicans to offer? In their new draft program, the Republicans make a strong plea for the Negro vote. What they offer we must examine closely. But this much is already clear. 1940 is a great turning point for the large masses of Negro voters. They know that the Republican Party has nothing to offer, and after eight years of the New Deal they are in as much misery as ever they were. They form one-third of the ten million unemployed in the country. Roosevelt slashes at WPA and relief. He says not a word about the Anti-Lynch Bill. It seems to be a case of either the Devil or the Deep Blue Sea.

But in 1940 there is a way out. There is no need to limit oneself to the reactionary Republicans or the hypocritical New Dealers. Why must the workers continually trail behind the bosses? What we want is a Labor Party, a party of the workers and the farmers, white and black. If we are to form it, however, we must start laying the basis for it now.

ON THE WAR IN FINLAND

Why We Should Defend the Soviet Union

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

The war being waged between France and England on the one hand and Germany on the other is an imperialist war. A great many people make that assertion without, however, understanding the real meaning of the term "imperialist". There are many who dump the Soviet Union into the class of imperialist countries and to prove this they point to the invasion of Poland and Finland. The net result of applying the term "imperialist" to the Soviet Union is to give the workers the idea that it is folly to defend the Soviet Union against imperialist countries because it too is an imperialist country.

When we say that Germany, England and France are fighting an imperialist war we mean something more than that the people who happen to be at the head of the government of those countries have bad motives. It is true that Hitler's aim is to destroy the British Empire and obtain the colonies that Britain now possesses. But it is important to understand that German industry needs these colonies in order to obtain raw materials, markets for its products, and for the investment of German capital.

Great Britain on the other hand wants to retain these colonies for the same reasons that Germany wants to get them. The ruling classes of both countries desire to exploit the hundreds of millions of colonial peoples. The same is true of the French ruling class.

Why? Because these countries are imperialist countries: their competitive capitalism has developed into monopoly capitalism; the banks (finance capitalism) have replaced industrial capitalism as the real power; every one of these countries needs colonies in which to invest their

surplus capital and sell their products.

If and when the United States enters into the war it will be an imperialist war on its part no matter how many times Roosevelt will assert that it is a war to save the world from fascism. The United States, being an imperialist nation, cannot wage a war that is not imperialist in character.

LENIN'S DEFINITION OF IMPERIALISM

Marxists have insisted on a very strict use of the term "imperialism"; especially since Lenin wrote his pamphlet on imperialism, in which he severely condemned everyone who did not use the term "imperialism" to characterize the latest stage in the development of capitalist nations. It should be used only to apply to the expansionist policy of finance capitalism.

There are of course many people who use the term "imperialist" to designate any kind of aggression, but they are not Marxists, although they might claim to be such.

When the Red Army, in the early days of the Soviet Union, invaded Georgia, the reactionary "socialists" set up a howl about "Bolshevik imperialism". At present every writer in the capitalist press, every liberal and every pseudo-socialist insists that the invasion of Finland by the Red Army is a sign of "red or Stalinist imperialism".

Marxists, however, will continue to ask: Is the Soviet Union a capitalist country? If not, then the term "imperialist" to characterize Stalin's invasions and policies is absolutely incorrect and can only result in confusing the masses and weakening their struggle against real imperialism.

Some radicals of various kinds and types insist that we can recognize the difference between the

economy existing in the Soviet Union and that of the capitalist countries and still use the term "imperialist" to describe Stalin's policies. They even attempt to justify the use of the term by stating that the aim of Stalin is to increase the "revenue, prestige and power" of the bureaucracy. This is undoubtedly true; but it can be pointed out to these people that the aim of every bureaucracy, including that of the trade unions is to gain "revenue, prestige and power". That, however, is hardly sufficient to transform the trade union bureaucrats into imperialists, unless one wants to use the term in such a broad sense as to make it meaningless.

In effect, they who shout about the imperialism of Stalin, whether they do or do not recognize any distinction between the economy in the Soviet Union and the economy in capitalist countries, are all against defending the Soviet Union not only in the present conflict with Finland but, it is safe to say, they will refuse to defend it in case England and France send their troops into Soviet territory.

IMPERIALISM IS THE MAIN ENEMY!

Calling the Soviet Union an imperialist country conceals the fact that the imperialism of France, Germany, England and the United States is the most reactionary phenomenon of modern society and the greatest enemy of the working class and of mankind in general. It is the imperialism of the capitalist countries that causes wars, exploits hundreds of millions of colonial slaves and its "own" workers, causes unemployment and retards the development of the productive forces.

The Russian workers, by expropriating the capitalists and landlords, delivered a terrific

blow to imperialism. By means of the foreign trade monopoly the Russian workers erected a wall to prevent the economic penetration of the Soviet Union by the forces of imperialism. One-sixth of the earth's surface was thereby closed to the imperialist world which was unable freely to sell its products or invest its capital in the Soviet Union — the greatest blow imperialism has ever received.

It has been the policy of revolutionary Marxists to defend colonial and semi-colonial countries, regardless of the reactionary character of their government, against attack by imperialist countries. When Italy attacked Ethiopia we defended Ethiopia even though its ruler, Haile Selassie, was a slave driver of the worst type. We defend China against Japan even though Chiang-Kai-shek has butchered tens of thousands of Chinese workers. In defending the colonial and semi-colonial nations we follow the principle that, as against imperialism, the independence of the backward countries is progressive. The defeat of any imperialist country trying to subject a colonial people, is a blow to all of imperialism, and revolutionary Marxists consider it their duty to help defeat their main enemy, imperialism.

If we defend Ethiopia against Italy and China against Japan, how much more is it obligatory upon us to defend the Soviet Union against the imperialist world, in spite of Stalin? The Soviet Union is completely closed to the imperialist world whereas the colonies, whether they are independent or not, are subjected to imperialist exploitation. As yet no imperialist country has the right freely to sell its goods in the Soviet Union or to invest its capital there.

HOW STALIN SERVES HITLER

How Lenin Negotiated A Treaty

Another Letter to a Communist Worker

Dear Will:

Last week I sent you an analysis of the Feb. 25 Sunday Worker article, "German Communists lead fight on Nazi hunger." I tried to show you that the title of that article was a fraud, for the article showed that the main activity of the Comintern in Germany, by its own claim, consists of propaganda on behalf of the Stalin-Hitler pact. And, in claiming that the pact "protected the vital interests of the German people", your party was helping Hitler. For if it is possible for Hitler to conduct a foreign policy beneficial to the German people, to that extent his overthrow is not a desperate necessity for the German people.

You reply to me, heatedly and at length. To sum up your argument, it is this: the Hitler-Stalin pact is of enormous benefit to the German people, but no thanks to Hitler. For, in the words of that Sunday Worker article:

"The Communists (in Germany) patiently explain to their fellow-workers that it was the victory of the proletarian October Revolution and the successful construction of socialism which gave the U.S.S.R. the strength with which to foil Chamberlain's plans and to strike fear into the heart of Hitler and to compel him to seek peace with the Soviets."

So we must thank Stalin, and not Hitler, for all the consequences of the Stalin-Hitler pact. Very well, then. Let us, for example, thank Stalin for one of these consequences—the partition of Poland.

The Polish state was everything which the Comintern press has called it: a dictatorship of the colonels, a monstrosity, imperialist oppressor of the Ukrainian and Byelo-Russian peoples, etc. Yet—one more of his crimes Stalin announced himself ready to defend this monstrosity in alliance with Britain and France, until the Hitler-Stalin pact was signed.

But what has replaced this monstrosity, thanks to the pact? The Comintern press boasts about the "liberation" of the western provinces. Let us assume it is liberation. But this liberation is one result of the pact; and another is the enslavement of the rest of Poland by Hitler. Eleven millions liberated, 22 millions enslaved. At this rate, socialism will be achieved at the cost of the enslavement of two-thirds of the world's population!

HITLER'S GAINS ENSLAVE GERMAN PEOPLE

It used to be understood, among people who called them-

selves Communists, that the enslavement of a foreign people meant tightening by that much the hold of a ruling class on its "own" people. Hitler's enslavement of 22 million Poles is therefore a disaster not only to the Poles but also to the German masses. That this is a result of the Soviet-German pact is a fact which terribly compromises the Soviet Union in the eyes of the German workers and class-conscious workers everywhere.

Note that your party does not say that the Soviet Union could not help itself and had to sign the pact. Your party doesn't say that rather than plunge the Soviet Union into war and thus endanger its existence, it was better to save the Soviet Union even at the cost of letting Hitler enslave the Poles. If your party said that, one could then argue whether or not it was possible for the Comintern to call upon the Polish people—not the Polish state of the colonels—to rise up against Hitler and for the Red Army to join the Polish masses in preventing Hitler's occupation.

But your party doesn't say the Soviet Union couldn't help itself. On the contrary, it boasts, in the words of the Sunday Worker article already quoted above, that the Soviet Union had the "strength" to "strike fear into the heart of Hitler and to compel him" to sign the pact as a result of which the Nazi and Red armies collaborated in dividing Poland and turned over to Hitler the lion's share and 22 million Poles (not to mention the doomed Jews!).

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STALINISM AND LENINISM

Compare Stalin's negotiations and collaboration with Hitler when the Soviet Union is assertedly "strong", with Lenin and Trotsky's negotiations with German imperialism when the newly-born Soviets were pitifully weak!

On December 12, 1917 Trotsky arrived in Brest-Litovsk to open negotiations. He insisted, successfully, that the negotiations be completely public. Every speech by the Soviet delegation constituted a public exposure of the imperialist aims of the German negotiators and a ringing call to the international working class to overthrow their rulers. By every possible device of radio, telegraph, speech and print, Soviet agitators communicated the proceedings to the entire world.

In the midst of the negotiations the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets on January

2, 1918, declared:

"We now declare that the Russian Revolution remains faithful to the policy of internationalism. We defend the right of Poland, Lithuania and Courland to dispose of their own destiny, really, freely. Never will we recognize the justice of imposing the will of a foreign nation on any other nation whatsoever."

Investia, organ of the Soviet government, that same day denounced the German negotiators as "wolves in sheep's clothing."

TREATY-MAKING A REVOLUTIONARY WEAPON

The same day Soviet agitators distributed leaflets in the German lines, denouncing the German peace terms.

The German generals constituting the negotiating delegation constantly protested against the revolutionary propaganda conducted during the negotiations, and called Trotsky's speeches "provocative" and "addressed to the gallery." You behave as if you were dictating the peace to us, when the fact is that we are victorious and are negotiating on occupied Russian territory, the Germans complained to the Soviet delegation.

The German generals listened in bewilderment at some of the Soviet demands: that passports be issued immediately to the German Independent Socialists for a visit to the Soviets; that any publications the Soviets desired should be sent to prisoners of war in Germany and to the Socialists of Germany and Austria.

The Germans presented a proposed treaty which began with the usual diplomatic formula: "A treaty of peace and friendship between Germany and Soviet Russia." Trotsky demonstratively struck out the phrase "of friendship." A revolutionary government could not permit itself such a lie!

Strikes in Germany were greeted by official Soviet messages: as the Soviet Congress met on Jan. 25, great strikes broke out in Austria; the Congress hailed "the rising of the Austrian workers."

Thus, in every possible way in the midst of the negotiations the newly-born Soviets called out to the German and Austrian workers over the heads of the negotiators.

After the German and Austrian revolutions of 1918 we learned how important in mobilizing the proletariat for those revolutions were the speeches which Trotsky delivered as "treaty negotia-

tions." Their revolutionary message took time, however, in reaching and moving the workers to action. The Soviets made one more demonstration of the situation to the world's workers; they refused to sign the treaty, the Germans advanced, and then when the treaty was signed every class-conscious worker in the world understood that the iniquitous terms of the treaty were solely due to the German-Austrian imperialists.

WHAT SOVIETS SAID THEN INDICTS STALIN NOW

The All-Russian Congress of the Soviets, meeting March 14, 1918, ratified the treaty in a declaration which said:

"It is unworthy of a true socialist if badly defeated . . . to deny that fact. . . . It is not true that we have betrayed our ideals or our friends, when we signed the peace. . . . We have not sanctioned or covered any lie. We have not refused to aid any friend or comrade in misfortune in any way we could, or by every means at our disposal."

The treaty sacrificed the national independence of the Ukraine. But every Ukrainian worker understood that the Soviets had "not refused to aid any friend . . . by every means at our disposal." No lie was covered or sanctioned.

Compare all this with what Stalin has done in the Hitler-Stalin pact!

The difference between the politics of Lenin and Trotsky and the politics of Stalin is epitomized in this:

The German social-democrats, lackeys of German imperialism, voted in the Reichstag for ratification of the Brest-Litovsk treaty, justifying their vote on the ground that the Soviets had ratified it. Lenin denounced them as traitors to the working class. For the Soviets, the treaty was a bitter necessity to secure a breathing-spell. But the social-democratic deputies should have been honor-bound to fight against their "own" rapacious imperialists.

Lenin denounced any German who supported the peace treaty of his imperialist rulers. But your party calls upon the German workers to support the peace treaty of their imperialist rulers. In that single difference is expressed the unbridgeable gap between the Stalinist bureaucracy and the revolutionary internationalism of Leninism.

Fraternally,

FELIX MORROW

Nazi Comment On Moscow's New Attitude

By OSCAR FISCHER

The Frankfurter Zeitung, mouthpiece of the chemical and export industries, published on December 24, 1939, an extensive report from its Moscow correspondent in the form of an annual balance sheet. The report bears the significant heading: "The Year of the Great Turn." It mirrors faithfully the raised hopes which a Fascist journalist today experiences in Moscow:

"German observers have been undergoing an incomparable year in Moscow, reporting and describing things from intimate proximity. The narrow circle of Moscow Germans suddenly discovered itself in the very midst of historic events. A breath-taking political development took place under the very eyes of the spectators. . . . Their aides and friends unexpectedly assumed the roles of fighters for new conceptions. They arose from their desks and engaged in conversation with the leading men of the Soviet state. They initiated an uninterrupted, highly significant exchange of ideas."

"Retrospectively, it seems almost impossible to say just where the point of departure was for this new policy, for this reshaping of relations between Germany and the Soviet Union. Undoubtedly a more pacific attitude among the two former antipodes developed as far back as December last year (1938), under the impress of the Munich settlement. There was also an element of readiness to be noted in Stalin's speech at the party conference in March, an undertone which later on grew perceptibly louder and which finally swung with it all of Soviet Russian public opinion. Unforgettable in one's memory remains the day on which was issued the report of Litvinov's downfall. . . ."

Regarding the sentiments of the population the Nazi reporter has, to be sure, nothing at all to say. He only speaks once on this point and precisely with regard to his discovery of Litvinov's downfall:

"I sat in a Russian railroad train . . . the provotnik, hoping for a good tip, handed the foreign passenger the latest Pravda. 'Anything new?' the other passengers asked, crowding around. The German hesitated as he looked at the dispatch and then turned the paper over to his neighbor, pointing with his finger to the dispatch in question. 'Maxim Maximovitch—liquidated!' the latter summed up philosophically."

Bureaucrats Welcome Nazi Gains

Nothing more was said by his Russian neighbor and the Nazi can report no more. But this philosophical silence is no less instructive than the warm sentiments which the Fascist press representative discovers inside the Stalinist bureaucracy and upon which he dwells at the close of his article again, as the most important result of the "great turn."

"German successes are observed with unconcealed satisfaction, which resounds even more strongly in private conversations than in the press and on the radio. The fate of the armored cruiser 'Admiral Graf Spee' has had a tremendous effect on the Russian power of imagination. . . ."

"The number of German press representatives in Moscow as well as that of Soviet journalists in Berlin is increasing in proportion to the greater desire for information."

"An incomparable year. The strictly enclosed circle of persons within which the German observer used to carry on his work has very rapidly been extended far beyond its former confines. Once again, after so many years of an alien atmosphere, a social bond is being forged between Germans and Russians. Among the foreign guests in the Moscow hotels, the Germans are at present the predominant element. There are quartered the various delegations, the German business representatives and industrialists. Even German travel book authors are beginning to make their appearance. . . ."

The Stalinists Are Losing Out In Harlem

James Ford, leading Negro Stalinist and twice vice-presidential candidate on the Communist party ticket, has been removed from power in the party, as a result of the alarming decrease in the party membership among the Negroes, according to The Pittsburgh Courier (March 2, 1940). Ford, the former executive secretary of the Harlem division of the C.P., was "kicked upstairs" at the recent meeting of the National Committee of the C.P. and appointed as special representative for the Stalinists in Mexico.

Ford was given the Mexican "assignment" after a special report was read to the meeting that of an estimated 5,000 Negroes who joined the party in 1939, only 250 now remain as members. The report stated that there are only fifty paid-up Negro members in Harlem.

Ford's Harlem work, says The Pittsburgh Courier, is being taken over by a bureau which is reported to be planning a campaign on the exploitation of Negroes in the West Indies, Africa and the U.S. The Stalinists dropped these issues in recent years during the People's Front and Democratic Front periods.

"Bitterness over the failure of the Communists and the Soviet Union to aid Ethiopia . . . is blamed for the big drop in Negro membership as well as the published charges of 'expelled' Negro leaders that the Communist officers practiced discrimination against Negro reds in unions, WPA and functionary jobs controlled by the party."

Now that the Stalinists are following a pseudo-revolutionary line it was necessary for them to find a scapegoat for past crimes and Ford is the victim. They have a tough job ahead, however. The attendance at a Harlem meeting at which Browder spoke in January, the opening gun in their attempt to win back their Negro membership, was not more than one hundred, whereas in previous years they had packed the Renaissance Casino and the Rockland Palace with party and united front meetings.

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. IV, NO. 10 SAT., MARCH 9, 1940

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

Editors:

FELIX 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: 6 cents.

"Reentered as second class matter December 4,
1935, 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.

Czarist Stocks Rise

The war correspondent undoubtedly told the story to be funny. It appeared in Tuesday's New York Times. When a Finnish patrol came upon a Russian soldier, he cried out: "Don't shoot—I am a Russian capitalist."

Funny? The incident may not have happened, but if he invented it, the correspondent didn't help his friend Mannerheim. What would it mean for a Red Army soldier to say that? That he looked upon the Finnish army as part of the imperialist-world, which would spare only those Russians who would adhere to capitalism.

In his own naive way the Soviet soldier understands infinitely more than the fat-headed liberals and labor skates who are raising money for Hoover's Finnish Commission, and the Norman Thomases and Lovestones who are rooting for a Finnish victory.

We should like to ask all those people who call themselves part of the working class and who, nevertheless, call for the defeat of the Red Army in this war, to give us their explanation of the rise in price of Czarist securities on the Paris Bourse.

A February 29 dispatch to the New York Times reports a phenomenal rise in Czarist oil shares:

"For instance, Baku industrials rose from 16 francs in August to 80 in December and are quoted at over 200 francs now, though in fact it is impossible to buy them at any price. Grozny, North Caucasian and other oils have risen too."

From 16 francs to 200—a 1250% increase. That's stock market language for indicating the vulnerability of the Soviet Union and the extent of the concentration of Anglo-French troops on the Soviet's Near-East border.

Defeat for the Soviet Union at the hands of its capitalist enemies means that the capitalists will proceed to restore capitalism in the territories formerly ruled by the Czar. That means that anybody that's for the defeat of the Soviet Union is, willy nilly, for capitalism. That simple Russian soldier understood that. In his own way he was saying that anybody who calls himself part of the labor movement and isn't for the defense of the Soviet Union is a traitor to his class.

The Paris Bourse makes that clear, if nothing else does.

Vote CIO In Auto

The National Labor Relations Board has ordered elections in the 59 plants of General Motors. More than 225,000 workers in twelve states will choose between the UAW-CIO, the AFL or "no union" in an election to take place "sometime in April."

The Union News Service, official clip-sheet of the CIO, announces extensive plans for a CIO campaign prior to the election. John L. Lewis, Phil Murray, and Sydney Hillman are scheduled for big meetings in Michigan and other auto centers.

The plans are pretty good as far as they go. But they don't go far enough. The auto workers want more than speeches. The best orator in the

world cannot solve their pressing problems by rhetoric alone. Spell-binder Martin dazzled many audiences but results were obtained by different methods.

Results were obtained by action in the great sit-down in Flint, in the famous Battle of Bull's Run which frightened the wits out of Knudsen, Sloane and Co. General Motors understands no other language. Why try speaking to them as if they were human beings?

The workers of General Motors will vote for the UAW-CIO. That is the only union for the automobile workers of this country. Martin's phoney AFL group is a disgrace to the name of unionism: it has participated in strikebreaking actions, it has made united fronts with Fascist demagogues like Coughlin and Gerald L. K. Smith. Any worker who does not vote for the CIO, is voting in reality for a return to the open shop.

But the auto workers will vote for the CIO with enthusiasm, lay down their lives on the picket lines, only on one condition: that the union goes to bat for the men in the plants.

The auto workers want the 30-hour week at 40-hour pay put on the first order of business in negotiations with G.M. The auto workers want to take the 30-hour week at 40-hour pay out of the far-away realm of "basic demands" and presented as an immediate demand.

The auto workers want their union. But they want their union to fight for them. Let Lewis, Hillman and Murray tell the auto workers what they intend to do today—not in the distant future—about the 30-hour week at 40-hour pay. That's what the auto workers want to hear.

That's what the auto workers want to do: fight for the 30-hour week at 40-hour pay.

Defend AFL Unions

As several hundred delegates from building trades unions throughout the country were meeting in Washington to organize the defense of the unions against the Department of Justice's union-busting campaign, the CIO committed a shocking act against labor solidarity.

The CIO News, official weekly organ of the CIO, published an article in its March 4th issue, entitled "AFL moguls in panic jump from frying pan into hotter fires." It said in part:

"Other signs of panic in AFL craft ranks were the calling of an emergency session of craft moguls in Washington to resist exposure and prosecution of racketeers who have exploited the workers and been a detriment to the industry. . . .

"On the spot in the court of public opinion distracted by prosecution of racketeers in their midst, plagued by jurisdictional disputes they can't control, and alarmed by growth of the United Construction Workers Organizing Committee (CIO), the craft moguls are facing the worst crisis of their history." (Our emphasis)

Every class-conscious worker will brand these statements as an act of disloyalty to the labor movement. It is an elementary duty of every unionist to defend all bona-fide labor unions, whether in the CIO, AFL or independent, against the class enemy. The Department of Justice is the enemy of the working class. Its "anti-trust" campaign is a scarcely-veiled campaign to smash unionism in the building trades. For every boss that has been indicted in the current campaign, a hundred trade union leaders have been indicted. The real moguls of the building trades industry, the banks which control building sites, construction financing, construction supplies and most of the construction companies, are whitewashed and not touched by Thurman Arnold. These facts alone brand the "anti-trust" campaign for what it is: a union-smashing conspiracy.

Practically every union procedure of the AFL building trades which is now under the fire of the Department of Justice is practiced by CIO unions. Refusal of union men to work on non-union materials; refusal of unions to supply men to contractors not certified by the employers' bargaining agency with which the unions have contracts; control by the unions of the introduction of new manufacturing operations and devices which involve cutting down the number of workers; union insistence that certain work be done on the premises and not brought in semi-finished form to be completed by union workers—these and a dozen other working rules of the AFL building trades now being attempted outlawed by Thurman Arnold, are practiced—one or more of them—by the International Ladies Garment Workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the Auto Workers Union and, indeed, in one form or another, by most of the CIO unions.

For the CIO to delude itself that blows on this score can be directed against the AFL without leading to blows against the CIO would be a fatal error. If the CIO top-leaders are so near-sighted as not to see this, they should be forcibly reminded of their responsibilities by the rank and file of the CIO.

Defend the AFL building trades unions against the union-busting drive!

In the World of Labor

By Paul G. Stevens

Militants Break with Australian C.P.; Hail Fourth International

Our Australian comrades' vigorous anti-war activity, reported in these columns on previous occasions, is bearing fruit. A considerable number of rank and file members of the Communist Party of Australia are drawing closer to the Communist League, the Australian section of the Fourth International, and some have already joined officially. The latest number of the Militant, official organ of the League, reports that J. N. Rawlings, editor of World Peace, has broken with Stalinism and endorsed the Fourth International.

Rawlings was a member of the Australian C.P. for fifteen years. From reserved criticism of the People's Front line he developed to the point where, at the outbreak of the war, he openly took issue with the local satrap of the Kremlin, one J. B. Miles, who went so far as to urge "fit and available members" of his party to join up with the army and "to participate in the struggle to defeat the aggressor armies." After several months of increasing conflict with the party leadership, Rawlings was summarily expelled, on December 17.

Rawlings had been editor of World Peace, the weekly paper of the League for Peace and Democracy, from its inception. He was immediately removed from that post upon his expulsion from the C.P. A squad of Stalinist worthies raided his editorial office, ordered him to leave with a threat of force and even refused to allow him to take his personal belongings with him. Guido Baracchi, another old time C.P. leader, has solidized himself with Rawlings in his conflict with the party leadership.

Aside from his journalistic work, which made his name familiar to radical circles throughout the British Empire, Rawlings is the author of the authoritative "History of the Australian People" and of numerous pamphlets on economic and historical questions.

Excerpts from the Statement
Issued by J. N. Rawlings

Here are some interesting excerpts from a statement issued to the press by comrade Rawlings after his expulsion:

"What of the thousands of workers who, remembering the last war, were ready to oppose this, but who, seeing the Communist Party support it, were either bewildered or led to believe that they should fight for the independence of nations now enslaved by Nazism?"

"But the decision to support the war was no 'mistake'. It was a perfectly logical step. . . . Capitalists and capitalist politicians were divided into two classes, good and bad, according as they were 'non-appeasers' and 'appeasers'. Capitalism was no longer the breeder of wars; wars now resulted from 'Fascist aggression'. . . .

"First it was 'democratic' France and Britain—and Communists in these countries voted war credits, supported conscription, sang the Marseillaise and God Save the King, and hobnobbed with duchesses, deans and scions of noble houses.

SPARKS IN THE NEWS

by Dwight Macdonald

The "Break-Even Point"

Much has been written about technological unemployment, but I have seen little discussion of one aspect of the problem: the steadily increasing ability of American industry to make profits at ever-lower levels of production. A key statistic in any industry is the "break-even point", i.e., the percentage of a plant's productive capacity which must be used in order to operate at a profit. In the steel industry, for example, this is now between 40 per cent and 45 per cent—that is to say, once the average steel plant begins to run at a rate which produces 45 per cent as much steel as it can produce at full capacity, it begins to make money.

This means that an industry with a break-even point of 45 per cent—and in many industries the point is even lower—can make profits even though it is producing less than half the amount of goods its plants can produce. Thus the national consumption of these goods can be reduced to half that of boom times, employment can be far below the boom level, and the industry in question can still make money.

There is another interesting thing about this break-even point: once production reaches that level, profits begin to increase much faster than production. If a steel company makes, say \$5 a ton at 50 per cent of capacity, its rate of profit at 60 per cent of capacity may well be not \$5 a ton but \$7 or \$8. Thus it is often possible to double and triple profits with only a slight rise in production. The reason for this is that a highly mechanized mass production plant costs a certain minimum to run at all: it takes about as many employees, as much coal and water and electricity, as much wear-and-tear on the machinery, to produce steel at 30 per cent of capacity as at 40 per cent. But once production is high enough to absorb these minimum fixed charges, then costs for additional production are reduced to little more than extra wages and raw materials.

Sales Up 58 p.c.; Profits 910 p.c.

In the first quarter of 1939 the automobile industry gave a dramatic illustration of the above point. In that period, the net profits of the six leading automobile manufacturers were \$65,500,000, as against only \$6,500,000 for the same quarter of 1938. The increase in production, however, was very much less: sales of trucks and cars for that quarter of 1939 totalled 1,056,000, as against 669,000 in 1938. Thus an increase of 58 per cent in sales caused an increase of 910 per cent in profits.

Earnings and Employment

The mysterious workings of the "break-even point" are one reason for the phenomenon we see today of enormous increases in profits unaccompanied by any significant rise in the national standard of living or any significant decrease in the number of the unemployed.

As the readers of the Appeal are well aware,

Then it was Nazi Germany, which Pravda led us to infer was invariably based on striving to defend and preserve peace! . . .

Today, Finland is being invaded, just as Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland were invaded. But this time the invasion is made in the name of Leninism! To such a level has the Communist Party of Australia, together with the rest of them, descended, that it can idealize that invasion and present it as the extension of Communism.

"With the Comintern attitude, switching now left, now right, towards the war, and with policies, spread over years, that led to that attitude, no true Marxian can have anything to do.

"Events have shown that the Third International has followed the path of the Second. But the path of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky is the only path that the workers can follow to their emancipation, and a new, Fourth, International must be built to lead them along it."

Labour Party Students Join
Against Social Patriotism

From time to time we have reported here the growing anti-war movement in the lower ranks of the British Trades Unions as well as in the Labour Party. Only recently, as this column pointed out, this movement showed such strength in the local Trades Councils that the top bureaucracy became obliged to enforce its rule by means of extraordinary measures intended to squeeze the local bodies into line by financial pressure.

Now we get word that the bureaucracy is also in conflict on this score with the University Labour Federation, the students' organization affiliated with the Labour Party. Arthur Greenwood, deputy leader of the party in parliament, found the conflict so sharp that he had to resign as president of the Federation. On January 4 the Labour students held their national conference at Liverpool. The first step taken by the conference was the adoption of a resolution "condemning the war as an imperialist war for profit and for world domination", and point out that the same anti-war policy has been "expressed by sections of the Labour Party and by trades unions in Edinburgh, Glasgow and Sheffield."

The resolution carried by a vote of 49 against 9 and 2 abstentions. Mentioning this fact, a statement of the Federation chides Greenwood for attributing their attitude to "Communist instigation." It continues: "The Conference of the U.L.F. regards the struggle against war on the part of the labor movement as a foremost task and as a step necessary for the realization of socialism. Only by such means can the L.P. and the U.L.F. fulfill their role as 'light-house of socialism'. The conference regards your (Greenwood's) action and that of the other leaders of the Labour Party who support the war and the political truce as treachery to socialism and to the interests of the working class. The conference has decided to continue the struggle against war and for socialism in agreement with the numerous groups in the labor and progressive movement who are opposed today and who will continue to oppose this war."

The A. L. P. Fight
--Stalinists Won
A Hollow Victory

By FELIX MORROW

The bitterest things said about Alex Rose were not said by the Stalinists, last Thursday night at the New York County convention of the American Labor Party. The Stalinists were, indeed, feeling rather amiable. Looking over the auditorium they saw predominate the familiar faces of their comrades.

The bitter souls in the place were the small band of members of the Social Democratic Federation. They had warned Alex Rose and the other big shots of the ALP, two years ago or more. He would not listen. He would not even consult with them. Because the Stalinists provided the necessary Jimmy Higgins crews for all the dreary detail work, he had welcomed them and let them take over club after club. He had told Louis Waldman it was all right, the Stalinists could be cleaned out any time it was necessary. Now his chickens were coming home to roost.

The final indignity that drove the Social Democrats into highly articulate fury—my seat at the press table was not too close to them but, stalking back and forth, they threw discretion to the winds—was Alex Rose's choice of a standard-bearer for the evening. The test vote was to be that for chairman. Like principled politicians the Social Democrats wanted someone put up who would symbolize the rabid red-baiting and pro-Ally program of the anti-Communist bloc. But Alex Rose hadn't even troubled to consult the Social Democrats. Instead he chose a man who, from the rigorous standards of the Social Democrats, was himself tainted with Stalinism—Sylvio Bottini, a minor building trades union official, the taint consisting of his friendship with Marcantonio, the friend of the Stalinists.

I confess that I got a good deal of pleasure, that evening, observing the infuriated but impotent discomfiture of the anti-Communist bloc.

* * *

The Stalinists, in capturing the New York County ALP, took over an empty shell. Their victory consisted in this: when they were still in a bloc with Alex Rose last August—before the Hitler-Stalin pact—the candidates for committeemen, who constitute the legally-recognized county organization of a party, were designated by the ALP district clubs, where the Stalinists had a majority, and ALP enrollees voted for these candidates at the September city primary. In other words, the Stalinists last Thursday captured nothing but the country machinery which the law requires every party on the ballot to establish through the primaries.

The Real ALP Beyond Their Reach

The real American Labor Party—the trade unions which constitute it—did not and of course could not pass into the hands of the Stalinists by counting noses of county committeemen. In the April 2 state primaries, at which state committeemen of the ALP are elected, if the Stalinists win, they again win an empty shell. The trade unions, other than the minority controlled by the Stalinists, will scarcely remain in the ALP if the Stalinists capture the legal machinery. The backbone of the ALP would be removed forthwith—the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the Ladies Garment Workers, the millinery union, etc.

A Labor Party without unions is an absurdity. Why, then, have not Alex Rose and his cohorts not emphasized in their public statements the absurdity of the Stalinist campaign to capture the legal machinery of the ALP? The trade union bureaucrats have a crushing argument against the Stalinists: why don't the Stalinists demonstrate what their strength is, not in the primaries dictated by the bourgeois parliamentary system in which a dentist's vote weighs as much as a trade unionist's, but in the trade unions which constitute the ALP?

The fact is that the ALP bureaucrats have never referred to this fundamental difference between a Labor Party and the capitalist parties. They have been too desirous of winning to the ALP the professional and middle-class flotsam and jetsam, taking the workers' votes for granted. Instead of sharply emphasizing that the unions have the right and duty of running their own party, the Alex Roses have wooed the elements outside the unions. The result: clubs full of lawyers, doctors and dentists, small businessmen—and Stalinists working in them by party assignment. In other words, easy picking for the Stalinists.

The workers in the unions affiliated to the ALP have never been made to feel that they are active members of it ALP through their unions. Around election-time a few speeches in the unions, and payment of ALP dues—this is all that the ALP has been to the union members.

If a union member wanted to be active in the ALP, he could not do so through his union, but only by joining a club in his neighborhood dominated by lawyers and dentists. The result: the unionists didn't trouble to go to the primaries and left the field to the Stalinists.

That the unions have not constituted the basic active units of the ALP is not an oversight. If the trade union bureaucrats paid by a Stalinist victory in the primaries for their failure to activate the trade union members, they prefer that to the alternative: steeping the unions in the basic political problems facing the working class.

The trade union as the workers' organization dealing with private employers in a specific industry is a difficult enough organism to keep under the control of bureaucrats committed down to their bones to the capitalist order. In the union as an economic organism, consideration of the basic problems of unemployment and insecurity are limited to what can be done to alleviate hunger and want and poverty within the specific industry—and this at a time when every thoughtful worker understands that these problems cannot be solved on a trade union level. To limit the union to this trade union level serves the capitalist order and the labor bureaucrats faithful to it.

Remove that narrow limitation from the workers' discussions of their life-and-death problems, turn the union floor over to the political level—to the question of the relation of the working class as a whole to the capitalist class as a whole—and, my God, think the bureaucrats, there is no limit to what the workers may try to do.

Alex Rose can make a militant in his millinery union look like an impractical fool for proposing to wipe out unemployment in the industry. But Rose would be in a fundamentally different situation if he tried to make fun of a militant on the union floor who demanded that the union's delegates to a national Labor Party insist on a program guaranteeing a decent living to every worker. That's why Rose prefers to keep the unions out of direct participation in the ALP even if that means that the Stalinists capture the legal machinery. The Stalinist victory is an empty one, Rose thinks, and that is true. Whereas a militant program that would sweep the unions would sweep Rose right out of the unions.