

# Japanese Military Seizes North China Province

(Continued from Page 1)

Nanking and as such might have drawn the fire of a desperate man who wanted somehow to express his opposition to Nanking's betrayal of the country. Information has been too scanty to say, but the shooting might equally as well have been part of the foul political intrigues always in progress inside the Kuomintang camp. None of us would have mourned Stalin's friend Wang, but the would-be assassin was a bum shot and Wang is recovering.

### Sowing Up the North

Japan has meanwhile blotted out the last vestiges of even nominal Chinese authority in North China, has taken over the polling of Tientsin and Peiping, compelled the resignation of the mayors of those two cities and the liquidation of the Peiping Military Council, the organ of Chiang Kai-shek's authority in the North.

One key to understanding what is going on is the fact that the Japanese have decided to get rid of Chiang. He has grown stronger than they like any one general to be. The defeats he inflicted upon the Red Armies, his conquests of the western provinces, his acquisition of the rich opium revenues at their source in Szechwan and Kweichow placed Chiang and the government he dominates in a position of authority greater than they have ever had.

Moreover, Chiang, while selling out to the Japanese at every juncture, has always played a wily game, keeping himself out in the hinterland and dealing with the Japanese only through underlings, like Wang Ching-wei or Huang Fu. The Japanese have tired of this game. They want the Nanking government to sign over its recognition of Manchukuo and of Japan's dominant position in China, politically and economically, and they want it done directly and formally by the central government.

### Britain's Maneuver

It is into this situation, Japanese imperialism aggressive, Nanking submitting but truculently and with an ill-grace, that British imperialism has edged its hand. The sudden announcement came on Nov. 4 that China had devaluated her currency, ordered nationalization of the country's silver stocks and in effect pegged a new Chinese paper dollar to sterling. These steps, long heralded by the disastrous flow of silver from the country (due in part to China's inordinately heavy adverse trade balance, the price she pays for imperialist patronage, and in part to America's silver buying which only accelerated the flow of silver outward) were taken at the advice of Sir Frederick

Leith-Ross, a British Treasury official now attached to Nanking as a financial adviser.

That Nanking took this step apparently without previously consulting Japan, is alone sufficient to show that a certain amount of definite British backing had been promised. Talk was current of a \$50,000,000 (U.S. currency) loan which was denied but which remains in the air. The War Office and Foreign Office in Tokyo were openly furious over this development and the Japanese banks in Shanghai will probably try to sabotage the effort at nationalization by refusing to surrender their silver stocks. Meanwhile the Japanese press has started fulminating at both Britain and Nanking. The currency reform is called a "return of the pro-European or pro-American clique" (T. V. Soong and Co.) and dire threats of military action have been resumed.

### Seeking New Markets

What these developments mean is simply this: Chiang Kai-shek, aware that the Japanese mean to smash him whether he crawls to them or not, has decided to give as much to the Japanese as he has to, but at the same time to seek other imperialist aid to bolster his position against the Japanese. He started doing this as early as last June when he sent W. W. Yen on a tour of European capitals and had Alfred Sze make a definite appeal for help in Washington. The latter appeal went unheeded because Roosevelt considered his silver-purchasing program of more immediate importance. But in London steps were taken which resulted in the sending of Frederick Leith-Ross to China and ever since then talk of a British loan has been in the air.

Another important current must be watched: press reports, mostly Japanese-inspired, to be sure, say Nanking is looking once more to Moscow for an entente. These reports are probably not true at the moment—but it is not impossible that they may become true if Nanking actually tries trailing for a while behind British imperialism instead of Japan. If the policies of Baldwin and Laval can "coincide" with Moscow's "peace policy" why not those of Chiang Kai-shek? For the time being, however, Nanking will surrender to Japan with one hand, hold on to Britain with the other. The result, as always, will be paid for by the Chinese masses, for whom devaluation, with its consequent rise in prices and financial chaos (where already there was anarchy) means the utmost hardships increased a hundredfold.

# WHAT ARE SANCTIONS?

## "Collective Effort for Peace" or Imperialist Battle for Empire?

By ARNE SWABECK

Fifty-two nations, including the Soviet Union, have voted to enforce sanctions, under the League of Nations covenant, against Fascist Italy. Liberals, pacifists and labor organizations, with but few exceptions throughout the world, support sanctions. A similar position is taken by the Second and the Third Internationals. In union, both of these Internationals have become aggressive supporters of sanctions ever since this ingenious device was invented by the capitalist statesmen at Geneva.

The fateful days of 1914 had for their rallying cry the "defense of the fatherland." Is history now repeating itself? Are not issues of similarly fateful consequences to the future of the whole of humanity joined-up in this rallying cry of 1935—the cry of sanctions?

What will sanctions mean when actually enforced? Are they to be purely financial and economic or are they to be military? Is it true that the sanctions to be invoked by the League of Nations represent the collective efforts of these nations to punish an aggressor and to stop war, or do they mean the extension of the war in Ethiopia on a far more colossal scale. This is the first and most essential question that confronts the working class.

For an answer it is necessary to examine at least the most outstanding factors involved.

### The Causes of War

It has been said—and correctly so—that war is the continuation of politics by military means. Imperialist wars arise from the constant struggle between the powers for increased ratios in world economy. All imperialist powers today feel the consequences of the economic crisis. The vast expansion of their productive forces presses them onward inexorably and irresistibly in the struggle for new markets and new colonial fields where they can tap the sources of raw materials, invest surplus capital and extract new and greater profits. On every continent they are openly advancing for new conquests. Owing to the severe defeats which the workers have suffered under Fascist onslaughts, the imperialist gamblers feel free to engage in a continuation of the conflict for increased economic ratios by military means.

It is, of course, not the particular aggressor attitude of one or the other of these powers that produces war. This merely expresses a readiness to strike out for new territories. Fascist Italy has embarked on its course of expansion at the

expense of the last of the independent African states. But in a world already divided into colonies and spheres of influence such a course must inevitably become a struggle for redivision of markets, involving in the first instance those powers having the greatest possessions. And so, in this case, Fascist Italy came into direct conflict with the British Empire.

### Britain and Italy

These two imperialist powers, Britain and Italy, are the major adversaries in the present war situation and in no case can the clash be considered a conflict of democracy versus dictatorship, as it is presented today. They are typical of a power pressing forward in the struggle for expansion and a power seeking to maintain its present possessions. On the one side is Fascist Italy, caught in its inability to stem the tide of its own internal economic and political contradictions, desperately seeking an outlet through the restoration of Caesar's empire. On the other side is the existing British Empire on which the sun never sets.

Britain had centuries to consolidate her position. Tapping vast resources all over the world, deriving countless profits from the sweat and blood of millions of subjected peoples, she enjoyed a privileged imperialist position and could not tolerate any rivals. Her diplomats scored easy victories—with the British navy standing by. Now she is hard pressed throughout the world; the diplomatic victories have become questionable; elements of decay are apparent and expressed even in the reactionary attitude of the bureaucratic leaders of her official labor movement in support of sanctions, not merely out of pacifist motivations, but in solidarity with the continued oppression of the millions of colonial peoples by the imperialist masters. 7,287,937 square miles containing a population of 446,191,000 is the extent of these possessions, dominion and colonial, that touch every continent. What is popularly called the imperial life line, begins at Gibraltar and extends through the Mediterranean, through the Suez Canal, the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden to the Indian Ocean. All along this line the British navy must remain supreme if the imperial possessions are to be retained unchallenged.

### Not Ethiopia—the British Empire

The British rulers are not concerned with the independence of Ethiopia. Only too often have they proceeded with fire and sword to crush the independence of other native peoples. No, their sole concern

is the preservation of their own far flung colonial empire. That Ethiopia's independence could be sacrificed easily enough was shown by the action of the League of Nations Council last summer. By a unanimous vote of all its members, including the Soviet Union, a resolution was adopted to dismember Ethiopia on the basis of the robber treaty of 1906 between Italy, Britain and France. But Mussolini truculently rejected this offer inasmuch as he wanted possession of Ethiopia for Fascist Italy alone.

Indirectly this spells danger to the British Empire through the prospects of uprisings by the millions of peoples it now holds in subjection. But much more directly, this threatens to cut the imperial life line. Fascist Italy is building fortifications in Eritrea, on the coast of the Red Sea, and it is aiming for naval and aerial supremacy in the Mediterranean. This is the most immediate issue around which the war clouds are thickening today and the main motivating force behind the swift action of Britain for sanctions at Geneva.

### The Many-Sided Danger of War

Obviously the League of Nations has not in the least, and could not in the least, serve to remove, or even to diminish, the causes of imperialist war. Organized as an instrument to ensure the spoils of the victors in the last war, and to maintain their hegemony, its numerous disarmament conferences served as a screen behind which all the capitalist powers, without exception, managed to perfect their armaments. New issues of conflict between these victors were, of course, inevitable. Japan some time ago embarked on its conquest of Manchuria, to extend its domination over China, and is now a constant threat to the borders of the Soviet Union. Fascist Germany is rearming feverishly in preparation for the time when its cruel regime can no longer bridge the gap of its internal contradictions: it will endeavor to find an outlet by means of new conquests. The imperialists of the United States have proclaimed neutrality while engaging in ever more extensive naval maneuvers in the Pacific with an eye to a future establishment of a base in China, in order to raise the question of possession of India at the next historical stage.

On the battlefields of Ethiopia war has become a reality. The guns of the highly mechanized Fascist armies are spitting fire in the campaign to ravage and subjugate the

native population. The capitalist powers in the League of Nations proclaim their peaceful intentions while all of them are arming to the teeth; some of them in order to use the first opportunity to spring to like conquests and others in order to defend their present possessions to the end. There may yet be an intermission before the general conflagration; but in any event the war that has already started in Ethiopia is only a prelude to the much greater catastrophe now in preparation under the rallying cry of sanctions.

### "Good-Intentioned" Treachery

Only on this background can the question of sanctions be properly understood. And yet in this situation the Stalinist party, through the Daily Worker, informs us that: "The next step must be punishment of the guilty—sanctions." It exhorts: "All opponents of war and Fascism should support this policy and demand that the League of Nations bar all trade with Italy and close the Suez Canal."

In the thieves jargon of diplomacy, sanctions, in their ultimate implication, mean war. Mussolini said so. Stanley Baldwin repeats it, although much less boldly, and with many disguising hypocritical trimmings. Nevertheless the leaders of the British Labor Party demand sanctions. And Harry Pollitt, the leader of the British Stalinist party, in a recent address before a London district conference of the party, formulated his demands upon the British government as follows: "But we also demand the closing of the Suez Canal, and the carrying out of the Covenant of the League of Nations, because we believe that all these measures can prevent Mussolini going to war, and we must utilize the present contradictions in the capitalist world, and force economic and military sanctions if necessary."

We may grant that Pollitt has other intentions than Stanley Baldwin, but the way to hell is paved with good intentions. Pollitt together with the leaders of the British Labor Party may criticize the National government, each in his own way, but this can only be incidental to the decisive issue of sanctions. And let it be noted, it is the League of Nations, and with it the British government, that are in this case called upon to close the Suez Canal and to enforce sanctions, "economic and military." Consequently the government is to be supported on this decisive issue. Behind this rallying cry of sanctions the British worker is being led into united support of the Tory government—the real enemy of the workers. To this enemy is to be entrusted the guarantee of peace.

### Democracy Versus Dictatorship?

While at this time particularly the League of Nations should be exposed for what it is and the mask of hypocrisy torn off from the face of the imperialists, old illusions in the League are being strengthened and a new confidence of the workers in the Tory government is being built up. A new national union is being created with the connivance of Labor Party and Stalinist lead-

ers for was: "The N.E.C. program provides the issues upon which we shall fight—Against the Roosevelt armament campaign; against war and imperialist tricks that lead to war!"

If the line taken toward the N.E.C. resolution is going to be the consistent line of the "Militant" leaders, then they must in all consistency prepare a new report on the Bauer-Zyromski thesis. If the N.E.C. resolution deserves the headline it got, then Bauer-Zyromski deserve a headline: "Left Wing Calls for World Revolution" (which the Bauer-Zyromski thesis does call for, just as much as the N.E.C. calls for a labor boycott, in both cases the "progressive" slogan being inextricably linked up with the reactionary program) If the N.E.C. resolution deserves the characterizations it receives from the Socialist Call, then the Bauer-Zyromski thesis should receive a new report, beginning: "Launching a worldwide campaign against war."

"Sounding anew the Socialist call for mass resistance," etc., etc.

### What Socialist Workers Should Do

But to those Socialist workers who wish to be consistently revolutionary, we say: The answer to Bauer-Zyromski is a good beginning. It must not be permitted to remain an abstraction. Zyromski himself for years maintained, in bare words, the idea of renunciation of the defense of the fatherland. Because he was permitted to bring the idea out for special occasions but never applied it to the day by day problems, it is now possible for Zyromski, having gone over to the social-patriots, to drag along with him many of his followers in the left wing. Remember the fate of Zyromski's followers. Take, rather, the opposite road of Zyromski's co-leader of the French left wing, Marcel Pivert. He did not permit the idea of revolutionary struggle against war to remain an abstraction; he applied it; and today he stands in the forefront of the Revolutionary Left

ers which, regardless of intentions, can lead only to war for the maintenance of the British imperial possessions.

Britain is today in the center of the war developments but it is not alone; nor is the position taken by the British Stalinists an exception. We are informed by the Daily Worker, for instance, that the C.P. of Czechoslovakia on October 7 cabled the League of Nations demanding "the immediate application of effective economic and military sanctions against Italy." Here is a voice from another "democratic" country which the Comintern has declared as its policy to defend against Fascism. But it is not the voice of the revolutionary workers. Can anyone conceive of Czechoslovakia, or Britain, or the United States, or any other capitalist democratic country, really going to war to defend the democratic rights of the people against Fascism? Need there be any doubt that the war they will wage will be for imperialist issues? And we might add, is it not more likely that when the war actually breaks out that serious efforts will be made by the capitalist rulers of these countries to transform them into Fascist states?

For the Stalinist parties the support of sanctions is not an accident; nor can it be regarded as just another mistake. It is a part of a whole system of policies which, once such a course is embarked upon, could lead to no other results. This system of policies proceeds consistently from reliance on pacts and treaties between the Soviet Union and the capitalist powers, instead of reliance on the proletarian revolution, to support of the League of Nations and to support of the capitalist governments in carrying out sanctions. In turn sanctions becomes the deceptive device for the mobilization of the masses for imperialist war.

### Shall It Be 1914 Again?

What we have before us in this question is imperialist sanctions, for imperialist ends, and not working class action, and not war. The two are not complementary, as the new-baked defenders of the remnants of bourgeois democracy would have us believe. Democracy would have us believe that not only are issues, as fateful in their consequences to the future of the whole of humanity, joined up in this question of sanctions as was the case of the rallying cry of the "defense of the fatherland"; but also to add, that another historic betrayal is in preparation, and this time on a far more colossal scale. In 1914, national unity within the imperialist powers and the plunging of millions into the bloody battlefield was preceded by the treason of social democracy. Today the demand for sanctions can lead only to restoration of national unity behind the capitalist governments to plunge the masses into another and far more terrible conflagration—a repetition of the betrayal of 1914—this time, however, participated in by the social democrats and the Stalinists jointly.

Still it remains as true as ever that only working class action can prevent war. Liebknecht warned that the enemy is at home; and in this respect nothing has changed since. Therefore the duty of the revolutionists is clear. It is the irreconcilable struggle to overthrow capitalism as the only way to do away with imperialist war.

of the French Socialist Party, the group who are leading the way for the whole world proletariat in the struggle against war. Karl Liebknecht gave us the immortal slogan: "The main enemy is in our own country." The Socialist workers must apply that slogan even more close to home. The Socialist Party is infested with brazen chauvinists like Waldman and Oneal. It is confused and muddled by pacifists like Hoan, Thomas and Allen, whose dependence on capitalist instrumentalities and mythical methods for the struggle against war, block the way to the only road, the revolutionary struggle against war.

Socialist workers: "The main enemy is in your own party." The struggle against war is the struggle against every ideological aid to the war-makers: social-patriotism, pacifism, retreat from the struggle in the name of unity with social-patriots.

### Read Lenin on War

Note how sternly, ruthlessly, with what intellectual and moral integrity, he sharply differentiated the real opponents of war from the manifold varieties of sham opposition.

See with what intransigence he fought off all attempts to gloss over differences on this fundamental question.

And, above all, remember: It was only the correct policy in the struggle against war which enabled the Bolsheviks to make the October Revolution.

### ANNOUNCEMENT

The Newark branch of the Workers Party is running a theater party at the Civic Repertory theater on both Nov. 28, Thanksgiving day evening, and Nov. 30 matinee. The play is the Theater Union production of "Mother," based on the Gorki novel of that name.

Comrades wishing tickets can write to Lew Merritt, 645 Belmont Ave., Newark. Tickets sell for 30c, 45c, 60c, 75c and \$1.00.

# "Militant" Socialists and the Bauer-Dan-Zyromski Thesis

(By the Editorial Board)

(Continued from last week)

The NEW MILITANT of October 5 published a critique of the war program of the Militant Socialists, as embodied in their general program presented at the "Socialist Call" Institute this Fall. Last week we analyzed the war resolution adopted October 12 by the N.E.C. of the S. P. Further discussion of the Militant Socialist program on war is required by the publication in the "Socialist Call" of October 12 of the chauvinist Bauer-Zyromski thesis and a short answer to it signed by the "Call" editorial board and by the Socialist Call reception of the N. E. C. resolution.

The proverbial man from Mars would be able to reconcile the October 12 answer to Bauer-Zyromski with the October 26 editorial and news story on the N. E. C. resolution, only on the assumption that the two issues had been written by entirely different groups. The correct explanation is, however, much more simple: two utterly irreconcilable tendencies still exist side by side within the camp of the Militant Socialists; the weight of tradition and the relationship of forces within the Socialist Party favor the tendency which found expression in the issue of October 26; if there are revolutionary Socialists who naively believed that the advances in theory recorded in the October 12 answer to Bauer-Zyromski were permanently secured, they have been thoroughly disillusioned by the fawning reception accorded on October 26 to the N.E.C. war resolution.

### Significance of Answer to Bauer-Zyromski

But if the answer to Bauer-Zyromski represents no permanently assured advance, it undoubtedly marks a new stage in the development of our discussion with Left wing Socialists on the vital questions of war. Hitherto, our discussion has been in terms of opposing to the pacifistic and utterly unrealistic war program of the Militants, the system of ideas on war developed by Lenin. We enter now a new stage because the answer to Bauer-Zyromski accepts a number of the fundamental Leninist ideas on war never previously accepted by the Militants. If, within two

short weeks, they attempt to place side by side with these Leninist conceptions the totally different conceptions adopted by the N.E.C. of the S.P., we shall demonstrate to all Socialists who really seek the revolutionary road that the revolutionary struggle against war involves the repudiation of the N.E.C. resolution.

The October 12 answer to Bauer-Zyromski is particularly significant for the following ideas:

### Develops Opposition to National Defense

1. As we pointed out in our criticism of the first "Militant" program, it was insufficient to merely say "against national defense;" this had to be implemented by explicit differentiation from the Bauer-Zyromski stripe of "left" chauvinists, by specific denunciation of the doctrine of defense of democracy against fascist countries, by refusal to support the American government in a military alliance with the Soviet Union. All this is now corrected in the answer to Bauer-Zyromski.

### Repudiates All Capitalist Instruments

2. It provides the clearest statement ever made by Militant Socialists in repudiation of the League of Nations as necessarily a capitalist instrument. On this point it sharply criticizes the Bauer-Zyromski thesis: "Instead of rejecting the capitalist instruments whose imperialist character the thesis recognizes (League of Nations, democratic governments), the document urges their support . . . (and) completely fails to recognize the only alternative to these imperialist snares—reliance upon independent action of the working class."

### For Real Internationalism

3. It sharply and clearly breaks with the Stalinist and social-chauvinist theory of "defending the Soviet Union" by pandering to the foreign diplomacy of the Stalinist bureaucracy. "Just as working class governments can be the only reliable allies of a working class government in Germany, so too only a working class government can be a reliable ally of the Soviet Union. Only a working class revolution in one or more capitalist countries can give real defense to the Soviet Union. But if the working class is

called upon to 'do its duty' every time the imperialist powers fall out, such a proletarian revolution is permanently impossible . . . to give up rich opportunities for revolution outside of Russia in order to 'defend the Soviet Union' will in the long run mean the defeat both of the Soviet Union and the world revolution."

### Drops General Strike Myth, Adopts Leninist Struggle Against War

4. Most important of all is the new conception of how to fight against war. Our analysis of the original "Militant" program particularly criticized their acceptance of the myth of the general strike as a realistic method of struggle; we pointed out that this slogan is alien to Lenin's teachings on war; that it is not complementary to, but a substitute for the Leninist program of turning the imperialist war into civil war. While not explicitly repudiating the theory of the general strike against war, the answer to Bauer-Zyromski actually throws it overboard and moves toward a Leninist position on this fundamental question. It says:

"To utilize a war crisis for proletarian revolution, the working class must from the very beginning of the war go into a position of opposition, must organize the natural resentment that must develop against the ravages of the war, must prepare an offensive against the government through strikes and demonstrations, must foment revolt in the army." And it concludes: "The capitalist cry to imperialist war must be answered by the working class war of emancipation. Only the working class can, by its own power, overthrow fascism and defend the Soviet Union. The Socialist parties of the world must call upon the working class to answer the threat of war and of fascism with the seizure of power for Socialism."

Many of the questions raised in our original critique of the "Militant" war program remain unanswered. Here, however, we wish to concentrate on one main point: Contrast the principles enunciated by the "Militants" in their answer to Bauer-Zyromski, with the principles of the N.E.C. resolution. What the "Militants" said of the Bauer-Zyromski thesis applies

equally to the N.E.C. resolution: "It is precisely because of this basic contradiction between revolutionary intentions (meaning phrases) and advocacy of reactionary practice that the thesis is dangerous unless it is subject to a thorough analysis." But thorough analysis is precisely what the "Militants" did not give the N.E.C. resolution. They whitewashed it instead.

Recall the main points of the N.E.C. resolution. Like the Bauer-Zyromski thesis it parades a "forthright" expose of imperialist designs and calls for working class vigilance and activity, only to arrive at a reactionary program:

### N.E.C. Supports Capitalist "Peace" Instruments

1. It commits the same crime as the Stalinists, the outright chauvinists, and the "left" chauvinists like Bauer-Zyromski, by calling upon the working class to put the struggle against war into the hands of the imperialists themselves, by calling upon the working class, by depending on capitalist instruments for peace-making. The N.E.C. resolution does this by calling for the reform of the League of Nations, which is theoretically impossible under capitalism, and also by calling for neutrality legislation. We need not repeat here the critical analysis of this reactionary conception, which we published last week. We quote another paragraph from the N.E.C. resolution, which shows how identical with the chauvinist demand for governmental sanctions is the N.E.C. demand for American governmental action:

"Specifically, we ask the organized trade unions and the unorganized workers to unite in a nationwide effort to force through Congress, in the early days of the coming session, legislation which will assure American neutrality so far as official acts can do so. The present neutrality law should be revised and stiffened; more significantly, it should be extended to cover loans and credits, public or private, to any belligerent."

"Militant" leaders! What is the difference between this appeal to capitalist instruments and that of the European and Stalinist chauvinists?

2. The N.E.C. repeats its usual farrago of pacifist anti-war bunk: ". . . for a program of war resis-

tance in a war emergency, including refusal to be conscripted for military service" . . . "nothing can finally prevent the waste and slaughter of another conflict save the combination of courageous war resistance by American youth and a united strike against war by organized labor, technicians and professional workers generally."

"Militant" leaders! What has this bombast in common with the doctrines you have signed your name to in your answer to Bauer-Zyromski? "Refusal to be conscripted" would mean, if actually carried out, the slaughter and isolation in concentration camps of the small number who, ready to fight against war on the day it breaks out, should be sent into the army to foment the revolt which the answer to Bauer-Zyromski rightly calls for. The "united strike" against war is the vicious myth of the general strike which blinds workers to the hard, uphill struggle which begins, not with mythical and impossible political strikes against war but with the elementary task of carrying on economic strikes and anti-war propaganda until the ravages of war shall have created the necessary preconditions for raising this struggle to the level of preparation for civil war.

How did the Socialist Call greet this vicious combination of "anti-war" struggle by way of governmental instruments and pacifist "resistance"?

### "Militants" Cover Up N.E.C.

It greeted it with a three-bank headline covering half its front page: "Socialists Urge Labor Boycott of Italian Goods." It greeted it with a news-story which characterized the document in these terms: "Launching a nationwide campaign against war and preparations for war," "Sounding anew the Socialist call for mass resistance and opposition to all war"—with not a word in the news-story about the N.E.C. proposals for reforming the League of Nations, seeking neutrality legislation, refusal of conscription and "united strike"! And to finish off, the "Socialist Call" carried an editorial, saying: "Congratulations to the national executive committee of the Socialist Party for a fine job at its quarterly meeting last week-end." Among the things it congratulated the N.E.C.