

# British Give Way to Japan On Asia Front

By GEORGE STERN

The British retreat in Asia is taking on the semblance of a rout. On August 8 the British Viceroy of India announced a new and slightly more precise promise of dominion status for India... after the war. On Aug. 9, the War Office in London announced withdrawal of all British forces from Peking, Tientsin, and Shanghai.

The new promise to India is no less empty than all those that have gone before. But it is clearly tinged with the desperation of an imperial regime that knows its end is drawing near. Lord Linlithgow's statement was clearly an appeal to the native ruling classes of India, promising "free partnership" in the British Commonwealth in return for support against the threat of complete submersion of British power implicit in the German march of conquest.

That these pitifully meager offers should be regarded in London as substantial "concessions" on Britain's part is an indication of the wholly dictatorial and autocratic nature of Britain's present rule over the 350,000,000 people of India. As the pressure on the British Empire increases and draws closer to India itself, we may expect still broader promises, wider concessions.

### Meaning of Retreat in China

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

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

It is not the passing of British power in China that is to be mourned, but the manner of it. Thirteen years ago the Chinese peoples rose in their scores of millions in a movement that threatened for a time to drive the British and their imperialist rivals together into the Pacific whence they came. It was then, in 1927, that the Powers rushed troops to Shanghai to defend the wealth of the International Settlement against the threat of Chinese nationalism.

### The New Slavemaster

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

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

Hongkong, French Indo-China, Singapore, the Dutch Indies all lie now at approaching stations on the Japanese march of conquest. Up until the collapse of France it had been generally understood that U. S. imperialism stood ready to challenge these advances and to fight for its own "right" to succeed to the mastery in Asia. Now instead the lords of Wall Street and Washington have to look to their holdings in the Americas. The 1200 U. S. marines in Shanghai must soon follow the British in retreat.

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

# THE NATIONAL DEFENSE LIE

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

By SAM MARCY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### NATIONAL DEFENSE IS A LIE TO FOOL US

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

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

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

### ARE WE PARTNERS WITH J. P. MORGAN?

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

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

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

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

### HOW THE DEFENSE COMMISSION PURCHASES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### THEY CALL IT "AMORTIZATION"

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

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

(A second article in this series appears next week)

# An Anti-Labor Clown Tries Red-Baiting

By MARK KNIGHT

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

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

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

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

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

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

This, according to Fitts, is but the beginning of a long and detailed expose. More than 60 witnesses have already been called before the Grand Jury.

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

### Fitts Notoriously Anti-Labor

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

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

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

### Why He Needs It

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

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

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

### We Don't Want Fitts' Help

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

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

# Labor's Answer to Conscription

(Continued from page 1)

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

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

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

We have now seen what will happen in industry, where the conscription regulations will help employers to weed out militant unionists and hold that threat as a club over the organized workers. That will be the regime in the factories. ... And now let us ask a question, (still from a "Simon pure" union standpoint) which Lewis and Green do not even hint at. What will happen to the workers who are drafted into the army? What kind of regime will they live under?

### The Army's Open Shop Regime

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### If Not Conscription, Then What?

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

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

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

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

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

### Labor's Military Program

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

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

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

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