

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. IV—No. 47 Saturday, November, 23 1940

Published Weekly by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASSN.
at 114 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: AL-gonquin 4-3447

Editorial Board:
FELIX MORROW ALBERT GOLDMAN

General Manager:
RUTH JEFFREY

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

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

FIGHT WITH THE
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

ON THE WAR FRONT:

For:

1. Military training of workers, financed by the government, under control of the trade unions.
2. The establishment of special officers' training camps, financed by the government and controlled by the trade unions, to train workers to become officers.
3. Confiscation of all war profits—all company books to be open for trade union inspection.
4. Expropriation of all war industries and their operation under workers' control.
5. Trade union wages for all workers drafted into the army.
6. Full equality for Negroes in the armed forces—Down with Jim Crowism.
7. An end to secret diplomacy.
8. A people's referendum on any and all wars.

AT HOME:

For:

1. A job and decent living for every worker.
2. Thirty-thirty—\$30 weekly minimum wage—30 hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
3. \$30 weekly old age and disability pension.
4. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.
5. Workers Defense Guards against vigilante and fascist attacks.
6. A twenty-billion dollar Federal public works and housing program to provide jobs for the unemployed.
7. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
8. An Independent Labor Party based on the Trade Unions.
9. A Worker's and Farmer's Government.

Mr. Dies and 'Sabotage'

During the past weeks a number of explosions in chemical plants have taken the lives of a score or more workers. All the evidence gathered by explosive experts, by company superintendents and representatives of the press shows conclusively that these explosions were due to accidents occasioned by the unparalleled expansion of the munitions industry. Not even the FBI, which will remain as long as a year on the study of an overturned truck in order to attempt to pin an alleged crime on a union, has been able to gainsay this evidence.

Nevertheless, members of the Dies Committee rushed into headlines throughout the nation with cries of "sabotage" and hints of a nation-wide "plot" to disrupt the munitions industry.

Neither Roosevelt nor any other of the tools of Wall Street resident in Washington have lifted a finger to dispel the sinister impression Mr. Dies and his committee are deliberately creating.

It is clear that the labor movement is facing a cold-blooded attempt on the part of the bosses to fan a spy hysteria. This hysteria on the one hand covers up the fact that the workers blown to bits in the explosions were the victims of the greed of employers, who in their eagerness to fill their pockets in the golden flow of war orders, are quite willing to sacrifice the lives of employees through hazardous short cuts in the manufacturing process of explosives or through inadequate precautions.

On the other hand, this hysteria permits the employers to direct blows against organized labor by calling protests, demands for improved working conditions, or strikes "sabotage."

If sabotage is at the bottom of these explosions as Mr. Dies alleges, we suggest that he make a practical proof. Let him bring on to the floor of Congress a few hundred tons of dynamite just before it goes through one of the delicate and dangerous processes in which the workers were killed. Let him and his committee members carry through this process step by step before the eyes of Congress in order to demonstrate that compounding

and mixing the ingredients of these explosives when "sabotage" is eliminated is as safe as sweeping the floor.

If any Congressman objects to such a demonstration on the ground of its danger, then let him repudiate Dies in the public press and launch an investigation where it is really needed—the manufacturing processes of the greedy munitions profiteers and their connections with men in public office like Dies who cover them up.

'You Can't Strike'

Those who are so eager to send American boys to die for "democracy" against "totalitarianism" might find plenty of fighting to do right here at home.

First Roosevelt tells the WPA workers that "You can't strike against the government." The National Defense Commission and the bosses are telling the workers that "you can't strike against the government" in private industries with government orders. Every piddling local government agency is pulling the same kind of talk.

La Guardia now tells the New York transport workers that they can't strike against violations by the local Board of Transportation of the union contract, because they are civil service employees.

What a commentary it is on the hypocrisy of these "democratic" gentlemen who have yelped loudest over the fact that in Germany the workers cannot strike against the government. Totalitarianism, you see, only applies to the "enemy."

Unknown Nationality

It is only two weeks since the re-election of Roosevelt for a third term, yet the steps leading the United States to military participation in World War No. 2 have visibly quickened.

Four German freighters after fourteen months in Tampico put out to sea. Not more than ten miles from port they were met, according to the press by "warships of unknown nationality." One of the freighters was scuttled by its crew, the others hastily returned.

This happened not in the North Atlantic, but in the Gulf of Mexico, not far from New Orleans, Houston, Galveston.

The press immediately dropped further mention of the "warships of unknown nationality." If they were British warships, they were within the 300 mile neutrality zone established by Roosevelt, in clear violation of Roosevelt's neutrality laws.

But a darker suspicion seems more probable. The British fleet is busy around England, the Mediterranean, the Far East. Were these "warships of unknown nationality" American warships? If that is true, then the American battle fleet has carried out the first act of military participation in the present imperialist conflict.

By Inches

Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the General Motors Corporation, and side-kick of William Knudsen, GM executive and head of the National Defense Commission, last week fired the starting gun in the race of Big Business to remove all limitations on the work week, and to eliminate overtime pay and the other conditions won by years of organized labor struggle. All in the interest of "national defense."

Speaking before a dinner of the Academy of Political Science attended by leading Wall Street big wigs and government representatives, Sloan drew rounds of applause when he advocated that the six-day week be substituted for the five-day week in all industries.

The *New York Times* of Nov. 14 reported: "In his prepared manuscript, Mr. Sloan urged that 'the penalty for overtime should be cancelled during the emergency to encourage a longer work week,' but he omitted this from his speech as delivered."

At the last moment Sloan decided a knife by inches is better than a guillotine.

Birmingham Buzzard

The death of Neville Chamberlain writes an ironic footnote to the history of the second world war. The old buzzard of Birmingham has had the last of his roses and the last of his brickbats.

The events of the last year and a half have shown, however, that the policy of appeasement pursued by Chamberlain and Daladier had a very sober basis in their appreciation of the real relationship of forces in Europe. This was certainly true in Daladier's case, as the quick collapse of France proved.

The appeasers were not simply naive dumbbells. They were men who understood that their own regimes were too rotten to risk in a war, that Hitler was militarily stronger, and that a conflict might prove fatal. But the war had to come nevertheless. The fatal outcome had to be risked. The appeasers won only a short year's respite for last-minute preparations. For France it was not enough. For Britain, thanks to its insular position, the extra time was worth a little more.

It is in this sense that the role of Chamberlain has to be assessed. He was not the poor, deluded sap over whose corpse editorial writers wagged solemn heads. He was both a symbol and a representative of the British bourgeoisie slipping from its position of eminence and domination in world affairs. It is doubtful whether he really thought it was "peace in our time" when he came back from Munich in September, 1938. But the people of England thought it was. They were miserably disillusioned.

The fight for "peace in our time" has still a long course to run—and to be won, it will have to advance beyond the Churchills and the Hitlers. The people won't be fooled all of the time.

Roosevelt and Wall St.

FDR Plans Same "50-50" Break for Labor in Coming War
As Workers Received in the Last Imperialist Conflit

By ART PREIS

During World War No. 1, 21,000 new American millionaires were created. Every slaughtered American soldier was worth \$500,000 net profit to Wall Street.

As for labor, it received an average 30 percent monetary wage increase. This was more than wiped out by an average price increase of 100 percent. The fiction that all the American workers were silk shirts during the war, is refuted by the fact that total average real wages declined as much as 40 percent.

LABOR REGIMENTED

In addition, the entire labor movement was regimented. Strikes were met by ruthless suppression; strikers were court-martialed and given long prison terms. In some instances Army troops marched into struck industries and operated them at Army pay, \$21 a month. When the war was over, the "defenders of democracy" came back to unemployment and accumulated debt. By 1921, there were over 5 million without jobs. The national debt, which was \$9.88 per person in 1914, was \$228 per person at the end of the war.

Despite terrorization, patriotic pressure and the complete capitulation of their own leaders, the workers were compelled to fight back against unendurable conditions. Starting with 1916, a tremendous strike wave swept the country. In 1917, there were 4,450 strikes, more than in any year except 1937.

VIVID MEMORY

The memory of this tremendous struggle is vivid in the mind of the ruling class. Through its agents, like Roosevelt, it now seeks to re-assure labor in preparation for the coming war. This time, say the pay-triots, labor is in for a fifty-fifty break.

The initiation of this "break" started in July 1939. During mounting unemployment, WPA appropriations were suddenly sliced in half. But more significant, the Roosevelt administration abandoned the principle of the "prevailing wages." This was a calculated provocation of union labor.

STRIKERS THROWN IN JAIL

When the WPA workers struck, Roosevelt declared, "You cannot strike against the government." Federal agents, acting as spies,

Wall Street Stooze



brought charges against 156 Minneapolis strikers. 32 received prison sentences. Roosevelt ignored the plea of the entire labor movement to pardon the convicted men.

The principle layed down by Roosevelt in July 1939 is now in effect in private industry. During the past year, the government has moved into every important strike to break it with the dictum, "You can't strike against the government." Every industry becomes part of "national defense," every strike is "against the government."

WAR ORDERS TO OPEN SHOPS

While Bethlehem Steel received over a billion dollars in war orders, despite a federal court ruling that the company is in violation of the federal labor laws, the government ruthlessly curbed a threatened strike of Bethlehem workers.

At the same time, it struck a deadly blow at all New Deal labor legislation by openly declaring a policy of granting war orders to the vilest open-shoppers, Du Pont, Ford Motors, Bethlehem Steel, etc.

First Results of Our
Military Policy---

(Continued from Page 1)

critics who have attacked our resolution in their official paper. These people are in favor of the proletarian revolution but they are really incapable of understanding transitional measures and demands which can take the workers as they are, not yet revolutionary, and advance them toward the revolutionary goal: a program which can form a bridge between the present consciousness of the workers and the ultimate logic of their struggle; in other words, a transitional program.

That is why they cannot understand or agree with us today any more than they could understand or agree with the general transitional program of the Fourth International adopted at its World Congress. It is this sectarian mentality in general that dooms them to complete isolation from the current struggle of the workers and condemns them to utter futility despite all their intentions.

SECTARIAN VIEW

The S.L.P. will surely reject our military program if they have not already done so. (God forgive me, I don't read the *Weekly People* as attentively as I should and don't know whether they have yet expressed themselves.) The S.L.P. will have nothing less than the "unconditional surrender of the capitalist class."—No immediate demand, no transitional program. But since the capitalist class, up to the present at any rate, has shown no disposition to surrender, the S.L.P. remains aloof, uninterested and uncontaminated and, consequently, without the slightest influence on the course of development in the labor movement. Abstract propaganda for socialism is good and necessary. But such propaganda alone can never produce a revolutionary victory of the workers. It is necessary to supplement it by a practical program of agitation adapted to the needs of the day and the present stage of working class development, in order to lift the movement higher and turn it in a revolutionary direction. That is why the revolutionary party needs

a transitional program in general. That is why in the present world conditions it needs a military transition program in particular.

A FIRST CLASS SUBSTITUTE

The Lovestonites have not yet commented on our military resolution, as far as I know. But if they find it possible to take time off from their frenzied defense of Great Britain, they will surely attack our resolution "from the left," as they attacked the general transitional program of the Fourth International last year. We shall wait and see. Meantime we have a first class substitute for a Herbergian outburst of phoney radicalism and pseudo-Marxism, embellished with irrelevant historical references and misapplied quotations, in a recent number of *Labor Action*, the official organ of the "Workers Party." This is the political group which the well-known Professor Burnham, with callous disregard of them, with callous disregard of his parental obligations, abandoned, with the cruel remark that it "begins with foundations none too firm" and the parting salute: "I cannot wish success to the Workers Party." The author of this burlesque is Max Shachtman. And it marks his first utterance on controversial questions for a long time. After the double disaster of his polemic with Trotsky and the desertion of Burnham, Shachtman retired into silence and contemplation for many months. And that was the best thing for him to do. Total abstinence is the best prescription for a man sick from talking too much. But that couldn't last forever. Now he is at it again and, of course, as he himself says, his remarks are "sharply polemic."

WHAT ABOUT BURNHAM?

When the announcement was made, with much fanfare, that Shachtman was returning to the political wars one might have thought that conscience and common sense would require him, first of all, to deal with the question of Burnham. Doesn't he owe his anxiously waiting public at least a few words of explanation on this score? How did it happen that Shachtman's mentor and "friend and colleague," with whom he fought shoulder to shoulder against Trotsky and the Trotskyists, suddenly—only two months later!—openly repudiated socialism and passed over into the camp of the class enemy? An explanation of this circumstance is what you might have expected from Shachtman—if you don't know Shachtman. But his "sharply polemic" article, full of sound and fury, is not directed at Burnham; it is intended to drown out the question of Burnham by shouting loud and long against others. It is not directed at the man who deserted socialism but at those who in their stupid, ignorant way still remain faithful to it.

DENOUCED TROTSKY

Only a few months ago, Burnham, with Shachtman at his heels, denounced Trotsky and the Trotskyites as capitulators to Stalin and as "the left cover for Hitler." So spoke Burnham, the spokesman of the minority, at our party convention a few months ago. Now, without so much as an explanation of our transformation, Shachtman describes us as capitulators to American imperialism, as almost-if-not-quite social patriots, as class collaborationists, as falsifiers of the "views and traditions of the Bolsheviks in the last war" which he, of course, defends.

An unsuspecting casual reader might easily imagine that the man is on a revolutionary rampage. But in reality he is only kibitzing. His entire article from beginning to end is a mixture of confusion and bad faith—a Shachtman "polemic." Not a single one of his "points" can stand inspection. In my next article I shall undertake to prove this, point by point. In doing so, I hope, as I said in the beginning, to contribute something to the clarification of the many and serious questions concerning our policy raised by workers in discussions with our comrades in the field. If I succeed in this the time spent on an otherwise distasteful task will not be wasted.

Go Forward

Eight Professional
Pacifists
Seek Jail Term

By JOSEPH HANSEN

Eight students of the Union Theological Seminary have been sentenced by the federal court in New York to serve a year and a day in prison for refusing to register under the draft. All of them as members of an organization opposing conscription and war on the ground of religious scruples would have come under the classification of "conscientious objectors;" hence, under present interpretation of the draft laws, not subject to active participation in the future armed conflicts in which the United States will engage.

Their acceptance—even seeking—of a prison sentence was thus a planned effort of professional pacifists to make a dramatic political demonstration of their views. They oppose war in general because of their scruples over the shedding of blood in general. They are principled vegetarians in the field of politics.

By their example, they hope to influence prospective soldiers into seeking jail terms rather than military education. Their answer to imperialist war is, jails not battleships!

IN KEEPING WITH THEIR POSITION

The refusal of these eight to register and their seeking prison sentence to underline this refusal flows with iron logic from their political position. If they oppose military training, then they cannot even carry a registration card. Anything else is cowardice, inconsistency, a fatal concession to the spirit of militarism. Like the fabled virgin they pray God to save them from becoming even a little bit pregnant!

Other pacifist groups who oppose military training in general and who yet make no demonstrations in demonstrating that they take their pacifist views either logically or seriously. These bible students are obviously honest and courageous. But they contribute nothing to the real struggle against war.

Their pacifism is not the pacifism of the oppressed—pacifism such as that mistakenly expressed by the Negro sailors who protested the Jim Crow conditions prevailing in the U. S. Navy. Their pacifism is the professional pacifism of such treacherous petty bourgeois politicians as Norman Thomas. Their pacifism is a perfidious snare designed to deliver the working class throttled and limp to the war-mongers.

In times of peace these pacifists accept all the class injustices, all the lies, the frame-ups, the perversions and distortions of truth imposed by the ruling class. But when the ruling class projects these injustices, lies, frame-ups, perversions, onto the field of battle, these pacifists make a demonstration: "No, We will have nothing to do with military training! It leads to bloodshed! We choose jail!"

'FORCE AND FORCE ALONE'

These pacifists who oppose military training must be rejected with the utmost contempt by the class-conscious worker, just as he would reject with scorn and hate a scab who said, "Unions? No I will have nothing to do with them. They lead to tear gas! I choose independence!"

The working class cannot exchange a year's military training for a prison cell as have these professional pacifists. Even if the millions in the working class could make a trade like this, that would not convince Wall Street that wars from now on should be conducted without tears, dirt, and bloodshed. Nor would it put an end to war in general.

The cold reality is that the working class will inevitably find itself up to the neck in the reek and bloody slush of the battlefields of World War No. 2—and no bomb shelters such as prison cells provide! The task is to smash the capitalist system which the pacifists endure and support. War is nothing but the extension of peace-time capitalist institutions in a more violent and horrible form. The bloody institution of war against which the pacifists offer up weak protests can be ended only by ending the system as a whole.

The working class alone can lead the masses in carrying out this task but to do so it must be trained in the military arts. That is one of the requisites. As Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, declared with truth before a group of business men in Boston on November 14, "In a world like this... force and force alone determines the fate of nations."

THE REAL OPPOSITION TO WAR

The revolutionary socialist in contrast to the pacifist is a real opponent of capitalist war.

He starts not with some abstraction about the desirability of peace and non-violence in general, a proposition with which anyone will agree. He starts from the real world of the class struggle and he takes his stand at the vanguard of the working class where the blows fall thickest.

Whether the pacifists think it objectionable or not, military training of the masses is on the order of the day. The question is, shall it be organized like an open shop with the bosses in strict control, through their officers or shall it be organized in connection with the trade unions with the workers in control?

Other political representatives of the petty-bourgeoisie, such as the so-called Workers Party, declare that trade union control of military training is bad and to be rejected because the present heads of the trade unions are treacherous fakers! This answer is as pious as the sentiments of the pacifists who went to jail, but not quite as honest. The basic question is, which class organizations shall control military training, those of the bourgeoisie or those of the workers?

Only the petty bourgeois pacifists, who reject the class struggle altogether, or those who like Westbrook Pegler offer conditional support to the trade unions providing they "cleanse themselves" of racketeering elements can refuse an answer to this question. The real opponents of capitalist war draw a sharp line of demarcation between the interests of the bourgeoisie, its agents, both labor fakers and professional pacifists, on the one hand; and the interests of labor on the other.

For the present period, this line is formulated in the slogan Military Training Under Control of the Trade Unions.