

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. IV—No. 50 Saturday, December 14, 1940

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

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.

Registered 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 peoples' 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 Workers' and Farmers' Government.

British "Equality"

The capitalist press devotes much of its space to describing the punishment being dealt out by the British authorities to the German and Italian forces; we permit ourselves to call attention to a few scarcely-noticed items concerning punishments dealt out by the British authorities to people who are not fascists.

Within Britain itself, we limit ourselves to just one small item, published by the *Chicago Tribune* under the misleading heading, "London Severe With Looters." We quote verbatim:

"LONDON, Nov. 18—The unprecedented severity with which authorities are meting out punishment for looting from demolished houses and shops was illustrated today when a London police court sentenced Mrs. Doreen Jones, 42 years old, mother of ten children, to three months in jail for receiving 29 cents worth of coal stolen by a ten-year-old boy. Mrs. Florence Pedder, also 42, received the same sentence for getting 40 cents worth of coal under similar circumstances."

The numerous stories in the press about the social transformation and the growth of real democracy in England, the socialist acts of the British government now that "Labor" is in the government, etc., etc., are shown up as just so much lying war propaganda by this little item. "Equality of all" in capitalist England today is the same old equality of which Anatole France wrote: the majestic equality of the law which forbids rich and poor alike to steal bread. Rich and poor alike are sent to jail for stealing 29 cents' worth of coal. To enforce the majestic equality of such laws, many British policemen and troops are kept in England who might otherwise be added to the armed forces fighting Germany and Italy. Such is the love for law felt by the British authorities that they restrain their impulse to send these police and troops against the fascists and keep them at home to punish "Mrs. Doreen Jones, 42 years old, mother of ten children" and all other lawbreakers like her.

Other large bodies of British troops have their backs turned to Hitler and Mussolini in order to mete out punishment to lawbreakers in India. Punishment such as the sentence to four years at hard labor, meted out to Pandit Nehru, a leader of the All-India Congress, for daring to say publicly that India has been dragged into the war without the consent of the people of India. The arrest of Nehru has been followed by a wave of mass arrests for the same "crime."

Still other British troops cannot go to fight Hitler because they must enforce the majestic equality of the law in Britain's colonies. The Negro newspaper, the *Pittsburgh Courier*, reports the imprisonment in a concentration camp of Wallace Johnson, secretary of the Sierra Leone Trade Union Congress; and the sending to prison of S. O. Boyle and George Thomas, publisher and editor

of the *African Standard*, for having published an article protesting Johnson's arrest. These and many similar arrests are made under the Colonial Defense Regulations, which give the British governors the right to imprison any native whose conduct is considered likely to "prejudice the successful prosecution of the war."

Not only troops, but useful naval vessels, are kept in Palestine, to carefully patrol the coast in order to catch and deport the desperate Jewish refugees who are trying to enter the country illegally—illegally, because by British edict practically none may enter legally.

A brilliant alibi for Britain's treatment of its subject peoples was recently conceived by an editor of the *New Leader*, the organ of the all-aid-for-Britain-including-war Social Democratic Federation. He printed a picture of Nehru and in the caption underneath triumphantly explained that if Nehru were in German-held territory instead of in British-held territory, Nehru would have been shot.

For once we find ourselves in agreement with the *New Leader*. We accept the distinction that it makes between German fascism and British democracy. In Germany, fighters for freedom are shot; in the British Empire, fighters for freedom are imprisoned for four years at hard labor. That is what the distinction between fascism and "democracy" amounts to.

From this distinction the *New Leader* draws the conclusion: therefore let us support the British ruling class in its war against the German ruling class. Let us, this means, become the adherents of four-years-at-hard-labor against death-sentences. Whoever draws such a conclusion has the soul of a slave or the heart of a traitor to the working class.

Down with those who sentence to death our brothers, the workers of Germany! And down with those who send to prison or concentration camps our brothers, the workers and toiling peoples of the British Empire! We ally ourselves neither with the hangman nor the prison-keeper! Our only allies are the workers and the oppressed peoples of every country!

A Correction

While the Army authorities have not appeared anxious to call the matter to our attention, we hasten to correct a serious error of fact in our last week's editorial, "The Draftees' Health."

We stated last week that among the first batches of draftees called for medical examination, from 15 to 25 per cent had been rejected as physically unfit. This is absolutely untrue and we hasten to correct the wrong impression conveyed by these inaccurate figures.

The correct figures included: (1) From 15 to 25 per cent of the draftees were rejected as physically unfit by the Army doctors at the induction centers; (2) Prior to that, in the medical examinations made by the draft board doctors, nearly 60% were rejected as physically unfit. The 15 to 25 per cent found unfit by the Army doctors were found in a body of men who remained after 60% of the original body of draftees had been weeded out. That means that, out of a hundred men called up by the draft boards as eligible for Army service, only from 25 to 35 were found physically fit!

The real picture of the physical havoc wrought by the eleven years of capitalist depression is, therefore, three times as gruesome as we had painted it last week.

For the conditions which have bred this disease and physical degeneration among the masses, the Army has now found a solution. "A slight trend toward greater lenity on the part of Army doctors conducting final physical examinations of draft inductees was apparent today," the November 29 *New York Post* reports. In other words, the Army's solution is to lower the health standards of the Army!

It reminds us of Jonathan Swift's savage satire on Britain's mistreatment of Ireland. Swift suggested that in order to take the Irish children out of their misery they should be eaten.

Industrial Explosions

Most of the newspapers which blazoned in front page headlines the strike-breaking "red scare" statements of Attorney General Jackson against the Vultee Aircraft strikers did not carry a line of his statement of December 5 in which he warned against attributing the epidemic of industrial explosions to sabotage.

Jackson's statement was: "Industry is engaged in a great and sudden speedup which results in accidents... Many men are being called to work who have long been idle, and their skills have suffered."

"Experiments are being undertaken by industry to increase production. All these things tend to increase the number of industrial accidents."

All of which adds up to one fact: the employers, in their lust to reap war profits, are resorting to such unendurable speed-up and dangerous "experimental" processes, that the resultant deaths can only be termed, MURDER FOR PROFIT!

The *N. Y. Post*, December 5, throws further light on this whole matter in a tiny item:

"FBI officials have said privately that there definitely had been no organized attempts to disrupt production."

"They point out that last year before the preparedness program got under way, manufacturing plants suffered 23,700 fires, 10,500 of them caused by explosions."

The imperialist war in which the capitalists of the world are now engaged is merely an extension and heightening of that bloody and continuous war against the workers, which even in "peacetime" numbers its yearly victims in the millions.

Juicy War Contracts Just Ooze Fat Profits

Reporter Gets a Peek at Some of the Contracts—They Give Away Everything Except the White House Linen

By DON DORE

Perhaps you haven't noticed it, but practically nothing appears in the press giving any of the actual terms of the war-materials contracts which the government has been handing out to Big Business.

There is good reason for such silence. Were the general public to learn of the contents of these contracts, there would be an end to the myth about "taking the profits out of war."

We have seen only one article in the press giving some of the terms of a few of these contracts. It was written by Frank Rhylick, in the *New York Post*, Nov. 19, for the purpose of showing the average businessman that Roosevelt was all right for business. It proved that too well, perhaps, for Rhylick never wrote any follow-up articles on the subject!

Of the contracts in general, Rhylick declares: "The contracts, and they were described as 'typical' of their kind by a War Dept. employee, contain none of the profiteering crudities that characterized many contracts of the World War era. But they show indisputably that business is demanding and getting handsome terms."

"... The War Dept., aided by formal Treasury Dept. decrees, has been open-handed in approving the items a contractor may charge to 'cost'... Some of the contractual provisions seem almost an invitation to pad the expense accounts."

Some of these "invitations," quoted directly from terms of a \$19,084,136 contract awarded the Douglas Aircraft Corp. on Sept. 12, include the following items chargeable to "cost":

1. "Any reasonable costs arising by reason of or in connection with labor shortage or labor disputes." This means, in effect subsidization of the corporations by the government during strikes, including costs of strike-breakers, and company police, hiring fees of professional scabs, etc.

2. "State and local taxes including franchises and other taxes, levied on the right to do business." Workers will continue to pay taxes out of their incomes, but the bosses will be permitted to plough all taxes—including "excess profits" taxes—back into "costs," and realize 6 to 12 per cent profit on their taxes.

3. "Reasonable costs of servicing and maintaining corporate structure, including taxes and expenses on the transfer of capital stock." The bosses will have a picnic on this one! A multitude of "costs" can accrue from the "expenses" of stock manipulations and "the servicing and maintaining" of interlocking directorates and holding companies!

4. "Such other costs as should, in the opinion of the contracting officers, be included in the costs of airplanes." Such other costs—an unrestricted blanket coverage of any item which the contractor wishes to include—might mean a new "corporation" yacht, six months in Florida for all the vice-presidents, etc. And it will, it will!

GOOD OLD UNCLE— ANYTHING GOES!

The proviso adds, just in case the war profiteers might overlook a few crumbs in the public treasury: "In the event that, prior to final settlement under this con-

tract, the laws may be amended so as to provide for additional allowable items shall be considered allowable items hereunder."

But that's not all. Still another clause provides that at any time during the manufacturing of planes under the contract, the manufacturer may re-open negotiations for re-determining costs "on the basis of the experience then available, or on the basis of other pertinent knowledge or information," and the new "fixed price" per unit which the government will pay "shall apply not only to units there after to be delivered, but also to units theretofore delivered, for which proper adjustment shall be made."

This provision, the Post explains, is not peculiar to the Douglas contract. It appears as a "special provision" in an \$11,707,657 contract awarded the Curtiss Wright Corp., Sept. 9.

The Post tips the mitt on the real significance of these contracts by admitting: "The War Dept. and Defense Commission officials are fully aware that the customary fee of 6 percent on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract is no indication of the company's real profit. The term 'fixed fee' has long caused chuckles among lobbyists, and army and navy heads are always frank to wink at the phrase in private, but this is the major fact of life in Washington."

A \$33,500,000 lump sum tank contract awarded the Chrysler Motor Corporation is even more wide open than the Douglas or Curtiss contracts. It does not even attempt to stipulate the concern's margin of profit. Anything goes!

Camacho Takes Office-- And Turns To The Right

By WALTER ROURKE

MEXICO CITY, Dec. 1—The past week has seen the last of the Cardenas Government and the first signs of the new Camacho Government in Mexico. Henry Wallace arrived to attend the inauguration of Camacho. General Almazan returned to liquidate the movement which supported him and which continued to the last minute to believe his repeated promises that he would take power in the National Palace today.

The visit of Wallace has been given a flowery reception by all of the daily press, from the most reactionary to Toledano's *EL POPULAR*. They all interpret the visit as a proof of the continuation of Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor" policy.

Such a reception by *EL POPULAR* is more repulsive since it is a trade union paper—official organ of the C.M.T.—Confederation of Mexican Workers. *EL POPULAR*, under the control of the close collaborator of the Stalinists, Toledano, was always especially diligent in "discovering" that the Yankee imperialists and reactionaries are active in Mexico through such agents as Leon Trotsky and other enemies of the Stalinist International. It referred to Comrade Trotsky several times as an agent of the Dies Committee.

But with Henry A. Wallace the story is quite different although even the *New York Times* states in an editorial that "... the expropriated oil properties, American-owned lands and American railway investments (are mentioned) as rumored subjects of conversations to be held between Mr. Wallace and Mexican officials." *El Popular* begs to differ: "... President Roosevelt has given one more proof of his loyalty and respect for the principle of non-intervention, consecrated in America, and has made patent at the same time his proposition to continue his policy of Good Neighbor..."

CAMACHO'S RIGHT-TURN

Such a stupid and servile statement is not so surprising as it would seem, when the recent trend of Camacho is considered. Soon after being elected Camacho stated in an interview that he was a Catholic and that furthermore he was not a "socialist" but rather a democrat. These are unprecedented statements for a Mexican president to make since the revolution. (The church was always left out of the picture and every Mexican politician claimed to be a "socialist.") In the same interview Camacho said that he was sure that Cardenas did not wish to participate in his government and that neither Toledano

nor the Communists would collaborate. It must be remembered that Camacho was elected only thanks to the support of these people.

Shortly afterward it was announced that Toledano would retire from the General Secretaryship of the C.T.M. at the next Congress which will be held in February. This report was confirmed this week by Toledano himself in his speech to the 15th session of the National Committee of the C.T.M. He assures his listeners that he will continue to be a soldier of the proletariat "in whatever country of the world I may find myself." Yes, Lombardo is going to take a trip; it is said that he will be active in the Central and South American trade union movement—outside of Mexico.

The inauguration ceremonies of the new president have been heralded by a demonstration in front of the American Embassy and a raid on the Communist headquarters and the Almazan headquarters. The demonstrators at the Embassy all claimed to be Almazanistas with surprising unanimity; a leaflet they distributed began "Remember Texas." Indications are that this was organized by the Nazis and not by the Almazanistas.

The raid on the Communist Party headquarters has been reported in various different ways. The facts are however that some members of the army or of the police force attacked the headquarters. There was a brief skirmish and several shots were fired—result, several wounded and an army Major was killed. He was neither a fascist nor an Almazanista but a Camachista. Communist party members ar-

rested insist that the Major was shot from outside. There are theories that this raid is the prelude to the complete outlawing of the C.P.

In the light of these few happenings it is possible to see why there are some misgivings as to the future course of the Camacho government. Yet Toledano affirms that "... no conservative force either from within or without will be able to do anything against the regime of General Avila Camacho." He calls upon the working class movement to give the same support to Camacho that it has given to Cardenas. Toledano aids Camacho with the same servility with which he aided the Stalinists in doing away with Comrade Trotsky.

We can be confident that Special Ambassador Wallace will not place any obstacles in the way of Camacho's dealing summarily with any of the "fifth columnists" who object to the United States' "non-intervention" intervention in affairs of Central and So. America. Garrisoned airdromes and naval bases located strategically throughout the Americas will serve to defend the interests of Uncle Sam against the competitors from without the western hemisphere and against the future protesting peoples from within. Wallace's "Good Neighbor" smile and Camacho's "democratic" ideas will help to screen the Latin American parallel to the North American jingoist reaction.

Request Photos Of Leon Trotsky

To all Comrades, Friends,
and Sympathizers:

The Party has set up a Film Commission headed by John G. Wright to gather together for preservation every possible scrap of photographic record concerning the life of Leon Trotsky. We earnestly request everyone who has taken pictures of Comrade Trotsky during any period of his life to send them to us for duplication and preservation. The originals will be carefully handled and returned to each sender, immediately after duplication.

The Party will appreciate the cooperation of everyone in this task. Please send all material direct to:
John G. Wright
116 University Place
New York, N. Y.

NOTEBOOK Of an Agitator

Finland and Greece

Public opinion—that melange of sentiments and moods which are set in motion by bourgeois pressure and propaganda—is reacting rather calmly to the Italian attack on Greece. A year ago this same public opinion was all in a lather over Finland, then under attack by the Soviet bear. Why is there no hue and cry for Greece? Isn't poor little Greece as noble as poor little Finland, and isn't Mussolini just as big a bullying scoundrel as Stalin? Evidently there is something different somewhere.

In many respects, the Italo-Greek war appears to be a duplicate of the Soviet invasion of Finland; the points of resemblance strike the eye. In each case a strong military power attacked a smaller and weaker opponent. The Soviet invasion of last year appeared to be poorly prepared. The victim of aggression fought back and scored initial victories. The press dispatches pictured David putting Goliath to rout while thousands cheered. So today, in the modern war of the Greeks and the Romans. The first attacks are repelled and followed by what appear to be successful counter-attacks which push the invader back in retreat.

Nevertheless, the sheer military preponderance of Italy over Greece would seem to assure eventual victory unless powerful new forces are brought to play in favor of Greece. Why, then, is the far-flung anti-Soviet mob of last year not in action? Why are they resting in their dug-outs with such maddening nonchalance while the armies of Mussolini and Metaxas fight it out? Where are the sermons thundering from the pulpit? Where is the Hoover Fund Raising Committee? Where are the special theatrical benefits for the victim of aggression? Where are the trade union relief committees?

The sympathy of the American ruling class is indubitably on the side of Greece, since Greece is an ally of Britain, and thereby also of the United States, in the developing and expanding world struggle of the rival imperialist powers. But this sympathy is lukewarm and restrained. There is no drum-beating campaign, we see no hysteria, no unbridled fury, such as that which swelled in a mighty tide against the Soviet Union during the Soviet-Finnish war.

Is this because the rulers and makers of public opinion perceive a fundamental difference between the regime in Greece and that of Finland? Not at all. The bloody work of exterminating the flower of the proletariat, which was carried through to completion under Mannerheim in Finland, and on the basis of which Finnish "democracy" was stabilized, is still in process in Greece under the dictatorship of Metaxas. But this is a factor of secondary importance which does not even interest the class rulers, to say nothing of determining their policy.

The difference from their point of view is the difference between the class nature of the Soviet Union and fascist Italy. A victory of fascist Italy over Greece, would be a military episode in a drawn-out world war. The masters of America, because of the international alignment, have an interest in preventing such a victory. But they do not permit themselves to get unduly excited about the prospect. The military domination of Greece by fascist Italy would not change anything fundamentally in the class structure of the latter. It would not spread the infection of expropriation and nationalization which the masters of property fear and dread above everything else.

The difference which the ruling bourgeoisie perceives, and which motivates their instinctive reaction, is the fundamental difference between the property relations in the Soviet Union and those of fascist Italy. They do not delude themselves for one moment by a vulgar identification of the two countries because of the superficial similarity in the political regimes. They know the difference between a fascist regime which reinforces the rule of private property and a soviet regime which signifies its annihilation, and they have great respect for this difference. The preservation of the system of private property is the one thing that really concerns them.

It was the threat to private property, implicit in a Soviet victory over bourgeois Finland, which determined the unrestrained violence of the bourgeois anti-Soviet campaign during the Soviet-Finnish war. They gave the workers an instructive lesson in class politics! The motivation of the bourgeoisie in this case was graphically summarized in the Manifesto of the Fourth International on "The Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution," adopted by the emergency conference of the Fourth International last Spring. This Manifesto, the last great programmatic document written by Comrade Trotsky, says:

"Extremely eloquent in its unanimity and fury was the campaign which the world bourgeoisie launched over the Soviet-Finnish war. Neither the perfidy nor the violence of the Kremlin prior to this had aroused the indignation of the bourgeoisie, for the entire history of world politics is written in perfidy and violence. Their fear and indignation arose over the prospect of a social overturn in Finland upon the pattern of the one engendered by the Red Army in Eastern Poland. What was involved was a fresh threat to capitalist property. The anti-Soviet campaign, which had a class character through and through, disclosed once again that the USSR by virtue of the social foundations laid down by the October revolution, upon which the existence of the bureaucracy itself is dependent in the last analysis, still remains a workers' state, terrifying to the bourgeoisie of the whole world. Episodic agreements between the bourgeoisie and the USSR do not alter the fact that 'taken on the historic scale the contradiction between world imperialism and the Soviet Union is infinitely more profound than the antagonisms which set the individual capitalist countries in opposition to each other.' (War and the Fourth International)"

From a class point of view, the bourgeoisie were absolutely right in the position they took on the Soviet-Finnish war. So were we right, from the point of view of the fundamental class interests of the proletariat, in firmly maintaining our defense of the Soviet Union in spite of the enormous pressure of bourgeois public opinion, which even found expression at that time in our own ranks. Contemptible was the faction of Burnham and Shahtman which attacked our program in synchronism with the bourgeois anti-Soviet campaign. Pathetic must be the fate of the faction whose "independent" existence stems from that shameful capitulation.