

**SOCIALIST APPEAL**

VOL. IV—No. 52 Saturday, December 28, 1940

Published Weekly by the  
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASSN.  
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.  
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-1147

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,  
1935, 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.

**Murray's Program**

President Phillip Murray of the CIO has sent to Roosevelt a proposal for "maintaining continuous production" on war orders. The essence of the plan is labor-employer boards in each industry. We are quite well aware of such differences as exist between the outlook of Murray and John L. Lewis on the one hand, and William Green and Sidney Hillman on the other. The main difference is on the question of industrial unionism and on that question, as we have often pointed out, we stand with Murray and Lewis against Green and Hillman. But on the question of "national defense" we find that all these four gentlemen see eye to eye with each other.

What does Green say? Addressing the quadrennial convention of the Carpenters recently he declared: "We maintain that labor should be represented on every board created by this government for the promotion of our defense program."

What does Hillman say? At the CIO national convention Murray declared that there should be a labor-employer board in every industry—substantially the same proposal that Murray now has made officially to Roosevelt. Hillman answered him: "We are starting on the course suggested by Murray... If it is the suggestion we set up defense industries commissions, we are on the way. We are right now setting it up in the shipbuilding industry and there will be an equal representation of labor and industry on that particular commission... We expect to do that in the aircraft industry as soon as we set it up in shipbuilding, and there will be representatives of labor."

And on November 30, Hillman announced the setting up of a "shipbuilding stabilization committee" along that line. And there's no reason to doubt that before he, Knudsen and Roosevelt are finished, they will have such committees in every industry. Why not? It's all to the advantage of the employers and their government.

So what's the difference in views among Hill-

man, Green, Murray and Lewis on this basic question? None that's visible to the naked eye.

Their proposal is as false as would be the proposal to give half the seats on a union executive board to the bosses. It's as false as would be a proposal for setting up compulsory arbitration boards. As a matter of fact, Hillman's actual boards—first in shipbuilding, then elsewhere—constitute a major step in the direction of compulsory arbitration.

We know that Murray and Lewis don't like the anti-labor consequences of such boards. Yet, reluctantly, without enthusiasm, Lewis and Murray ended up by proposing to Roosevelt the formation of such boards. That was inevitable, given the present political outlook of Murray and Lewis. They had to take some stand on the questions arising out of war production. Only two main positions were possible. Either they could, like Hillman and Green, agree to class-collaboration with the bosses and their government. Or they could declare themselves firmly as the defenders of the interests of the working class against the bosses and their government. One or the other! The issue is now posed on a razor edge and can't be evaded.

So Murray and Lewis have taken the same stand as Hillman and Green. Because to take the opposite stand means to launch the labor movement on the road of independent political action, on the road of a Labor Party. Because it would mean that the working class should itself become the power and the government of the country. That's the only real alternative to the Judas role of Hillman and Green. Everything in their past and present, however, keeps Murray and Lewis from adopting that alternative.

But the workers of the CIO don't have that kind of past and present. Their catastrophic experiences with the Hillman-Green-Murray-Lewis position will inevitably drive these workers, for their very salvation, to the road of independent labor action.

**AFL Bourbons**

The AFL bureaucracy, like the Bourbons, learns nothing and forgets nothing. Its conception of a good union man still is a fellow in one of the sheltered and well-paying crafts who has worked at the same trade for forty years in the same town. This stupid conception remains untouched by the 11-year catastrophic crisis which drove millions upon millions from their trades and their towns. It remains impervious to the inspiring fact that the trade union movement has more than doubled its membership in the last few years, and that the new members are the most militant and now constitute the backbone of the labor movement.

How all this passes by the dull mind of an AFL bureaucrat is shown in the Dec. 17 issue of the AFL *Weekly News Service*, in the column of its editor, Philip Pearl. He brazenly undertakes to defend the \$300 initiation fee charged by the Washington, D. C. local of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, against the complaint of a worker:

"In the first place, the only reason this migrant worker sought to join the union was because he couldn't get the (army construction) job otherwise." Note that smug, contemptuous reference to a "migrant" worker. Workers who have to migrate are just scum to Mr. Pearl. "If he had enough skill to qualify him to become a member, the probabilities are that he acquired his skill working in scab shops as a non-union man." So what, Mr. Pearl? Five million good union men were non-union men five years ago—and today they're better union men than you are.

But then Mr. Pearl gets down to the meat of the thing. "The chief reason for initiation fees is to keep new members out when there are not enough jobs to go around for the members already in." His idea of a union is a job trust. Keep all the jobs for "our" boys, and to hell with everybody else. To add insult to injury, after keeping the others out Mr. Pearl calls them men who "acquired their skill working in scab shops."

Mr. Pearl's policy meant, concretely, during the years of mass unemployment, to drive out of the unions the unemployed who couldn't keep up their dues, and to keep the unemployed out of the union. It meant to set up an impassable barrier between the employed and the unemployed, pitting one against the other.

Precisely such a policy, pursued by the the Social Democratic leaders of the German trade unions, served to drive the desperate unemployed into the arms of Hitler.

Fortunately, the CIO industrial union movement has grasped the importance of uniting employed and unemployed and bringing all into the unions. Fortunately, too, some AFL unions don't set up impassable barriers against interested workers. But this Bourbon outlook of the AFL bureaucracy can still do great damage to the American labor movement.

**Anaconda Copper Trust Hits The Jackpot Again**

**It's Just Like It Was In 1917—The Sky's The Limit—It's Nice To Have Friends In Washington**

The Anaconda Copper Mining Company, and its subsidiaries, which has a virtually complete monopoly on the ownership and production of all copper in the United States, and controls no less than 60 percent of the world supply, announced a consolidated net profit of \$24,241,675 for the first nine months of 1940. This is more than a 100 percent gain in profits over the 1939 corresponding period.

It is obvious that the Copper Trust is continuing and even bettering its profiteering record of the last war. Anaconda Copper in nine months of 1940 made \$3,438,805 more profit than it did for the whole of 1938. The net take for 1938 was \$20,802,870. By the end of the present year, the total copper profits will far surpass the 1917 total of \$25,203,751.

What this monumental profiteering really means in terms of the influence of the Copper Trust over the present Administration can only be realized when we consider how Anaconda Copper garnered its lesser profits during World War No. 1.

**TOOL OF TRUSTS HEADS WAR BOARD**

Heading the War Industries Board, which had dictatorial control over all industry and government purchasing during the last war, was Bernard M. Baruch. Baruch was a speculator in copper stocks who was given his start in the brokerage business by James Keene, a confidential broker for J. P. Morgan and

Company. Baruch made his first big pile in the Amalgamated Copper manipulations of the Morgan-controlled National City Bank out of which came the Anaconda Copper trust. In 1904, Baruch became a confidential broker for the Guggenheim interests which had control of Anaconda Copper. As chairman of the War Industries Board, this tool of Morgan and Guggenheim spent government funds at the rate of \$10,000,000,000 annually.

Baruch was ably assisted in cleaning up for the copper trust by John D. Ryan, president of the Anaconda Copper Corporation, who was Assistant Secretary of War under Woodrow Wilson, and head of the copper buying committee of the War Industries Board.

After the war the House of Representatives set up a special committee, headed by William J. Graham of Illinois, to investigate the war-profits scandals. The evidence of this committee fills 21 massive volumes, and includes overwhelming proof of the graft, corruption and gigantic thievery of Anaconda Copper in conjunction with the government.

**HOW THEY SQUEEZED THE GOVERNMENT**

Among the findings of the Graham committee was the fact that just two weeks before Wilson sent his war message to Congress on April 2, 1917, Ryan and Baruch had arranged a monopoly combination of all copper producers to sell to the government 45,000,000 pounds of copper, an indispensable

war material for 16 2-3 cents a pound. The combine was known as United Metals Selling Company, with Ryan as president. From this combine, the government during the war bought 523,338,735 pounds of copper of a total of 592,258,674 pounds purchased.

The average cost of producing copper, according to the Graham committee's findings, was 8 to 12 cents per pound. But by October 15, 1917, when the government made its second great copper purchase of the war, the price advanced to 26 cents by June 15, 1918. Copper profits ranged from 33 to more than 200 percent.

From 1916 to 1920, the Navy Department did tremendous purchasing, including a great deal of copper. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who had continuous important dealings with Baruch and Ryan, was a young fellow named Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The press on Tuesday, November 26 of this year gives front page notice to the fact that Roosevelt had "lunch" with Baruch just prior to an important special secret conference of the President with the heads of the War and Navy departments and the National Defense Commission. Although the present incredible profits of Anaconda Copper are evidence enough, this luncheon tête-à-tête tops off the proof that Roosevelt is not forgetting his old-time friends like Barney Baruch.

So much for Anaconda, the same story can be told about all the other big trusts. War—it's wonderful—for the fat cats.

**Latin-American Masses Fear Uncle Sam's "Aid"**

By QUEBRACHO

**BUENOS AIRES (By Mail)**—The announcement in New York that the Uruguayan government was preparing to consider construction of air and naval bases at the mouth of the Rio de la Plata, in connivance with the United States, produced a sensation in this part of the continent.

In a recent interpellation in the Uruguayan Senate, Foreign Minister Guani said that already in June a U. S. military commission had visited Uruguay to survey favorable sites for bases. Yet nobody here knew of the existence of this commission; only now has the Uruguayan government said a word about it. What is more: every rumor concerning this possibility of such bases—rumors which always came from the United States—have been categorically denied by Cordell Hull and the South American governments. The game is now clear: these rumors were launched as trial balloons in order to accustom the people of our countries to the idea of having Yankee imperialism installed in a series of Gibralters in South America.

Despite this preparation the announcement now made about projected bases at the mouth of the Rio de la Plata, a few miles from Buenos Aires and Montevideo and controlling the most vital zone of the South Atlantic, has deeply moved our people. The innumerable organs of publicity controlled by Yankee imperialism—which are operated here in truly amazing number, increasing all the time—have exhausted all methods to convince the masses of the necessity of installing such bases against the "Nazi danger", and that the bases will be built "without affecting in any way the sovereignty of the countries involved." In spite of all this propaganda, the uneasiness of the public cannot be soothed away, even though this uneasiness often fears to express itself because it doesn't

want to appear as a partisan of Nazi-fascism.

The press and organizations here which serve the Axis powers have of course hastened to raise a gain in their "anti-imperialist" banner, filling this city with posters against the cession of these bases, accusing the Uruguayan government of "treason," and pointing to the danger of permitting Yankee imperialism to control the mouth of the Rio de la Plata.

The Chilean government has felt it necessary to declare that it is not considering the possibility of ceding bases to the United States, while a representative of official circles has declared himself flatly opposed to such cessations.

For its part, the Uruguayan Senate, after interpellating Minister Guani, made a declaration similar to that of Chile, although in this case the action loses much of its weight since it was inspired by the "Herrerista" party, which is linked to Nazi-fascism. (Since this article was written, the three Herrerista ministers have resigned from the Uruguayan cabinet in protest against the negotiations for bases.—Editor.)

The Argentine government has as yet said nothing, although it is known here that acceptance of the plans for "continental defense"—i.e., cession of bases on the southern coast, in Patagonia—is the condition demanded for granting the \$100,000,000 loans and arrangements for commerce, now being negotiated in Washington by our Prebisch mission. If that condition is agreed to, there will be a great public outcry, especially in the army and navy, which may well be taken advantage of by the Nazi-fascists.

However, everything indicates that Wall Street is going to move with extreme caution and advance only little by little its plan for economic and military domination of South America. Cordell Hull has declared for the hundredth time that the proposed bases will not affect the sov-

ereignty of the South American countries. The bases would be under the control of the South American countries which would construct them, and which would, only in case of external aggression, put them at the disposition of the other nations of the continent, including, forsooth, the United States. In return, the South American warships would be able to utilize the bases of the United States—I needn't underline the comical aspect of this "in return."

When all factors are taken into consideration, it is easy to see that, in spite of the great uneasiness shown by the people at the announcement about the bases, the project will go forward. That is already stated by General Balmori, President of Uruguay, in spite of the contrary vote in the Senate.

The ever-greater campaign of the "democratic" press of this continent, in the service of Yankee imperialism, will make inroads in convincing public opinion that opposition to these plans is the exclusive work of totalitarian propaganda and that all those who don't support it are members of the "fifth column." In this way they will be able to castrate, for the present, the patriotic impulse of the South American people. In this way they will stifle the voice of the revolutionary workers by identifying them with Nazi-fascism and discredited Stalinism. And the South American people will accept with clenched teeth, as a "lesser evil", the open or covert installation of Yankee imperialism on our coasts.

Until they awake to the realization that, through the treason of their governing classes, this step means the chaining of our peoples to the war machine of the United States and our enslavement by that which will be the most brutal imperialism of all times, Wall Street imperialism-

November 25, 1940

**Shachtman Takes Chair Vacated By Professor Burnham**

By JOSEPH HANSEN

The announcement of Max Shachtman in the December issue of his *New Internationalist* that he has been led "to abandon the position that Russia is a workers' state," will come as a surprise to no one who has followed the development of the petty bourgeois group to which he belongs. Shachtman has only moved over to the position occupied by his ex-client, Professor Burnham, before the latter abandoned the camp of the working class for the camp of the bourgeoisie.

It will be recalled that Burnham for some years held the view that the Soviet Union is not a workers' state. Nevertheless so long as the Franco-Soviet pact endured he found it possible to defend the Soviet Union unconditionally against imperialist attack. With the switch of Stalin into the orbit of Hitler, marked by the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact, Burnham found he could no longer defend the Soviet Union.

Like Burnham, Shachtman now finds that "developments in the world situation occasioned by the Second World War raises to the forefront once more, the Russian Question." That is, in response to the pressure of the war-mongering imperialist bourgeoisie, he has decided that this is the time to revise all the carefully worked out analyses of the Soviet Union accomplished by the Fourth International in peacetime.

Like Burnham, Shachtman finds that "Russia's role in the war on the side of German Imperialism only emphasizes fundamental trends inherent under Stalin's Regime." That is, in response to the pressure of the war-mongering imperialist bourgeoisie, he has decided that this is the time to revise all the carefully worked out analyses of the Soviet Union accomplished by the Fourth International in peacetime.

In promulgating his views on the class nature of the Soviet Union, Burnham was extremely cautious: "The ruling stratum of the Soviet Union does not constitute a crystallized bourgeois class in the traditional sense, nor can it be predicted with assurance whether its evolution in the future—even if unchecked—will be toward such crystallization." Now that Burnham is no longer present to indicate to Shachtman some of the implications of his views, Shachtman finds it possible to plunge head over heels down the logical course of Burnham's position, i.e., that there is an entirely new ruling class in the Soviet Union. "The old crap was revived—in a new, unprecedented, hitherto-unknown form, the rule of a new bureaucratic class."

In arriving at Burnham's position on the class nature of the USSR—"a new attempt at revising the class theory of the state" as Trotsky remarked of precisely this position in 1937—Shachtman bases himself almost exclusively on Trotsky's analyses of the Soviet Union. Just as J. R. Johnson considers Trotsky "one of the most powerful agents of social dynamics who has lived in this or any other time" only to conclude that Trotsky was a political idiot, so Shachtman says of Trotsky that "Nobody has even approached him in the scope and depth of his contribution to understanding of the Soviet Union" only to conclude: "The traditional view of the (Fourth) International on the class character of the USSR rests upon a grievous theoretical error." Trotsky, a Marxist on the level of Marx, Engels, Lenin, was unable to arrive at a correct determination of the class nature of the Soviet Union! Apparently Shachtman considers Trotsky a theoretical idiot.

Shachtman bolsters his arguments with numerous quotations from Trotsky's works. It is only necessary to put these quotations back into their context however to see that each one of them refutes Shachtman at every turn. Even more damaging to Shachtman is the fact that Trotsky answered long ago every one of the arguments that are now brought out as something new by Shachtman. If one merely listed the points which Shachtman attempts to establish, a completely crushing answer could be given him simply by counterposing Trotsky's previous answers to the revisionists who stood a few years ago where Shachtman stands now. Two articles alone of Trotsky's written in 1937: "Once Again: The USSR and its Defense," and "Not a Workers' and Not a Bourgeois State?" published in *Internal Bulletin* Nos. 2 and 3 of the SWP answer every one of the essential arguments now raised in 1940 by Shachtman.

"The touchstone of a revolutionary political leader is the question of the state," Trotsky remarked in his *History of the Russian Revolution*. Belatedly Shachtman has provided another remarkable demonstration of the importance of this dictum in working class politics.

In the January 1938 issue of *The New Internationalist*, Shachtman himself aptly characterized the stale dish he now serves up as an innovation: "At bottom, the ultra-leftist position on the Soviet Union which denies it any claim whatsoever to being a workers' state, reflects the vacillations of the petty-bourgeoisie, their inability to make a firm choice between the camps of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, of revolution and imperialism."

The next logical step of Shachtman's development in the wake of Burnham is, like his former client, to make a firm choice.

**NEW YEAR'S EVE CELEBRATIONS**

Dec. 31—9 p.m. Until All Hours

**IN NEW YORK CITY**

**GERMANIA HALL**

3rd Avenue and 16th Street

Subscription: 91 Cents

**DANCES AND GAMES**

**REAL BLOWOUTS**

**EATS AND DRINKS**

*Auspices:* SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

**IN CHICAGO**

**1114 PRATT BOULEVARD**

Subscription: One Dollar