

Workers
Of the World Unite!

SOCIALIST APPEAL

For the
Fourth International!

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AS THE OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

Vol. II. - No. 6. 1933

Saturday, February 5, 1933

5 Cents per Copy

Stalinists Try Frame-Up In Canada

Furriers' Union Aroused To Fight Charges Made Against Federman

Bulletin
TORONTO.—Appearing before a large general membership meeting of Locals 40 and 100 of the Toronto Furriers, a workers' jury, which had been selected to hear charges brought against Max Federman, Vice-President of the International and Manager of the Toronto Locals, brought in a verdict of acquittal.

The committee unanimously exonerated Federman and declared that in their opinion all the charges were a frame-up.

TORONTO, Canada.—The Stalinists in the Furriers International with Ben Gold as the spearhead, are preparing to conduct a local version of the Moscow trials. The victim is Max Federman, a Vice-President of the International Fur Workers Union and Manager of Toronto Locals 40 and 100.

The charges that were brought against Federman alleged that he had mishandled union funds. In the meantime the whole of the Toronto labor movement boils over the development, especially the local furriers.

For the past few months, two of the Stalinist-selected vice-presidents of the International were busy in Toronto cooking the plot. These unfortunate agents were assigned to their unenviable jobs by the recommendation of a sub-committee of the General Executive Board of the International.

Gold Tactics Repudiated

Since their arrival in Canada, it is reported, the agents of Gold have occupied themselves exclusively with the work of discrediting Federman. They have terrorized, blackmailed, bribed and threatened to withdraw the union charter. Nevertheless, the overwhelming belief of the furriers is that the charges against Max Federman are patently framed. The workers in Canada quickly established their disgust with the antics of the two vice-presidents and with Ben Gold, who came to Toronto personally.

At a general meeting conducted by Locals 40 and 100, Federman received a clear vote of confidence. The recommendation to suspend him was defeated by a carefully counted vote of 268 to 71. A Trial Committee of seven was elected, with the sanction of both vice-presidents.

The Trial Committee had a number of sessions. Witnesses were questioned and it prepared to present the results of its investigation. With the knowledge that the findings of the Committee would uncover the whole rotten frame-up, the Stalinist vice-presidents rushed a call to Ben Gold. Gold's first step in Toronto was to get to work on the members of the committee.

With an arbitrary sweep, in violation of all the principles of the workers movement, Gold discharged three of the regularly elected members of the Committee. He then appeared at a general membership meeting and demanded the dissolution of the Trial Committee, proposing a new one.

Maneuver Defeated

The Toronto furriers were not in the least intimidated. By a huge majority, they decided that the remaining four members of the Committee should bring in their verdict in the name of the whole committee of seven. The Committee will report at the next general membership meeting.

Max Federman is a Left Paole Zionist, well liked by the workers, who was largely responsible for the amalgamation of all fur unions into one International. He has stated repeatedly his willingness to submit to any decision of an impartial workers' tribunal. During the last election in Canada, Federman supported the C.C.F. Canadian social democratic party, against the Stalinists. This is undoubtedly one of the causes for the CP campaign to drive him from the union.

Stolberg CIO Articles Faulty In Analysis

His Attack On Stalinist Disruption In Unions Weakened By Whitewash of Leaders and Support of Class Collaboration

By B. J. Widick
Labor Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party

While exposing the treacherous and disruptive role of the Stalinist Party in the labor movement, the Benjamin Stolberg articles, "Inside the C.I.O.," printed in the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers, suffered from the usual defects of liberal

SECOND STEEL PLANT STRUCK IN NEW JERSEY

Following the splendid example set by their brothers in Harrison last week, when a 36-hour sit-down forced the management to concede to almost every demand they made, the workers at Crucible Steel Company's Spaulding and Jennings plant in Jersey City went out on strike Tuesday January 25.

The rank-and-file action committee, elected by the local union, Lodge 1339 of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, issued a leaflet in the plant, listing the demands of the strikers, among which were demands to put an end to the stagger system; time and a half for Saturday, Sunday and overtime; equal pay for the same kinds of work; an immediate end to all discriminations; settlement of all grievances; reinstatement of all union men unjustly fired; and "that the company recognize the shop stewards, officers and grievance committee of the union as being exempt from the provisions of the seniority clause and that during their term of office the above are the last to be laid off in the plant."

Have No Illusions

Because of the highly skilled nature of the work at the plant, and the resultant difficulty in obtaining strikebreakers, the strikers felt they could afford to obey the anti-labor ordinance of Hague's administration. Pickets were limited to four at a time and wore large buttons instead of placards. But the workers are under no illusions about the administration. At all times, a goodly number of the 300 union members employed at the time of the strike vote are to be found across the street from the plant in the union headquarters, ready to act to protect their strike.

Thus far, the police, deterred by the tremendous amount of publicity given the anti-Hague campaign, have made no moves to break the strike. With messages of solidarity coming in from Crucible and other steel lodges all over the country, the Jersey City Crucible workers are determined to stay out until a real victory over the company has been won.

Labor Secretary Widick Blasts Hague Before Jersey Unionists

NEWARK, N. J.—"Success in the Crucible steel strike in Jersey City will be the greatest impetus to union organization in Boss Hague's domain that is possible," B. J. Widick, labor secretary of the Socialist Workers Party pointed out last Sunday night in a talk to nearly 100 trade unionists and party members here.

"The strategy of the steel workers offers a key to the C. I. O. problem of how to fight I-am-the-law Hague, and win," Widick declared.

"By involving the workers and the people of Jersey City against Hague and aiding them in getting elementary demands from the bosses we will split the seemingly united backing that Hague claims to have."

"The C. I. O. must emphasize in its fight with Hague that the right of collective bargaining, of union organization, are the fundamental issues, with other political considerations coming in as secondary at the present time," Widick declared.

journalism. Although many labor leaders inspired by the Stalinists have condemned Stolberg's articles, not a single prominent person outside the Stalinist circle has as yet disagreed with his fundamental analysis of the Stalinists.

Correct Premise

"The Communist Party today is neither red nor Communist nor revolutionary," Stolberg wrote. "It is, in every country a branch of the Stalinist dictatorship. The force of the Communists derives from their totalitarian source in Moscow. They are interested in the American labor movement only insofar as they can use it for the political purposes of Stalinist world policy. Hence, they must rule or ruin."

This basic evaluation is correct. The West Coast labor movement, above all, has discovered through bitter experience, the real role played by the Stalinists. Only a few weeks ago, the Sailors and Firemen unions repudiated in unmistakable fashion the Stalinist policies which Harry Bridges advocates under the guise of the C. I. O.

Militant, progressive and class-conscious unionism is feared by the Stalinists because of the obstacles it presents to the warmongering policies advocated by Earl Browder and his henchmen. Stolberg's expose of the Stalinists was, however, weakened by his inadequate explanation of this basic motive behind the "rule or ruin," order of Stalin to the Browder-Bridges clique.

False Characterization

The United Automobile Workers of America has been the scene of the latest and most intensive campaign of the Stalinists to capture a powerful union movement.

Stolberg devoted considerable space to exposing the double-dealing and unprincipled maneuvers of the Stalinists there. Yet he lost much of the force of his arguments by a false characterization of Homer Martin, the sky-pilot president of the auto workers.

"Homer Martin and his administration in the U. A. W. are known as the 'progressive' group. That name describes their program," Stolberg said. "The opposition known as the 'unity' faction is bent on only one thing—to control or destroy Martin and to try to impose upon the union a Communist-guided leadership."

Actually, Homer Martin's program in its trade union aspects differs not in the least from that of the unprincipled Stalinist clique opposing him. Heywood Brown, writing in the New Republic, might find fault with Stolberg's praise of Martin, but he neglects to mention that Martin's opponents are of the same

(Continued on page 2)

"Periphery organizations, fake slogans about the C. I. O. drive being a battle between 'democracy and fascism,' and other such ballyhoo must be kept in the background."

"Hague is on the spot. He raised the red scare against the C. I. O. but now he's up against the fact that a strike has been called by known Jersey City workers, who are popular in their locality, and that the grievances which the workers have will win wide support. It will be infinitely more difficult for Hague to pull a successful red scare now."

"The Crucible Steel Company is confronted by a determined rank and file leadership assisted by an S. W. O. C. organizer, Ed Kaempf, who only last week directed a successful sit-down strike at the Harrison plant of this concern."

"Organized labor throughout the country must give unstinting

(Continued on page 2)

Seamen Stop Stalinists In Union Fight

Rank-and-File Rescind Plan Hitting At West Coast Brothers

NEW YORK.—Rank-and-file revolt against the Communist Party's bitter campaign to destroy the militant and progressive Sailors' Union of the Pacific reached a peak last Tuesday when a group of militants in the National Maritime Union succeeded in rescinding the Stalinist plan to pull West Coast men off East Coast ships.

A special joint meeting of the Deck, Engine and Cooks Divisions of the National Maritime Union, C. I. O., was called by members of the District Committee in New York on January 24. The purpose of the meeting was to "take proper action" with regard to a telegram from Joe Curran, National organizer of the N. M. U. from the Pacific Coast, which asserted that the Sailors' Union of the Pacific was yanking N. M. U. men off the West Coast ships regardless of whether they had strike clearances.

An Old Trick

News of this special meeting was given out in the morning of the meeting day. Hundreds of seamen on the ships in the harbor could not be notified of the meeting in time.

The only point on the agenda was the resolution by Moe Byne which was presented by Jack Lawrensen, both stooges of the Communist Party. The resolution claimed that whereas the N. M. U. district officials had repeatedly made attempts to bring about unity with the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, which was "discriminating" against N. M. U. men, therefore members of the S. U. P. shall be given until February 28 to transfer into the N. M. U. or else be pulled off of all East Coast ships. This resolution, if passed, meant an open declaration of war by the N. M. U. against the militant Sailors' Union of the Pacific.

National Action Need

Jerry King, Lemmon and other progressive officials opposed this resolution. They and other rank-and-file fought hard, pointing to the need of national action to defeat the government Mediation Bill, showing that Lundeberg was for striking against this Federal attempt to hog-tie the seamen, and that it was time to fight the ship-owners and not our brother seamen. The Communist Party machine was too effective. The seamen were caught unawares. By a vote of 480 to 221 the "civil war" resolution was passed. The progressives were set back but not defeated.

Throughout the next morning, petitions were circulated among the N. M. U. men, on ships and ashore, calling for a second special meeting that night to rescind the former action and condemn the undemocratic method of passing the "civil war" resolution. Hundreds of names on the petition resulted in another joint meeting.

The progressives' resolution with the signatures was presented. A motion to table was made by the first person recognized by the chair. And then followed an hour of discussion on points of order, which resulted finally in the passing of the motion to table. But immediately Lemmon presented the chair with another written motion in line with the first one which took precedence over a motion from the floor to adjourn.

Finks Not Tolerated

N. M. U. men who sailed for months on the West Coast, with papers to prove it, testified that full-fledged members of the N. M. U. who had strike clearances are sailing from S. U. P. halls on West Coast ships, but that the West Coast was not tolerating anyone possessing a Copeland "finkbook" or who could not prove his strike-clearances. The arguments of those fighting for the "civil war" resolution were that "the S. U. P. does not want national unity because they voted for Independence and because

(Continued on page 2)

"Hates War"



PRES. ROOSEVELT

Dockmen Tie Up Ships, Cargoes In Puerto Rico

Strikers Demand Wage Hike To 75 cents; Ortiz Arrested

Luis Vergne Ortiz, political secretary of the Independent Communist Party of Puerto Rico (Fourth International), was arrested by the San Juan Chief of Police on January 7 for distributing a leaflet on the dock workers' strike. The longshoremen's strike, led by the C. I. O., began January 3, since which no cargo has entered or left the island's ports. Crews on board the ships, by refusing to furnish steam for the winches, have made it impossible for the strike to be broken by scabs on the docks.

The strikers' demands included wages of 75 cents an hour (the prevailing rate before the strike was 32 cents), a wage settlement with clerks, checkers, and watchmen, recently organized by the C. I. O., and the discharge of cargo at ports of destination regardless of the size of the cargo. The companies have offered 40 cents an hour and, although the strikers have lowered their demand to 60 cents, have refused to budge. Nor will they discuss a wage settlement with the clerks and watchmen or the question of delivering cargo to ports of destination.

Asks Strike Support

The leaflet comrade Vergne Ortiz was distributing called for united support of the strike by all workers—members of the C. I. O. and the Free Federation affiliated with the A. F. of L.—employed and unemployed—and advocated industrial unionism pointing to the joint action of the ships' crews and the longshoremen as an example of the effectiveness of that form of unionism. He was arrested, however, on the ground that the leaflet did not bear the name of the printer. When the leaflet was shown to be mimeographed, the charge was dismissed. This is but one example of the pressure used by the police under the influence of the manager of the Bull Steamship Line, who was president of the Police Commission until recently. His influence over the police system has not been curtailed by his resignation from his official post.

The Puerto Rican government, faced with an outrageous increase in the cost of necessities, has been forced to set up a commission to regulate prices. Prices have been skyrocketed so high as to put dried codfish beyond the means of the underpaid workers. Even in normal times, food prices in Puerto Rico are from 20 to 25 per cent higher than in New York City, since the island imports most of its food (including the beans, rice, and codfish that make up the diet of the great bulk of the people), and pays excessive freight rates and U. S. tariffs. When it is recalled that the Puerto Rican worker has to spend over 90 per cent of his income for food,

(Continued on page 3)

Roosevelt Speeds Drive Toward War With Navy Budget

BROWDER BACKS F. D. R.; HEARST BACKS F. D. R.

In both his annual budget message and his special message to Congress on naval appropriations, President Roosevelt has proposed the biggest armaments program the United States has ever had in its peace-time history.

Why? To "protect the coast-lines" of the United States from attack? Preposterous. No man in his right senses believes that the territory of the United States is liable to attack from a foreign power.

Hugh S. Johnson has stated that "there is no great power that could invade continental United States."

Major-General Douglas MacArthur has declared that an attack on American ports is impossible.

The late Admiral William S. Sims said that no foreign power or group of powers could operate across the oceans and stand a chance in combat with forces operating from the home base.

ARMS FOR WAR ABROAD

The fact is that the unprecedented increase in armaments proposed by President ("I hate war!") Roosevelt is for the defense and expansion of American interests abroad. The bigger army and the bigger navy are meant for war!

What interests have the American masses abroad? What do they need a war to protect? The billions of dollars invested by Wall Street in all parts of the world? The collection of war debts to American financiers in Europe? The markets of American capitalism in Asia and Latin America?

That's what the army and the navy are being built for.

Who stands back of the monstrous armaments bill of Roosevelt?

COMMUNIST PARTY OKAYS BIG NAVY

As was to be expected, President and his Communist party are behind the President. They do not have a single word of criticism of the phenomenal naval appropriations which Roosevelt demands. In actual fact, they endorse the Big Navy by the argument that the reason for it lies with the "war-loving fascist" nations. In actual fact, they endorse the Big Navy by explaining how it can be built up in the "best" way. The *Daily Worker* (Jan. 31, 1933) says:

"The demand should be raised: 'make the rich pay' for the increased armaments and increase all social legislation to balance the human budget."

Which is another way of saying: So long as the rich pay for a Bigger Navy, we have no objections to it! The Communist Party has no objection to a Bigger Army and Navy with which the workers of the world are to shoot each other into perdition, so long as Wall Street pays for every shell that is used.

HEARST ALSO SATISFIED

The President and Browder are not alone in their endorsement of the armaments campaign. They are joined by William Randolph Hearst. The Hearst papers have given their unqualified support to the President's increased armaments demand. The *New York Journal and American* (Jan. 31, 1933) writes:

"The President has listened to the VOICE OF AMERICA. . . . President Roosevelt's stirring words and his practical application of them should receive the backing of the whole country. We are now pledged to defense—a DEFENSIVE PEACE—and a NAVY SECOND TO NONE. LET CONGRESS ACT AT ONCE."

A fine united front for the billion-dollar arms program: Roosevelt, Browder and Hearst. All together for imperialist war!

Instead of a billion dollars for workers' homes, they are ready to give you a billion dollars for workers' graves.

Down with the war-mongers and their lawyers!
Not a man and not a penny for their capitalist wars!

Lynn Food Workers' Unity Move Aids Fight Against Sahraf Chain

The Sharaf strike was settled over the week end with the Foodworkers Union winning a preferential shop, wage increases, reduction in hours and time and a half for overtime, besides vacations with pay.

(Continued on page 3)

Will Spend Billion In Arms Program

Huge Outlay Bares War Aims of American Imperialism

By Maurice Spector

President Roosevelt's message to Congress last week called for naval and military appropriations totalling one billion dollars, the greatest "preparedness" budget in the peace-time history of the country.

In 1932 the Democratic platform had attacked Hoover for burdening a tax-ridden populace with military and naval expenditures "approaching a billion dollars annually." That is a thing of the past. In complete disregard of the express anti-war sentiment of the masses, Roosevelt continues spelling out the imperialist logic of his Chicago speech.

Stages of Policy

There he contemptuously jettisoned the laboriously constructed Neutrality policy of Congress; next he ordered American diplomatic participation in the Brussels Conference; now comes the huge arms Bill; and on February 14 there is to be American participation in the British naval demonstration at Singapore.

It means for example the self-arrogated "defense" of the Latin and Caribbean Americans under the Monroe Doctrine. It means the defense of Standard Oil tankers on the Yangtze. Finally it means implementing the policy Roosevelt enunciated of the quarantine, which is another word for blockade anywhere on the seven seas.

Pushed By Depression

American imperialism has emerged from its phase of temporary quiescence. To this the collapse of the New Deal has powerfully contributed. The more catastrophic his domestic policies turn out, the more insistently Franklin (Happy Days Are Here Again) Roosevelt will turn in the direction of the world market.

Representative Maverick, a friend of the Administration, charges that "the New Deal has more or less abandoned all its economic ideals and is riding horses in all directions without getting anywhere." The cost of living travels upwards. The millions of unemployed continue to add to their ranks. The trust busters and brain trusters are at sixes and sevens. The New Deal has labored mightily and alphabetically to produce another slump, in accord with the laws of a decaying capitalism.

As the keenest representative of the American ruling class, Roosevelt realizes that the predatory set-up of Versailles is in ruins. The struggle for redistribution of the world's spoils, colonies, materials, and markets, is in process. In the future the post-war antagonism between the British Empire and American interests, temporarily tided over by the naval parity agreement, will again come to the fore. But at this juncture Roosevelt is cautiously moving in the direction of Anglo-American collaboration against the lean hungry fascist powers, menacing the accumulated fat of both. The *New York Times* reports that the news of the Roosevelt message was received in London almost "as if Britain had won a war victory."

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued on page 3)

U.M.W. Gives Blank Check To Roosevelt

District Autonomy Is Blocked By Lewis Union Machine

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The United Mine Workers convention held here has adopted policies reflecting the basic aims and purposes of John L. Lewis and the C.I.O. leadership. They indicate the trends that the C.I.O. movement will follow in the coming period.

Although over 200 resolutions were introduced asking for the right of district autonomy (the right of districts to elect their own officials) the Lewis administration was able to forestall the introduction of this elementary democratic procedure by pushing through a spurious "compromise" resolution.

In the compromise resolution passed, the majority of the districts which are in dispute were given the right to elect vice-presidents and other minor officials, but the key posts of president and secretary-treasurer are still subject to appointment. Lewis intends to continue his iron-hand control of the miners' union.

For Roosevelt

Faith in Roosevelt was the keynote of all political speeches delivered and a special resolution of unqualified support to F.D.R. and his policies was unanimously approved by the convention. No mention was made of the role of Roosevelt in the "Little Steel" strike betrayal, nor of the action of the miners' executive board condemning the role of the Federal Government at that time.

The Lewis machine squashed any rumors about beginning a "third party" movement. Labor's Non-Partisan League was praised and its policies approved. The C.I.O. intends to use the League as a buffer force between politicians and not for independent political action by the working class, the speakers indicated.

The need for fighting against wage-cuts was realized and emphasized by Lewis in his opening address.

High, Wide and Handsome

The salary of Lewis was raised from \$12,500 a year to \$25,000, while Vice-President Phillip Murray and Secretary-Treasurer Thomas Kennedy get increases to \$18,000 a year from their present pay of \$9,000. At the last convention Lewis dramatically refused a wage increase because \$12,500 was enough. The time for that sort of demagoguery apparently has passed.

The reactionary A.F. of L. Executive Council was put squarely on the spot by Lewis in his offer of unity between the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. Lewis said the C.I.O. would be willing to march as a whole into the A.F. of L. on Feb. 1, with A. F. of L. charters given to all C.I.O. unions at once; or, if the A.F. of L. wanted, it could march as a whole into the C.I.O. which would give charters immediately. A convention of the united labor movement would then decide any question raised by jurisdictional claims, etc.

Unity Approved

The convention approved this offer of unity.

The size of the convention and the power of John L. Lewis were impressive testimony that the back-bone of the C.I.O.—the miners' union—was intact and that talk by A.F. of L. bureaucrats that the C.I.O. is a "mere passing phase," is sheer nonsense. The C.I.O. is still the powerful, historically progressive movement and the miners' union is its stronghold.

Widick Flays Hague

(Continued from page 1)

support to this struggle since it spells the beginning of Hague's end as the pompous, "I am the law" political over-lord," Widick emphasized.

"Hagueism is a classic example of American politics. Hague is a supporter of Roosevelt, along with most reactionary democratic politicians. His outrageous political activities are possible because he has the united support of the Chamber of Commerce and sweatshop owners, who are willing to pay a high price to keep Jersey City labor unorganized so they can continue to exploit them mercilessly."

"The answer to Hagueism is a union organization drive conducted on the lines of the Crucible strategy, and independent political action of the working class to combat him on the political field," Widick said.

Progressive Slates Win In Lundeberg Victory

West Coast Seamen Show Their Determination To Follow Militant Leadership By Casting Huge Vote

By Glen Trimble

SAN FRANCISCO.—As usual on the West Coast, the Sailors' Union of the Pacific has taken the lead in blazing the progressive trail. The results of the annual elections overwhelmingly favor amalgamation of the unlicensed seamen into a united, industrial union affiliated to the Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast. This decision was outstanding in a general landslide for the progressive candidates and policies backed by the militant group headed by Harry Lundeberg.

In one of the largest votes ever cast, the West Coast's Stalized C.I.O. took a terrific drubbing despite an intensive, expensive and vicious campaign which involved the expenditure of thousands of dollars on radio broadcasts, leaflets, pamphlets, "mass meetings," and so on. Every ounce of "C.I.O." talent was mustered but the S.U.P. membership again proved its title to the rating of most advanced section of the working class in the Western United States by discounting the flood of hostile propaganda and attack and holding to a genuinely militant course.

Reactionary Squabble

The amalgamation resolution read: "Are you in favor of the amalgamation of the unlicensed seamen as divisions of a single, united, independent industrial union of West Coast seamen, affiliated with the Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast?" Two thousand three hundred and eighty-two sailors voted yes; five hundred and sixty-five No.

Only slightly less decisive was the rejection of any entanglement at the present time in the C.I.O.-A.F. of L. "beef," which, on this coast, has degenerated into a thoroughly reactionary squabble between Stalinists and other reactionaries for jurisdictional picarons and machine control. Sailors voted 2,203 for Independence. The combined A.F. of L. and C.I.O. votes totaled only 641!

The coast-wide referendum on coast and branch officers resulted in a 21 to 0 victory for the progressives and a crushing shut-out defeat for the Stalinists. Lundeberg's 2,496 to 453 election over Harry Meyer was outstanding but still typical of the vote of confidence given the entire progressive slate.

SO. CALIFORNIA A.C.L.U. FIGHTS FOR ANARCHIST

The Southern California branch of the American Civil Liberties Union has started a campaign in behalf of Marcus Graham, well-known philosophic anarchist who after 18 years of persecution by reactionary officials of the U.S. Department of Labor is now being threatened with prison and deportation.

Graham was first arrested in 1919 and ordered deported to Canada, but the Canadian authorities refused to admit him. In 1921 he was arrested by New York's iniquitous "Bomb Squad" and, after brutal third degree treatment, turned over to the immigration authorities. The Labor Department jailed him for six months.

The next stage in the hound when the Labor Department had him arrested on the trumped-up charge of having crossed the United States border into Mexico without a permit. The only evidence produced against him was the fact that he was found in possession of a copy of "An Anthology of Revolutionary Poetry" which he had compiled and edited. A nation-wide protest by well-known authors and educators forced the Labor Department to dismiss the proceedings.

Then followed official harassment of the monthly publication, "Man," of which Graham is editor. Subscribers were visited by immigration inspectors and threatened with prosecution unless they cancelled their subscriptions.

In October, 1937, Graham was again arrested. Immigration inspectors searched and ransacked his home without a search warrant and seized his personal papers as well as correspondence and articles belonging to "Man."

Deportation proceedings against Graham, based upon an order dated more than 18 years ago, are now under way in an effort to stifle the publication, "Man."

The A.C.L.U., which has taken issue with the authorities on the ground that the new move against Graham is a threat to freedom of the press, has furnished counsel to Graham and is sponsoring a civil suit for damages against the immigration officers based on their unlawful search of Graham's home.

The Stalinists' chief figure in the S.U.P., Al Quinttner, ran for three offices and failed to make the grade even as a trustee, though five were elected.

Election Results

The annual elections in the Pacific Coast Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders and Wipers Association have also resulted in an upset progressive victory and a crushing defeat for the Stalinists and for the Stalized C.I.O. top staff on the West Coast. All coastwise officers — Secretary, Assistant Secretary and Treasurer, branch agents at the three most important coast points (aside from San Francisco Headquarters whose officers are the union heads) — San Pedro, Portland, and Seattle, and the majority of port patrolmen were elected by the "progressive seagoing firemen's" group. Stalinists won the Agent at Honolulu and a San Francisco patrolman, chiefly because of six- and seven-candidate fields.

Even "uptown" the new line is getting a working-class kick-back. Two Stalinist bases of supply for every innocent front and phoney conference have revolted. The Waiters Union, a strong unit of the powerful miscellaneous bloc in the labor council, defeated the entire heavily-subsidized Stalinist slate and elected a relatively progressive group around Hugo Ernst. The Office Workers Union, sole clarity "mass base" but so overrun with Stalinists that the latter's election seemed sure, defeated every Stalinist candidate for individual office, allowing them only three out of ten on the executive board in a proportional representation election.

Clearly, the days of Stalinist disruption in the San Francisco labor movement are numbered!

Police Terror In St. Louis Strike

Ford Workers Fight Provocations; Union Men Arrested

ST. LOUIS.—The vicious tie-up between the management of the St. Louis plant of the Ford Motor Co. and the St. Louis police and relief agencies has been thoroughly demonstrated to the striking Auto Workers here by this time. The U.A.W. strike, forced on the union by company discrimination against militant workers in rehiring, has been on since the last week in November.

Bert Gantner, personnel director of the Ford plant, accompanies the police every time the union headquarters are raided and selects for arrest whatever members he wants detained. He then directs the examination and questioning of the arrested men at police headquarters. It would be superfluous to say that the police never trouble themselves about warrants in making their illegal raids.

Provocateurs At Work

Strikers applying for relief are forced onto WPA jobs, though ordinarily relief applicants are not handled in this way. This method naturally diminishes the number of strikers available for picket duty, and active union work.

A number of acid-throwing cases, in which new Ford cars and even some Ford scabs have been the targets, have occurred recently and naturally have seriously injured the union's popularity. There is little doubt that these incidents are the work of agents-provocateurs, and the union members are leaving no stone unturned to find the actual aggressors. Naturally, each such event is the signal for mass arrests of union members. Absolutely no evidence has been found to link any unionist with these tactics.

Publicity Backing

Unfortunately for the cause of the strikers, the strike bulletin which was published for two weeks has been allowed to drop, and the union, taking no advantage of the lessons of the big gas house strike here a few years ago, has been forced to see its fight presented to the public only by the capitalist press, where the facts are consistently sensationalized and garbled. The necessity of active publicity presenting the union's case correctly, both for the sake of the morale of the men and that of the union's sympathizers, has not yet been grasped by the union leadership, which otherwise is waging a courageous fight against serious obstacles.

Lundeberg Hits Back At Charges

Denounces Slandorous Accusations Made Against Seamen

WASHINGTON.—Appearing recently at the hearings of the Copeland Committee Harry Lundeberg, militant head of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, registered a vigorous protest against the establishment of a Maritime Mediation Board as proposed in Senate Bill 3078. He scored the flood of false propaganda charging American seamen with being "undisciplined" and inefficient, declaring it to be not only untrue, but "camouflage to cover up the real reason for the sickness of the American shipping industry."

"In the last few months," Lundeberg said, "the seaman has been constantly accused of lack of discipline, insubordination, and bad performance aboard ships. This publicity has been carried on through the newspapers, leading magazines, and statements by various people in public office to such an extent that by now the front pages of the nation's papers are covered with stories about the 'undisciplined' American seamen, etc., which in their language is ruining the American Merchant Marine. We know that these stories are not based on fact but on assumptions."

Cites Federal Laws

"As a matter of fact, the United States federal laws take ample care of the handling of 'undisciplined' seamen. If a man refuses duty on the high seas on American ships he can, according to the laws, be prosecuted for mutiny, which carries a sentence of from three to five years. Secondly, before an American seaman goes to sea today, he must sign articles before the U. S. Shipping Commissioner with a government certificate, called the 'Certificate of Efficiency.'"

He cited the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. "This in itself," he pointed out, "takes care of any undisciplined crews. In fact, in our opinion, as we stated when we appeared before the House Committee on Merchant Marine last year, this is too severe a law.... We maintain that the department of Steam Boat Inspection Service has more than enough power to invoke discipline under this act, and that thereby anyone accusing the seamen of lack of discipline, is in reality accusing the Department of Commerce of failing in its duties."

Grounds of Opposition

The opposition of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific to the Mediation Board was based, he said, on the following reasons:

1. It takes from the workers their most important means of protection: strike action.
2. It delays for months the settlement of grievances.
3. It will ultimately put the sailors in the same category as the seamen of Italy, Germany and Russia, whose right to economic action has been completely taken away from them and consequently their conditions are not what they want, but what have been forced upon them by edict.
4. We, as seamen, believe we should have the same right as other American workers, the right to have a direct voice in the determination of our own working conditions.

Defends Union Power

"5. Seamen are entitled to the prompt adjustment of grievances by means of direct negotiation. But all experience has shown that negotiations can be fruitful only if the unions have the power and freedom to back up reasonable demands by strike action. This proposal would tie up the adjustment of the most pressing grievances in so much red tape and involve so many delays as to be tantamount to a virtual stoppage of the right to strike. The American seamen can never agree to such an infringement of their rights."

"6. Furthermore, the adoption of this proposal, with its provision for endless delays would involve the industry in prolonged periods of unrest and uncertainty injurious to normal functioning and to the morale of the seamen. Drawn-out delays in the adjustment of grievances would tend to demoralize the workers and lead to all kinds of sporadic actions beyond the control of the unions."

Party Resolutions

TRADE UNION MOVEMENT and the S.W.P.

The following is the first installment of the resolution on the trade union question adopted by the convention of the Socialist Workers Party.

The most important single field of activity of the revolutionary proletarian party is the trade unions. Unless the party is deeply rooted in the basic economic organizations of the working class, and is inseparably associated with them in their daily struggles, it can be, at best, a literary propagandist group but not a living revolutionary political party of the proletariat, able to lead the latter in the decisive struggle for power. The party that is divorced from the trade union movement and its daily work, is doomed to sterility and disintegration. This is especially true in the United States at the present time.

The outstanding characteristics of the working class movement in the United States in the recent period are the enormous growth of trade union movements which now embrace millions of workers never organized in the past; the development of the C.I.O. as the movement of the workers in the basic key and mass-production industries, organized in industrial unions, as contrasted with the classic A. F. of L. form of craft unions; and the violent conflict between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O., and the recent trend towards the unification of the two bodies; and the expansion of the powers and role of the federal government as "mediator" in the conflict between the workers and the employers.

Most significant and promising of all recent phenomena in the working class is the speedy growth of the C.I.O. movement among the hitherto unorganized workers.

Essentially the A. F. of L. always was and today especially is the organization of the skilled worker or the aristocracy of labor. With the exception of a few of its affiliates or of certain periods in its history, it pursued a deliberate policy of ignoring the great mass of the unorganized proletarians in the basic industries of the country. So far as organizing the mass production industries was concerned the craft union structure of the A. F. of L. made the achievement of that task practically impossible.

The C.I.O. movement represents a radical break with this reactionary tradition. Under the banner of this movement hundreds of thousands of hitherto unorganized workers have swelled the ranks of organized labor, demonstrating the practicability and even the ease of organizing the masses of unorganized once the doors of unionism are thrown open to them. Moreover, the C.I.O. movement has grown on the basis of the organization of the key and mass production industries of the country controlled by the most powerful financial oligarchs (rubber, auto, steel, packings, etc.). Still more, it has shown that the only possible and feasible means of organizing big industry and of preserving the unions is the industrial, or vertical structural form.

Industrial Union an Essential Form

Contrary to the obsolete craft union structure of the A. F. of L., which is thoroughly reactionary and divisive, the industrial union corresponds entirely to the modern organization of industrial life, made possible by the tremendous technological progress and consequent leveling of skilled workers to the plane of semi-skilled or unskilled. Finally, the organization by the C.I.O. of the unskilled mass production industrial workers, the most poorly paid and the least subject to petty bourgeois influences, produced a decisive change in the social composition of the organized labor movement.

Up to that time, the latter was dominated overwhelmingly by the labor aristocracy, closely interwoven with the bourgeois political parties, and presided over by a reactionary bureaucracy which never encountered any really perilous proletarian opposition in the ranks. Now, the organization of several million truly proletarian elements into unions drastically alters the relationship of forces in the organized labor movement. The unskilled, truly proletarian forces are the predominant element in the union movement for the first time, and thus constitute a formidable power not only against the conservative labor bureaucracy but also against capitalism itself.

This is already indicated by the fact that, immediately upon their organization into unions, and despite the fact that their employers represented the most powerful groups of the bourgeoisie (or rather, precisely because of that fact), these masses in the basic industries adopted the most advanced fighting tactics, encroaching directly upon the "sacred" property rights of the bourgeoisie (sit-in strikes), and conducted their struggles in the most militant and aggressive manner, often in disregard of the restraining hand of the C.I.O. bureaucracy.

It is indicated also by the fact that, scarcely having entered the field of economic organization, they already showed their inclination to arm themselves with independent political organizations as well, to break with the traditional bourgeois parties (which are also the traditional alternatives of the A. F. of L. political policy), and to create their own party. This highly significant political tendency is weakened or checked—but its existence is not disproved—by the attempts of the C.I.O. leadership to direct it back into old party channels or to distort it

in the form of petty-bourgeois Labor and Farmer-Labor parties. All these considerations underline the fact that, on the whole, the C.I.O. has been and remains the more progressive force in the organized labor movement.

The growth of the C.I.O. movement has not, however, eliminated the A. F. of L. as a factor in the labor movement. Quite the contrary. The A. F. of L. has not only succeeded in maintaining virtually intact all the forces it had after the departure of such C.I.C. organizations as the United Mine Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers but has even registered an increase in membership, in vitality and even in strike activity. The unionization of the American working class in the recent period has not, by and large, taken place in one section at the expense of the other, but has proceeded along parallel lines, both in the C.I.O., which has recorded the greatest and most significant gains, and in the A. F. of L.

The preservation and even growth of the A. F. of L. is accounted for by a number of important factors. In the first place, it still remains the organization primarily of the skilled workers, the aristocracy of labor. The A. F. of L., furthermore, is the "traditional" organization of union labor, with strong craft traditions. In many industries and trades, its solidity is based upon the fact that it has regular contracts with the employers. Moreover, its main basis is constituted by more or less stable unions of long standing, having a strong apparatus, regular dues systems, and ample treasuries, a firm bureaucracy, regulated local and national organizations, with their own regular meetings, conventions, constitutions, elected officials, etc., etc.

A. F. of L. Also Using Industrial Form

In addition, under the irresistible influence of the patent successes of the industrial form of organization, certain sections of the A. F. of L. and its bureaucracy have relented from their stiff insistence on the craft union form of organization and organized new unions on an industrial basis. Finally, the fact that the once apparently unhalting sweep of the C.I.O. has been checked, and even driven back by the employers, has served to strengthen the feeling among certain sections of the working class that the A. F. of L. is not outlived and can be utilized as well as or even better than the C.I.O. for the defense of labor interests. The flagrantly undemocratic system of leadership instituted by the C.I.O. in the new unions organized by it, has also been skillfully exploited by the A. F. of L. bureaucracy to its own advantage.

A whole series of circumstances has now brought prominently to the fore the question of the unification of the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. The main responsibility for the split two years ago unquestionably lies on the shoulders of the A.F. of L. bureaucracy. By its reactionary control of the labor movement, the Executive Council of the A.F. of L. sought to stifle every attempt to modify the obsolete craft union structure upon which it is based, and actively sabotaged all efforts to organize the unorganized, especially in the mass-production industries, on an industrial, that is, on the only conceivable basis.

The formation of the C.I.O., its fight against the Green-Well-Frey machine, its decisive plunge into the work of organizing the masses of the unskilled in the key industries, were progressive steps and more than warranted the active support given by the labor movement in the C.I.O. as the progressive section of the labor movement. In its fight against the C.I.O., the leadership of the A. F. of L. played a disloyal and reactionary role. Instead of facilitating the work of organizing the big industries of the country, it stood in the way at every turn, joining in the union-breaking chorus of the employers and their apologists. In many cases, the A.F. of L. leadership even resorted to downright strike-breaking in an effort to stem the sensational advances made by the C.I.O.

However, notwithstanding the wide rift that developed between the two sections of the labor movement, there are now strong forces at work for their unification. The setbacks suffered by the various sectors of the union movement in most recent times has strengthened the feeling that one united organization, instead of two antagonistic ones, would make it easier to win labor's battles against the employers. The defeat registered by the workers in the "Little Steel" and similar strikes, has only served to emphasize the need of putting an end to the division in labor's camp.

On top of this is the ominous deepening of the new crisis, which weakens labor's hold on industry and foreshadows an employers' offensive to reduce the workers' standards of living, annul all the gains made in the past period, and wipe out whatever union control has been established. The dangers of the crisis are reflected in the mounting sentiment among the organized workers throughout the country for a speedy unification of the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. so that labor may be able to present a sorely needed common front against the capitalist class.

Pressure from All Side for Unity

Contributing to this inexorable trend are a number of subsidiary factors. The Roosevelt regime is not antagonistic to (Continued on page 4)

Seamen Stop Stalinists In Union Fight

(Continued from page 1)

they did not take part in the Unity Conference in San Francisco on January 17. Therefore we will have to force them to unite with us."

These arguments were squelched by proof that N.M.U. men sail from the S.U.P. halls; that seamen from all unions were on the beach because of the depression and because winter is the worst time of the year for shipping; that because the S.U.P. wanted unity of the men on the job they went independent so as not to take part on either side of the labor civil war between the A.F.L. and C.I.O. on the Pacific Coast, and that the S.U.P. has always united in action with all seamen against the bosses or the government.

The final motion that passed was to rescind the "civil war" resolution, ask for a statement from the S.U.P. on their policy toward N.M.U. men on West Coast ships, and refer any action on this matter to a referendum vote of the N.M.U. This

Revolt Crystallizes In Newsstand Union

NEW YORK.—During the last two weeks rank-and-file revolt has begun to crystallize in Local 906B of the C.I.O. Retail Newsstand Employees Union against the Stalinist leadership.

Discontent has been created by the manner in which the Stalinists precipitated the unprepared strike against the Collier's Service Corporation on the I.R.T. and B.M.T. lines, fostering false illusions and faith in the State Labor Relations Board until the strike was lost.

The Stalinists have been offering no opposition to the wholesale firing by the Interborough News Company, and refuse to prepare for a strike despite the coming expiration of the closed-shop contract.

passed by an overwhelming majority of 356 to 101—a victory for the Union, a defeat for the Communist Party.

MEET ME AT ENVOY DAIRY RESTAURANT Most Modern Dairy Restaurant and Luncheonette

4312 - 13th Avenue At 43rd St. - Brooklyn, N. Y.

Choice of:
FREE TROTSKY: Whither France?
TROTSKY: Lessons of October
SERGE: From Lenin to Stalin
SCHAFTMAN: Behind the Moscow Trial

With Each Purchase of Any of the Following Books:
THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AFTER LENIN by Leon Trotsky \$2.50
THE STALIN SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION by Leon Trotsky \$2.50
RUSSIA TWENTY YEARS AFTER by Victor Serge \$2.00
WORLD REVOLUTION by C. L. R. James \$3.50
THIS OFFER IS GOOD UNTIL FEB. 28th ONLY
All four books (including the free copies) may be had for \$10.00, post free.

Order Now
Pioneer Publishers 100 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C.

STALINISM and BOLSHEVISM
by Leon TROTSKY
Pioneer Publishers 100 Fifth Avenue New York, N. Y.

SURVEYING The American Labor Scene: LECTURE I.
A. F. L. U N I T Y
Speaker: B. J. WIDICK (Nat. Labor Sec. S.W.P.)
LABOR TEMPLE
242 E. 14th STREET
Friday, Feb. 4, 8:00 P. M.
Auspices: East Side Branch, S.W.P.

Real Plan Behind Reubens Case Now Becoming Clearer

By Junius

One relation of Mr. Earl Browder to the impending "Robinson-Rubens" frame-up, which is already clear, and which he wishes could be kept obscure, is the contribution of his party to the groundwork of the frame-up in the United States. All trails have led to the door of the Communist Party, and some behind the door, nine floors up. Despite the reticence of Mr. Hull and Mr. Yezhov, which was absolute this week, new facts that point in the same direction continue to come to light.

Mr. Browder has another relation to the case through his politics, which today consist chiefly of "struggling against Trotskyism," and "implementing Roosevelt's Chicago speech." The Communist Party, however, is a feeble arm to wield such a big spear.

Franklin is implementing it himself with Uncle Teddy's big stick: the billion dollar armament program. No one is better aware of the feebleness of 13th Street's blatant jingoism than its absentee proprietor, Stalin himself. But the Stalinists have other methods of "implementing" speeches: the spy scare and the program against "foreigners."

Browder's Japanese Scare

In a most candid statement of the war program of the Communist Party, Mr. Browder in the current New Republic advocates a Soviet-American alliance against Japan. He says that a continuance of weakness at Washington will cause Japan "to take over the Philippines, Hawaii, Guam and Alaska, as guarantees against the future, when the United States might dare [to fight]. From that it would not be a large step to recall how much more successful are the Japanese than Americans in cultivating the beautiful and rich lands of California." Any Jew in Rumania today could tell you what that means.

Browder's chauvinist remark "implements," in addition to Roosevelt's, a recent speech of a Vice-Commissioner of the G.P.U., who declared that California is overrun with Japanese spies. The Japanese-in-California crack is a tip-off of the "Robinson-Rubens" frame-up. Double R will supply the link in the Trotsky-Mikado formula. The locale will be California.

California Setting

There are of course both Trotskyites and "Trotskyites," as well as Japanese in California. According to the 1930 census (not a 1917 Baedeker), about 70 per cent of the Japanese in America are concentrated in California, and fully 90 per cent on the West Coast. And anyone who has a slight acquaintance with that part of the country knows how rampant is the anti-Japanese chauvinism. The soil is rich, as Browder says. A hotel in San Francisco, Los Angeles, or San Diego looks like a better proposition than the Bristol in Copenhagen.

Another time we will take up the deeper implications of the Browder remark and the frame-up, in the matter of national minorities. Abandoning principle, the question of whose minority rights the Stalinists will champion and whose they will attack becomes one of expediency. Italians and Germans may come next. And who can say for sure that it will never be expedient for Browder to unload even those racial groups that have no mother country?

Is Stalin Rebuffing U. S.?

The Soviet action in rebuffing the State Department's attempt to visit Mrs. Rubens is remarkable in view of the enthusiastic efforts of the Stalinist government to court the "democratic nations," especially the United States. That Stalin should risk the loss of much of the good will obtained through the 7th Congress of the Comintern and reactionary moves on all fronts, by treating the United States like hostile Fascist Germany in a case involving an American citizen, is at first blush, inexplicable.

Perhaps the G.P.U. has been caught in its own trap. Refusing the interview strains diplomatic relations; but permitting it might expose the magician of the Moscow Trials, and strain everything. If a trial is held, it may be taken for granted that Stalin will attempt to recoup his diplomatic fortune by involving Americans for the apparent be-

nefit of the American Government. Certainly Washington is not above allowing Moscow the courtesy of proceeding with its frame-up. The two governments share hostility to the left. Diplomatic developments, the present situation of the American Government, and certain differences between Browder and Roosevelt seem, however, to be against, not the possibility, but the probability of such collaboration.

Nature of C. P. Patriotism?

The Stalinists here are trying to be more American than the Americans; but their parvenu vulgarity sets them off from the real McCoy. Browder announces that he is an American more often than a Legionnaire in his cups. The affectation is consistent with Stalinist politics. For the American Stalinists are not the garden variety of nationalists. They do not reflect or represent, however hard they try, the total national interests of the American bourgeoisie.

The only genuine international interest is that of the working class, which the Stalinists have long since ceased pretending to represent. The Stalinists represent the interests of the Soviet bureaucrats, and only through them the historical interests of capitalism. There is, however, a considerable gap in immediate interests between the patriotic Roosevelt and the double-dyed Browder.

Browder's patriotism is simulated for the purpose of bringing about an alliance between the Soviet bureaucracy and the American Government. With or without an alliance, however, the American Stalinists tend to push the American Government toward war with any nation that is threatening the Soviet Union. Hence Mr. Browder's super-patriotism. From the viewpoint of an imperialist diplomat like Hull, to whom war is military politics to be handled with finesse, Browder may well look like an irresponsible provocateur.

Roosevelt really does represent the American bourgeoisie, which, unlike the European, has had little experience or use for the peculiar contribution offered by the Stalinists: the policing of the revolutionary workers. At present Roosevelt is satisfied with Lewis; and although Lewis is sheltering the Stalinists, they are not indispensable to him.

What Does Washington Know?

It seems unlikely that Washington will at this time assist Moscow in getting control of labor by further frame-up drives. There is more reason to believe that Washington feels that, as long as a left exists, it is better split than a Moscow-controlled monolith.

The State Department in the "Robinson-Rubens" affair is evidently out to catch as big a fish as it can. It is releasing only such data as it finds advisable to release. The impression already given by the bourgeois press, is that the political left is composed of conspirators, chiefly foreign, engaged in shady rackets—a variation of the impression Browder seeks to create. But Washington may try to turn the affair into a scandal of the left with a plague on all its houses, including the one with the American flag and the red light. It may sometime release information on its findings; but pressure must be brought to get this information released now.

The labor movement can look for trouble in the "Robinson-Rubens" affair from Mr. Browder and both governments. From Moscow the spy scare frame-up. From Washington the "alien agitator" campaign. From Mr. Browder a continuance of his Yellow Peril.

GO ITALIAN!
EAT SPAGHETTI!
ENJOY YOURSELF!
Gala Spaghetti Dinner and Dance
Given by
New York District YPSL
Saturday, Feb. 5 8:30 P. M.
159 Rivington St. (near Delancy)
ADMISSION 40c.
All the Spaghetti you can eat
Convention delegates; relax at the Yipsel dance and get yourself in trim for the sessions the next day!
Dancing, Games, Drinks and...
SPAGHETTI

Frame-up Artist



ANDREI VISHINSKY

Roosevelt War Speeded Up By Naval Budget

(Continued from page 1)

Realize Mass Opposition

Roosevelt is aware that the masses are opposed to his imperialism. The Gallup Poll showed at least 60% of the electorate favoring withdrawal of U. S. forces from China, and an equal percentage in favor of the Ludlow amendment. The masses are hostile to the League of Nations, and the whole idea of "collective security." But the forces of jingoism, militarism and social-patriotism are intent on swinging them into line.

The Japanese are counted on to assist. There will be more Panay incidents, and a few more U. S. diplomats will stick out their chins to be slapped. The American war front is forming: the sixty families, the economic royalists, Landon and Knox, the Nation and the Daily Worker, William Green and Lewis, Heywood Brown and Barney Baruch, Nicholas Murray Butler and Earl Browder.

Browder's Fair Fields

Browder salutes the "President's declaration of a positive peace policy" more lyrically than anybody. Debating with Charles H. Beard in the New Republic he openly undertakes the defense of American imperialist interests and colonies. He conjures up the possibility of the Japanese seizing Guam, the Philippines and Alaska. There is a throb in his voice, as he envisions the danger confronting "the beautiful and rich lands of California."

We must not, he suggests, encourage the enemy by giving them a picture of an America sharply torn by class struggle. There is little that can be added by way of comment to "expose" Browder. The Stalinist agents of imperialism proceed so brazenly now that their own statements are the plainest avowals of their treason. Browder in the U. S. loyally follows in the path of Social Democratic allies in France and Czechoslovakia who vote the war budgets without a quaver.

The greatest of all the lies which Browder uses to trick his own following is the distinction between "aggressor" and "non-aggressor." In 1915 Lenin wrote: "The truth is that for decades three highway robbers, the bourgeoisie and the governments of England, Russia and France, were arming to sack Germany. Is there anything surprising in the fact that two highway robbers launched an attack before the other three got the new knives they had ordered? Is it not sophism when the phrases about the 'initiators' are used to obliterate the equal guilt of the bourgeoisie of all countries?"

Why The Lag?

The following letter from far away South Africa might well be used as an example of what many of the lagging Party locals right here in America should be doing for the Appeal:

"Johannesburg, December 26, 1937.
"Dear Comrade:
"We have here in Johannesburg an ever-widening circle of comrades working for the platform of the Fourth International. We welcome the reappearance of the Socialist Appeal, particularly its clean-cut exposure of Stalinist corruption and degeneration.
"We would like to assist in spreading the paper's circulation. We enclose herewith a draft for \$10.00 towards the paper's funds and shall be pleased if you would kindly send us every week four

Stolberg CIO Articles Faulty In Analysis

(Continued from page 1)

breed. Brown picks one flaw in an effort to discredit the main import of the articles.

Unprincipled Opposition

It is a fact, testified to by the minutes of the International executive board meetings, that those "opponents" to Martin-Mortimer, Reuther, etc. (Stalinist stooges of the Brown variety) have voted with Martin on all important union questions since the convention last fall. That is why their "opposition" is unprincipled.

In the recent Pontiac sit-down, the entire executive board approved of Martin's actions and criticism of the rank and file that had been goaded into a sit-down by the company. Incidentally, on all these questions, the Lovestonites went along as appendages to the Martin machine.

The pitfalls of liberal analysis are clearly indicated in the Stolbergian evaluations of the C.I.O. top leaders. Dave Dubinsky was called a "shrewd politician, a hard bargainer, as tough as he is honest, and full of fun." At whose expense, we might ask? What about the Dubinsky who fought the left-wing for years? Hillman, according to Stolberg, is "almost the opposite of Dubinsky. He lacks Dubinsky's good humor, his tough and homely democracy."

"Hillman's fault is his self-overstatement." Yes, yes, but what about the internal situation in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers union? Remember what Hillman tried to do to Joseph Schlossberg because Schlossberg would not go along with the Roosevelt election campaign?

Weaknesses Ignored

Stolberg, throughout his series, said nothing about the fatal weakness of the C.I.O., its bureaucratic structure. In his desire to protect the C.I.O. from vicious outside opponents and from the insidious Stalinists, Stolberg did some unnecessary "white-washing" of the leadership.

John L. Lewis deserves credit for promoting industrial unionism as C.I.O. chairman, as Stolberg pointed out. But that does not excuse his faults. The Ohio district miners are still fighting for the right to elect their own officials. And when are the steel workers going to

be permitted to hold a constitutional convention to set up an autonomous international union? Is Phillip Murray ever going to allow the S.W.O.C. to elect its own international officers?

Harry Bridges' policies have divided the once powerfully united West Coast labor movement as Stolberg showed. But Lewis arbitrarily appointed Bridges, and thus bears joint responsibility.

Union Democracy

When Stolberg told about the struggle of the top C.I.O. leaders to establish "industrial democracy," he did not emphasize that a necessary pre-requisite is "union democracy." This weakness in the C.I.O. is fuel for the fires of labor's opponents, and the way to take away the fuel is to establish union democracy in the steel and other C.I.O. unions where it is lacking.

Stolberg's summary deserves special attention. "The program of the C. I. O. is simple, progressive and historically inevitable. Modern industrial labor must organize in industrial unions," Stolberg wrote. Will the Daily Worker hack journalists call this a "fascist" argument? Stolberg is absolutely correct.

"The C.I.O. is not getting ready for independent political action in 1940. The political arm of the C.I.O. is Labor's Non-Partisan League, of which the various local and state-wide labor and farmer-labor parties are completely autonomous bodies," Stolberg shrewdly indicated. It is precisely this policy that offers dangers to the C.I.O. movement. The failure of the C.I.O. to organize genuine independent political action has cost the workers plenty. The strike-breaker, Martin L. Davey, governor of Ohio, was the Labor's Non-Partisan League nominee only a year and half ago, despite the protests of many progressive, especially in the rubber workers' unions. Dependence on the capitalist politicians takes a heavy toll in the organized labor movement. If the workers in the "Little Steel" strike had depended only on their own strength and power, aided by the union movement, they would not have been trapped by the Daveys and Earles in whom they had been told to have confidence. Stolberg apparently assents to the C.I.O. class-collaboration policies. We do not.

School Holds Class In Party Principles

The program of the Socialist Workers Party will be discussed in detail by Maurice Spector, co-editor of the New Internationalist, in the Marxist School course on "Principles of Revolutionary Socialism." The lecturer will elaborate the "Declaration of Principles" of the party. He will trace the laws of imperialism and explain the development of the New Deal, fascism and war; the role of trade unions and Farmer-Laborism; the struggle for working class power; the workers' state, the socialist ideal and the Soviet Union today; the role of the Second and Third Internationals and the tasks of the Socialist Workers Party and the Fourth International. The course will be held Tuesday evenings, 8:45 P. M.-10:15 P. M., commencing February 15.

Another course of great value particularly to trade unionists will be given by B. J. Widick, national labor secretary of the Socialist Workers Party and E. R. McKinney, former organizer for the Steel Workers Organizing Committee and present New York organizer of the S.W.P. These comrades will cover the historical background of the C.I.O.-A.F. of L. dispute, the real issues involved and the tasks of the progressives and revolutionary socialists in the trade union movement today. The

course, "Problems of Trade Unionism," will be held Wednesday evenings, 7:00 P. M.-8:30 P. M.

Dockmen Tie Up Ships, Cargoes

(Continued from page 1)

the seriousness of a rise in food prices can be judged.

Bosses Threaten

The business and industrial interests of the Island, on the ground that the strike is "jeopardizing the livelihood of every inhabitant," are threatening to take things into their own hands. At a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce in San Juan on January 23, they cabled to President Roosevelt, asking his intervention.

Fears were expressed that neither the Federal Government nor the President had "adequate authority in law" to meet the situation. A suggestion that "outsiders" (the C.I.O. representatives) be given 24-hour departure notice was cheered. One of the leading industrialists advocated a complete "commercial sit-down" to arouse the community against the strike. Others, in true vigilante spirit, wanted the "community" to step in and settle the strike, regardless of the Government and contending sides.

A "Socialist" Acts

Santiago Iglesias, resident Commissioner at Washington, for forty years A.F. of L. boss of Puerto Rican labor and leader of the misnamed Socialist Party, tried to get the strikers to go back for a 25 per cent increase, but his proposal was howled down.

Governor Winship next took a hand, issuing an ultimatum on January 25 that if an agreement was not reached in 48 hours, he would intervene. But when the 48 hours had expired, the steamship companies' Puerto Rican representatives told the governor they had no authority to accept his proposal for arbitration, and had referred the whole matter to their New York offices. The annoyed governor could do nothing but await the pleasure of the companies in New York.

SPANISH HOLD FRANCO BACK ABOVE TERUEL

But Deadlock Threatens For Want of Bold Social Program

The military deadlock in Spain continued virtually unchanged last week, with the struggle for control of the vitally important mountain passes north of Teruel still proceeding. While the Government forces seemed to have the upper hand in the immediate Teruel salient, the Rebels fought desperately to retain their feeder highways through the Palomera Mountains. Along with this stubborn defense Franco continued the most systematic and vicious series of aerial bombings of Loyalist cities which the war has yet witnessed.

Distinctly inferior to Franco's machine in point of equipment and training, the Loyalists have made a certain headway in Teruel only thanks to the heroism of the proletarian fighters in their ranks. The peasantry of the entire district seem passive. The bulk of the soldiers on the Teruel front are workers of the anarchist CNT-FAI and of the POUM, a fact omitted from all official press dispatches.

Bold Program Needed

The military deadlock of the last months makes it increasingly clear that definitive victory in Teruel, as in the war in general, is impossible without a bold social program.

Writing in the Paris Journal of January 2, a bourgeois observer had the following to say about the Teruel offensive: "Since it (the government) did not have the military superiority, it was necessary to make an effort on the political plane, and, instead of opposing them to each other, to attempt a union between the peasant of Navarre and the worker of Barcelona."

But the stubborn defense of private ownership of the land in Catalonia has alienated the peasantry and placed severe limitations on mass recruitment from their ranks. Further than this, the entire Aragon-Huesca-Saragossa front was sabotaged for many months by the government because of anarchist, and POUM, predominance amongst the militias stationed there. No basis, either military or social was laid along this front for the rapid extension of the Teruel drive.

Reaction Advances

On the other hand, political reaction, forced by joint Russian-British-French pressure, is making steady inroads on the earlier social conquests wrested by the workers and peasants. The Stalinists and socialists of the PSUC have been pushing vigorously to eliminate union delegates from factory administration boards. A proposal to that effect was voted down at the recent Barcelona congress of the UGT. However, the Stalinist City Council has already forced the municipalization of the Barcelona transport system, thus taking it out of the hands of the workers' organizations. Centralization proceeded one step further last week with the Catalanian government taking over the war industries previously under union control.

Against this background of rising reaction, much speculation has arisen on the meaning of the Teruel drive. Why this offensive now, at this particular time?

There are many indications in the European press that France and England decided upon a localized Teruel victory for a two-fold reason: (1) to chastise Franco for resisting a break with Hitler and Mussolini; (2) to furnish Prieto with the necessary basis for negotiations leading to armistice. In no other way can Prieto's paper, quoted above, be understood when it comments on the proposals of "an English politician" identified only as a great friend of Spain, and adds that England's demands for a government entirely under its domination are burdensome but nevertheless "preferable to the prolongation of the war."

The social reaction which accompanies the new offensive lends credence to the suspicion that London and Paris—with Moscow's approval—are intent upon an armistice. Undemocratic centralization proceeds in the army, the death sentence for soldiers lacking in respect for their appointed reactionary officers has been passed, workers' control over transport and vital industry is harshly removed, revolutionists continue to be imprisoned and shipped to distant villages.

Stalemate Prevails

Success at Teruel can be only temporary at best, in fact it is accompanied by steady encroachment upon proletarian and pea-

SOVIET UNION NOTES

Litvinov's Removal Certain — Case of A. N. Tupolev — Shadows Over Stakhanovism

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

Litvinov's Removal Certain.

The oft-repeated rumors concerning Litvinov's downfall in connection with the purge of the diplomatic corps will be substantiated in the near future. His post has already been stripped of its previous significance, for, on a motion by Beria, the Supreme Council voted to establish a permanent committee on Foreign Affairs which, in effect, supersedes the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs. The chairman of this committee of eleven (on it are Beria, Mekhlis, and Khrushchev) is none other than Zhdanov, member of the Politbureau, who exorciated Litvinov's Commissariat in his speech at the session. The Chairman has the power not only to guide and alter foreign policy but to intervene in the appointment of ambassadors, etc. Because of the role played by Litvinov and his public prominence, it is quite likely that a special "method" will be used in his case. Rumors, which appear to be officially inspired, have been circulating that Litvinov will "retire" in six months, and his place taken either by Zhdanov or Potemkin, with the latter appearing to have the inside track.

While the stage is being prepared for Litvinov's "retirement", Stalin's hangmen are mopping up the Commissariat itself. Among those just liquidated is Sabanin, head of the legal department of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, and a close friend of Litvinov's. Together with him, four other functionaries were placed under arrest: Fchner, Neumann, Shakhov and Beckman.

In the case of Litvinov, the blows aimed at him, as well as inevitable elimination, are intimately linked with a change of Soviet foreign policy that is doubtless being contemplated by Stalin.

The Case of A. N. Tupolev.

Perhaps the most sudden and least expected of the recent purgings was that of Andrei N. Tupolev, head of Tsagi (Soviet Aerodynamic Institute), one of the world's outstanding aeronautical engineers and inventors, creator of the Red Air Force, better known to the general public by his initials ANT which used to appear on Soviet planes, in particular, ANT 25 which made the record Moscow-San Diego flight. The Special correspondent of the Paris Temps, Pierre Berland, gives some interesting details relating to Tupolev's downfall in a communication devoted entirely to the current purge (Le Temps, Jan. 7).

As Berland comments, "Tupolev was perhaps the most decorated man in the Soviet." He was given the Order of Lenin, the Order of the Red Star, and that of the Red Labor Banner. Privileges were heaped upon him. He had a vast luxurious apartment in Moscow and a summer house. And, according to Berland, the Government opened for him an unlimited bank account to use for his experimental and construction work. He had free entrance to the Kremlin and even, it is reputed, to Stalin, an honor accorded only to Voroshilov and Yezhov. He was likewise chummy with Voroshilov. It goes without saying that he was designated as candidate for the Supreme Council. When his name was removed at the last moment from the roll of deputies, the world learned of his fall from grace. Officially, of course, there has been no news. The darkest rumors are circulating as to his fate. Many of his colleagues have been placed under arrest. At a recent meeting of the workers of Tsagi a "party representative" (i.e., G.P.U. functionary) urged the assembly to unmask the "Tupolevites," declaring that a "ruthless struggle" must be waged against this latest variety of the enemies of the people, the "Tupolevites," in no way to be distinguished from the "Trotskyites," "Bukharinites," "Rykovites," etc. etc. Tupolev's initials have been removed from all planes, even from ANT 25, with which Gromov established the world record. It is now only a number: 25.

Soviet circles are reported as lost in speculation as to the reasons for Tupolev's arrest. Comments Berland: "It may well be that Tupolev objected to the methods of the purge which was creating breaches in the war industries. No official comment has appeared as yet to provide a key to this mystery. The customary accusations of sabotage-espionage seem hardly applicable to a Tupolev. All his achievements gainsay the charge of sabotage. As for espionage, it bears no semblance of truth. He had nothing to gain and everything to lose from a change in the regime."

To the crushing blows he has dealt to the Soviet Army and Navy, Stalin has now added a blow at the Air Force, which the bitterest enemy of Russia could not have hoped for in his most sanguine moments.

Berland reports among those arrested as "Nazi terrorists," one Nissen, a crack camera man, usually detailed to cover big events. It was he who took pictures of the unanimous vote for the Constitution in the great hall of the Kremlin on Dec. 5, 1936.

Shadows Over Stakhanovism.

The Soviet press, in general, and Stalin's lackey and apologists abroad, in particular, used to raise a howl whenever anyone pointed out either the disruptive effects of Stakhanovism on Soviet industry (the more Stakhanovists in a plant the lower the output) or the fraudulent and spurious nature of many of the records. It may sound unbelievable but it is nevertheless a fact that both Izvestia and Pravda on the same day (Jan. 9) in their leading articles admit the baneful effects and frauds of Stakhanovism, in guarded but plain terms. Says Pravda: "Certain enterprises are still being carried away by organizing for individual records to the detriment of organizing the Stakhanovist work of entire brigades, shifts, and plants." The editorial then goes on to warn the managers, engineers and technicians not to "forget" their duty of assuring to each worker "the opportunity for over-fulfilling the norm." And then Pravda adds the following eloquent statement: "Some industrial directors countenance a sporting attitude toward individual high records and, as was to be observed in the Donbas, countenance therewith even fraud, ascribing the results achieved on the basis of a division of labor between a group of workers to a single individual alone. The sooner we put an end to such distortions of the Stakhanovist movement, the more the country will benefit from it. A correct leadership of the Stakhanovist movement... leads to the growth of the productivity of labor not only of individual record holders, but of entire groups of workers, and entire groups."

Economic difficulties, especially those in connection with the spring sowing campaign, are compelling the ruling clique to revise its attitude toward one of its pet panaceas, Stakhanovism. A retreat has already started. Shortly scape-goats will be produced. An "expose" of record-holders is in the cards.

social conquests. Under the slogan of "Military victory first, social reform after," the Popular Front government has brought the general military situation to a stalemate. Only deep-going, social reforms can draw the peasants into the fight and revitalize the entire working-class in face of a technically superior fascist military machine.

The revolutionary program for Spain is indicated in the leaflet distributed among the anti-fascist forces by the illegal Bolshevik-Leninists (Fourth Internationalists): "WORKERS: The victory of Teruel can be assured and carried out only by the struggle against the bourgeoisie. Defend the collectivization threatened by the Popular Front Government! Liberty for the 15,000 imprisoned revolutionists! Legality and liberty for the workers' press and organizations! Freedom of political propaganda for the soldiers!"

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. II. No. 6. Saturday, February 5, 1938. Published every week by the SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N. at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.

MAX SHACHTMAN Editor.

HAROLD ROBERTS FRANK GRAVES Associate Editors. BOB BROWNE Business Manager.

"Fugitive From Justice"

Immediately upon the announcement that the Massachusetts authorities had arrested Fred Beal and held him for extradition to North Carolina where a 20-year prison sentence awaits him, the Daily Worker labelled Beal a "fugitive from justice."

These three words reveal a depth of degradation that has rarely been reached by a paper claiming devotion to the cause of labor.

From what "justice" is Beal a fugitive?

Beal and six of his fellow unionists were framed-up and sentenced in September 1929 to long terms of imprisonment in a lynch court in North Carolina for the simple and sole reason that they had led the unspookably exploited textile slaves of Gastonia in one of the most magnificent and heroic strikes the Bourbon South has ever seen.

Upon the decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, of which the defendants were members, they forfeited their bail and fled to the Soviet Union. After they had left, the Daily Worker of August 27, 1930, wrote:

"They are quite justified in escaping from the vicious sentence imposed upon them, by placing themselves beyond reach of the Southern capitalist class justice.... The working class as a whole should glory in the fact that they got away. The workers should support their escape despite the howls of the bourgeoisie.... Let the bosses take the bail; it is better that they have \$27,000 than the seven Gastonia fighters serve 117 years in their prison."

Why were none of the Gastonia defendants "fugitives from justice" in 1930? Why does the Daily Worker join in 1938 with the "howls of the bourgeoisie" in demanding that "Southern capitalist class justice" be given its victim, Fred Beal?

Because Beal has committed the greatest crime imaginable in the eyes of the Stalinists. His residence in the Soviet Union made him an opponent of the Soviet bureaucracy.

That is the only reason why the Communist Party in this country would like to see him pay the penalty of imprisonment for his devoted working class activity among the textile workers.

And in order to get their revenge, the Stalinists sink to the lowest level of the traitor; they blow the whistle to call the cops against a militant worker! Like stool-pigeons, these eminent defenders of the reactionary Southern courts put the finger on Beal as a fugitive from "justice."

Whoever does not feel a shudder of revulsion at this latest display of Stalinist ignominy, is lacking the elementary spirit of working-class solidarity. To those still imbued with that spirit, who still work in the great tradition of defending the victims of American class "justice" from the days of the Haymarket martyrs to the days of Sacco and Vanzetti and Mooney and Billings, we once again call for an iron ring of protection around the imperilled militant, Fred E. Beal. Let the united front of the Stalinists and the cops be broken by the united front of the entire working class.

Another Frame-Up

The International Furriers' Union is run by Mr. Ben Gold and the other Stalinist leaders just as Turkish Wallis managed a province under the bloody Sultan. They are now adding to their repertory of domination the methods of the Moscow Frame-Ups.

The Stalinists in the furriers' union have been feeling the ground shift from under them. In New York, the biggest center, there is a rising movement of revolt by progressives, especially among the Greek workers. Gold and Co. have therefore proceeded with an attempt to frame-up the leader of this opposition on the charge of being a stool-pigeon and the like. Now they are trying a similar stunt in Toronto.

Max Federman, vice-president of the International and manager of the Toronto furriers' locals, is being framed by the New York union leaders on the charge of embezzling funds. At a joint meeting of the two Toronto locals at which the charges were heard, the membership voted overwhelmingly to acquit Federman. The Stalinist officials have nevertheless taken action against him.

Federman, who has in the past worked harmoniously with the Communist officials, is nevertheless a member of the Left Poale Zion in Canada, a radical Jewish workers' organization. His crime apparently consists in not being a 100 per cent Stalinist, ready to take orders and give them in accordance with the bureaucratic decisions of the Stalinist leaders. Too popular to be replaced, he must needs be framed-up and driven out of the labor movement.

How much longer will the workers tolerate this infamous crew of Stalinist character-assassins and the policy of totalitarian rule in the labor movement which they follow at the behest of the anti-Soviet bureaucracy of the Kremlin? The Federman case again shows the need of burning the Stalinist cancer out of the working class and its organizations.

The Ludlow Amendment

The Appeal has pointed out that regardless of the faultless intentions of the supporters of the Ludlow Amendment for a popular referendum on war, especially of the masses of the people who see in it a way of preventing the American war-lords from hurling the workers and farmers into a new imperialist slaughter, we cannot become the advocates of the Bill. And that for the simple reason that we regard it as another of the many pacifist illusions by means of which the masses are distracted from the only means whereby imperialist war can be fought, namely, the continuous prosecution of the class struggle against the system which inevitably breeds war.

For those who consider the Ludlow Bill a guarantee against the United States government launching a war without sanction from the people, we recommend the following comment by one of the prominent advocates of the amendment, Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen. Writing in the official organ of the United Automobile Workers (January 15, 1938), Whitney says:

"As I interpret this Amendment, our government would still be free to pursue a vigorous international peace policy. There is nothing in the Ludlow Amendment that would prevent our ships from turning their guns on attacking planes, just as was recently done in the Panay incident on the Yangtze River. There is nothing in the Ludlow Amendment that prevents the vigorous defense of the Monroe Doctrine. There is nothing in the Ludlow Amendment which would prevent Congress from spending 100 per cent of our national income for defense purposes. Under the Ludlow Amendment, Congress could even conscript American citizens in contemplation of a conflict. Our warships may continue to be manipulated in peace time just the same under the Ludlow Amendment as at present."

To imagine that after all such preparations have been made for a new war, the imperialist masters of the country would hold off final action because of a "scrap of paper," is simply to drug the masses into the paralysis of false security. That's the trouble with the Ludlow Bill.

People's Front Balance

The Promise:

The People's Front Government in France will smash Fascism. The People's Front in France will guarantee democracy. Through democracy the masses will go forward to socialism.

The Reality:

Four years ago the masses, by their own spontaneous action, had the tiny Fascist groups on the run.

Today, every one who knows anything about France admits that the Fascist movement is stronger, larger and more aggressive than ever.

Early in 1936, the masses struck by the hundreds of thousands and by their own action and solidarity obtained considerable wage increases, the 40-hour week, and union recognition.

Today, the wage increases have been wiped out by the rise in the cost of living and the government is preparing to smash the 40-hour week in cahoots with the employers.

In 1936, the Unions grew to enormous proportions. Today, a Fascist trade union movement is gaining ground for the first time, based on the demoralization and disillusionment caused by the treacherous People's Front regimes.

The first People's Front government early in 1936 was overwhelmingly Socialist, with the capitalist Radical party playing a background role, and Blum as premier.

The second People's Front government marked a shift to the right, in favor of the capitalist parties in the cabinet, although Blum remained premier.

The present, third People's Front government has shoved the Socialists out completely, made Chautemps, a capitalist politician, premier, and marked another sharp shift to the right.

That is how the People's Front in practice, in reality, "stops" Fascism and "leads to socialism."

The 'New International'

The February issue of the New International, which has just appeared, inaugurates a new and valuable feature, a Review of the Month by the Editors. The bulk of the Review this month is devoted to a survey of the record of the New Deal, Roosevelt's course during the "recession," and the administration's war preparations as revealed in the new defense appropriations. Especially impressive is the lengthy analysis of the Ludlow amendment and the debate which has raged around it.

Also pertinent to the present American scene is James Burnham's article on "Roosevelt Faces the Future," which casts a balance sheet of Roosevelt's class record and points out the trends toward political realignment and third-party formations in connection with the 1940 elections. The editors announce a series of articles by Burnham on American politics, the next to be concerned with the Labor Party movement. The timely article by James P. Cannon, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, on the foundation of the new party, and George Novack's study of "Marx and Engels on the Civil War," round out the material relating to the national scene.

International events are covered by Alfred Rosmer's comments on the impasse of the French Popular Front, and Felix Morrow's review of the current crop of books on the Spanish civil war. Much historical material, hitherto unavailable, is furnished by Trotsky's "Two Letters on the Question of the German October," which relate to the German events of 1923, and the extracts from John G. Wright's study of the controversial Kronstadt revolt.

The chief difficulty with the New International is a purely technical one: the limitation of space. Articles on many important subjects—the murder of Corcoran, the anniversary of Lenin and Luxemburg, the Brandler-Thalheimer position on the Soviet Union, the Mexican situation—were crowded out of the present issue, as were many important reviews. Support for the subscription drive and an increase in circulation will pave the way toward a larger and still more useful New International.

The Peace-Loving President



Browder Defends Imperialism

By James Burnham

When Marxists state that Stalinism now functions in the world labor movement as a counter-revolutionary force, as the chief obstacle in the struggle for workers' power and for socialism, there are still, of course, many who do not believe them. There are, for example, honest members and sympathizers of the Communist Party itself who think that this altogether sober and scientific analysis of the Marxists is the slander and ravings of "mad dogs." Such persons are compelled by their own conscience to think in this manner.

They differ in their whole moral makeup from the cynical, depraved and shameless bureaucrats who actually run the Communist Parties of the world. In their own hearts, they sincerely want socialism; and they believe that the only road toward socialism lies through support of the Communist Party, which they mistakenly look upon as the heir to—instead of the most bitter enemy of—the October Revolution. If they understood the true role of Stalinism, they would abandon it overnight. That is why we must dissect every concrete manifestation of Stalinism, in order to remove the false outer skin and lay bare the internal decay.

WAR QUESTION IS DECISIVE

It will need no argument to prove that today the war question is the decisive question. Since it is the decisive question, the answers given to it provide the surest touchstone to the character of every political movement. To anyone who doubts that the Stalinist answer is and means, the New Republic of February 2 offers an easy and spectacular way of clearing up those doubts.

In this issue of the New Republic there is published a debate between Earl Browder and Charles A. Beard on the general subject of "Collective Security." I plan, on another occasion, to analyze Browder's arguments in this debate, as well as those of Dr. Beard, and in particular to discuss the whole conception of "collective security." I wish, in the present article, to consider merely the point of view from which Browder writes.

Naturally enough, Stalinists pretend to their own followers that they write from the point of view of the international proletariat. Even a brief survey of Browder's article in the New Republic can demonstrate beyond any doubt that he is reasoning and writing from the point of view of the defense of U. S. imperialism.

BROWDER SPEAKS FOR ROOSEVELT POLICY

In no line does Browder even suggest that his policy is a working class policy, or an independent policy of any kind. He himself speaks openly for Roosevelt's policy. The cover of the magazine correctly reads: "Earl Browder— for the President's Policy." "Clearly, then," Browder writes, "in our country the task is to or-

ganize effective support, behind the President's policy, of the 27,000,000 who voted for him in 1936." Replying to Bruce Bliven's objection that his policy is peculiarly "Russian," Browder says: "We will not quarrel with Mr. Bliven as to how the policy could be best framed in American terms; we are willing to leave that to the President...."

The President, according to Marxism, is the chief political executive of the ruling class, the bourgeoisie, in this country. Browder, by his own words, accepts the war policy of the chief executive of the bourgeoisie, accepts it one hundred per cent, and is willing to leave its fuller formulation altogether to that chief executive.

WOULD SUPPRESS LABOR'S STRUGGLE AGAINST CAPITAL

In Browder's article, the class struggle—according to Marxism the motive force of history, from an understanding of which all Marxian analysis of all social and political problems proceeds—is mentioned only once. There is no word of the class struggle in the discussion either of the causes of, or the cure for, war. On the one occasion where the class struggle appears, it is cited as one of the major weaknesses of the United States as against Japan; and, it therefore follows, as a factor which must be overcome if an "effective peace policy" is to be achieved.

Browder's argument thus advocates the suppression of the class struggle, as a necessary part of the means for achieving what he calls an effective peace policy. This does not appear so odd when we understand that in reality Browder wants to achieve not a peace but a war policy for the United States: suppression of the class struggle is, in fact, necessary for an effective war policy on the part of a capitalist nation. "But America, rich and full of potential booty, is still considered by the world to be in a pacifist funk, is torn by a constitutional crisis and sharp class struggles, and contains powerful forces that would welcome Japanese aggression for their own fascist ends."

BILLED WITH FRANK JINGOISM

Browder's article is filled with the frankest jingo appeals to the interests of U. S. imperialism. "A continuance of isolation policies by the United States will surely convince the arrogant militarists of Tokyo that now is the time for them to take over the Philippines, Hawaii, Guam and Alaska, as guarantees against the future, when the United States might dare. From that it would not be a large step to recall how much more successful are Japanese than Americans in cultivating the beautiful and rich lands of California." This is the crux of Browder's argument.

He continues it by stating that the United States is in more danger from Japan than is the Soviet Union. "A continuance of the same line (pursued up to now by Japan) leads her not to Vladivostok, Habarovsk and Chita, but rather to Manila, Honolulu and Nome." That is to say, Browder's central argument in favor of his own war position is that his policy alone can protect and defend—what? The working class? The struggle for socialism? Not in the least. His policy, he says in his own words, alone can defend the possessions of U. S. imperialism.

There is nothing more revealing in this article than Browder's use of "our" and "we." In every instance these words stand for the United States as a nation—that is, for the imperialist state. For Marx, the workers had no fatherland until they conquered one for themselves. Browder is less lonely. "Our country" appears twenty times. "If we continue to desert them to their fate, as Mr. Bliven advocates, we will have no one to blame but ourselves when we have to take up the full military burden under more unfavorable conditions." Browder speaks these days with the full rounded phrases of a statesman. But not, he is careful to make clear, of a statesman of the working class. "We," says Browder, and the other representatives of the imperialist United States, will be ready to assume "the full military burden" even "under more unfavorable conditions."

ROOSEVELT WILL SAVE HUMANITY

The most startling and naked of all the sentences in this remarkable article is, however, the following: "Only the courageous implementing of the policy laid down by President Roosevelt in Chicago can save our country, and all the capitalist world, from unparalleled reaction and catastrophe." Criticism itself becomes tongue-tied when faced with such a remark.

Whom is the working class called upon by Browder to save? He answers: "Our country, and all the capitalist world." And what must this capitalist world be saved from? He answers: "From catastrophe." But what is catastrophe for the capitalist world? Catastrophe for the capitalist world is, and is only the socialist revolution. Browder's entire article is summed up in this clarion call: join with me to save capitalism from the socialist revolution.

(This article is the first in a series of four on the New Republic debate between Earl Browder and Charles A. Beard. The remaining three will discuss the origin and meaning of "collective security"; Dr. Beard's "isolationist" reply to Browder's advocacy of collective security; and the Marxist answer to collective security. —ED.)

Party Resolutions

TRADE UNION MOVEMENT and the S. W. P.

(Continued from page 2)

unity, but rather favorable. In its systematic work of preparing the country for war and extending the militarization of all institutions, it understands that the trade unions can be more smoothly coordinated into a war machine if friction in their ranks is eliminated and if they are a single unit led and controlled by a single reactionary leadership.

In addition, a certain section of the employers is exerting pressure in the direction of unification because it finds the "raids" conducted by the C.I.O. on the A.F. of L., and vice-versa, with their consequent effects on industrial production, to be more unprofitable to the employers than dealing with a single, conservatively-led union would be. The financial drain upon both C.I.O. and A. F. of L. in the violent struggles against each other, are also a factor of some influence in bringing unity closer to realization.

Finally, the original point in dispute, namely, the question of organizing the mass-production industries on an industrial (vertical) basis, has already been settled by the realities of the auto, rubber, steel, electrical unions now in existence and functioning. Not even the most hardened Bourbon of craft unionism in the A.F. of L. leadership would seriously propose today to dissolve the United Automobile Workers, for example, into the 22 craft unions which existed under the Green dispensation prior to the C.I.O.'s advances.

Apart from face-saving considerations, the principle of industrial unionism, at least as applied to the mass-production industries, may be considered generally acknowledged throughout the organized labor movement, and reluctantly accepted even by the Green-Woll machine. What stands chiefly in the way of the successful conclusions of the unity negotiations now under way, is the struggle for power in the united organization between the old A.F. of L. and the new C.I.O. bureaucracies. The main point in dispute is not the right of industrial unionism, but such a form of re-unification as will give the one or the other bureaucratic machine the greatest number of supporters and the upper hand in the united organization.

Our party, together with every revolutionary and class-conscious worker, takes a clear-cut position in favor of the earliest and completest possible unification of the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O., and also the hitherto unaffiliated Railroad Brotherhoods. The only condition, practically speaking, under which such a unity would be a step backward would be one binding the former C.I.O. unions to abandon the industrial form of organization and to divide themselves into scores of impotent craft unions. Unification on such a basis is, however, scarcely conceivable.

Unity would be a tremendous step forward for a number of reasons. The united trade union membership in the United States today is the largest ever reached in all its history, far larger than at the post-war peak. Unity of all the unions into one, would mean a common, organized union front of approximately 8,000,000 workers, with a tremendous attractive power for the still unorganized, with almost inexhaustible forces capable of withstanding the offensive of the employers and of advancing aggressively the demands of the workers on all fronts. The unification would overcome the present, thoroughly reactionary division between the unskilled, proletarian elements in the unions, on the one side, and the skilled labor aristocracy on the other. Finally, a united union organization is, in general, a better field for the work of the revolutionary vanguard than a union movement divided against itself.

The reactionary role which the A. F. of L. leadership has played is clearly established in the minds of the class-conscious workers. From this it should not follow that the revolutionary vanguard makes a fetish of the C.I.O. and worship unquestioningly at its shrine. Prior to the establishment of the unity of the two organizations, which the revolutionists must advocate as their general line, they work in either organization, according to specific local circumstances.

Unity Must Be On Proper Basis

The revolutionist does not withdraw from a union just because it may be conservative in policy or leadership; on the contrary, such a condition is usually all the greater reason for revolutionary activity in the union, always provided, of course, that the union embraces the decisive sections of the workers (employed or unemployed, as the case may be) in its particular field. But even where concrete circumstances dictate working in an A.F. of L. or craft union, the revolutionary militant must always bear in mind the need of stressing the obsolescence and ineffectualness of the craft union form and the demonstrated superiority of the industrial form of organization, be it achieved by direct organizing of the unorganized, or by the amalgamation of craft unions already in existence in a given industry.

Although it is impossible for us at the present time to influence decisively the course of events, or to determine the pace and method of trade union unity, we are nevertheless bound to concentrate our propaganda and agitational activity among the workers in favor of the most desirable basis for unity, that is, democratic organization and a wide measure of autonomy for the affiliated unions, especially such a measure as would facilitate the organization of the basic industries into industrial unions and preserve the integrity of those already in existence. Every attempt to carve up the industrial unions into craft formations must be stubbornly resisted as thoroughly reactionary.

While the general line of all militants in the labor movement must be based upon the speediest consummation of unity, it does not follow that each and every single concrete question can be solved by the abstract consideration of unity at all costs. Prior to the complete unification of the two main bodies of labor, a number of cases, have already appeared where the bald slogan of unity would actually set back the militant and progressive movement. While the tactical line in each particular case must be subordinated to the general line of complete unification of the trade union movement, it does not follow that the two coincide in every given instance or at every given moment.

MARXIST SCHOOL

Opens Week of February 14th

- 1. ELEMENTARY SOCIALISM—Hal Draper Monday, 7 - 8:30 P. M.
2. PROBLEMS OF YOUTH MOVEMENT—Jos. Carter — Monday, 8:45 - 10:15 P. M.
3. MARXIAN ECONOMICS—J. Wright Tuesday, 7 - 8:30 P. M.
4. PRINCIPLES OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM—M. Spector — Tuesday, 8:45 - 10:15 P. M.
5. PROBLEMS OF TRADE UNIONISM — B. J. Widick - E. R. McKinney —Wed. 7 - 8:30 P. M.
6. HISTORY OF THIRD INTERNATIONAL — Max Shachtman — Wednesday, 8:45 - 10:15 P.M.

All courses will have ten sessions each. Tuition fee is \$2.50 per course. Register now!

Marxist School, 116 University Place, New York. — Telephone, GRamercy 5-9142

Subscribe To The Socialist Appeal