

Stop the Sell-Out!

The Betrayal of Czechoslovakia Brings War Closer Home

EARL BROWDER

CHAMBERLAIN has come into the open as the accomplice of Hitler. By covering his crime with the melodramatic flight to Berchtesgaden under the cry of "peace," he expects to dragoon British labor into support of his treason, and to smash the Popular Front in France, an aim long close to his heart. Fanatically pursuing the narrowest class interests of British monopoly capital, Chamberlain and his associates are striking at the heart of the last hopes of world peace and democracy. It is the blackest and most open treason ever registered in modern history. Through the betrayal of Czechoslovakia, world peace and democracy are to be betrayed.

A storm of protest must and will arise from all the world. From every peace-loving people must come the repudiation of this cynical treachery. Especially from the American people, who hold the greatest power to influence world events, and who have the most advantageous position to influence events for peace without immediate risks to themselves. It is the height of demagoguery to cry out against the crimes of other lands if we of the United States should be influenced by those Pharisees who preach at us to pass by on the other side.

The Hitler aggression against the Czechoslovakian republic is one of the sharp points of universal aggression, directed against the whole world. Not least is it against the United States. The wild uprisings staged in the last months by Hitler's forces in Mexico, in Brazil, and in Chile are only slight indications of what is to come when Hitler gets into his stride. The idiotic ravings of the Dies committee show how high within our own government do Hitler's direct accomplices reach. And for years, one of the principal problems of our Commerce and State Departments has been how to cope with the measures of economic war being waged by Hitler against the United States, in the form of trade practices directly contrary to every established policy of the United States and of every other democratic country.

It is time that the policy of surrender to fascism, of which Chamberlain gives the most dastardly example, be stopped all down the line, in big and little things. The United States should and must establish its own independent

initiative to this end, not only from motives of human solidarity, but even from its most selfish national interests.

What are the minimum measures for implementing an American policy for peace in the present moment?

Two steps by Washington would decisively change the atmosphere of panic engendered by the accomplices of Hitler. They are minimum steps, they do not solve the problems, they are carefully buttressed in established American traditions, principles, and legislation—but they have the merit of posing a more realistic estimate of the relation of forces in the world, and show that democracy still has teeth short of war. These two measures would be:

First, a declaration by the President that the United States, vitally interested in inter-

national order and peace, is prepared to discuss with all signatories of the Kellogg pact those common measures which will become necessary to realize the aims of that solemn treaty if the present disturbances between nations continue.

Second, a declaration by the President, under the authorization of Section 338 of the Tariff Act, that the economic aggressions by Germany, foreseen by that act, have increased and become an established system, which can only be countered by the United States by applying the full measure provided in the act—that is, by embargo on German trade with the United States.

For several years now, the spokesmen of the United States have been reading excellent moral lessons to the aggressors who drag the world to war. More and more, the response to these moral rebukes has come in the form of jeers and insults. Nothing more is to be gained by high-sounding words; they will contribute nothing to world peace, and will only dissipate our country's prestige and moral weight. The next word must be such as will carry weight—or it had better not be spoken. Mild words, but such as convey a businesslike determination toward peace, backed up by even a minimum of action, are worth a volume of the most brilliant generalities. We propose nothing more than that at this moment, when the fate of world peace is in the balance, because we are convinced even this small contribution—because it passes from words to deeds—might easily make all the difference between maintenance of what peace is left in the world and universal slaughter and catastrophe.

Hitler and all his helpers have set the world stage to place before the peace-loving majority of the world the alternative: Surrender or War!

They want the world to believe that the struggle for democracy and peace has come to an end, that it is hopeless, that the war-makers hold all the trump cards.

That is a typical fascist lie, a lie on the grand scale, the lie to suck out the fighting spirit from the democracies, to sap their morale, to spread defeatism among the masses of the peoples.

The fight for peace is only beginning.



J. Bartlett



A. Birnbaum

GET IT?

British labor is already shaking itself free from the shackles of Sir Walter Citrine and Chamberlain. British labor moves very slowly, it is not easily provoked to action, but there is every indication that it is stirred to its depths by Chamberlain's attempted treason. And when British labor begins to move, it is a mighty colossus which can sweep away Chamberlain's power overnight. Let Chamberlain consult Winston Churchill on this point—that same Churchill who cracked his shins on Labor's Councils of Action in 1920, when he tried to use British power to restore the old order in Russia.

French labor, which has already been given a little foretaste of what a future of following Chamberlain has in store for it, has not agreed with Daladier to surrender the future of all France as well as the future of French labor to the ukase from Berchtesgaden.

And America has not yet spoken its final word. It will be a grievous mistake for the warmakers to think that the hesitation of America to speak that word arises from any doubts as to what kind of word it is to be. It will be an even more grievous mistake to conclude that the people of the United States are becoming pacifists willing to surrender democracy and peace to the world bandits. The fate of the world cannot be decided without the United States. And the United States is on the side of democracy and peace.

Let there be no mistake about this. Let the voice of America be heard, the voice of labor and of the people, first of all in our national councils in Washington, in meetings, and in the press, and on the streets.

Let there be a mighty roar of protest against the treason of Chamberlain.

Let there be bold but coldly cautious counsels pressed upon our national spokesmen in Washington!

Let there be full knowledge given the world, that America will never surrender to world fascism, that America is ready to help the world stop its surrender to fascism!

War can still be stopped. Peace can still be saved! Democracy can still be preserved! But the hour is growing short.

The people of America must speak!

★

They're Not All Nazis

As a Sudeten German, I have a right to say something about the situation in Czechoslovakia. Five weeks ago I paid a visit to my parents in the Sudeten section. I found that they are glad to live in democratic Czechoslovakia, as are all law-abiding Sudeten Germans. I was told by the Henlein party there that if I didn't join them I never would be able to go back to Czechoslovakia again. We true democrats, Catholics and Sudetens, will never be united with the Third Reich. We are Germans, but still Czechoslovakian citizens. I say, "God save Czechoslovakia and its President, Eduard Benes."—MAX KRAUSE, in a letter to the New York "Daily News."

Washington Looks at War

Problems, Plans, and Persons in our Foreign Policy

THEODORE DRAPER

Washington, D. C., September 18.

IF WAR in Central Europe should break out tomorrow, this country's foreign relations would be caught in an embarrassing transitional position. We are moving away from one policy and we have not yet adopted another. As a result, the subject is riddled with inconsistencies. The President, who is directly responsible for the conduct of foreign relations, distrusts and dislikes the neutrality legislation of the past three years. He would change it drastically if he could. In his favor, public opinion in the main is no longer isolationist, as it was from 1935 to 1937. There is agreement here that the idea of isolation as a guarantee of peace is largely a thing of the past though no unanimity about a positive substitute may have arrived. When the two basic factors in the operation of any foreign policy—administration and public sentiment—are so out of line with existing legislation, some change is practically certain.

Until the menace of immediate war during the past week, two possible formulas for revision of the Neutrality Act were seriously considered. Neither involved explicit distinction between aggressor and victim. It is well to supply this background, though neither will be enough even from the administration standpoint if war does break out.

According to the third and last piece of neutrality legislation, passed in May 1937, the President can exercise discretion in two ways. He has to "find that there exists a state of war" before prohibiting the export of "arms, ammunitions, or implements of war" to belligerents. But he need not "find" the state of war if he does not so choose, or at least there is no power to force him to find it. By this simple expedient—the discretion inherent in the word "find"—he can delay or prevent the operation of the act. Secondly, the President can add non-military products to the embargo if he thinks it advisable.

But the act is mandatory in one respect. If the President does find a state of war, then he must embargo "arms, ammunition, or implements of war" to both sides, no matter whether one is the aggressor and the other is the victim. When this lack of moral and political discrimination aids the aggressor (as it must do always), this country necessarily becomes a partner in the crime. Obviously, only in rare cases can the President judiciously fail to find a state of war, as he has done in the Far East; even so, no positive solution is thereby contributed. The Far Eastern precedent would probably not work in a general European war.

One formula was worked out on the basis of such reasoning. Let the President have complete discretion over every provision of the act and, in this way, hold the door open to some type of concerted action against the aggressor if warranted at the time by the state of public opinion. High officials in the State Department tell correspondents, as one told me, that it might not be bad to keep other powers guessing, that the present act is bad because it "binds the President's hands," that the present act is too rigid when the foreign scene changes every day, and so on. It is doubtful, in my mind, whether the President intended to ask for discretion in applying the act to the aggressor alone rather than to all belligerents. Such a request would force precisely that debate on principle which this formula seeks to avoid.

The second possibility was somewhat more courageous. This country has treaty agreements with various powers bearing on peace and war. Outstanding among these is the Nine Power Treaty, dealing with peace in the Far East, signed in Washington in 1922. Another is the Pact of Paris, signed by sixty nations to outlaw war as a national policy, of which one of the initiators was the then Secretary of State Kellogg. The hierarchy at the State Department has little affection for the Pact of Paris, probably because all the aggressors signed it. So the proposal has been made to cut off economic relations with all countries which break a treaty agreement with us *other than the Pact of Paris*.

These two plans were the favorite revisions of the Neutrality Act, at least until last week's crisis in Europe. As I see it, either would be a substantial improvement over the existing law, though both have some very serious weaknesses.

The idea of giving the President "more discretion" is plausible but it does not, of itself, come to grips with any question of principle except by indirection. If the President exercises his discretion consistent with his public declarations against the aggressors, the result would be sheer gain compared with the present mandatory neutrality on arms. But there is some danger in placing the issue on technical rather than political grounds, even as a matter of practical politics. The tory axis in the Republican and Democratic parties may very well decide to oppose the President on foreign policy with the same, single strategy: Beat Roosevelt. Of course there is no comparable unity within this bloc on foreign af-