

# Revolt

Organ of  
Revolutionary  
Workers  
League,  
U. S.



Vol. III.—No. 1  
CHICAGO, ILL.  
JANUARY 6, 1940  
Price 3 Cents

# CANADA bans REVOLT

CHICAGO, JAN. 2.—REVOLT announces the receipt today of a New Year's greeting from the Canadian government. The greeting, transmitted by the United States Post Office, follows:

United States Post Office  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Publisher, Revolt  
My dear sir:

Please be informed that the Postal Administration of Canada advises under date of December 14, 1939, that the "Revolt" has been placed on the list of publications, the transmission of which by post is prohibited in Canada.

Therefore, copies of the publication intended for delivery to subscribers in Canada, should not be presented for mailing in future.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) Ernest J. Krueger  
Postmaster

December 29, 1939

Continued on Page Four

## The American Way

"We must... keep ablaze... the flames of human liberty, of reason, of democracy..." — F. D. R. to Congress.

\* \* \*

Tuskegee, Ala., Jan. 1.—(UP radio despatch). — Only five official lynchings, a sharp decrease from former years, occurred in the United States in 1939...

There were 20 "quiet" lynchings in the state of Mississippi alone...

# Mr. President: *The lamb cannot lie down with the lion*

## Mr. President:

In your annual message to Congress on the state of the union you said that *production is back to 1929 levels*. You also spoke of the *fact of unemployment of millions of men and women*. You did not say how many. You said that *the unemployment problem today has become very definitely a problem of youth as well as of age*. As each year has gone by, *hundreds of thousands of boys and girls have come of working age*. They now form an *army of unused youth*. You spoke of the unemployed as a *surplus of labor which the efficiency of our industrial processes has created*.

You said that the task is *finding jobs faster than invention can take them away*. But you did not say how this can be done. In fact you said *you have not yet found a way to do this*. You said that the *surplus of unused youth are a burden to action on your part*. But you have no action to suggest.

You said that you are asking Congress for *army and navy increases*. And that *the only important increase in any part of the budget is the estimate for these increases*. In your budget message the following day you pro-

posed to cut the appropriation for relief by half a billion dollars.

Mr. President, you are the head of the most powerful government and the richest country in the world. The productive plant of the United States is capable of satisfying the needs of everyone of the 130,000,000 who live within its borders. Yet you were compelled to tell the Congress that this government and this country as it is organized today is unable to solve the problem of millions of unemployed men and women and boys and girls. And you were either unable or unwilling to recommend to Congress that it appropriate sufficient money to feed and clothe and house the unemployed.

You decried *doctrines which set group against group, faith against faith, race against race, class against class*. You pleaded that the *words of national unity, must be made to have real meaning in terms of the daily thoughts and acts of every man woman and child in our land during the coming year and the years that lie ahead*.

Mr. President, the unemployed worker cannot be united with the owner of industry who threw him out of work. The man who starves

cannot be united with the man who attends banquets at \$100 a plate. The worker, driven beyond endurance by speed-up cannot unite with his employer who makes millions out of his sweat. The striker on the picket line cannot unite with the employer who is trying to cut his wages and smash his union. The negro worker who is lynched cannot unite with the scum who lynch him. The worker whose demonstration is broken up cannot unite with the cop who clubs him. The worker who is deported to fascist Italy, Spain and Germany to be imprisoned or executed there cannot unite with the government which deports him. The man who is robbed and slugged by this social system cannot unite with the man who robs and slugs him because he is on top of this same social system.

MR. PRESIDENT: I will not lie down with the lion.

Mr. President, there cannot be unity while wealth accumulates at the top of society and misery accumulates at the bottom. There can be no unity while the starvation of millions is the condition for the well-being of a few. There can be no peace between the haves and the have-nots.

Between them there can be only war until the poor rise up to overthrow the system which breeds their misery.

Mr. President, your message to Congress was a confession of impotence to solve the problem of starvation and unemployment. It was not so much a confession of your personal helplessness as of the helplessness of the government for which you spoke and of the wealthy folk whom it represents and whose interests it defends. It signifies that any government dedicated as is yours to the defense and perpetuation of private ownership of the means of producing wealth which is the cause of the misery of millions, will be equally helpless to remove the causes of his misery.

The workingclass would, therefore, be justified in ceasing to place any faith or hope in your government and in taking the solution of the problem of unemployment into its own hands by raising itself to the position of the ruling class, erecting its own government and reorganizing production so that the capitalist and his profit would be eliminated and economic progress would become identical with improvement in the well being of all.

## Starvation Faces Detroit Mothers, Kids

DETROIT, Dec. 29.—"Business Upturn in 1939 Brightens 1940 Prospects." So runs a headline published tonight in the Detroit News. In releasing a report on industrial conditions here for the last two years, Willis H. Hall, manager of the statistical, industrial and research department of the Detroit Board of Commerce, concluded:

With this fine start, 1940, barring labor disturbances, should be one of the best in Detroit's history.

2,300 Wayne County dependent mothers with 7,000 children, are wondering what 1940 will bring them. On Monday, January 1st, the State, with Federal Aid, will take over the payment of mothers' pensions. Under the new plan mothers with one child who have been receiving \$43.33 a month, will receive only \$24; mothers with two children who have been receiving \$52 a month, will get only \$30. A four-person family will get \$42 a month.

Mrs. Ruby Zahn, president of the conservative Progressive Civic League here, declared:

Today the mothers of this country are actually facing starvation if the amounts given out to the public are correct.

The amounts were given in the newspapers of December 20. No refutation of these figures has been given yet.

Also, under the new State-Federal plan some of the Wayne County mothers would be left off the new roster entirely, according to the Detroit News of December 20. The maximum age for minor children will be 17. State Budget Director Gus T. Hartman declared no provision had been made for medical care of mothers and children.

IN yesterday's News Hartman stated that \$2 a week was sufficient to purchase all the food necessary for a mother and child.

Edward H. Williams, Wayne County Budget Director, published menus offered by Hartman much to the latter gentleman's anger and discomfort. Williams contrasted Tuesday's meals on Hartman's menus for a mother and child with the regular Tuesday meals at the Michigan State Prison.

### HARTMAN'S MENU

•Breakfast: Hot Cereal, one half cup milk, one slice bread, one cup of coffee (for mother only).

Dinner: Mutton stew all (vegetables, quarter pound meat), one cookie.

Supper: One quarter can of tomatoes on two slices of bread, one quarter pound stewed raisins, one slice bread, one cup of coffee or milk (for child, one for mother).

### PRISON MENU

Breakfast: Cracked wheat, milk, cinnamon rolls, bread, oleo, coffee.

Dinner: Fried beefsteak, brown gravy, braised potatoes, fried cabbage, bread, coffee.

Supper: Fried pressed ham, mustard, fried potatoes and onions, jello, bread and oleo, coffee.

Continued on Page Three

## NLRB Investigation Aims Blow at Unions

PLANS OF Anti-New Deal Democrats and Republicans to scuttle the Wagner Labor Relations Act and the National Labor Relations Board which it established, or to convert them into open anti-labor instruments, were brought one step nearer realization by the decision of the Supreme Court, on Jan. 2, which ruled that decisions of the Board determining what constitutes an appropriate bargaining unit are final and not subject to review by the Federal Courts.

At first sight the Supreme Court decision appears to strengthen the NLRB since it closes to employers a channel which they have used to fight decisions of the Board; and since it closes a channel which rival unions used in their jurisdictional warfare. If this decision were made a year and a half or a year ago that would undoubtedly be the conclusion.

But when this decision is examined in connection with two other recent event entirely different conclusions will be reached.

1. This decision comes on the eve of the resumption of the House investigation of the NLRB, begun in Washington, Dec. 11, 1939, after five months of preparation, and scheduled to resume Jan. 5. Thus far the House investigation which rivals the Dies Committee hearings for its one-sided, undemocratic procedure, lurid revelations, and anti-labor and anti-New Deal propaganda has crystallized two chief charges against the NLRB: maladministration by rendering illegal decisions which aided strikes and union organization, for example, in the Little Steel strike; partiality to the CIO over the AF of L.

Both charges are false. Any aid which the NLRB gave strikers was like giving them "ice in winter" as the saying goes. Workers got anything out of the NLRB only when they were ready to fight for their demands by strike action. The NLRB was created for the purpose of preventing strikes. Preamble of the Wagner Act states:

The Act proceeds on a simple theory based upon... facts... that strikes interfere with commerce; that the failure to bargain collectively is one of the major causes of strikes; and that the elimination or reduction of this cause will reduce the number of strikes....

NLRB may have made illegal decisions, but the overwhelming majority of its decisions which have been appealed to the courts, have been upheld.

The charge of partiality to the CIO is also false. Facts show that in 746 NLRB elections 262 were won by the AF of L, 260 by the CIO, 52 by independent non-affiliated unions; in 172 no labor organization won a majority of votes cast. In jurisdictional disputes the NLRB has ruled for the AF of L 51 times, for the CIO 44 times; both won part victories in 13; in cases of direct conflict where no other union was involved NLRB ruled for AF of L in 16, CIO in 19.

Continued on Page Three

**Communist Workers Group,  
Revolutionary Workers League (Fighting Worker),  
Comrades:**

**THE SEVENTH Plenum of the Central Committee of the League, in session December 24 and 25, 1939, having reviewed the efforts of the League to bring about unity of revolutionary groups in the American labor movement, and having carefully considered the position taken by you up to now on these efforts, decided to propose that the three groups unite.**

The League is aware of the fact that the basis for unity projected by it in its Open

Letter to Revolutionists, published in the September 16th issue of REVOLT, has been rejected by you. And that the Revolutionary Workers League (Fighting Worker) declares that the 14 points of the Provisional International Contact Commission of which it is an affiliate constitute the programmatic basis for unity. And that the Communist Workers Group declares that the material published by it is that programmatic basis.

IT BELIEVES that unity is possible despite this difference. All three groups recognize that unification can take place only on the basis of a Marxist program. The question is whether the position advanced by the League or the 14 points or the material of the CWG is such a program. The League's position is that as far as the theoretical principles of Marxism are concerned all three are on the

Letter and repeated in subsequent issues of REVOLT.

It repeats it now again with respect to the 14 points and the material of the CWG. As far as the 14 points are concerned concretely this is its position.

The League recognizes these 14 points as an attempt at a brief statement of principles which have been concretized by the League in its propaganda, particularly in REVOLT.

With the exception of the point which deals with the Soviet Union and Stalinism, and that which deals with the need for a new Communist international party, they are principles which were formulated in Marx's time, and in Lenin's.

They are, therefore, necessarily abstract. They make no analysis of the second imperialist world war, the war in the Far East, such developments as the Stalinist invasions of Poland and Finland, and the class struggle and the labor and revolutionary movements in the United States and its colonies; draw no lessons from the experience of the workers' struggles of the last 17 years; state neither a political perspective nor concrete objectives in the present situation.

In their present form, therefore, they cannot serve a revolutionary group in the United States today as a guide in its day-to-day propaganda and agitation. But as an abstract or summary of the principled content of what a Marxist program should be, they can be used as a theoretical basis for its elaboration. The League is entirely willing to consider them in that light and use them for that purpose.

In the opinion of the League the material published by the CWG represents essentially an expression of the theoretical principles embodied in the 14 points in the form of editorial comment and analysis on the present world and domestic situations and their development. This material like the agitation of REVOLT is not an attempt at a systematic statement of underlying principles. The League is willing to consider this material as material to be used in drafting a systematic, concrete statement of principles.

IN making these statements of its attitude the League does not want them to be construed as unqualified endorsements. It has a number of serious differences with the 14 points and the material of the CWG. For example, to take the 14 points first.

In the fifth point, that titled, The USSR and the Extension of the October Revolution, the following sentences occur: "Marxists will support the Soviet Union no matter in what kind of a war the USSR is involved. But such support and defense of the USSR can be accomplished only on the revolutionary line of the extension of the October revolution and... a political revolution against the Stalinist bureaucracy."

We understand that the 14 points were drawn up before the present war broke out and before such developments as the Stalinist invasions of Poland and Finland were envisaged. The fifth point is probably intended to apply to wars in which imperialist powers attack the Soviet Union and in which the Soviet Union either stands alone or makes a military alliance with one or more capitalist countries.

NONETHELESS, recent experience has shown that formulation, as it stands, without modification, can lead to serious errors if applied to such events as the invasions of Poland and Finland by the Stalinist regime. For example, the Fighting Worker of October 15, in discussing the invasion of Poland, asked: "Is the Red Army marching then, in order to help the World Revolution?" To which it replied: "No, that is the tragedy.... The Red Army is used merely to defend the interests of the Stalin bureaucracy."

The Fighting Worker then asked: "Shall we fight, then for the defeat of the Red Army....?" To which important question it answered: "No."

In brief what is suggested but not stated explicitly is that the Polish workers and peasants should have submitted to the invasion, a proposition which is repugnant to revolutionists.

In discussing the invasion of

Finland the January 1, 1940 Fighting Worker characterizes that war as follows:

Soviet Union against Finland is a struggle against World Imperialism." This characterization is absolutely false.

A war against an imperialist oppressor such as the war which China is fighting today, is a progressive struggle. A war, a military struggle against world imperialism can be conducted only by a proletarian dictatorship and IS A REVOLUTIONARY WAR. The revolutionary character of such a war is determined by the class aims for which it is fought—defense against imperialist attack, assistance to revolution in other countries—and by the fact that the class which conducts as well as fights it is the proletariat.

IN THE invasion of Finland this is not the case. We have here, in a much clearer form than in the recent invasion of Poland, a new, unique historical development. Russia is still a transition society between communism and capitalism degenerated to the point at which it stands in danger of the restoration of capitalism. But the proletariat, the Russian working class, does not rule, does not have control of the state, of economy. The Stalinist bureaucracy controls the state and economy, grows fat at the expense of, oppresses the workers. The bureaucracy has been, is, the product and the agency of the degeneration of the social structure created by the revolution of 1917.

From the social standpoint it is not the Russian working class, but the Stalinist bureaucracy, which is fighting the war against Finland, for its own counter-revolutionary ends. The counter-revolutionary character of this invasion does not consist in the fact that the Red Army has violated the Finnish frontier. We are not bourgeois nationalists; the class struggle in general, revolutionary wars, are fought to abolish national frontiers, to erect an international proletarian dictatorship. The counter-revolutionary character of this invasion consists in three sets of facts.

One—The purpose for which the Stalinist government is seeking naval bases in Finland, removal of the frontier on the Karelian isthmus further away from Leningrad, and acquisition of the Petsamo peninsula, which the Finnish capitalist government, under imperialist pressure, was willing to grant only in part, is not defense of the Russian revolution. Defense of the

Russian revolution can be successful only through the development of world revolution. Stalinism is counter-revolution. It liquidates the Russian revolution; fights revolution everywhere.

As in the invasion of Poland the Stalinists seek strategic advantages to defend against anticipated imperialist attack their own social interests at the expenses of the interests of the Russian and Finnish Workers.

THE RUSSIAN revolution would be in a much stronger position if it did not have the strategic advantages the Stalinists seek, but enjoyed the sympathy of the Finnish workers and peasants and even the diplomatic "friendliness" of the Finnish bourgeoisie, than it will be if Stalin conquers Finland and the Finnish workers and peasants not to speak of workers everywhere are filled with bitter hatred of Russia. It would be in a stronger position if it followed Lenin's policy when the much weaker Russian state of 1918 did not have these advantages but when its respect for the right of the Finnish people to determine their own existence—even after the Finnish revolution had been crushed—induced the Finnish capitalists to refuse the demand of the Allied imperialists to let them use Finland as a base for attack on Russia.

If they are successful in acquiring what they seek the Stalinists will use these bases to crush revolution in the Baltic and Scandinavian countries as they stifled it in Spain.

Two—If they are successful the Stalinists intend to impose a hand-picked and controlled government on Finland, dictate Finland's relations to Russia and other countries, impose economic and social reforms by military force, acquire by force what they could not win by political and diplomatic negotiation. In a word, the Stalinist regime is fighting this war for the counter-revolutionary purpose of destroying the right of the Finnish people to determine their own existence, which they realized for the first time as a result of the proletarian revolution of 1917. Stalin's attack on Finland is part of his general liquidation of the Russian revolution.

Three—the Stalinists will not develop the Finnish revolution. The invasion drives the Finnish workers and peasants into the arm of Finnish capitalist and landlords. The Stalinists have declared that they have no intention of changing the property relations of Finland from capitalist property relations to the state property which still obtains in the

Soviet Union. The reforms they propose are bourgeois reforms, which the Finnish capitalists were too poor to afford, which they intended as a bribe to win support in the Finnish population for their invasion. The Stalinists have declared through their puppet Kuusinen "People's Government" that they will respect the financial and economic obligations of the Finnish government to other countries, the \$30,000,000 in loans and the special \$8,000,000 debt to the U. S. government; which means that they intend to leave intact the economic chains by which British and American imperialism made an economic vassal out of the Finnish nation. If the Finnish workers rise the Stalinists can be counted on to slaughter them.

ON WHAT, then, does the assertion of the Fighting Worker that this invasion is a struggle against world imperialism rest? On what analysis? What data? On three sentences.

One—"The myth that Finland is 'independent'—or that any small nation in the present imperialist epoch CAN BE Independent—is a brazen lie."

Two—"The truth is that Finland was yesterday... and is today... an agent of the imperialists...."

Three—That world imperialism is "supporting Finnish capitalism and the Russian counter-revolution to the hilt."

As to the "myth" of Finland's independence. Exactly what the Fighting Worker's conception of national independence is we do not know. But whether Finland is independent in the sense which the Fighting Worker has in mind or whether it can or cannot be independent in that or some

other sense in the imperialist epoch is not the question. The point is that the Finns have the same right that the Chinese have or the Filipinos or the Indians to determine their own existence, and that Stalin is waging a war to extinguish this right. Further, the Finns and, in the first place, the Finnish workers have the absolute right to decide for themselves whether they wish to live under Stalinist rule. The plain fact is that not only the Finnish capitalists but the Finnish workers and peasants don't want to be subjected to Stalinism and have taken up arms against the imposition of Stalinist rule.

As to 2 and 3 they have been true ever since the Russian revolution and the establishment of Finland as a separate nation in 1917. These facts could justify an invasion of Finland only if the imperialists were using Finland as a base for war against the Soviet Union; as the French and British did with Poland in 1920, or if the Finnish workers and peasants were rising against the Finnish capitalists and landlords and needed aid from the Russian workers—and then only if the invasion were the military application of that revolutionary policy. Unfortunately the Finnish workers are not rising. But if they were Stalin would send troops not to aid them but to crush the revolution.

AS TO THE former. The Trotskyists bleat that this is a war on the Finnish government against the Soviet Union and that the world imperialists are waging an undeclared war against Russia. The Fighting Worker says "...even though Russia fired the first gun it is the imperialists who are the aggressors." If it were a war against world imperialism, this would be correct. But it is not a war against world imperialism on the part of the Stalin government. And world imperialism is not, at this time, waging war against Russia. The hundred or so airplanes and the meagre supplies which Italy, Germany, England, the U. S. and other countries have sent to Finland; the \$40,000 credit of the French government and the \$10,000,000 credit of the American government to the Finnish government; the aid disguised as relief, are expressions of capitalist hostility to Russia and Stalinism. But they are no more an imperialist war against Russia than the aid Germany and Italy gave Franco in the Spanish Civil War, and the aid Britain and France permitted the Republican forces to receive in the Spanish Civil War among these powers.

IN VIEW of its characterization of the war as a war against world imperialism how shall we understand the criticism which the Fighting Worker makes of the invasion as "stupid and costly military measures to bureaucratically conquer Finland," and its assertion that it "reflects" that "soviet foreign policy is now being dictated by Hitler," and the assertion that "the present moves by Stalin in both Poland and Finland undoubtedly are attributable in part to the pressure of the far-sighted capitalist elements in Russia who are looking forward in the near future to the days of a new imperialist Russia"?

Both the characterization of the war as struggle against world imperialism and the assertion that in waging it Stalin reflects the fact that his foreign policy is being dictated by Hitler, cannot be true. They exclude each other. They reflect a great confusion of mind.

Confusion is also exhibited in the line of action which the Fighting Worker

advocates. It says: "The Red Army men must overthrow their officer caste, democratize the army, re-establish the Soviets throughout Russia, fraternize with the Finnish workers and help them overthrow the Finnish agents of world imperialism. It is a fight on two fronts—against world imperialism and its present spearhead, the small Finnish bourgeoisie, on the one hand; and against Stalinism...."

This is a program to transform the war into a social revolution in Finland and a political revolution in Russia. 'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished. But then it is not now, not yet, not at this time a struggle against world imperialism. The Fighting Worker refutes the Fighting Worker.

How does the Fighting Worker propose that this transformation be accomplished?  
Continued on Next Page

The Decision Rests With You

# NLRB Probe

Continued from Page One

**A**F of L unions won 58% of elections in which they appeared; CIO 53%; independent 41%. 88% of the 205,597 persons eligible to vote cast their ballots. Of all the elections, 481 or 65.5% were held with the consent of all parties, the rest being conducted under NLRB order.

Real purpose of the charges is to provide a justification for amendments which would cripple or kill the Wagner Act, and to smear the New Deal as pro-labor, pro-CIO, anti-business.

Leader in the movement for amending the Act is the National Association of Manufacturers, with twelve amendments, six of which limit the right to strike, and all of which are anti-labor. Boiled down they would: 1—enable employers to defeat union organization drives by giving them the right to petition for elections—which they do not have now—and which they would invariably do before the union had won a majority of the workers in the plant which it is required before it can petition for an election; 2—limit the right of unions to solicit members by the inclusion of a clause prohibiting coercion of workers from any source. Since the employers are already prohibited specifically from discriminating against workers because of union membership, etc., the sense of this amendment can be directed only against the unions; 3—withhold "benefits" of the Labor Act from workers engaged in strikes in which there are "systematic acts of violence and intimidation"; "strikes without presentation of demands or grievances and reasonable opportunity for their consideration;" etc. Since employers provoke violence and stall on settling grievances it is obvious that these amendments have a strike-breaking purpose.

The United States Chamber of Commerce which agrees with most of the amendments of the NAM proposes in addition separate the functions of the NLRB independent department, which would be the administration of the Act impracticable and a maze of legal red tape in which no worker could hope to find his way.

Loudest howler against the NLRB is the AF of L Executive Council which proposes to replace the present three-man Board with an entirely new five-man Board; make recognition of craft unions mandatory.

Amendments proposed by the CIO, which mark the first time the CIO has asked for changes in New Deal laws, would change the Act in a direction opposite to that of the amendments of the NAM, AF of L, etc. The CIO amendments would impose criminal penalties on violations of the act by employers; restrict the right of the NLRB to decide bargaining units to prevent industrial unions from being carved up into craft unions; and would have the government refuse contracts to firms with anti-labor policies. Last point is vague since all employers are anti-labor.

By ruling that appeal against the exercise of the powers of the NLRB which are already the object of violent opposition by powerful interests may not be taken to the Federal Courts; and by suggesting in its decision that the remedy lies only with Congress, the Supreme Court shrewdly added fuel to the fires of the reactionary, violent propaganda for emasculating the Act.

**2. THE SUPREME COURT** decision is also likely to have an entirely although equally reactionary anti-labor result. On Dec. 29, Federal Judge Biddle of the U.S. 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals, former chairman of the NLRB, voided an order of the NLRB to Swank Products, Inc., to disband its company union. Biddle ruled that company unions are entitled to the same recognition as AF of L and CIO unions. Biddle, who should know what he is talking about, ruled that the Wagner Act

...does not purport to prohibit plant or so-called company unions, except where they are linked with the employer.

Company unions which are not linked with the employer is a contradiction in terms. What is probably meant is that company unions which are not openly influenced by the employer are legal in view of the language of the Act which prohibits the employer from "interfering," "restraining," "coercing," workers from joining or not joining unions. It is one of those subtle legal quibbles, so-called jokers

or loopholes in the law by which capitalists always get around laws they don't like with the help of Judges like Biddle.

Biddle based his ruling on a similar one by the 2nd Circuit Court in New York. On the same day that Biddle made his ruling the U.S. 4th Circuit Court of Appeals in Richmond, Virginia, overruled an order by the NLRB to L. Grief & Brother, Inc. to void a contract between the company and what is described by the Associated Press as the "employees' union," polite name for company union.

The Supreme Court decision making absolute the power of the NLRB to determine the appropriate bargaining unit and the ruling by the Circuit Court that company unions are legal bargaining units gives the NAM and labor's enemies generally an entirely new instrument to destroy existing unions and impose company unions on the workers. All that is needed now is to change the personnel of the NLRB and put in men who could be counted on to carry out such a program.

H. W. Smith, reactionary Virginia Democrat whom the New Deal failed to purge in the 1938 elections; who voted against the Wagner Act, the Wage and Hours law; who is charged with voting against all labor laws; who is reported to have informed Southern manufacturers not to obey the Wagner Act, Wage and Hours law, or any labor legislation on the ground it is unconstitutional; author of the Resolution to investigate the NLRB, and chairman of the five-man Investigating Committee; demands the resignation of Madden, present chairman of the Board, and Ed Smith, board member.

# Decision

Continued from Preceding Page

What role does it assign to the Russian workers? Should they demand an armistice? Fraternization at the front? Recall of the Red Army? Resumption of negotiations? Respect for the right of the Finns to determine their own existence?

**THE Fighting Worker** does not say explicitly. But its position is very close to the position of the Trotskyists which is that the victory of the Red Army would be a lesser evil than its defeat. It says: "The Red Army cannot turn back. Otherwise the imperialists and counter-revolution will be victorious." Then, it follows, the Russian workers should demand victory.

What should the Finnish workers do? How should they transform the war into social revolution? If they are caught in an imperialist war against Russia as the Trotskyists and the **Fighting Worker** say, their policy should be revolutionary defeatism, as the Trotskyists openly propose. If Russia is fighting world imperialism they should become partisans of the Red Army as the Trotskyists state. The **Fighting Worker** does not say. But if the Red Army cannot turn back because it would mean the victory of imperialism then, it follows, that the Finnish workers should become partisans of the Red Army, submit to the invasion as was implied by the **Fighting Worker** in the case of the invasion of Poland.

What should the workers of other countries do? Should they support the invasion, as the Stalinists demand? Should they support the Finnish government as the social-democrats propose? Or should they strive by independent working class action to fight the invasion, bring it to an end, transform the war into revolution? The **Fighting Worker** does not say.

At bottom, despite criticism and denunciation of Stalinism the position of the **Fighting Worker** is: support of the invasion.

**I**N OUR opinion the right of a small nation or an oppressed minority to determine its own existence should be defended whether it is attacked by an imperialist power, or by the Stalin government. The Finns today are making a progressive fight just as the Ethiopians did in 1935, the Chinese since 1937 to take the date of the latest Japanese aggression, and so on.

The duty of the workers is clear: to give no support to the Finnish government but to fight the invasion by independent working class action; to use the desperate situation of the Finnish capitalists to develop revolutionary agitation and organization for an independent republic in which the workers will be the ruling class, for a proletarian dictatorship in Finland.

What will be tomorrow remains to be seen, Should the imperialist powers convert the war into an imperialist war to crush the Soviet Union our attitude would change ac-

Some reports state that Madden and Smith will be "kicked-up-stairs," appointed Federal Judges in the footsteps of Biddle. According to these plans Board member Leiserson who has denounced many of the Board's decisions as favoring workers against employers will be retained and made chairman. If these reports are true they indicate that the Roosevelt administration is willing to give the opposition to the New Deal at least part of what it wants.

It is possible, in view of these developments, that the reactionaries may abandon the struggle to force amendments through Congress which would make them the target for bitter attacks and exposure as enemies of labor in exchange for the new set-up; or try some combination of both methods.

Labor faces a great danger. It finds itself in this position because it put its faith in capitalist laws, capitalist politicians, and such leaders as John L. Lewis and William Green. It can meet this danger only if it adopts a policy of relying on its own solidarity and organized strength to compel the employers to grant its demands; only if it adopts the policy that there is no substitute for strike action.

If it adopts such a policy then no matter what amendments are made to the Wagner Act or the Wages and Hours law or any other New Deal reform law labor cannot lose. Experience has shown that when labor is on the march judges like Biddle discover loopholes in the law more favorable to labor. But when labor is passive these judges spread themselves in the interests of the employers.

Jack Drake

# Mothers Starve

Continued from Page One

Dr. Henry F. Vaughan, Detroit Health Commissioner, declared Hartman's menu to be unbalanced and inadequate. He characterized the diet as sufficient for a bare subsistence

for one person not actively engaged in work, and not growing. The four quarts of milk provided each week should be increased to 12 quarts... There are no eggs... A mother and child should have eight or nine eggs a week. The calories content is low, but this is not so serious as the lack of protective foods like milk, fresh fruits and leafy vegetables.

State Budget Director Hartman accused Williams of "trying to excite poor people and carry on an argument for political reasons." Hartman declared:

He (Williams) didn't even say that whatever menu is used by these mothers, it means something that is given them by the taxpayers. That's been forgotten all the time by a lot of people.

Behind all this is the following fact: Detroit will face a relief crisis at the end of January "with no way remaining by which the city could borrow money to help finance welfare costs until the fiscal year ends June 30." The city officials fear that they will have to supply supplementary relief to dependent mothers and their children under the new State-Federal Plan. The state budget director, on the other hand, wants to keep relief costs for the state down. On January 1st, the state will have only \$4,000,000 left of the \$8,750,000 appropriated for 1939-40, and has been spending money at the rate of \$90,000 a month.

And 2,350 Wayne County dependent mothers with 7,500 children are wondering what 1940 will bring them.

E. Barton

selecti. ... policy of and make arrangements for the publication of a weekly four-page paper;

4—Draft a statement of tasks the new organization shall undertake;

5—Organize a unification convention.

The League proposes that representatives of the three groups meet to discuss these five steps or any modification or amendment of them which they may care to suggest, or substitute or alternative proposals for any one or all of these five steps.

It is the opinion of the League that members of the three groups having once before been united in one organization on a theoretical basis which all three now separately defend, it should be possible, in view of the present situation, to unite again. It realizes that such unity would be stronger if the lessons of the experience which led to the present division were drawn and assimilated. But it realizes that none of the groups is convinced that it was incorrect and, therefore is not prepared to recognize the other groups as its political superiors. In view of this the League feels that the ends of unity can be served only if the three groups agree to defer to some future time the drawing of these lessons.

Conscious of its obligation to put the interests of the working class above its own group interests the League declares that in its approach to unity it is not motivated by a desire or intention to force or win from you a recognition of the correctness of its role in its struggles with you, convinced though it is that it was correct.

It is motivated only by a desire to do whatever is possible in the present situation, while there is yet time, to make a more effective revolutionary agitation and organize a more effective resistance to the war plans of the American ruling class and its government, then any of the three groups or all three together are capable of today; to take the first steps to change the development of the revolutionary movement from division to unity and so to construct a center of attraction for other revolutionists.

If you meet us in the same spirit, unity should be possible.

The decision rests with you.

Comradely,

**CENTRAL COMMITTEE**  
Revolutionary Workers  
League, U. S.  
January 2, 1940.

# PACIFIST YOUTH WITHOUT HOPE CONGRESS SHOWS

CHICAGO, JAN. 1.—The Third National Convention of the Anti-War Congress of the Youth Committee Against War of the Keep America Out of War Congress met here at International House at the University of Chicago, Dec. 27-30. The hall was bedecked with slogans: **Job at Home, Not Death Abroad; Enlist for Peace or be Drafted;** which reflected the pacifist character of the Convention.

Delegates from the National Council of Methodist Youth, Young People's Socialist League (Socialist Party youth organization), Fellowship of Reconciliation, War Resisters League, Student Peace Service, trade unions, Farmer's Educational and Co-operative Union, and India, Germany, South America, Canada, etc., sang

We don't want to march in the infantry  
Shoot in the artillery  
Ride in the cavalry  
Drop bombs over Germany  
We're in the peace army.

Excluded by the call for the Convention were all those standing for totalitarianism. Included under totalitarianism, by interpretation of the Credentials Committee, was the proletarian dictatorship. Stalinists and Trotskyists were excluded on the ground they stood for this last. Two Stalinists who slipped by were discovered and expelled.

In political control of the Convention were the Socialists whose fueder was Al Hamilton of the YPSL. When an amendment was introduced at one point expressing opposition to Socialism a socialist spokesman declared his desire for socialism but stated the Socialists would support the amendment on the ground that the issue today is not socialism. The Amendment then carried. Other conflicts were avoided and differences smoothed over by taking straw votes on controversial points.

THE Program adopted undoubtedly expresses the opposition of American youth to war and to militarization. It comes out against the ROTC; demands abandonment of all mobilization plans; endorses student strikes against war; declares "we refuse to support the government of the U. S. in any war it may undertake."

But it is full of pacifist and reformist ideas. It demands exemption from conscription for political humanitarian and religious objectors to war. It does not call for a struggle against conscription. It speaks of "taking the que and peace into the passage of what it ca in this through the war referendum amendment."

This Convention did not go even as far as some of the capitalist demagogues and writers who understand and say that the cause of war is found in the profit system itself and cannot be eliminated until that system is replaced by a socially progressive system of society. The Convention was therefore entirely unable to lay down a program for combatting imperialist war. In excluding proletarian dictatorship the Convention excluded the only possible solution for imperialist war.

The articulateness of the delegates succeeded only in exposing the confusion of the Convention and its hopelessness as an instrument in the struggle against war.

Apparently some idea of its hopelessness must have penetrated the Convention because it set itself the perspective of recruiting only 3,000 members in 1940. Since all members of organizations affiliated with the Youth Committee Against War automatically become members of the YCAW this number is less than insignificant. Pledges of 25c a week were met with thunderous applause.

When American working class youth decides to make a struggle against imperialist war it will never turn to the YCAW for guidance and leadership. That much the Convention absolutely proved. If the revolutionists in the U. S. succeed in building a revolutionary party in the short time which is left they need not anticipate that the YCAW will be a formidable obstacle in winning the youth.

H. Marsh

## Revolt Banned

Continued from page one

No reason for the ban is given. Inquiries are being made.

The Socialist Call, January 6, reports that the Canadian government has banned 29 periodicals and papers. REVOLT makes 30.

This is the second time REVOLT experiences persecution at the hands of a capitalist government. February 7, 1939 REVOLT was advised that the January 7 issue had been banned by the U.S. Post Office. Reason given was the quotation from the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels. A censorship was clamped on REVOLT. Subsequent issues had to be submitted to the Post Office for approval before they could be mailed.

Although the Canadian government has made no explanation of the ban we know the reason. The Canadian government is helping the British imperialists wage an imperialist war. REVOLT agitates to transform the war into social revolution. Hence the ban.

On July 3 the ban by the U.S. government was lifted as a result of protests by labor papers and the American Civil Liberties Union. The Canadian ban will be lifted when the Canadian workers decide that they don't want any part of the war.

# BOOK REVIEW

## Black Workers and the New Unions

By H. R. Cayton and G. S. Mitchell  
University of North Carolina Press, 1939, 434 pgs.

TO DATE, this book is probably the latest written on the above mentioned subject. It is obvious when reading it, that it is written by two scholars, well acquainted with their facts. It is thoroughly documented and every point is reinforced by statistics, charts, graphs and authentic interviews with those concerned. Field work was carried on for a period of approximately three years in three leading industries employing Negroes to a great extent: iron and steel, meat packing, and railroad car shops.

The thesis of Messrs Cayton and Mitchell is as follows: Negroes entered the large scale industries either as strike-breakers or at times of great labor shortage. This tended to depress wages as well as cause antipathy between black and white workers. There is well established proof that Negroes are more discriminated against than any other group. They are given the most menial and dangerous jobs at the lowest wages; they are denied advancement in favor of white workers with less seniority. In the iron and steel, and meat packing industries these practices are very common. In the railroad car shops, although pretty much the same conditions prevail, the factors of handling delicate machinery and technological changes have complicated matters.

Using the pretext of the "sub-normal intelligence of the Negro," a most vicious unscientific theory, the capitalists have managed to displace Negro workers in many instances. Still another factor is the system of apprenticeship. It is an accepted fact that one cannot enter the established crafts without first serving as an apprentice. Negroes as a rule are barred from learning the skilled trades and as a result cannot attain skilled jobs.

In their discussion of trade unionism Messrs Cayton and Mitchell expose the AF of L for its Jim Crowism. They show that in steel two forces stood in the way of the unionization of the Negro worker—first, the fact that the white unions did not want him and second, that company unions would receive him.

...in its 53 years of existence, from 1880-1933, the Amalgamated of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers—AF of L, had not made a single serious attempt to include Negroes in its ranks in a position of full equality with white union members.

THE CIO attempt at unionization is treated favorably.

The Negro bourgeoisie is dealt with as strike-breakers.

Although the authors correctly analyze the reasons for white antipathy and scabbing on the part of the Negro worker, and their intentions are of the best, their suggested solution falls short. They propose a Negro Chamber of Labor similar to the Italian Chamber of Labor. It would not be a dual union organization organizing independently and in competition with existing trade unions. Its task would be to serve as a special race organization to advance the cause of unionism among unorganized Negro workers and for a better understanding in the existing unions.

The authors do not seem to understand that the cause of Jim-Crowism in general is the need of the capitalist class to divide the American working class in order to prevent it from organizing on class lines; and that the discrimination in the unions by the bureaucrats and pie-card artists, especially in the AF of L, but also in the CIO, is a reflection of capitalist policy and makes them agents of the capitalist class.

The struggle against discrimination in the unions is a progressive one and should be pushed vigorously, but it can be successful only to the degree that the workers as a whole, black and white, succeed in driving the capitalist agents out of the unions.

In the last analysis equality of the negro worker with the white worker can never be achieved under capitalism. That is a task which only the working class revolution can solve.

E. Denny

# SHOP TALK

"Have you noticed what a s.o.b. Jones is," said Glenn to me at lunch time.

"Uh-huh, maybe that's why he's chief foreman now," I replied.

"I guess you're right", answered Glenn. "I remember when I worked alongside him on the line. That was just two years ago. Even then he was a hell of a guy."

"Yup," broke in Frank. "And do you remember when he was made straw-boss? He was a terror. Everybody said the promotion went to his head."

"Maybe it did," said Glenn. "But take Al for instance. He's been here longer and knows more about the racket. But he's a good guy, so he's still a straw."

"Sure," I said. "And Tony was demoted the very next season."

"You're damned right," said Frank. "It seems that if you're a right guy and one of the boys, the company has no use for you."

"Well that's not surprising," said I. "The company needs a slave driver for the foreman's job."

"But what the hell," exclaimed Frank. "I work better for a good foreman than for a heel."

"Up to a certain point," I answered. "But you won't kill yourself for anybody, will you?"

"No, I guess not."

"So the company hires foremen who're tough enough to force you to speed-up. That's all. You see, fellows, you can't serve two masters. We want a reasonable rate of speed, but the company needs a high speed in order to make big profits. Jones is the sort of guy who'll give them what they want, so they promote him. He's a heel, of course, because only heels can turn against the men the way he has. But once we get together and organize, we'll see to it that Jones and other such bullies don't go around the plant terrorizing us."

Mike Bono.

## REVOLT

Published by the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Workers League, P. O. Box 5463, Chicago, Illinois  
3 cents a copy 50 cents a half year (13 issues) \$1.00 a year (26 issues).

Jan. 6, 1940

Vol. III.—No. 1

Whole No. 32

# CAN THEY UNITE?

WILL THE LAND-LOCKED war in western Europe be resolved by a British-German deal to attack Russia? Can England and France on the one hand and Germany on the other sink their differences for the purpose of carving up Russia? Will Japan and other countries join them in a holy crusade against Bolshevism? What would be the role of the U.S. in such a war?

R ports in the newspapers are of no assistance in answering this question. There are reports that Italian planes were sent to Finland across Germany with the permission of the Hitler government. There are reports that the planes were denied transit across Germany and were returned to Italy after they had set out. Britain, according to the N. Y. Times, which is sending planes, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns through Sweden insists that Germany is sending Finland arms for cash payments. On the other hand the Associated Press reports from Berlin that Germany

is keeping a close watch on what kind of aid Britain gives Finland. Germany desires to stay out of the Russian-Finnish conflict... If British soldiers were to appear on Finnish soil, however, or if munitions deliveries from Britain were to reach decisive proportions there seems little doubt Germany would support Russia actively... German authorities profess belief that the western powers... want merely to use the little republic as a pawn in the game against Germany.

REVOLT believes that a united imperialist attack on Russia is not beyond the realm of possibility, but that as a practical consideration at this time it is extremely improbable. It bases this opinion on the following considerations:

As long as the means of production in Russia remain state property and so long as the government maintains a monopoly of foreign trade—and it will as long as state property endures—whether the government be Leninist or Stalinist capitalist investment and capitalist profit in Russia is impossible for the world imperialists. Moreover, as long as capitalism has not been restored in Russia, the imperialist world outside of it must always reckon with the possibility that the Russian working class will get rid of the Stalinist regime and return to a policy of world revolution. For the world imperialists therefore there is a continuous necessity to destroy the Russian revolution.

Not one of them is strong enough to do alone, because of economic, political or strategic reasons. To solve that task they must unite. But that is exactly what, experience shows, they have been unable to do.

THE EFFORTS of the imperialists to unite against Russia in 1918-21 failed because of their inability to come to an agreement on the division of the booty if they won. The U.S., for example, which sent troops to Archangel in northern Russia to assist British troops there to crush the young proletarian dictatorship, also sent troops to eastern Siberia to prevent the Japanese from annexing the rich maritime provinces of that country.

The antagonisms and conflicts among the imperialist powers are much sharper today than they were 20 years ago.

If Germany and England were able to sink their differences for war against Russia they would have done so before Sept. 3, 1939. They would not now be at war. There appears to be no possibility of an agreement between them on how to dispose of the booty if they won such a war. Above everything else Germany needs oil of which it possesses practically none, and would no doubt demand as item number one the rich Baku oil fields. But this is exactly what Britain wants and can never permit Germany to have. Moreover, the British Empire would regard powerfully developed Germany entrenched on the shores of the Black Sea as a much greater menace to its Near East domain than Stalinist Russia.

The price that Japan would demand for its participation would be much more than U.S. capitalists would be able or willing to consent to.

And so on.

There is only one condition which would compel these imperialist plunderers to unite. That would be the outbreak of proletarian revolution in Germany, or in England, if world revolution threatened to destroy them all. But if they were successful in putting down this threat the antagonisms among them would burst out again into new imperialist wars.

These sentences are a brief sketch of a study which REVOLT is preparing and which will appear in the following issue or the one after that. It will show that the imperialists have reached an absolute impasse. They cannot fight the war to a conclusion because it will be too costly and involve the danger of revolution; they cannot make peace; and they cannot unite against Russia. The only issue from the present situation is revolution. When this thought penetrates the thinking of the 13,000,000 armed men in Europe who are waiting the word to be slaughtered the war will come to an end and the revolution will have begun.