

REVOLT

Published by the Central Committee of the
REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE, U.S.

P. O. Box 5463, Chicago, Ill.

3 cents a copy—50 cents a half year (13 issues)—\$1.00 a year (26 issues)

Vol. III.—No. 3 CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 10, 1940 Whole No. 34

Snow, Beautiful Snow

We again had a most beautiful snowstorm yesterday and I have word that even in Texas, for the first time in many years, some sections have had as much as four inches of snow, so that schools have been closed in order that children might enjoy this rare phenomenon.... I can only hope that they found.... enough.... sleds.—“My Day” Eleanor Roosevelt, Chicago Times, Jan. 25.

Associated Press, Jan. 25.—A new cold wave dug deep into the south today, inflicting wide-spread hardship....

Two persons froze to death in Ohio. The relief situation was described as “pitiful” in Missouri.... Most relief offices were snowed under with requests for aid....

ATLANTA, Ga., Jan. 26 (I.N.S.)—Winter took a firmer hold on the south. One man froze to death in New Orleans.

....Fuel shortages added to the intense suffering.

It's Your Fault If You Starve in the richest country in the world

THE LETTER in the box adjoining this column appeared in the Detroit Times of January 9. The Times splashed it in big type clear across the top of the front page. For the Times it was another sensational journalistic scoop to build circulation.

But for the writer of the letter and for thousands of other women in Detroit and other cities it is the daily, terrible truth. In Chicago a spokesman for the United Charities said, “children have had their faces frozen from sleeping in unheated rooms. Some South Side families have burned their furniture as fuel.”

Since Mrs. Knaple wrote her letter protests have brought a small increase in the funds doled out to working class mothers in Detroit. Instead of the \$29 Mrs. Knaple got a mother with one child can now expect \$36 a month; mothers with two children \$47; and so on.

In the nearby city of Flint there stands the Mott Foundation for Youth, established more than ten years ago, to “keep children off the streets and out of trouble,” the Associated Press says.

This institution was established by

She is not ashamed to go out into the street. She is visiting friends in Phenix, Arizona with Mr. Mott. Mrs. Mott is in this fortunate position because Mr. Mott is a vice-president and the largest single stockholder in General Motors.

Mr. Mott is very rich, so rich he is able to announce a new gift of 100,000 shares of General Motors stock worth \$5,200,000, without ceasing to be an extremely wealthy man. Mr. Mott who is 64, has been making gifts for a long time because he is interested in “the welfare of youth and underprivileged adults.”

When the auto season is over tens of thousands of workers get laid off. As the largest auto manufacturer General Motors lays off more than any other auto corporation. Mr. Mott's corporation doesn't pay wages or relief to auto workers whom it lays off. How they eat and what kind of clothes they wear and whether they go on vacations or suffer like Mrs. Knaple is no concern of General Motors of which Mr. Mott is vice-president.

But in the slack season Mr. and Mrs. Mott don't have to pull in their belts or look for other jobs or try to get on relief. They collect their dividends in the slack season just the same as in the production season.

Profit doesn't stop. It keeps on piling up. Enough profit so Mr. Mott can give away millions and still

TO THE EDITOR

Detroit Times:

I am one of the unhappy mothers who received a big cut in my mother's pension. I have two children and what am I going to do? I am desperate.

I had to pay my rent or go out in the street, so when I paid the \$25 a month rent I had \$4 left to eat on for the whole month.

I will go without eating myself as long as I can so the children will have more, but how long will \$4 last?

What can I do when it's gone?

I am not well and this was quite a shock to me. We never had too much before. I often went very hungry, but I am afraid I can't go without food much longer.

This is a slow death as we must live now. It would be better to die quickly. Do you think, Mr. Editor, it will remain this way? It's not human to treat innocent children this way. Why must they collect money for some

starving?

I could not get out with the other mothers to protest. I have no clothes to wear. I have shoes too old and large for me and no stockings and no hat.

I am ashamed to be seen on the street. I feel as though I were 100 years old instead of 22.

I will not see my children go hungry. I will steal or do anything before they go hungry. My little boy is 3 and he is small and thin, and now, Oh, I shall go mad just to think about it.

Please forgive me for this letter but I had to tell some one and your paper seems to feel sorry for us.

MRS. MARY KNAPLE
256 Edmund Place

live on top of the world.

Auto workers, men and women like the Knaples, make the cars. But the Motts own the machines they use to make them. That gives the Motts the right to hire the Knaples and lay them off, take the cars the Knaples make, sell them, live on top of the world, and keep the “underprivileged” Knaples.

Mrs. Knaple complains because she doesn't understand that she has to suffer so that Mr. Mott

can make enough money to take care of women like her and children like her kids.

Courage, Mrs. Knaple! Carry on! There must be sacrifices you can make that you haven't thought of. Governor Dickinson of Michigan said that public welfare families should not have telephones in their homes. Take yours out! That will save you a lot of money.

The Governor also said that he disapproved of “persons on the welfare rolls who spend their money for tobacco.” Stop smoking, Mrs. Knaple!

The welfare boards of several counties have decided that families on relief must turn in their license plates or “get off welfare.” “Turn them in.” Mrs. Knaple! You don't need an auto. You haven't anywhere to go. When the time comes the government will give you a free ride to the cemetery. Or, maybe it will be the garbage dump.

“Do you think it will remain this way?”

Mr. Mott must think it will because he is giving away more money to take care of “underprivileged” people.

The New York Post says:

We must abandon the idea that the unemployment problem is merely temporary or that it is likely to be solved by some external factor such as the war in Europe.

Mr. Mott can't solve the problem of unemployment. In this annual message to Congress Roosevelt admitted he had no solution.

Does that mean it can't be solved? Not at all.

It can be solved quite easily. You can do it Mrs. Knaple.

And you don't have to steal.

There's enough food and clothing and shelter to go around. This is the richest country in the world. There's no real reason to go hungry or cold or without a decent place to live in. There's enough machinery and plants and workers to turn out what everyone of the hundred and thirty millions of people in this country need to live like human beings.

All we underprivileged have to do to get it is to take away from the Motts the RIGHT they have to own the machines which make these things, the right to throw us out of work, the right to give us charity, make the machines the property of the whole population and run them to satisfy the needs of all of us.

It's as simple as that. That's all there is to it.

It's so simple, the remedy is so close at hand that we say

IT'S YOUR FAULT IF YOU STARVE IN THE RICHEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD.

No Wreaths for Borah

WILLIAM E. BORAH, the “lion of Idaho,” died last month at the age of 74, 33 being spent in the U.S. Senate.

Borah has received a flood of posthumous praise for his “unique independence” in congressional struggles. “Senator Borah was like a lion against monopoly,” say the newspapers.

He has been glowingly depicted as a “friend of labor.”

Capitalist have good reason for praising Borah.

Borah was special prosecutor in the 1906-7 case against the Western Federation of Miners. Governor Stenness of Idaho, elected by the miners' vote, had called out the militia in the Coeur d'Alenes strike struggles in 1899. One year after he was out of office, on the night of December 30, 1905, he was blown to pieces by a dynamite bomb attached to his front gate.

Big Bill Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone, the three leading officers of the Western Federation of Miners, were accused of be-

ing responsible for the killing by a stool-pigeon, Orchard. None of them had been in Idaho at the time. To bring them to trial they had to be brought to Idaho. They were kidnapped.

The Supreme Court declared the kidnapping legal. Clarence Darrow was the defense attorney, Borah the prosecutor. So well did Borah do his job that Big Bill Haywood stated:

“Well, I have heard the best of them in the country, but Borah beats them all.”

Borah “beat them all” in his enmity to labor, guaranteeing his election to the U. S. Senate.

Continued On Page 4

Bill Green Tells All

I AM AN outstanding member of the Democratic Party, having run on its ticket for the Ohio Senate in 1911, where I served two terms as President of the Senate through 1914. “I was repeatedly selected as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention.”*

My allegiance to the U.S. government, its laws and even its injunctions is proved by my careful education of my followers “that a trade unionist has a prior obligation as a citizen of a democratic country to conform to decisions of duly constituted governmental agencies and contest and establish issues of justice through proper channels. We endanger our freedom when we attempt direct action.”

I completely supported the U. S. government in World War I, and always will support it:

“...when war was declared we were prepared to cooperate in every way with the government to win that war.... affirming American labor's allegiance to our democratic government in peace or in war....”

Of course, I “realized early that unions must become contributory agencies to war purposes or face suppression as a military necessity.... War production had to be maintained at high and uninterrupted levels.”

I was instrumental in hog-tieing labor to the government by having the UMWA sign the Washington Agreement with the coal operators under which strikes and wage increases were tabooed “for the duration of the war.” Armistice was declared in 1918, but the war was not officially over till 1922!

My attitude toward the 1917 Russian revolution was:

*Labor and Democracy by William Green, Princeton University Press, 1939.

Continued On Page 4

Text of

Communist Workers Group

Jan. 17, 1940

Dear Comrades:

In reply to your first unity proposal, we stated that abstract agreement on the war question could not be the sole basis for unity. We believe that the whole program of an organization is necessary as a basis to discuss unity. We stated that we were ready to discuss with anyone on the basis of our position, to see if agreement could be reached at.

Your proposal for unity now which assumes that RWL (Revolt), RWL (FW) and the CWG all stand on the same basis makes a further error. We have had all along important differences with you on the Road to the Party, and we expressed our differences on the method of fighting war in reply to your first unity proposal. As regards the RWL (FW), our political basis for separation from them was outlined in Workers Banner No. 1 and our statement on the RWL-FW 8d convention. Briefly, they covered the Soviet Union, the U. S.-England conflict and Workers Control of Production. We decisively reject the concept that a mere repetition of formulae makes up a program, and that claim of adherence to Marxism makes an organization either revolutionary or Marxist.

In any case, your present position of objective support to Finnish capitalism—calling on Finnish workers to fight against the Workers State—instead of calling for revolutionary defeatism in capitalist Finland engaged in imperialist war, makes unity with you out of the question.

The Communist Workers Group holds the position of revolutionary defeatism in ALL capitalist countries, for aid to the Soviet workers against the bourgeois force and their Stalinist agents. We call for international solidarity of the working class against the capitalist interventionist drive. We will support a revolutionary war against imperialism. Not a war of imperialism against the Workers State.

We have proposed a united front of action against the imperialist war.

For the Communist International

RUTH GRANT

Revolutionary Workers League

(Fighting Worker)

Comrades:

We have your letter of January 2nd reiterating your request that we participate in a "UNITY" conference with yours and other groups. We deem it necessary to deal with a number of points you raise.

1—It is our opinion that you have completely missed the significance of the 14 Point Programmatic Declaration. In

Replies to

concise form here is the only international declaration in the labor movement today which demarcates revolutionary Marxism from reformism, centrism, and ultra-leftism.

We disagree with you that these Points have little or no relevance for the movement today, that they are "abstract" principles that could have been written in Lenin's or Marx's time. If the 14 Points are of no value and "abstract," then what must your group say of the 21 Points of the Comintern or the 11 Points of the Left Opposition, both of which in their time just as the 14 Points today, demarcated Marxism from all forms of revisionism?

CONCRETELY, here are just a FEW of the points at dispute in the revolutionary movement TODAY, which the 14 Points deal with: the two-fold antagonism of capitalism, which the reformists and others deny; the fact that this is an epoch of wars and revolutions, which many ultra-lefts deny; the question of the organizational and political independence of the vanguard—which Trotskyism has thrust underfoot; the question of the U.S.S.R.—Stalinism, socialism in one country, march separately and strike together, the role of the bureaucracy, material aid, etc.—all points of violent dispute in the labor movement TODAY; the question of HOW to fight Fascism, a vital question in such countries as Germany and of profound importance in the U.S. today where all the reformists and centrists are giving left support to bourgeois democracy; the question of the Labor Party; Workers and Peasants Party; the disputed question between Marxists and the whole labor movement of whether there can or can not exist a state in between the Dictatorship of the

Jan. 17, 1940

Bourgeoisie and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat; the Road to Power, disputed by the POUM and practically everyone in the U.S. during the Spanish events; the question of soviets, of the colonial revolution, of the right of self-determination; the question of the Road to the Party—New Zimmerwald, reform of centrism, orientation, organic unity, democratic centralism—all of these and many other points that are of DECISIVE SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT TODAY.

It is quite true that the 14 Points do not deal with dozens of important strategic and tactical questions for the American Revolution, but without agreement on THE BASIC PRINCIPLED QUESTIONS dealt with in the 14 Points, the elaboration of Marxian strategy and tactics for the U.S. is impossible.

Your letter unfortunately does not deal

League's

with these questions. You speak of elaborating a concrete program for the U.S. on the basis of the material in Revolt, Workers Banner, and the 14 Points. We must point out to begin with that the Revolutionary Workers League adopted at its last convention a Program politically based on the 14 Points but dealing much more in detail with concrete strategic and tactical questions, as well as a concrete analysis of the most important trends in world events and in the development of U.S. imperialism.

We do not object and in fact would welcome further elaboration. But we do not demand our full program as a basis for unity. We insist, however, upon political agreement with the fundamentals of Marxism, as opposed to centrism, ultra-leftism and reformism. For this reason we present the 14 Points as the basis for negotiations. Your letter in effect reduces the 14 Points to mere additional material for discussion, together with the Revolt and Grant material—material which can be accepted or thrown out, according to you.

We must therefore inquire still again, for the 4th or 5th time whether the Revolt Group is willing to accept the 14 Point of the Contact Commission as the basis for negotiations, and we urge you this time to drop all evasiveness and give

a definitive answer.

2—You propose to include the Grant group. But the five comrades in this group have rejected the 14 Points as "CENTRIST." How do you square this fact with your statement that the 14 Points "CAN BE USED AS A THEORETICAL BASIS FOR ITS ELABORATION (of a Marxist program)." If your letter to us and the proposal to include these comrades are not merely for the record, then you are in reality throwing out the 14 Points and proposing a "NEW ZIMMERWALD" conference.

From our point of view, since the Grant comrades reject the 14 Points as centrist there does not seem to be any basis for "UNITY" with these comrades and it would be useless to participate in a conference with them.

4—There are many questions which your letter disregards. You state that it would be best in any discussion to "DEFER TO SOME FUTURE TIME" the drawing of the lessons of the split of the Revolt Group and the Grant Group from the RWL. We would have no objection to deferring the discussion of the organizational and historical elements of the split; but this cannot be made a vehicle to defer serious questions that are TODAY in dispute, regardless of how they arose.

Proposals

For instance, we would insist on a definite position on the question of democratic centralism vs. "VIOLATE AND APPEAL," all the more because we are today facing a war. Unity without first settling this question could leave the door open to new splits tomorrow. Without a correct position on this question we could have no assurance that "UNITY" on the basis of the "violate and appeal" position were not merely a maneuver and a prelude to attempts at new and more painful splits.

In addition to the 14 Points we feel that there must be a rounded discussion and a Marxian position taken on the question of the Road to the Party—a rejection of economism and of the New Zimmerwald line for building the re-

volutionary Party, which the Revolt Group seems now to have adopted and around which all your letters and maneuvers for "unity" are taking place.

The first basis for unity you proposed was around the question of "REVOLUTIONARY DEFEATISM." The present basis proposed is a little bit broader. We note, however, that the important question for you is not the program, or the basis for "UNITY," but unity at almost any cost. To achieve this "NEW ZIMMERWALD" form of "UNITY" you are constantly willing to change the basis proposed for such "UNITY."

6—The RWL disagrees entirely with your five proposals for an agenda for a conference. In the main this agenda deals with organizational points: leadership, a weekly paper and an editor, organizational tasks, a unification convention. You speak, in addition, in point 1 of drafting a "program"; but from what you state before it is evident that you want to develop a "program" of strategy and tactics for the American Revolution on the basis of the material of the Revolt, Grant Group, and the 14 Points. Your agenda ASSUMES a solid political agreement. From what has been said in this letter and your own letter it is evident that there is no such complete agreement as you constantly speak of. In our opinion, any agenda for negotiations must first take up the political questions, such as are presented above and in the 14 Points. Only if there is agreement here do we see any use in even considering such questions as who shall be editor, leadership, etc.

In summary, we re-iterate our position:

1—We are willing to enter into negotiations with any group or groups that agree with and accept the 14 Point Programmatic Declaration as the BASIS for negotiations.

On Unity

2—For the reason given above we can not accept the basis proposed in your letter, and propose instead the 14 Points. We await your reply to this and to the specific questions raised in this letter.

HUGO OEHLER, National Secretary Comradely,

Statement by the Central Committee

ABOVE are the texts of the replies received by the Central Committee of the League to its proposals for unity of the League, the Communist Workers Group and the Revolutionary Workers League (Fighting Worker), mailed January 2 and published in the January 6 issue of REVOLT. The CWG reply was received January 17! RWL (FW) reply Jan. 23.

These replies are the latest development in the campaign which the League began, following the outbreak of the war between Germany and the Allies, to bring about unity of revolutionary groups in this country. To understand the significance of these replies it is necessary to review the preceding developments.

Early in September the Central Committee proposed unity to a number of groups including the CWG and the RWL (FW). The proposal appeared in the September 16 issue of REVOLT under the title, An Open Letter to Revolutionists, and is summarized in adjoining columns.

Both the RWL (FW) and the CWG rejected the basis proposed by the Central Committee. In a letter received September 27, extracts from which were published in the October 14 issue of REVOLT, the former declared the basis proposed by the League was non-Marxian and the cry of a "Society of Lost Souls." It counter-proposed the 14 programmatic points of the Provisional International Contact Commission of which it is an affiliate, as a basis for negotiations.

The CWG wrote, in a letter received September 23, extracts from which were also published in the October 14 issue:

The proposal for unity... is a snare and a delusion... Our political basis for unity is the material issued by the group to date... We welcome unity of the revolutionists on a Marxist line...

Other groups also replied to the proposal of the League. A conference resulted in New York City on November 26. The conference was not committed in advance to any basis for unity; nor to any procedure for considering what the basis should be. It was open to any interested group to attend. Both the RWL (FW) and the CWG declined invitations to do so.

The result of the conference was reported in REVOLT, December 9. It was entirely negative. Following this conference, the Central Committee addressed itself to the RWL (FW) and the CWG and again proposed unity. This offer was published in REVOLT, January 6.

In its second offer the League tried to meet both groups more than half way. It accepted the 14 points as an attempt at a systematic statement of theoretical principles which distinguish Marxists from anarchists, stalinists, trotskysts, in fact, from all species of opportunists. It recognized in them principles for which it stood; for which its members had fought years before either group had come into existence, and before the original Revolu-

tionary Workers League had been founded in the winter of 1935-36. It acknowledged them as principles to which it had striven to give expression, principally in the form of agitation, in REVOLT.

It indicated differences with the 14 points of style, formulation, arrangement and political position. It criticized one of the points for ambiguity, that dealing with the Soviet Union, and made a lengthy analysis to show that the particular formulation to which it objected had been concretized in the case of the Stalin invasions of Poland and Finland in a false position toward these events.

The Central Committee called attention to the fact that these 14 points were abstract statements of theoretical principles and in THAT FORM were not capable of serving as a guide for day-to-day action and propaganda in the class struggle.

At the same time it declared that its attitude was that these differences were not issues of fundamental principle, could be resolved by discussion, and should not stand in the way of unity. It stated its willingness to use the 14 points as an abstract or summary for the elaboration of a program "of concrete analysis, aims and principles for the class struggle today, above all and in the first place, for the class struggle in the U.S."

TOWARD the CWG the League took a similar position. It accepted the material of the CWG as an expression of theoretical principles, with which it is in agreement, as an expression of the principles summed up by the 14 points of the RWL (FW).

It indicated some differences with the positions advanced in this material and stated one of them. At that time it was unaware of the position, of the RWL (FW) on that event. As it turns out now the League has the same difference with the CWG on this question that it has with the RWL (FW).

As in the case of the differences between itself and the RWL (FW) the League declared that the differences between itself and the CWG (and by inference between the CWG and the RWL (FW)) were not splitting issues and not a bar to unity of the three groups. It expressed its willingness to use the material of the CWG along with the material of the League in writing a program for a united revolutionary organization.

In conclusion the Central Committee proposed that the three groups write a program and a constitution; work out a political basis for the leadership of the united organization; draft the policy of a weekly four page paper which the new organization should publish; draft a statement of tasks to be undertaken; and organize a unification convention.

The replies of the RWL (FW) and CWG of January 23 and 17 followed.

THE POSITION of the CWG is brief and to the point. It rejects unity with the

League and the RWL (FW). Its grounds are stated in the second and third paragraphs of its letter.

Its reasons include those given for rejecting the League's first offer. But to these it adds a new one which, it makes clear, is decisive, even if the others were not: the difference over the invasion of Finland. Incidentally whereas the League's position is that the Finnish workers in resisting Stalin's invasion should give no support to the Finnish government but should take advantage of the desperate position of the Finnish capitalists "to develop revolutionary agitation and organization for... a proletarian dictatorship in Finland," the CWG misrepresents this to mean defense of capitalism in Finland against proletarian revolution.

And it offers neither analysis, argument nor data against the position of the League, nor in support of its own.

The CWG makes it very clear that agreement of theoretical principles which distinguish those who hold them as a Marxist position is in its view, not enough for unity. Something more is necessary—complete agreement with all the political positions taken by it on important issues of the day.

The CWG demands, in effect, recognition of itself as the theoretical and political leadership of the revolutionary movement. That is its price for unity.

The CWG does not base this claim on any achievement in organizing workers and leading them in struggle for immediate demands or revolutionary ends; nor on its success in building a large revolutionary organization which is rooted among workers in industry. It cannot base its claim on such achievements because they do not exist.

Its claim rests on "the material issued by the group to date"—half a dozen issues of its publication and one or two pamphlets. Its idea is that this material constitutes the only true revolutionary position in the United States today, and is, therefore—this is its reasoning—the only group of Marxists in the country. Before it will consent to join with other revolutionists in doing the vital things that must be done to fight the plans of the ruling class to plunge the country into war, and to prepare for the revolution which is approaching, all other revolutionists must agree that what it says about itself and its political position is true.

In a word the CWG puts its prestige above the need of the revolutionary movement.

There are yet other considerations which make the attitude displayed by the CWG unacceptable. Assuming that an organization could be erected on its basis, it should be clear that it would be as rigidly monolithic as the Roman Catholic Church or the Stalinist parties. Differences of opinion on important issues could not be tolerated and would result in divisions which would lead to splits. In such an organization the chief function of the regime, obviously, would be police duty against positions which conflicted with the official position. From defense of official doctrine it would inevitably develop into a persecution of opposition.

We have here an unwritten theory of revolutionary organization which is perversion of the theory and practice of Lenin's party which, while it defended its fundamental position against all opponents as tenaciously as the CWG would today, unlike the latter, knew that differences are inevitable, and took the attitude that as long as opposition stood on the same fundamental theoretical ground as the party, differences on lesser issues, no matter how important, were neither legitimate grounds for division nor obstacles to unity.

On the basis of the CWG the unity of the Bolshevik party with Trotsky's organization in the summer of 1917 would have been impossible and the great difference between Lenin who was

who were for fighting a revolutionary war; and Trotsky who said it was impossible either to sign or to fight; would have led inexorably to a split in which the young and weak proletarian dictatorship would have gone under. The theory of the CWG is distinctly in the spirit of Stalin.

Yes, there are differences between us on how to construct a revolutionary party. The League proposes the broad methods of Lenin. It offers the CWG a road out of its isolation. The CWG, however, is firmly determined to stand alone in "splendid isolation." This is pure sectarianism.

By the sentence it has passed on itself the CWG will stand alone while the party is constructed, or, until it convinces itself that its way is futile and that it must seek another theory and another road. When that time comes the League will not erect obstacles in its way.

THE SELF-ELIMINATION of the CWG narrows the possibility of unity to the RWL (FW). This raises an important question for the League. It unity with the RWL (FW) in the interest of the revolutionary movement? Will it result in an increase in the amount and effectiveness of revolutionary agitation against the starvation and war program of the ruling class among workers in industry and the unemployed? Will it result in greater, more widespread and more telling penetration of the trade unions with revolutionary ideas and tactics? Will it increase the influence of organized revolutionists in the step toward a broader unity with other revolutionary groups and individual revolutionists and thereby toward an even greater increase in revolutionary agitation and influence?

Answers to these questions require careful consideration. It is already clear from the attitude of the other groups which the League approached that fusion with the RWL (FW) cannot be extended to include them, at least not immediately. Whether this can be brought about later is an open question and will depend on many things, not under our control, chief among which at this time appears to be their sectarianism. The extent to which a united group can influence the others to change their stand will depend on the success which the united group will have in its agitation. To this extent then, broader

Statement By The Central Committee

unity will depend on the basis which the fusion, if it can be brought about, lays for making a revolutionary agitation, and the persistence and boldness with which it is subsequently conducted.

THE SAME is true with respect to individual revolutionists in opportunist organizations and in no political organization. A number of them may join a united organization at once. But the ability of a united organization to become a center of attraction for revolutionists will depend on the success it has in acting as a revolutionary organization. And this in turn depends on whether the fusion establishes a basis for acting in that way.

The problem, therefore, is reduced to the character of the fusion. If the fusion is simply a sum in arithmetic, if it only adds the members of one group to the members of a second group; and in the combination of offices and office furniture and mailing lists; if it does not result in some significant increase in revolutionary agitation and in the energy with which it is conducted, the fusion would be meaningless. To the extent that it prevented us from striving for unity that would advance the cause of revolutionary agitation and action it would be harmful. We would be opposed to it. The RWL (FW) is wrong when it says that we are for unity at "almost any cost."

But if unity would result in, for example, the systematic production and distribution of a four page weekly agitation paper, or if it resulted in widening and deepening our connections with the workers in the trade unions and the unemployed organizations; if it increased the influence of all of us among the workers; if it did these things; or, if it only laid the basis for doing these things in the period following the fusion, then that fusion would be a progressive revolutionary step; it could lay the basis for a broader unity. We are for that kind of revolutionary unity. For that kind of unity we say openly we are prepared to make whatever concessions are necessary. If the RWL (FW) approaches the problem in the same light, if it has the same will to unity as a path to greater effectiveness today, then, it should be possible to find common ground on which to stand.

It is these considerations in mind that we reply to the cause of unity?

To this question the Central Committee would like to give an unqualified "yes." It regrets that it cannot.

THE REPLY of the RWL (FW), unlike the reply of the CWG, not only does not reject unity out of hand. It reaffirms a willingness to "enter into negotiations with any group or groups that agree with and accept the 14 Point Programmatic Declaration as the basis for negotiations." It inquired, as it says, "for the fourth or fifth time" whether the League is "willing to accept the Points of the Contact Commission as the basis for negotiations." And it "urges" us "to drop all evasiveness and give a definitive answer." It contains other sentences which express the same ideas.

Although there is no definitive statement to that effect in the reply, these sentences appear to express a desire on the part of the RWL (FW) for unity. If our impression is correct it is a positive factor which can advance the cause of unity.

Unfortunately there are elements in the reply which impede the realization of unity. The RWL (FW) urges the League to declare definitively whether it accepts the 14 points as a basis for negotiations. It appears to overlook or ignore the fact that the League accepted them in the proposal for unity to which the letter of the RWL (FW) is a reply.

In that proposal the Central Committee said:

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 groups stand on the same ground...

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.

The Central Committee then went on to propose that steps be taken jointly to apply them in action. The first step has to be the writing of a program on the basis of which the united organization can act in the present world and American

situations.

The 14 points are not such a program. They say of themselves they are a political statement which as briefly as possible presents a Marxian position on the basic questions of the day, separating the forces for the New Communist (4th) International from the reformists, centrists, and ultra-lefts.

The RWL (FW) reply compares them to the Conditions of Affiliation to the Communist International adopted by the Second World Congress of that party in 1920; and with the Eleven Points adopted by the International Pre-Conference of the International Left Opposition (the Trotskyite movement) in Paris in February 1933. It says that both sets of Points "in their time just as the 14 points today, demarcated Marxism from all forms of revisionism."

IN THIS comparison there is both truth and error. We grant that the 14 points demarcate Marxism from opportunism. Our point is that they do so on a theoretical plane and that they are abstract. We do not say that these qualities in themselves are objectionable. We merely assert that they are facts. The RWL (FW) disputed this contention.

We believe that it can be demonstrated easily and convincingly. Let us consider the third point, for example, that one which bears the title, PARTICIPATION IN THE CLASS STRUGGLE. The following is its complete text:

The Marxian Party fights for the day to day demands of the working class, but at no time separates them from the object and aim of the ultimate demands for the overthrow of capitalism. The immediate needs can be solved finally and conclusively only by the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism.

There can be no doubt that Point 3 asserts a principle of Marxism. It distinguishes the Marxist position from the position of those who contend that the struggle for any aim short of the final aim of overthrowing the capitalist system, is opportunist. And also from the position of those who struggle only for immediate

THE FOLLOWING summary of the basis for revolutionary unity consists of extracts from the Open Letter to Revolutionists which appeared in Sept. 16 issue of Revolt proposed to the Committee for Revolutionary Labor Action, Communist Workers Group, League for a Revolutionary Workers Party, Marxian Labor College, Revolutionary Workers League (FIGHTING WORKER), and Socialist Union Party by the Central Committee.

The SUP rejected unity with any group which stood for the "TACTIC OF THE PROLETARIAT." The WLC and CRLA rejected unity with the League on any basis. The RWP expressed a willingness to consider unity and attended a conference in New York City, November 28, at which it took the position that agreement with its characterization of Russian society was the condition for even discussing what the basis for unity should be, and rejected unity with the League. The positions taken by the CWG and RWL (FW) are discussed in adjoining columns.

Comrades: **THE CENTRAL** Committee of the Revolutionary Workers League calls on all revolutionists in the United States regardless of their present affiliations, to unite. The situation in the country today demands it.

The outbreak of the war in Europe creates an entirely new situation, new perspectives and imposes new tasks. The revolutionists must meet their responsibilities. The new situation arises from the following factors. No matter which side wins the war will give rise to a new round of revolts and revolutions. Revolution will not be confined to the belligerent countries, but will sweep over most of Europe and Asia. It will invade the Western Hemisphere.

The task before the revolutionists of all countries is the construction of revolutionary parties in time to act as the leadership of the revolution. In the U.S. we face the same perspective and consequently the same task.

The war and the imminent entry of the U.S. into it ensure the rapid development of the revolutionary political maturity of the American working class. This is the decisive significance of the war for the class struggle in the U.S. And, therefore, for the revolutionary movement and the creation of a revolutionary party. Objectively the country has been ripe for the transformation to communism since 1929. But there was a tremendous gap between the objective situation and the level of development of the working class. The war will make the objective situation still more favorable and will close the gap in a relatively short time, in a few years.

THE IMMINENCE of events whose shadow is already over us, which will propel the American workers to political maturity and revolutionary action, signifies that the final promise for the creation of a revolutionary party in this country, which has been missing for the last ten years, is at hand. The creation of the

gains and ignore or oppose the final solution of the problem of the working class.

BUT THIS demarcation is made in general theoretical terms. It was just as true fifty years ago as it is today. But fifty years ago capitalism was still capable of social progress while today it is capable only of destruction. Fifty years ago the revolution was not an immediate perspective, whereas today, in the imperialist epoch generally, and during the second world war in particular, it is on the order of the day on a world scale. Fifty years ago the capitalists could afford to grant reforms to the workers at home while they extorted super-profits from the colonies. Today the workers can gain serious improvements in their conditions only by revolutionary action or by action which threatens to become revolutionary. In short the specific concrete relation of the struggle for immediate demands to the final solution today is decisively different from what it was fifty years ago.

This difference involves a decisive difference in strategy and tactics. The tactics of fifty years ago are not sufficient for the needs of the present day. Today the emphasis must fall squarely on revolutionary action. This difference in the sphere of strategy and tactics involves the difference between social democracy and revolutionary communism or Marxism.

Point 3 does not make this distinction clear. It does not make its demarcation in terms of the present epoch and of the present world situation. And it does not do it for the United States. It must be obvious to anyone who reflects on it only a little that the problem under discussion has one aspect in Europe where an imperialist war is stalemated for strategic and economic reasons, but primarily because of the fear of proletarian revolution; and a different aspect in the United States in which the class struggle stands on a lower level but is expected to develop rapidly.

IN OTHER words Point 3 asserts a theoretical principle of Marxism but in an ABSTRACT manner. The remaining 11 points have the same character.

The fact that these principles are in dispute in the revolutionary movement today, as the RWL (FW) says, is only another way of saying that they demarcate Marxism from opportunism. It does not, thereby, make them concrete.

All 14 points are identical in that they do not apply the principles they define to the situation today. That is why the Central Committee said that

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.

This was conclusively shown by the RWL (FW) itself when it mechanically deduced from the theoretical principle of the need to defend the remaining conquests of the October Revolution in Russia, the strategic error of supporting Stalin's invasion of Finland.

But because the 14 points make a theoretical demarcation between Marxism and opportunism the Central Committee con-

cluded that... 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. Quite different was the demarcation made by the 11 points of the International Left Opposition. The ILO regarded itself as the Marxist movement of its time. The RWL (FW) agrees with that estimate. The League does not. If the League is correct then there is no analogy. But even if we grant the truth of the estimate there are important differences between the 14 and the 11 points. The 14 points attempt a summary of basic Marxian principles. The 11 points had a more limited aim. The International Pre-Conference which adopted them declared; **The ILO stands on the ground of the first four Congresses of the Comintern... The Left Opposition rejects the revisionist decisions of the Fifth and Sixth World**

Congresses and considers necessary a radical restatement of the program of the Comintern...

The 11 points which followed were a summary of the principles which separated the ILO from the Stalinists and their allies in the Communist International who, at that time, were to the right of the former; Bukharin, Tomsky, Rokov in Russia; Brandler in Germany; Lovestone in the United States. The 11 points did not state the issues which separated the ILO from the social democracy. This had been done in the decisions of the first four congresses and had been contradicted violated and negated by the decisions of the fifth and sixth congresses. The 11 points were the basis for a correction. That is distinctly not the aim of the 14 points.

In one very important respect the 11 points were superior to the 14 points—in the method by which the demarcation was made. For example, Point 1 begins with

The independence of the proletarian party, always and under all conditions... The 14 Points include this principle as follows:

The Marxian organization, if it is to unify the proletariat in a struggle against capitalism, must remain politically and organizationally independent of all other organizations, including the reformist and centrist parties, such as the Labor Party, Social Democracy, Stalinism and the various centrist organizations...

Whereas the 14 points let the matter rest with a sweeping theoretical assertion the 11 points relate the principle to the situation their authors lived and fought in, and to their purpose of combatting Stalinist revisions.

The independence of the proletarian party, always and under all conditions; condemnation of the Kuo Min Tang policy of 1924-28 (the alliance of the Communist Party of China with the Kuo Min Tang in which the former was subordinated to the latter and the revolution of 1925-27 was drowned in blood by Chiang Kai Shek); ...condemnation of Stalin's theory...

And point 2: **Recognition of the international and thereby the permanent character of the proletarian revolution; rejection of the theory of socialism in one country...**

And so on. First the statement of the theoretical principle; then its relation to the experience which made its restatement necessary; The 11 points cover the years 1924-32; politically they sum up the struggle of the Trotskyists against Stalinism in those years.

In method as in aim there is no comparison between the 14 points and the 11 points.

The difference is even greater between the 14 points and the Conditions of Affiliation to the Second International. The purpose of the latter was defined by the Communist International as follows:

More and more frequently parties and groups which only recently were affiliated to the Second International, but which have not yet really become Communist, are applying for affiliation to the Third International. The Second International is completely smashed. The intermediate parties and groups of the "Center," realizing that the Second International is hopeless, are trying to lean on the Communist International... hoping, however, to retain such "autonomy" as will enable them to pursue their former opportunist or "Centrist" policy...

Under certain circumstances, the Communist International may be faced with the danger of becoming diluted with wavering and half-hearted groups which have not yet abandoned the ideology of the Second International...

In view of this, the Second World Congress deems it necessary to lay down very definite conditions of affiliation for new parties and also to point out to those parties which have already been received into the Communist International the obligations that rest upon them.

The aim of the Conditions of affiliation then was not to make a demarcation in general on theoretical grounds between Marxism and opportunism as the 14 points attempt to do. They aimed to solve a concrete political task. As far as aim or purpose is concerned there is no analogy between the 14 points and the Condition of Affiliation.

The content of the Conditions is, also entirely different. Where the 14 points state a principle of Marxism in theoretical terms, the Conditions apply it concretely. Where the 14 points assert that "the Marxian party fights for the day to day demands of the working class but at no time separates them from the object and

Book Review

Blood is Cheaper Than Water
by Quincy Howe
Simon & Shuster, 1939, 215 pgs.

THOSE WELL acquainted with the neutrality question are aware of two distinct lines of policy advocated by the writers and publicists of the capitalist class. One is the idea of "collective security" or "interventionism," and the other is "isolationism."

Mr. Howe divides neutrality exponents into two categories. The collective security shouters are the "war party," and the isolationists are the "peace party." The ideas of the "peace party" are:

American participation in the next war is not inevitable. The U. S. cannot determine the course of events in other countries. No nation or group of nations threatens to attack the vital interests of the U. S. The American form of government and the American way of life can be preserved only if the American people concentrate on their domestic problems. Common action with other countries will subordinate and destroy American interests to the advantage of foreign countries.

You couldn't put more day dreaming and wishful thinking into one paragraph. The author seems to think that America is a sort of vacuum, and if left alone can solve all her domestic problems. In other words, the U. S. has too many troubles of her own and can't be bothered with other nation's troubles.

Mr. Howe says that if we have peace we can solve our domestic problems. This is pure nonsense. The U. S. has had peace for 20 years now and, what's more, "democracy" too. But the problems have become worse.

CAPITALISM has exhausted its home market and must look abroad. By investing capital abroad and exporting goods the U. S. is treading on the toes of other expanding countries. But the earth has geographical limits.

And, therefore, wars for these markets and colonies are an inevitable outcome of imperialism. They cannot be averted by looking for market on Mars. And furthermore, these colonies and investments must constantly be defended.

In short, Mr. Howe and the other isolationists are talking through their hats. They correctly expose the New Deal as driving for war and also how the anti-New Dealers all support the war budget. Just like the last war, when the U. S. enters the conflict, the isolationists will jump on the band wagon for dear old U.S.A.

The only solution to this vicious circle is a third method with Mr. Howe and the other hired hacks of the capitalist class do not mention: the organization of a Marxist party and the overthrow of the capitalist system which causes war. E. Denny.

BORAH

Continued From Page 1

Borah always defended the interests of the Idaho silver barons. He was an advocate of "free silver," and of inflation—by using silver as the backing for paper money.

He opposed the Soldier's bonus because the "bonus measure expressed feeble policies and irresolute leadership. It will be a financial burden to the country."

Borah's greatest fame comes from his "isolationism," and "anti-imperialism." However, he voted for the war in 1917! He defended Theodore Roosevelt's action in engineering a fake revolution to separate Panama from Columbia, and seize the territory now known as the Canal Zone.

Borah was said to be the outstanding authority on the American constitution, and always praised the "equality" it guaranteed to all citizens. This did not prevent him from viciously opposing the woman suffrage amendment.

Nor did it prevent him from opposing the anti-lynching bill. In his 1938 speech Borah stated:

"I shall contend that the Southern people have met the race problem and dealt with it with greater patience, greater tolerance, greater intelligence, and perhaps greater success than any people in recorded history. I know of no finer sense of duty than that displayed by the South in the help it gives the Negro in bettering his condition as to property, as to economical strength, and as to education."

Since the Civil War there have been more than 5,000 lynchings in the South. "As a southern man to a northern man," said Senator McKellar of Tennessee, "... I want to thank him for that speech."

STATEMENT OF C. C.

Continued from Page 3

aim of the ultimate demands for the overthrow of capitalism," the Conditions lay it down as a rule for practical activity, that

Everyday propaganda and agitation must bear a genuinely Communist character. All organs of the press belonging to the party must be edited by reliable Communists who have proved their loyalty to the cause of the proletarian revolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat must not be discussed simply as if it were a fashionable formula learned by rote; propaganda for it must be carried on in such a way that every rank-and-file working man and working woman, every soldier and peasant, shall see that the necessity for it arises from the vital facts which are systematically reported in our press day after day....

But this is not the only difference in content. The Conditions deal very largely with organizational questions.

Point 2 demands the removal from editorial boards, trade unions, co-operative societies, etc. of "reformists and adherents of the 'Centre' and their replacement by reliable Communists."

Point 11 demands the "overhaul" of the "personnel" of "parliamentary fractions."

Point 16 instructs new affiliates to revise their old social-democratic programs and draw up new communist programs.

Point 18 instructs them to change their name to "Communist Party of such and such a country...."

Point 19 instructs them to convene special congresses after the Second World Congress adjourned to "officially endorse" the obligations which the Second Congress laid on them.

Whereas the line of demarcation which the 14 points draws is an abstract theoretical one, that of the Conditions is concrete political, practical and organizational.

Because it wanted to apply the 14 points in action the Central Committee made its proposal to write a program applying them to the situation today; And it was to realize this aim that it also proposed to formulate the political qualifications for leadership; outline the policy of a weekly four page paper; define the tasks the united organization should undertake; and organize a unification convention.

In one word it proposed to accept the 14 points as a basis for working out the foundation stones of a united organization. Precisely because it was ready to negotiate an agreement it declared that it was ready to consider "any modification or amendment" of its five proposals, of substitute or alternate proposals for any one or all of these five steps."

The reply of the RWL (FW) admits that

It is quite true that the 14 points do not deal with dozens of important strategic and tactical questions for the American revolution.

It calls attention to the fact that the RWL (FW)

...adopted at its last convention a program politically based on the 14 Points but dealing much more in detail with concrete strategic and tactical questions, as well as a concrete analysis of the most important trends in world events and in the development of U.S. Imperialism.

This estimate is not correct. But whether it is or not need not be an issue in view of the fact that the Introduction to this Program says:

The Program is an International Program which gives special consideration to the problems of the working class under American Imperialism. It is not in its present form a specific U.S. program, although American Imperialism is dealt with at some length.... The Program must be concretized for each country and section.

THE AMERICAN WAY

...Fifty per cent of the people of the United States do not get enough in the way of dairy products, fruits and vegetables to enable them to enjoy full vigor and health. A large number of them do not get enough because they can't afford it.—Secretary of Agriculture Wallace in Foreword to Agricultural Yearbook.

The anti-lynching bill was defeated. Needless to say, no capitalist law can stop lynching.

His biographers write that

"He did more than any other man to put Hoover in the White House."

"He neither smokes, drinks, nor plays," they say. He had "an elusive charm."

And also because the reply says, about this Program.

...we do not demand our full program as a basis for unity. And we do not object and in fact would welcome further elaboration.

But this same reply REJECTS THE LEAGUE'S PROPOSAL TO NEGOTIATE AND WRITE A PROGRAM FOR THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN THE U. S. USING THE 14 POINTS AS A THEORETICAL BASIS.

The reply says that the RWL (FW) "would insist" on a "definitive position" on "democratic centralism vs. 'violate and appeal,'" a reference to a difference between us over the question of the relation of bureaucracy to the rights of the membership in a revolutionary organization. It was the intention of the League to raise for discussion the whole question of party regime. That is why its proposals include the writing of a constitution and the formulation of a "political basis for the selection of a qualified leadership." BUT THE REPLY OF THE RWL (FW) REJECTS THESE PROPOSALS.

The reply of the RWL (FW) demands "in addition to the 14 Points" (!) a "rejection of economism and of the New Zimmerwald line for building the revolutionary Party" which the League "seems to have adopted," charges which the RWL (FW) has made repeatedly but which it has never attempted to prove and which are, moreover, false. BUT IT REJECTS THE LEAGUE'S PROPOSAL TO "DEFINE THE POLICY OF AND MAKE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PUBLICATION OF A WEEKLY FOUR PAGE PAPER."

The League's proposals to negotiate the necessary steps to apply the 14 points in action in the present world situation, in the American class struggle, are rejected because, "in the main" they are "organizational points."

But the RWL (FW) does not make counter-proposals. It proposes "again the 14 points," which the League has already accepted. And it compares them to the Conditions for Affiliation to the Communist International in Lenin's day!!

In short the League took the RWL (FW) at its word and held out its hand for unity. The RWL (FW) did not come forward and grasp the outstretched hand of the League.

What is the reason for this act of coldness? It is the result of a misunderstanding?

Or is it because the RWL (FW) has changed its position and is not willing to negotiate with the League on the basis of the 14 points?

If the RWL (FW) has changed its position it would be best if it said so frankly and explained the reason for the change so that everyone could see exactly what the position of the RWL (FW) is and decide whether it is a correct decision or one which is not in the best interests of the revolutionary movement.

But if it is the result of a misunderstanding of the position of the League, the Central Committee hopes that the exposition which it has made will help to clarify the question. That was its purpose in writing at such length and in so much detail.

With the hope that it was no more than a misunderstanding the Central Committee repeats its five proposals and declares again its willingness to consider modifications, amendments or counter-proposals.

It hopes that the reply of the RWL (FW) will enable both groups to advance toward unity. These are critical days and our time is short. The League earnestly wants to end the division in the revolutionary movement to construct a party in time to do for the American working class what the Bolshevik party of Lenin's time did for the Russian working class.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE
February 9, 1940.

LIFE, LIBERTY AND THE PURSUIT

Washington, D. C., Feb. 6 (A.P.) — An account of the lynching of two Negro boys by a Texas mob was given to a senate judiciary subcommittee today by the Rev. Gresham Marmion.

The young clergyman told how he pleaded in vain with a mob of from 300 to 500 persons in Colorado county, Texas, the night of Nov. 12, 1935, not to hang the boys, who were accused of killing a white girl.

The mob listened for a minute or two.. and then began booing. He said he was pulled from the fender of an old car that furnished light for the scene and the two Negro boys, 15 and 16 years old, were hanged....

Shop Talk

NEW YORK, February 1.—Almost every lunch hour the workers in my shop get together to eat. We tell each other of little things that happen at home, jokes and funny stories.

"When I came to the city from the farm I got a job at \$12.00 a week in a ball bearing factory keeping an eye on the belt and taking out the imperfect ball bearings with a spoon. This job required one hand to work.

"I soon got advanced to a tool machine that required using two hands. After getting the knack of this operation the boss said I was good and put me on a power press. Here I used both hands and pressed my right foot on the lever.

"I soon got another pat on the back and was transferred to another machine. Now I had to use both hands, and both feet. The left foot was stamping a pedal that kept the work moving.

"Pretty soon the boss told me he was losing money and watched me work for hours and then finally hit on a bright idea.

"He got a box screen and told me to put it on my knees. Then he spilled the finished work in the screen and told me to work. The action of my feet, stepping the right foot on and off the lever and my left foot on and off the pedal, knocked the box screen around.

The oil on the ball bearings dripped off faster. Then the boss placed a pan under me and caught the oil. He saved a quart a day which was used again. He thought nothing of wasting any oil that seeped thru soiling my pants.

"A few days later he told me: 'Don't stop to oil the machine and wheels. You waste too much time.. Take this oil can and put this straw in your mouth, siphon the oil through the straw into your mouth and then squirt it through your teeth right on the work.' 'Will you put some vanilla flavor in the oil,' I asked. 'You never thing of my expenses,' he barked.

"That afternoon I suddenly became aware of the boss behind me. Without even giving me a how-de-do he began to attach to my backside a long flexible piece of steel on the end of which was a magnet. 'You're dropping too many ball bearings,' he said. 'Now with this...'

monkey's tail and pick up all the bearings.'

"Why didn't he tie a broom on so you could sweep the floor?," someone asked.

"That wasn't all," I said. "This labor saving device was so successful the boss wanted me to exhibit it at the World's Fair. But he wanted me to pay my own expenses."

The whistle blew before I could finish. But I noticed that several of my shop-mates looked a little queerly at the foreman that afternoon when he told us to step on it. D. Whitman.

GREEN

Continued From Page 1

"We in the American Federation of Labor believe in private ownership....

I do not propose that the workers "take over industrie in order to increase pay and working conditions...."

I love American capitalism "where the principle of an equal chance for all to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness had guided our thinking for a century and a half. We had no class hatreds; we had no century-old tradition of domination by one class over another."

I have a no-strike policy. "I had long urged collective bargaining as more effective procedure than strikes." Strikes are worthless: "Only by legislative action can the basic standards of social justice be extended to all workers

"No legislation since the war has been of more importance to labor's welfare than the Social Security Act," despite what some reds say about the list of 40 million workers who made out Social Security applications being turned over to the War Dept. for use in drafting an Army.

Believe it or not, my union "was planned to allow democratic control by the rank and file.... but it also lent itself to control from the top, for the president might be absolute in the interval between conventions."

I am an enemy of the CIO because it is "a movement whose real purpose is to enhance the power.... of a few self-seeking individuals."

Naturally I am not self-seeking. I only pay income tax on a \$25,000 yearly salary—not to mention my expense account.

I have been head of the A. F. of L. since 1924.

I am William Green.

Jack Drake