

I.L.P. Calls for an End to Imperialism

(We publish below the declaration of the Executive of the British Independent Labor Party on the occasion of the German invasion of Denmark and Norway.—Editor.)

London, England.

THERE are signs that the war will extend over further parts of Europe, submerging one small nation after another in destruction and death.

The small nations are the victims of the struggle of the great powers to secure possession of the economic resources necessary for their imperialist conflict.

The I.L.P., which warned the peoples of this danger from the beginning of the war, expresses its sympathy with those who are thus being drawn unwillingly into the calamity which is overwhelming Europe, and appeals to the workers of Britain, of the other belligerent nations, and of the countries which so far remain neutral, to insist that the war be stopped before the disaster which threatens humanity spreads even further.

The I.L.P. calls on the workers of all lands not only to demand an armistice, but to strive to secure a peace which shall end the system of imperialism, and its resulting wars, by the establishment of a socialist international economic organization which shall distribute the resources of the world according to the needs of all peoples.

EXECUTIVE OF THE INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY

Brockway Hails Struggle Of German Socialists

(Some weeks ago, we published in these columns a message of the German Independent Socialists to the socialists of Britain and France. Below we present the reply to this message by Fenner Brockway, political secretary of the British Independent Labor Party.—Editor.)

TO THE GERMAN INDEPENDENT SOCIALISTS:

WE have heard with profound emotion of the heroic way in which you are carrying on the struggle against the Hitler regime and the war. Comrades, your courage is an inspiration to socialists of all countries.

You know of our complete solidarity with you. Sometimes, the German wireless and press misuse speeches and articles published in Britain. Do not be misled.

Whilst we are fulfilling our socialist duty in this country of opposing capitalism, imperialism and war, we share with you completely your hatred of Nazism, and we look forward to the day when the German people will be in a position to overthrow the tyrannical regime of which they and other peoples are the victims, and to unite with us and our comrades in all lands in the achievement of a socialist world of brotherhood, freedom and happiness.

FENNER BROCKWAY

War Threatens Doom of Civil Liberties in Australia

Democracy Imperilled thru Drastic National Security Act

By C. HARTLEY GRATTAN

WAR is the bitterest enemy of civil liberties. Every democratic country which has been at war offers evidence to support that thesis. Most Americans entertain a highly favorable view of democracy in Australia, those of liberal persuasion because of the apparently immense power of labor, fortified as it is by strong trade unions and a Labor Party which is never of lesser status than the official opposition in the parliaments, state and federal. Social legislation also contributes to giving Australia an excellent reputation abroad. The elements of a true democracy seem, to superficial view, to be present in abundance. It is depressing therefore, to discover that civil liberties in Australia never fully recovered from the blows struck at them during the World War, that in the interval between wars both statutory and administrative attacks were constantly being made upon them, and that the National Security Act, passed on the outbreak of the present European war, surpasses in comprehensiveness and severity anything achieved during the hysteria of 1914-18.

During the World War, the statutory provisions of the War Precautions Act and related measures and the amendments to them, when taken with attendant administrative regulation, added up to a tremendous total of restriction. Australian censorship was shockingly mismanaged, under a show of legality, and men were sentenced to jail under circumstances which, when exposed, became a public scandal. A tradition of bureaucratic tyranny was established from which the country never really freed itself. Authorities on the matter distinguish three distinct drives against civil liberties during the post-war years: in 1920-21, in 1926-29, and in 1932-37. During those periods, there is concrete evidence of the repressive mentality at work in the form of actual legislation. Running parallel is a record

of repression on the basis of administrative rulings and entirely extra-legal actions by state and federal office-holders up to the rank of the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth.

LABOR'S POSITION

Many of the laws passed by the Commonwealth Parliament were directed against labor. How this was possible requires a word of explanation. In spite of the political power of labor in Australia, it has rarely won federal office and has never really won power in the sense of having secure control of both houses of Parliament. During its last period of federal office, it was frustrated by a hostile Senate. Its record in the states is, of course, quite different, but it is the interferences with civil liberties by the Commonwealth that are significant. The Commonwealth government has usually been in the control of the conservatives, in late years of the United Australia Party, ordinarily in alliance with the Country Party. Much of the time labor had more seats in the House, the significant branch of the legislature, than either of the other parties. That is the position today. But against the united opposition of the two conservative parties, it cannot obtain office. It wields its power, such as it is, as a strong opposition; but the tradition of party regularity among the conservatives insures labor's defeat on all significant issues. This accounts for the ability of the conservatives to put over legislation which restricts the freedom of trade unions; it also accounts for the fact that the laws of Australia are administered in a fashion disastrous to civil liberties, a point otherwise anomalous in a country where labor is strong.

Liberal protest against both the legislative and administrative attacks on civil liberties is somewhat hampered by the fact that the liberals lack a press and that labor

War Spreads as Nazis Invade Low Lands

WOE TO THE VICTOR!



—from the New York Daily News

War 'Inevitability' Talk Rises Again

Administration Reported Behind Move To Break Down Neutrality Safeguards

By FLORENCE B. BOECKEL

Washington, D. C. War talk in Washington is again about when we are "inevitably" going in. There was the same kind of talk last Fall when the war first started. After the neutrality debate in Congress, in which both sides assured the country their one aim and object was to keep out of war, the talk of our "inevitably" going in died down. Why is it heard again? And why has the date been advanced from "not until after the elections" to "perhaps before the elections?"

Other Washington observers are making two points. One is that, although the Administration may not be as some have said, "trying to lead this country into war," it is definitely not leading the people away

from war. The other point is that close study of Administration statements shows many promises not to send an expeditionary force to Europe but an absence of any promises in regard to the navy and air force. Those who talk of war before election admit that it would have to happen as the result of some incident—probably in the Pacific—for in an election year, Congress will not be called back for a declaration of war as a result of any deliberate change in policy involving prolonged discussion.

But as to the "inevitable" entrance of the United States into the European war in the course of the next nine to twelve months, back of that talk is recognition of the many pressures from sources abroad and at home. Only recently a Canadian official declared that Canada's major job should be to get this country into the war. Duff Cooper, announced on his return to England from a lecture tour in the United States that more British war propaganda was needed over here. Lord Lothian, ambassador of Great Britain, disclaiming any propaganda, is making these points in his speeches: First, that "a new friend may mean a victory, without a battle for either side" (in other words, the United States can come in perfectly safely); second, there isn't going to be any great peace conference after this war (that is, if the United States is going to have anything; to say about the peace, it must take part in the war); third, the Monroe Doctrine has always depended on the British navy.

So much for diplomatic and political pressure. Added to this is the growing pressure of the church forces in the belligerent nations, beginning to be echoed here and there in American pulpits. The last war was a "holy war." This one is proclaimed as a "righteous war." It is again a question of Armageddon battling "for the Lord."

On the financial side, exactly what supporters of the old Congressional

a particularly dangerous business in view of the limited publishing facilities within Australia. Under the broadcasting act, notable abuses are the exclusion from the air of a distinguished judge who proposed to deliver a vigorous talk on freedom of speech and the abrupt cutting off the air of a labor-owned station from which criticism of the government had been broadcast. And under the film censorship, many films of unpopular political connotations have been banned, in addition to the expected quota banned on "moral" grounds. Finally, federal ministers, including the Prime Minister, have often in recent years, appealed to the press and the people to cease discussing issues in foreign affairs on the grounds that they were ignorant of the facts and were embarrassing the government. This occurred at the time of the Australian-Japanese trade dispute in 1936 and during the Munich crisis of 1938. And on one notable occasion, after the leader of the Labor Party had assailed him, a Minister of Defense declared, to quote his own words: "I said of Mr. Curtin's criticism that such statements were imported from abroad was instituted,"

Let's Not Commit Suicide Out of Hatred for Hitler!

THE German invasion of Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg, following so close on the heels of Hitler's assault on Denmark and Norway and Stalin's attack on Finland, has greatly intensified the indignation of the American people at such acts of wanton aggression and has raised to a fever pitch the hatred in which the masses in this country hold the bloody dictators. These feelings are deep and sincere and thoroughly justified, for they express the horror of a people as yet measurably free from the madness of war at the frenzy of murder and destruction running wild in Europe.

But however justified these feelings may be, they must not cause us to lose our bearings and adopt a course that will ultimately lead to ourselves being swallowed up in the same whirlpool of barbarism and slaughter. Now, if ever, is the time for us to keep our heads and be guided by the realities of the situation and not by our feelings, however deep and sincere they may be.

What we are witnessing in Europe today is the logical, inescapable result of the system of imperialism, with its rivalries, antagonisms and conflicts, that has been developing in that part of the world for the past fifty years or more. It is the logical, inescapable result of the last war and the last "peace" and the two decades of ruthless power-politics that followed. It is, basically, a resumption of the World War after a breathing spell of twenty years to allow the exhausted combatants to recuperate their powers of destruction and to complete a new system of alliances. It is but a phase of the cycle of bloody wars engendered of imperialism—of British and French as well as of German and Italian imperialism.

Europe can have no hope of lasting peace, however the present bloody episode may end, until the entire system of imperialism is destroyed. There is no use blinking the facts. We are fully conscious of the horror that a victory for Hitler would imply. But victory for the Allies would bring nothing but a super-Versailles with a new cycle of repressions, hatreds, rivalries and wars even more savage and ruthless than before. Europe, the entire world, is doomed unless the vicious circle of imperialism—war, "peace" that is but preparation for another war, and war again—is broken, and broken it can only be by the peoples themselves overthrowing the war-breeding social system and the war-making political regimes that thus doom them to utter destruction.

For us in America, our duty is clear: **KEEP OUT OF WAR!** Our involvement in the European war would mean the greatest possible disaster for the American people and would bring no genuine benefit to the people of Europe, for whom only the destruction of the imperialist system can bring any real hope of salvation. It is necessary for us to be especially vigilant at this moment of deep indignation and tense feelings lest we be misled into taking any measures that will break down our neutrality safeguards and ease the road to our involvement in the war. Let us not commit collective suicide out of our hatred for Hitler and Stalin.

We must give all possible assistance to the forces fighting imperialism everywhere in the world, to the forces fighting for freedom in the dictator-ridden countries of Europe in the stricken lands under the iron heel of Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini. But above all, we must **KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR!**

Garment Unions to Hold Conventions This Month

Labor Unity, War and Support of Third Term for Roosevelt Chief Problems

New York City. Two labor organizations, outstanding in the country for their organized power and prestige and for their strategic positions in the divided ranks of labor, will hold their conventions this month in New York City. The sessions of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers will open on May 13, while the convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union will begin on May 27.

Both of these organizations are powerful numerically—the I.L.G.W.U. of which David Dubinsky is president, has a membership of over 250,000, and the A.C.W. headed by Sidney Hillman, has more than 150,000 in its ranks. Both have wide control of labor conditions and relations in their respective industries. Both, too, have a high standing with organized labor as well as with public opinion generally.

The problem of labor unity will face both conventions, tho in a very different way. The I.L.G.W.U. was a founding member of the C.I.O., but was little by little alienated from it by growing dualism, Stalinist control and Lewis's one-man rule in that organization. It broke its connection with the C.I.O. when the latter reconstituted itself into a permanent organization, rival to the A. F. of L., towards the end of 1938. Since then it has remained independent of both federations, with sentiment for reaffiliation to the A. F. of L. growing very rapidly. The issue will be placed before the convention and there is every reason to believe that the overwhelming majority of the delegates will favor reaffiliation. However, it is expected that final action will not be taken by the convention itself. The greatest likelihood is that the General Executive Board will be empowered to take whatever steps it may deem necessary to further labor unity, including reaffiliation.

The A.C.W. is in an entirely different position. It, too, was one of the founders of the C.I.O. but it has

remained within the fold of that organization and has hitherto been one of its main pillars. However, in recent months, its relations with the C.I.O., and Sidney Hillman's relations with John L. Lewis, have become rather strained, primarily over the third-term issue but also over the questions of Stalinist infiltration and labor unity. In top C.I.O. circles, the A.C.W. has already been "written off," it is said; a break is regarded as virtually inevitable, if not welcome. It is unlikely that any such break will take place at the convention here next week, but it is quite certain that the issue of labor unity and relations with the C.I.O. will play a big role, behind the scenes if not openly.

It is difficult to forecast how the war issue will figure at the conventions. The leadership of both organizations are strongly pro-Ally and interventionist in sentiment. They agree with President Roosevelt's policy of step-by-step involvement in the war under the slogan of "measures short of war." They would like to go even farther. However, in view of the Administration's need for political caution in an election year and the deep keep-out-of-war sentiment thruout the country, it is not likely that the conventions will officially do very much more than denounce Hitlerism and Stalinism and approve the Roosevelt policy. How strong the anti-war forces will be at these conventions and what showing they will be able to make is not yet clear.

Both conventions will certainly go on record in favor of a third term for President Roosevelt. This will bring the A.C.W. officially in conflict with the anti-Roosevelt attitude adopted by John L. Lewis in the name of the C.I.O.

Besides these big political issues, the conventions will be confronted with a series of difficult industrial and organizational problems of major importance to the hundreds of thousands of workers in the garment trades.

Next German Thrust Seen In Balkans

Churchill Replaces Chamberlain, Labor Joins Cabinet; Voroshilov Ousted

With its position in Norway already partly consolidated, Germany struck again last week and in a series of lightning blows invaded the Low Countries—the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg.

The Nazi forces swept down on these countries by land and by air. Parachute troops were used, but apparently with indifferent success. Despite the element of surprise, it was apparent that the Germans were not having things their own way by any means. Two hours after the Nazi troops had crossed neutral borders, meeting strong resistance, French and British troops were already in Belgium. Battle was engaged at many points, but there was no reliable information whatever as to how things were going. Berlin made no great claim of immediate victory, aside from the general statement that enemy resistance in the border region had been broken. From all indications, the Allies had succeeded in blocking the Nazi Blitzkrieg and halting the German troops within twenty or twenty-five miles of the frontiers. There was also heavy fighting on the Rhine-Moselle front.

And so, in the thirty-sixth week of hostilities, after months of stagnation on the western front modified by some "diversions" or "side-shows" in the North (Finland, Scandinavia), total war broke out in all its fury, with the immediate prospect of large-scale engagements fought with the most destructive weapons of modern warfare. Annihilating air bombardments of civilian centers were expected soon as part of the new phase of the conflict. The war was spreading rapidly, about to envelop all Europe.

Why did Germany take this step, which so changed the character of the war? Most probably because it feared that its resources, material and moral, would not be able to stand the indefinite prolongation of the exhausting deadlock on the western front. Action and quick decision, Hitler and his advisers must have felt, were necessary, especially before American economic assistance could begin to tell and the Allies make up their inferiority in the air arm.

The decision to strike first at the Low Countries rather than in the Balkans was probably motivated by the difficulty of getting a complete understanding between Russia and Italy and with them for joint action in that part of Europe. Apparently, Mussolini had declined to let Italy get into the war unless Hitler succeeded in preoccupying the British sufficiently elsewhere to make his position easier in the Mediterranean and the Near East. Despite the obscurity in which the negotiations between the totalitarian states were shrouded, it seemed likely last week that the invasion of the Low Countries would be followed up with a Berlin-Moscow-Rome Axis thrust in southeastern Europe and the Near East.

Something very important was apparently brewing in Moscow in connection with the next Russian move in the European crisis. Marshal Voroshilov was suddenly removed as Defense Minister, a post he had held for the last fifteen years, and replaced by Marshal Timoshenko. There was every indication that this removal was not so much punishment for the fiasco of Russian arms in Finland as preparation for some new and sensational action on the part of Moscow. The new Russo-Yugoslavian trade treaty, said to imply also some sort of political and military understanding, was regarded as of great significance in this connection.

As heavy fighting began in Belgium, Britain completed the reorganization of its government, made necessary the week before as a result of the defeat in Norway. In the big test in the House of Commons, Chamberlain was saved from overthrow by a margin of only 81 votes, 281 to 200. At first, it appeared that he would retain office despite everything, but when it became clear that Labor would not join the cabinet under his leadership and that many Conservatives were irreconcilable, he resigned. Winston Churchill immediately took over the formation of the new government, becoming Prime Minister and Minister of Defense. Chamberlain was retained in a subordinate capacity but Sir Samuel Hoare was dropped. The Labor Party sent three of its leaders, Clement Attlee, Arthur Greenwood

(Continued on page 4)

