"PEACE" MEET SHARPENS U. S.-BRITISH RIVALRY

(Last week Ellen Ward showed how "the naughty boys from Washington left Gannes and the Daily Worker holding the bag." The Daily Worker had analyzed the government's objective at the Buenos Aires Conference as the formation of "an alliance of the American nations for the maintenance of peace" (issue of Dec. 9) and had expressed the belief that "the Conference can become one of the most powerful forces to block the fascist drive to a new world conflagration." (Nov. 19). But the American delegation maneuvered at Buenos Aires to oust the British interests so powerfully entrenched in farther South America, and to prepare for the coming war by consolidating its hinterland and protecting the military rear. In this second and concluding article the writer compares the views of the Mexican C.P. with those expressed in the Daily Worker, and analyzes the "achievements" of the "peace" conference.—Editor)

* * *

By ELLEN WARD

It is interesting to contrast the perspective on the conference of the **Daily Worker** with that of the progressive workers and the Communist parties of the semi-colonial countries. The latter is less cock-eyed. Perhaps because they suffer a great deal more at the hands of imperialism. Let us look at the position of the progressive labor movement of Mexico for example. Lombardo Toledano, leader of the CTM (Confederacion de Trabajadores de Mejico) writes in his official organ:

"The progressive labor movemovent of Mexico is opposed to the Peace Conference of Buenos Aires because a League of American nations would have only one aim: a weapon of American imperialism against the rest of the world, and Mexico has little to hope for from such an arrangement."

An editorial in **El Machete** (official organ of the Mexican Communist Party) (Dec. 5, 1936) states: **"The speech of President Roosevelt declares that the aims of the conference are to unite the American family of nations into a single economic union which will stand for peace in the Western hemisphere. These are the ostensible aims of the conference but the objectives which are not mentioned are: the domination of the continent, control of its resources and its places of strategic defense. Before the dreadful nearness of war the United States is determined to secure its colonial control, strengthen all its relations, especially those of an economic nature."**

Another editorial in **El Machete** (Dec. 17) continues: **"We are face to face with the sly American manoeuver through which the United States hopes to readjust its economic and political relations with a view to a new war. It must consolidate its territorial bases and its raw materials in preparation for it."** And in conclusion referring to the "peace" maneuver—**"We realize full well that peace can only be maintained through the force of the organized masses and the collective will of the people."**

These are very different statements indeed from those appearing in the **Daily Worker.**

Illusions Flourish

But such clear views of the aims of American imperialism are unfortunately limited to a very small group of communists and communist sympathizers and their clarity is often not sustained. The great masses of Latin America are filled with illusions—illusions about the policy of the Good Neighbor—illusions about Roosevelt, who is revered much more among them than among his own people. What are the causes of his great popularity below the Rio Grande?

Throughout Latin America the opinion is generally current that the policies of Roosevelt will lead to some kind of socialism. They see in the New Deal something they would rather follow than what has been done in Russia, Germany or Italy (which in their minds they group together). They believe that President Roosevelt is working out a policy which would eventually eliminate the concentration of wealth and improve the economic standards of the working class and the progressive elements of the population think that is their goal too.

The new political development in South America today is the formation of the peoples front. The frente popular declares its aims to be the freeing of the masses from those European institutions which are still supported by the conservative political parties. Chief among these is the feudal system of vast landed estates with their absentee landlords kept in luxury through the labor of a peon class living in abject poverty. Another aim is to liberate themselves from the influence of the Church in the political life of most Latin American countries.

Unrest Is Great

The formation of the frente popular has been spurred as a result of the series of revolutions in South America in 1930. These revolutions enabled the conservatives with the aid of the military, to wrest control from the more progressive elements. This was especially true in countries like Argentina, Chile and Uruguay.

But this is only a transition stage. Even in those countries where the wealthy landowners have retained their power, they are being forced to make some concessions. There are strong movements on foot everywhere for the 8 hour day, for social security legislation, workmen's compensation and regulation of working conditions for women and children. There is also agitation for nationalization of natural resources and for state ownership of principal industries. In this connection,

(*Continued next column*)

it is interesting to note that Argentina is beginning to nationalize its oil fields.

President Roosevelt has been sold to Latin America as a champion for all these causes and that explains his tremendous popularity among the masses.

Man learns slowly and it will take quite a few years and not a few world-shaking events to teach the Latin American masses that Roosevelt is not all that their ruling press has cracked him up to be. They will learn that even he is an instrument of his class which he aims to defend with perhaps greater astuteness than his predecessor in office. These masses can learn even now from the events which began to unfold almost on the eve of the closing of the "Peace" conference.

Results of Conference

Before the echoes of the last farewells died down at Buenos Aires, a constitutionally elected president of Cuba was removed by the military dictator Batista with the aid and consent of American interests.

President Roosevelt has just secured the joint resolution prohibiting the sending of arms to the Madrid Government—thus objectively aiding the fascists in Spain.

The Conference did nothing to settle the Chaco dispute.

The conference failed to lay the ghost of the Monroe Doctrine as proved by the fact that it was resuscitated and under fire again just a few days later at Valparaiso, where amidst great clamor a resolution was jammed through, calling for the complete independence of Porto Rico from the Colossus of the North. A member of the Argentine delegation (**N. Y. Times,** Jan. 10, 1937) said **"it was stupid of the conference to talk about peace until all the American peoples were independent of Yankee imperialism."**

So we see that the "Peace" Conference which was summoned with such great pomp and which opened with such great applause and good cheer—this great tabernacle of love has crumbled like a house of cards. The conference heard a great number of speeches but it defeated an American League of Nations. The **Times** (Dec. 20) reports a little laconically: **"The Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace has approved the following:**

"A resolution postponing consideration of the proposed American League of Nations to the eighth Pan-American conference in Lima, Peru in 1938."

Does all this mean, however, that the United States has yielded its objectives? Nothing of the sort. From now on negotiations continue **in camera.** Central America is under its complete domination and no problem. But in South America there will be much maneuvering in the next twelve months. There will be planning and intrigue and barter and no end of economic compulsives with each separate country. There will be horse-trading in ways which will not bear telling and the American empire will secure its hinterland for the coming war if it can defeat England in farther South America. In any event the "Peace" Conference was really a war measure.

or the *Brooklyn Tablet,* which sets the editorial policies of Catholic papers and journals, and you will find the anti-Semitic campaign in full blast. The open propaganda of the *Sentinels Of The Republic* for Fascism and anti-Semitism, finds an enthusiastic ally in the Church. Ask any Jewish lawyer in Massachusetts, particularly Boston, about the virtual ban on Jewish lawyers pleading their cases before the bar.

The 1936 election campaign brought forth the Jewish issue for the first time as a national issue. The 1936 convention of the American Federation of Labor found the Vatican-influenced executive council injecting the poison of anti-Semitism into the labor movement with undisguised satisfaction.

And here in New York in all public welfare agencies the Jews are being thrown out as swiftly as the Catholic guilds and big sisters' groups can manage. Why does Father Donovan have access to the files containing the personnel and other records, at the Emergency Relief Bureau? Maybe he just wants to be helpful?

Far more important than any of the anti-Semitic sentiments, so "unobtrusively" injected into practically all Catholic literature, is the very obtrusive word-of-mouth Catholic propaganda throughout the land. The time is not yet for shouting and raving a la Julius Streicher, but the day swiftly approaches.

LENIN SPEAKS ON D

(*Continued from last week*)

7. "Freedom of meeting" may be taken as an example of the demand for "pure democracy". Every class-conscious worker who has not broken with his class will understand at once that it would be stupid to promise freedom of meeting to the exploiters at the period and in the circumstances when the exploiters are showing resistance to their overthrow and insisting on their privileges. The bourgeoisie, at the time when it was revolutionary, did not give, either in England in 1649 or in France in 1793, "freedom of meeting" to the monarchists and nobles who had called in foreign armies and were "meeting" for the organization of attempts at restoration. If the present-day bourgeoisie, which has long since become reactionary, demands of the proletariat that it should guarantee beforehand, whatever resistance the capitalists may show to their expropriation, "freedom of meeting" for the exploiters, then the workers will only laugh at the hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, the workers know quite well that "freedom of meeting" even in the most democratic bourgeois republic is an empty phrase, for the rich have all the best public private buildings at their disposal as well as sufficient leisure for meetings and protection by their bourgeois apparatus of power. The proletarians of town and country and small peasants, that is to say the immense majority of the population, have neither the first, nor the second, nor the third. So long as things are arranged in this way, "equality", that is, "pure democracy", is deception. In order to win real equality, in order to realize in practice democracy for the toilers, it is necessary in the first place to take away from the exploiters all public and luxurious private buildings; it is necessary in the first place to give leisure to the toilers, it is necessary that the armed workers should protect the freedom of their meetings and not the aristocratic or capitalist officers with their down-trodden soldiers.

Only after such a change can you speak of freedom, of equality, without mockery of the workers, of the toilers, of the poor. But nobody ca out such a change save the vanguard of the the proletariat which overthrows the exploi bourgeoisie.

8. "Freedom of the press" is also one chief slogans of "pure democracy". Ag workers know, and the socialists of all c have recognized millions of times, that th dom is deception so long as the best printin and the largest supplies of paper are seize capitalists and so long as the power of capi the press remains, a power which through world appears the more vividly, the shar more cynically, the greater the developmen mocracy and of the republican system, as ample, in America. In order to win real and real democracy for the toilers, for the and the peasants, it was first of all nece take away from capital the possibility o writers, of buying publishing houses and newspapers, and for this it is necessary throw the yoke of capital, to suppress thei ance. The capitalists have always called "f the freedom of profit for the rich, the fre the workers to die of hunger. The capita the freedom of the press freedom for the buy up the press, freedom to make use o for the manufacture and forging of so-calle opinion. The defenders of "pure democrac in practice appear as defenders of the same system of the rule of the rich over the m enlightening the masses, appear as the dec the people, distracting them. by means of fa ing, fine and thoroughly false phrases, f concrete historical tasks of liberating t from its enslavement to capital. Real free equality will be that order which the Con are building and in which there will be no ty of growing rich at the expense of others, there will be no objective possibility of ei ectly or indirectly subjecting the press to t of money, in which there will be no hind prevent any toiler (or group of toilers of a

PORTRAIT OF MEXICO

(*Continued from Page 3*)

ico. With this thin shadow of a specter Catholic propagandists for intervention would terrify the United States and make it believe that "red radicalism is rampant in Mexico." And with these same phrases in lieu of substance, Communists of the People's Front variety would content the Mexican workers and peasants and work themselves and their movement internationally into an intense fever of enthusiasm for "Socialist" or "People's Front" Mexico.

Another Language

President Cardenas leaves most of the demagogy to his assistants and supporters, especially to his supporters of the Left. After all, they are the masters of the revolutionary phrase and if they choose to put it at the service of his government and thus drape his far from revolutionary acts in a flag of red, why should he object? He too, on occasion, has known how to make the mountains of Mexico ring with his radical speeches: but when he speaks to American financial interests, he talks another language.

On December 22, 1936, in his first public interview with the American press since the consolidation of his regime, President Cardenas told a representative of the Associated Press what he had previously said in private to United States Ambassador Daniels:

"Mexico would look with gratitude on elements with capital which might want to invest money in the country, giving them every class of guarantees within the law, and they ought not alarm themselves since our legislation is more protective of capital than that of the United States, where taxes are greater and wages higher."

This is the simple truth, and no doubt a natural program for the spokesman of the ruling class of a semi-colonial government, whose core is formed by men who are developing in their own persons the beginnings of a native capitalism. But it is a far cry from the radical phrase-demagogy, the "Socialism," "Marxism" and "Revolution" with which his speeches bristle when they are intended for popular home consumption. It is, too, a far cry from the fervid anti-imperialist sentiments that actuated the stor-