

Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. 7, No. 7.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1938

5 Cents a Copy

UAW Urges Jobless Aid

Auto Union Leaders Put An Extensive Program Before Roosevelt

Immediate action to help relieve the increasingly acute unemployment situation as well as the ultimate necessity of legislation to take control of the country's basic industries, were urged upon President Roosevelt last week by a delegation of the United Automobile Workers, consisting of Homer Martin, president of the union, Richard T. Frankenstein, vice-president, William Munger, research director, and W. Jett Lauck, labor economist.

The U.A.W. spokesmen placed the main burden of their emphasis on the following points:

1. Extension of federal public-spending or "pump-priming" activities, thru W.P.A., low-cost housing and all possible forms of public works. A minimum of \$30,000,000 was asked to be made available for Michigan immediately and \$100,000,000 more to follow.

2. An annual-wage system to stabilize employment and earnings for the automobile workers. An annual wage of \$2,000 was suggested.

3. Legislation to place under government control the basic industries of the country "to function in the public interest on the basis of limited profit and lower prices per unit of output, unrestricted expansion of production and complete reemployment with higher rates of pay and shorter hours for all those able and willing to work."

The union representatives pointed out that 320,000 were out of work in the auto industry. Out of

High Court OK's NLRB's Powers

In two far-reaching decisions made last week, the Supreme Court ruled that federal courts do not have the power to issue injunctions against proceedings of the National Labor Relations Board. The ruling came as the court's conclusion in suits brought by the Dry Dock Company and the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Company, seeking to halt Labor Board proceedings on complaints of unfair labor practices in their plants.

The court based its ruling on grounds that there was no final order from which an appeal properly could be taken until after the board had issued orders against a company, and that no damage could be shown until that stage of the proceedings was reached.

Then, the court pointed out, no enforcement can follow until the board appeals to the Circuit Court for a compliance decree, which would be refused by the court if the company proved unlawful damage.

The decision, unanimous except that Justice Cardozo, ill, did not participate, was delivered by Justice Brandeis.

This decision is of prime importance in facilitating enforcement of the Wagner Act. Opponents of the act are now preparing a campaign in Congress to destroy it by the process of "amendment."

Fate of Unions In War

TRADE-union organizations in practically all of the belligerent countries were promptly asked to suspend union regulations for the duration of the war. This meant the abolition of strikes and the surrender of rights and privileges affecting hours, wages and conditions of labor. It was a demand of colossal proportions and one which brought to light the impermanence and inherent weakness of labor's even most conspicuous gains under a production system that is basically hostile to it. Gains for the attainment of which labor fought and struggled for generations were to be swept into discard at the first sign of emergency.—Rose M. Stein: M-Day.

a normal employment of 517,000, a total of 197,000 were only partially employed, according to their survey.

The interview of the U.A.W. leaders with the President has made a big impression in governmental circles in Washington, especially because of the far-reaching character of their proposals. (Read the Editorial on page 4—Ed.)

200,000 Detroit Unionists Demonstrate for Relief

Detroit, Mich. Over 200,000 workers jammed Cadillac Square and adjoining streets in downtown Detroit on Friday, February 4, in the mightiest outpouring of organized labor in the city's history. It was a great mass demonstration of the United Automobile Workers and other Detroit unions against the lay-offs in this automobile center and in favor of a more adequate relief and W.P.A. program.

Homer Martin, president of the U.A.W., Richard T. Frankenstein, vice-president, George A. Addes, secretary-treasurer, Adolph Germer, regional C.I.O. director and Richard T. Leonard, chairman of the U.A.W. welfare committee, addressed the meeting amidst the thunderous applause of the vast audience, consisting of every section of the city's working class. In the name of the U.A.W. and the C.I.O., they demanded an immediate federal appropriation of \$130,000,000 for relief and W.P.A. jobs in Michigan, cash relief, a debt moratorium for the jobless and drastic reductions in rent.

Martin told the scores of thousands of workers before him of the conference that he and his colleagues had had with President Roosevelt at Washington the previous week. He indicated that the

President had agreed to confer with W.P.A. heads immediately in order to make some additional money available without delay. Aubrey Williams, deputy W.P.A. administrator, confirmed this in a special telegram read at the demonstration.

"We demand immediate relief," Martin went on, "We want \$1,000,000 a week immediately as direct relief in the state of Michigan."

Richard Frankenstein, assistant president of the U.A.W.A., read a message from Governor Murphy, ill at Ann Arbor, saying:

"If adequate relief meant a deficit, I would choose the deficit."

The governor added that he would call a special session of the Legislature if a survey he was having made showed it to be necessary to provide additional relief.

The great mass demonstration of Detroit labor has thrilled the whole state. Similar actions are being planned at Flint, Cadillac and other centers.

The U.A.W. is setting an inspiring example for the whole labor movement, showing how a militant, progressive union looks out for the welfare of its members in periods of recession and unemployment with the same energy and vigilance that it protects their standards in the shops while they are at work.

PRICES, WAGES AND RECOVERY

By Lyman Fraser

WHEN business is good, the almighty capitalists take all the credit; when business is bad and times are hard, the capitalists blame everyone and everything except themselves and their system. Now the capitalists and their apologists are blaming labor, and especially the C.I.O., for the newest economic recession. Their argument is stupid but their intentions are not, for they want to use the argument as a bludgeon to beat down wages—and to weaken, if not smash, the militant labor unions.

The simple stupidity of the argument has been put into "scientific" form by H. G. Moulton of the Brookings Institution, now become the most shameless apologist of reactionary capitalism. Moulton says:

"The aggressive labor movement (meaning the C.I.O.—L.F.), which succeeded in obtaining for a large part of the American workers a substantial reduction in the length of the working week and substantial advances in the rate of pay, (is) primarily responsible for destroying the existing balance and altering the whole course of events." How and why? Higher wages and shorter hours increased labor costs, which forced the capitalists to raise prices, which brought about the recession.

False In Facts And Theory

This argument is false in its facts and misleading in its theory.

It is suggestive to recall that, several years ago, Moulton and the Brookings Institution issued four books on income and economic progress, in which it was argued that the cause of unused productive capacity and crises is increasing concentration of income resulting in

oversaving and insufficient consumer purchasing power. Now Moulton forgets that! He forgets that renewed and increasing concentration of income expressed all the other factors in the economic ill-balance that brought this new recession. According to the summary of income-tax reports issued by the United States Treasury Department, it appears that:

The national income increased 31% in 1935 over 1933.

Income-tax returns of \$5,000 up increased 51%.

Total income of returns of \$5,000 up increased 47%.

The larger incomes gained much more from recovery than the smaller ones. That kept up from 1935 to 1937. There was a renewal of the concentration of income—and that was largely responsible for two disastrous conditions

1. Insufficiency of mass consumer purchasing power, an inability to create an increasingly larger mass demand for the goods and services that industry is capable of producing. (That was made worse, during most of 1937, by the constantly smaller net contribution of government expenditures to purchasing power, which became zero toward the end of 1937.)

2. Oversaving by the larger incomes, in relation to available capital needs; this condition was evidenced in the piling up of idle capital funds unable to find profitable investment. That oversaving was a deduction from consumption and lessened the effective demand for goods and services.

After forgetting his own theory and the facts, Moulton argues that everything was going fine until just about the middle of 1936, when the C.I.O. began raising

wages and shortening hours, and thus labor, militant labor, was primarily responsible for the recession.

But, if wages are "too high", their first effect is to lower profits. Yet, during the period under discussion, there was no stop in the upward movement of profits. For the whole recovery and prosperity period 1933-37, profits rose much more than output, national income or wages.

Recession And Prices

It is simple, all too simple, to say that high prices caused the recession—for there are other factors. Recessions have taken place in the midst of rising, falling and stationary prices.

Rising prices, especially in particular industries, were undoubtedly a factor. But it is false to blame the high prices on wages.

In every period of recovery after depression, there is a rise in prices. And prices rose in practically all industries after 1933, regardless of whether wages were rising or falling or were stationary. Moreover, where prices and wages both moved upward, prices rose much more than wages. In the steel industry, for example, the rise in prices was three times as great as was necessary to cover the higher wages of steel workers. (One of the most important reasons for the price rise was the growing foreign demand for iron and steel for rearmament purposes.)

Now consider another angle. The recession is sharpest in the basic heavy industries, in steel, machinery, automobiles, etc. In those industries, prices fell least, if at all,

(Continued on Page 2)

AFL Delays CIO Ouster

Final Decision to be Made Later In Week; Green Attacks L.N.-P.L.

Action on the status of the C.I.O. unions as well as on the appeal of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor against President Green's order for a "purge" in that state, was delayed by the Executive Council of the A. F. of L., meeting in Miami last week, until Tuesday, February 8 at the latest. This delay after two weeks of continuous sessions, reflects the sharp clash taking place in the council between the die-hard elements, such as Frey, Duffy (of the carpenters, representing Hutcheson), Coefield and Wharton, who urge immediate expulsions, and those who, like Green, Woll, Harrison and Tobin, want to play the game of watchful waiting a bit longer, hoping for dissension in the C.I.O. to weaken and destroy the industrial-union movement. It is also understood that strong White House pressure has been exerted in support of the "moderate" tendency, for the administration is anxious to stave off irrevocable action on the part of the A. F. of L.

A few days before, the council had accepted the report of its conference committee, which tried to throw the burden of responsibility for the rupture of negotiations upon John L. Lewis personally. At the same time, William Green not only refused to listen to Lewis's simple proposal to achieve unity by the blanket admission of all C.I.O. affiliates into the A. F. of L. but even rejected as "impractical" Father Hass's suggestion that unity conferences be immediately resumed.

In the early part of the week, the convention of the United Mine Workers, meeting at Washington, unanimously endorsed Labor's Non-Partisan League and called upon all U.M.W.A. locals to give it the utmost support. The A. F. of L. Executive Council, on the other hand, reiterated its hostility to independent labor political action, denounced the L.N.-P.L. as a C.I.O. "dummy" and urged Federation affiliates to deny it any assistance or support. This decision will probably mean an aggravation of the split in labor's ranks on the political field, the disastrous results of which have been seen in Detroit.

On the so-called "Green case," the U.M.W.A. convention decided to refer the trial of the A. F. of L. chief, who is a member of the miners union, to the union's International Executive Board, with full power to act. It is understood that Green will refuse to appear for trial.

An important event at the mine-workers convention was the revision of the union constitution. It was decided to amend this document so as to replace the words "A. F. of L.," wherever they appear, by the word "C.I.O. thus indicating the exact position of the U.M.W.A. The clause barring "members of the Communist Party" from the union, along with Ku Klux Klanners and other "undesirable" elements, was retained by an overwhelming vote. It was also decided that support extended by U.M.W.A. locals to strikes should be limited to those strikes that are endorsed by the C.I.O.

The U.M.W.A. also adopted a

(Continued on Page 2)

Viewed from the Left

By Politicus

Washington Plays Monopoly

HOW long the administration can play its ludicrous game of Monopoly-Anti-Monopoly-Monopoly is becoming a leisure-time problem for students of American politics. The revival of this ancient and outworn shibboleth of American "progressivism" is supposed to raise with it a political dust-storm to obscure the actual strengthening of big and bigger business—but whom does it fool? Consider the history and origins of the New Deal. Its first contribution was the N.R.A., a gigantic attempt not merely to unite industry into various employers associations but to accelerate the salient features of trustification. It made mandatory the regulation of production to revive capitalist profits, thereby forming "combinations in restraint of trade". It worked overtime to dig prices out of the ruins of the capitalist debacle and thereby operated as a price-fixing agency. It made the financial pivot of its structure the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which poured the government's money into the banks, railroads and other large-scale industrial enterprises, continuing the avowedly pro-corporate policy of Hoover.

One need only recall, as a matter of fact, the famous Darrow Report, to indicate the upsurge of trust and monopoly symbolized by the N.R.A., and the consequent crushing of many sections of so-called "small business" that had survived 1929.

To answer the new (or is it the reborn?) recession, the actual program of the administration seems to be taking concrete form around some sort of "revived N.R.A.", with its "objectionable", features removed. That is, the outbursts of Ickes and Jackson are, quite apart from their own intentions, no more than smoke-screens serving to cover the real aims of the administration in removing "hampering" anti-trust legislation, as Donald Richberg, former N.R.A. director and present conferee of the President, has phrased it.

Strengthening of big business, increasing the spread of finance-capital's grip upon the life of the country, refusal to interfere with monopoly's depredations, support of the corporate policy of high prices—this is the New Deal today.

It may go thru the motions of holding conferences with "small business men", whose independence is a joke among all reputable political observers, but the administration, in its own way, carries on the traditional pro-monopoly policy of the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover era. It is committed to the maintenance of the capitalist system and hence must play ball with the spokesmen and protagonists of that system, the big shots not the small fry.

The strengthening of corporate industry, which has been and is the central policy of the New Deal, is, in this day and age, not the major concern of "independent", small business but of labor. As a matter of fact, the trust-busting issue as raised by the petty capitalists, died with the World War, despite the fact that its ghost walked

BEN LIFSHITZ
speaks on
The Labor Movement Today
Sunday, Feb. 13th, 11 A.M.
935 Southern Blvd
Auspices:
Local 117, I.L.G.W.U.

CHICAGO LABOR PARTY AIDS L.N.P.L.; TAKES PEACE STAND

The Chicago and Cook County division of the Illinois Labor Party held its third and largest convention since its formation on Sunday, January 23 in the I.L.G.W.U. Hall in Chicago.

Eighty-three organizations of Chicago workers were represented with a membership of 100,000. Twenty-four A. F. of L. unions, 17 C.I.O. unions and 42 fraternal bodies and local Labor Party clubs made up the total. The organization committee reported 17 of Chicago's 50 wards already equipped with Labor Party clubs.

For the 1938 elections, a program of concentration on selected state and Congressional districts will be followed and the barriers set up by present reactionary election laws for a county ticket avoided. The convention endorsed the policy of also putting up a state-wide ticket and campaigning for a labor vote sufficient to create a legal Labor Party on the ballot of the state. It agreed to postpone the state nominating convention until late in April so that Labor's Non-Partisan League may have a full opportunity to see what it can accomplish in the primaries with its policy of backing old-party candidates sympathetic to organized labor.

George A. Meade, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, was elected chairman of the convention and of the new county committee. Five vice-chairmen were elected, namely: Tom Dixon, business Agent of Machin-

ists No.390; Sam Glassman, of the International Ladies Garment Workers; Alois Hruska, of Carpenters No. 54; Simon Trojar, of the Illinois Workers Alliance; and John Helfrich, of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Society. Mel Pitzele, a member and until recently an organizer for the S.W.O.C., was elected secretary-organizer and Helen Gill of the Millinery Workers Joint Board, financial secretary.

While the Illinois Labor Party and Labor's Non-Partisan League pursue and expect to continue to pursue distinct and independent policies, relations are most cordial and the officers of the two labor political forces have conferred on all important questions which might involve competition or conflict between them.

The Labor Party convention adopted resolutions demanding a special session of the State Legislature immediately from Governor Horner and the appropriation of the \$18,000,000 surplus in the unemployment portion of sales-tax funds for relief and a state works program. A sharp division in the convention took place on the resolution on war. By a vote of 123 to 59, against the opposition of the Stalinists and some New Dealers, a resolution was adopted calling for a four point program similar to that adopted by the recent convention of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee and the Executive Board of the United Automobile Workers: (1) a consumers and labor boycott of all Japanese goods; (2) support of the LaFollette-Ludlow war-referendum amendment; (3) opposition to Roosevelt's proposals for increased military and naval armaments, urging public housing instead; and (4) withdrawal of all armed forces from the Far Eastern war zone.

Main platform proposals called for a vast increase in public-housing projects to increase employment of building-trades workers and to relieve the unspeakable congestion in Chicago. Particular protest was expressed at the discrimination against the Southside aimed at the Negro workers of the city. Public ownership of a unified transport system and opposition to all curtailment of public-school facilities, were also headlined. An executive board of 21 members was elected and 10 vacancies left to be filled from the growing number of affiliated organizations.

and lower prices, and, if it cannot be done now because of capitalist decline, then labor must demand new measures and new methods to achieve a wholly desirable result.

They want to beat down wages. Labor must not permit it! But labor's program must cover the whole situation. It must demand:

1. Higher wages and shorter hours for the workers who are still at work.
2. Increase of mass consumer purchasing power thru larger government expenditures on relief.
3. Reduction of capitalization, capital claims and profits.
4. Measures to increase to 100% the utilization of our available productive forces and labor.
5. To insure full utilization of existing capacity to produce, it is necessary to stimulate the heavy goods industries, where the recession is sharpest and unemployment greatest. To do that is possible only thru a large-scale housing program to rehouse the masses of the people. And that is possible only thru the government spending from one to two billions a year on subsidized low-cost housing.

This program is wholly possible economically. It would mean a constantly greater output of goods and services and increasing tech-

nically-economic efficiency. It would eliminate the appeal of rearmament as a measure to provide work. It would strengthen the militant labor movement.

But, if what is wholly possible economically is impossible for class-political reasons, because of the opposition of capitalist interests, then labor must move toward broader action. It must demand nationalization of housing, of one industry after another. It must demand whatever action is necessary to put to use all our available economic resources and labor. And labor must demand that these measures are carried out thru the most democratic means, with the government taking the initiative but with the utmost decentralization and union participation in the institutions necessary to carry them out. Otherwise, tendencies towards imperialist state capitalism and fascism may be strengthened. Labor must demand self-government and power to move toward broader freedom and socialism.

A.F.L. HOLDS OFF ACTION ON C.I.O.
(Continued from Page 1)
resolution on war, denouncing fascist aggression and calling for an American foreign policy based on the "wholehearted desire of the American people for . . . peace" rather than on the "protection of the vested property interests" of big business in this country.

A special statement adopted by the A. F. of L. council threatened a break with the International Federation of Trade Unions, with which it is now affiliated, should the latter admit the Soviet trade unions into its fold.

A Program For Labor
If it is economically wholly possible to raise wages, shorten hours

Send-Off Is Big Success

Rivera Hall was crowded beyond capacity on Friday, February 4, at the send-off party for Jay Lovestone as delegate of the I.C.L.L. to the international revolutionary-socialist conference to be held in Paris at the end of February. It was more than a send-off; it was a stirring expression of enthusiasm at the beginning of a revival of true internationalism after so many years of working-class defeat and demoralization.

Speakers compared the present situation with the days of the World War and expressed their hope that the Paris conference would play an historical role analogous to that of the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences during the last war in the way of rallying and uniting the revolutionary internationalist forces against war and reaction. There was unanimous approval of the idea emphasized by all speakers that the fundamental dividing line in the working-class movement today was the attitude towards war and war preparations.

Despite uncomfortable crowding, the audience sang, cheered and pledged support for revolutionary socialism. Over a thousand dollars was contributed for conference expenses and aid to underground Germany and Spain. Old-timers, not seen for years because of their discouragement at the degeneration of the official communist movement, took active part in the send-off and expressed their enthusiasm at the prospect of international revolutionary-socialist unity.

Speakers included Lewis Corey, Edward Welsh, Bertram D. Wolfe and Charles S. Zimmerman. Warm greetings were read from James Farrell, one of America's outstanding writers, and Louis Hacker, well-known Marxist historian, who were unable to attend. Telegrams were received from many organizations and individuals thruout the country. The meeting closed with an inspiring address by Jay Lovestone on the significance of the Paris conference.

Months before the convention, active progressives in the A.S.U. were aware that the militant spirit of the organization was being consciously sapped by the pro-war elements in preparation for the swindle they planned to carry thru at the convention. The sabotage of the Oxford Pledge by the Young Communist League came into clear evidence at the C.C.N.Y. peace meeting on November 12, 1937, where the Y.C.L. leadership of the A.S.U. fought against the Oxford Pledge and refused to take it when administered. Later, at the meager and poorly organized discussions that preceded the convention, sinister cries of "disruption" were raised against those who fought for the preservation of the old program. Those who fought for the maintenance of the Oxford Pledge program were summarily labeled "Trotskyites" and threatened with expulsion. At City College (Evening), New Utrecht High School and Chicago University, to give a few examples, verbal threats of this character were made.

The election of delegates that followed was likewise under the control and domination of the Y.C.L. machine wherever possible. Where strong minority opposition prevailed, attempts to secure proportional representation in order to have minority opinion represented at the Vassar convention, were also ruthlessly attacked as "disruption."

At the Lexington Avenue branch of Hunter College, for example, the votes were split eleven for "collective security" and nine for the Oxford Pledge. Yet not one of the large minority was represented on the whole delegation which attended the convention! This is a fine

The ASU Becomes A Pro-War Agency

By JOE ELWOOD and EDWARD CARROLL

THE strange transformation of the American Students Union from a militant anti-war organization into an adjunct of Rooseveltian imperialism is no less remarkable than the swift change of the Communist International from ultra-leftist sectarianism to bankrupt reformism and the most extreme opportunism. In fact, the two phenomena are organically related.

For the Stalinists had planned, in elaborate detail, the manner in which the convention, held at Vassar College during the Christmas week, would change its fundamental approach to the war question to conform with the newest dictates of the party line. Previous to this convention, the A.S.U. was supposedly dedicated to an unyielding fight against American imperialism. The job of the Stalinists became to carry on a big campaign of agitation thruout every chapter of the A.S.U. against the whole previous war position and to substitute the new panacea of "collective security." In this campaign, they had the wholehearted support of the school administrations, of the capitalist press and, above all, of President Roosevelt himself, who was represented as the leader of the "collective-security" movement in this country.

In an enthusiastic letter to the convention, the President said: "I send hearty greetings to your convention and sincere wishes that your deliberations will be fruitful in making our schools and colleges a genuine fortress of democracy." How quickly have the Stalinists forgotten that, during the last war, every college campus became literally a military fortress—"to save the world for democracy."

Preparing To Kill The Oxford Pledge

Months before the convention, active progressives in the A.S.U. were aware that the militant spirit of the organization was being consciously sapped by the pro-war elements in preparation for the swindle they planned to carry thru at the convention. The sabotage of the Oxford Pledge by the Young Communist League came into clear evidence at the C.C.N.Y. peace meeting on November 12, 1937, where the Y.C.L. leadership of the A.S.U. fought against the Oxford Pledge and refused to take it when administered. Later, at the meager and poorly organized discussions that preceded the convention, sinister cries of "disruption" were raised against those who fought for the preservation of the old program. Those who fought for the maintenance of the Oxford Pledge program were summarily labeled "Trotskyites" and threatened with expulsion. At City College (Evening), New Utrecht High School and Chicago University, to give a few examples, verbal threats of this character were made.

The election of delegates that followed was likewise under the control and domination of the Y.C.L. machine wherever possible. Where strong minority opposition prevailed, attempts to secure proportional representation in order to have minority opinion represented at the Vassar convention, were also ruthlessly attacked as "disruption."

At the Lexington Avenue branch of Hunter College, for example, the votes were split eleven for "collective security" and nine for the Oxford Pledge. Yet not one of the large minority was represented on the whole delegation which attended the convention! This is a fine

exhibition of what the Y.C.L. means by "democracy." Even at the convention, they did not hesitate at excluding legitimate delegates by rejecting their credentials on various technicalities. The case of a delegate from the Philadelphia Normal school may be cited as an illustration. It is significant that she was a determined advocate of the Oxford Pledge.

At the convention, about 500 delegates were present, the Y.C.L. having the largest group numerically. The Stalinist delegates were fully supplemented in their work by a large number of Communist Party members who came as "fraternal" delegates or in other semi-official capacities. These "innocent" representatives did yeoman service by surreptitious attacks upon the old A.S.U. program and its advocates at dinner tables, dances and in the convention lobbies. This was part of the Stalinist strategy to maintain a constant pressure upon the independent liberals and pacifists who were still unconvinced about "collective security."

These liberals and pacifists constituted the second largest group at the convention, also they were, for the most part, unorganized and many of them left in the end disillusioned and confused. The remaining tendencies consisted of young

socialists, I.C.L.L.ers and Trotskyites.

The convention began with the Executive report by Joe Lash, in which he stated: "We can no longer subscribe to the Oxford Pledge of non-support to any war which the government may undertake. The Oxford Pledge demobilizes the immediate struggle for peace. The

(Continued on Page 5)

Lenin on Peace Movements

A MASS sentiment for peace often expresses the beginning of a protest, an indignation and a consciousness of the reactionary nature of the war. It is the duty of all social-democrats to take advantage of this sentiment. They will take the most ardent part in every movement and in every demonstration made on this basis but they will not deceive the people by assuming that, in the absence of a revolutionary movement, it is possible to have peace without annexations, without the oppression of nations, without robbery, without planting the seeds of new wars among the present governments and the ruling classes. Such deception would only play into the hands of the secret diplomacy of the belligerent countries and their counter-revolutionary plans. Who ever wishes a durable and democratic peace must be for civil war against the governments and the bourgeoisie.—G. Zinoviev and V. I. Lenin: Socialism and War.

socialists, I.C.L.L.ers and Trotskyites.

The convention began with the Executive report by Joe Lash, in which he stated: "We can no longer subscribe to the Oxford Pledge of non-support to any war which the government may undertake. The Oxford Pledge demobilizes the immediate struggle for peace. The

(Continued on Page 5)

socialists, I.C.L.L.ers and Trotskyites.

The convention began with the Executive report by Joe Lash, in which he stated: "We can no longer subscribe to the Oxford Pledge of non-support to any war which the government may undertake. The Oxford Pledge demobilizes the immediate struggle for peace. The

(Continued on Page 5)

War Means Fascism For America

By BERTRAM D. WOLFE

(This is the third in a series of four articles based on the special report on "Problems of Strategy and Policy in the Struggle Against War" made by Bertram D. Wolfe to the plenary session of the I.C.L.L. held recently.—The Editor.)

I WANT to emphasize again that, under the slogan of a struggle against fascism, the plans for the development of war-time fascism in the United States are being carried out. Let's go behind this smoke-screen of words to the real war plans of this democratic country of ours.

I have made an analysis of the plans for what has now become popularly as well as technically known as "M Day"—Mobilization Day. Those plans are fully worked out. The government began working on them as soon as the last war was finished and worked continuously, from 1920 to 1933, on the complete drafting of the mobilization plans for America's participation in the Second World War. These plans, as worked out, give the President and the War Department complete and absolute power over labor and over the armed forces, and sweeping powers

over industry but the power over industry is specifically limited by the provisions of the Constitution of the United States providing for no seizure of property without "just compensation." The other provisions of the Constitution, about free speech, freedom of press and freedom of assembly, the mobilization board intends to scrap, but those on property the mobilization board says must be respected.

The power of the Executive must be made complete. I quote from Colonel C. T. Harris, in charge of the Planning Division and representative of the War Department at the Congressional hearings: "My opinion is that in time of war you should write a blank check to the President." And it is necessary for us to recognize that "Comrades" Landon, Knox, Stimson and Browder have already written out the blank check.

There are seven bills in this mobilization plan. The War Department refuses to submit the text of these bills prior to the declaration of the war. They do not want any debate on these bills. They want to wait until war is declared and then jam the bills thru. And then, whoever wants debate on them will be branded as a "wild-fowl obstructionist" and "enemy agent" and the like. But the seven bills have been summarized by the War Department for the benefit and information of Congress. And the summary provides, among other things, that the President shall get the authority to create a machinery answerable only to him for the control, complete and absolute, over the man-power of the nation, over the channels of public opinion and information and over industry as limited by the provisions of the Constitution. They also provide that labor is to be disarmed and its organizations paralyzed or destroyed by a combination of propaganda plus coercion.

These bills stipulate that no male between 18 and 45 is exempt from the draft. There are to be no exemptions, only deferred classifications. Any one classified as valuable in civilian service for the conduct of the war may have his classification changed if he subsequently proves of no value or harmful.

Barney Baruch, who should know what he is talking about because he handled the last war from this angle, testified to Congress in the following language: "Every man in military service—whatever may be his domestic or other circumstances—warranting deferment or exemption—must be usefully and faithfully employed in an occupation essential to the military progress of the nation. . . . The work or fight method . . . is far more effective than any chain-gang or impressment that might be invented."

One of the seven bills sets up a Public Relations Administration—a P.R.A.—under executive control. I quote four of its provisions: "A. To mobilize all existing mediums of publicity. . . . Well, the Daily Worker is already mobilized. It is time for us to ask ourselves: what will happen to the Workers Age? "B. To combat disaffection at home. . . . "C. To combat enemy propaganda at home and abroad. . . . "F. To establish rules and regulations for censorship. . . . The Communist Party, it can safely be assumed, will, in America as it does now in Spain, furnish the most expert political censorship that the government will possess. According to these seven bills, as explained by the War Department, we find the following: that, when

(Continued on Page 4)

LABOR'S STAND ON WAR an editorial

THE Daily Worker is just beside itself with joy—slightly synthetic, we suspect—over the resolution adopted by the United Mine Workers convention on the war question. It hails this resolution as a vindication of its own policy in supporting the Roosevelt administration's course towards war. More than that, it makes a rather crude attempt to play off this resolution against the one recently adopted by the United Automobile Workers and, also, against the almost identical one of the S.W.O.C. convention last December. It lists a whole series of statements of trade-union leaders under the pretense that, in making such statements, these leaders are aligning themselves with the war party and against the U.A.W.-S.W.O.C. stand against war.

One glance at the U.M.W.A. resolution, or even at the Daily Worker editorial commenting on it, is enough to show what a brazen fraud the Stalinists are trying to put over. For what does the U.M.W.A. resolution really say? In the preamble, it condemns the "continued aggressive actions on the part of the fascist nations" and emphasizes that "labor is most vitally interested in the policy of this country in regard to the international situation." In the "resolves," it repeats the condemnation, comes out for a "boycott of Japanese manufactured goods in this country" and concludes with the following significant statement, taken word for word from the U.A.W.-S.W.O.C. declaration: "Further resolved, that it is the expression of this convention that the foreign policy of the United States shall not be formulated or made dependent upon the protection of the vested or property interests in foreign countries of the large corporations in this country but rather that such foreign policy should express the whole-hearted desire of the American people for

the greatest assurance of international peace."

What is there in this resolution that can give aid and comfort to the Stalinist war-mongers? Not so much, apparently, what is said as what is left unsaid. The U.M.W.A. resolution does not come out in favor of the war-referendum idea or the withdrawal of American troops and warships from the Far East, as do both the S.W.O.C. and U.A.W. declarations. Nor does it take a stand against the government armaments program, as does the U.A.W. These are undoubted weaknesses in the mine-workers resolution, obviously a result of the clash of conflicting pressures.

But by the same token, the U.M.W.A. statement refuses to go on record in favor of the fraud of "collective security"; nor does it endorse the Roosevelt policy as enunciated in the Chicago address—something that the Daily Worker is forced to take note of and bemoan in its editorial. In fact, the resolution does not say exactly what policy should be followed in the present grave crisis, except that such policy should not be dictated by the interests of American big-business in the Far East. But this provision is really decisive; it just blasts the whole Stalinist case into smithereens. For what is the "collective-security" idea but the cover for a "strong," that is, aggressive, policy in the Far East in defense of the investments, the financial and commercial privileges of American big-business groups in China? As Secretary Hull puts it, there are "certain rights and certain interests" that must be defended. But why go to Secretary Hull; the testimony of the Stalinists themselves is enough. Not so long ago the Stalinist New Masses made a direct appeal to big-business men to see the advantages of an aggressive Far Eastern policy from the viewpoint of their own interests as capitalists: "It is good business for the

United States to keep China's vast but undeveloped resources out of Japanese control, despite the short-sighted attitude, from the viewpoint of their own self-interest, of some big-business men in this country."

In one form or another, this appeal has been repeated a dozen times since. What is being urged here: a foreign policy expressing the "whole-hearted desire of the American people for . . . peace" or one directed towards "protecting the vested or property interests . . . of large corporations in this country"? The answer is obvious. There cannot be any doubt that the Stalinist war-mongering under the guise of "collective security" is diametrically opposed to the fundamental idea of the United Mine Workers resolution on war.

After this, it is hardly necessary to expose the petty trick perpetrated by the Daily Worker in connection with the names of some prominent union leaders. Martin, Frankenstein, Thomas, Reuther and others are quoted as hearty in favor of the U.M.W.A. convention decision and the impression is created that this is somehow equivalent to a repudiation of the resolution previously adopted by their own union. But here there is manifest fraud. There is no conflict between the two resolutions and there is no reason in the world why any one who supports one should not be able to support the other as well.

The fact of the matter is that, between the United Mine Workers declaration on war and that of the United Automobile Workers and the S.W.O.C., there is no contradiction at all. In direction and line, they are fundamentally the same; the only difference is that the former does not go as far as the latter nor is it as clear in its conception and formulation. For the labor movement of this country, the U.A.W.-S.W.O.C. resolution still remains the best and most reliable guide in the present difficult situa-

WORKERS AGE

Organ of the National Council, Independent Communist Labor League, 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Publishers. Subscription Rates: \$1.00 per year; \$60 for six months; 5c a copy. Foreign Rates: \$2.00; Canada \$1.50 per year.

Entered as second class matter Nov. 5, 1934, at the Post Office New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879. Phone: BRyant 9-0127

Vol. 7. February 12, 1938 No. 7.

THE U.A.W. TO THE FORE

WHEN Homer Martin, Richard T. Frankenstein, William Munger and W. Jett Lauck proposed a program of immediate relief and long-range industrial reform in their interview with President Roosevelt last week, they spoke not merely for the hundreds of thousands of automobile workers in the union of which they are officers but for the millions of workers in industry throughout the country as a whole. Their voice was the voice of the most advanced and wide-awake sections of the American labor movement who are rapidly becoming conscious of the far-reaching implications of the present "depression" as a crisis of the whole economic system of capitalism.

What did the U.A.W.'s officers propose in their interview with the President? Of course, in the first place, a program of immediate unemployment relief thru vastly increased public spending, since over 60% of the workers in the automobile industry are jobless at the moment, while the rest are on part-time at best. The special emphasis on W.P.A. appropriations, on the necessity for low-cost public housing and other forms of public works, was certainly in place. Pertinent, also, was the stress laid on the annual-wage question, for auto workers are among the worst sufferers from irregularity of employment with all its consequent evils in the way of earnings and security. In presenting these suggestions to the President, Homer Martin and his colleagues gave articulate form to the most pressing needs of the workers and showed that their union can be relied upon to champion the interests of the jobless masses in the present emergency.

But the union leaders went much further than that. They called attention to the fact that, as the result of finance-capitalist exploitation, the economic system has broken down and that no scheme of industrial reform can possibly bring recovery as long as the profit system and the grip of capitalist private property over industry is allowed to remain intact. They therefore urged legislation for what virtually amounts to the nationalization of the basic industries of the country under a system of high wages, short hours, lower prices and unrestricted expansion of production.

This is not socialism by a long shot. But the keen recognition of the breakdown of the present economic system that it implies, is the beginning of socialist wisdom. For the American labor movement, in the past so thoroughly permeated with the senseless prejudices of capitalism, it represents a tremendous advance.

Just how big the advance really is can be seen by contrasting the attitude of the U.A.W. delegation with the position of President Green of the A. F. of L., on the one hand, and of the Stalinist leaders, on the other. On the very day of the White House interview, Mr. Green delivered himself of one of his usual reactionary homilies on the imperishable virtues of the "American system," which is what he calls the system of capitalist exploitation. "We believe that our recent depression and, more lately, our present recession, does not prove that the American system has failed," he intoned. "The American system has proved . . . its ability to maintain the highest level of mass happiness . . ." and so on and on and on. A man who can speak in this way in the year of grace 1938, with the country in the spasm of a new depression before it has emerged from the old, with ten or eleven million virtually permanently unemployed, with capitalism itself on the dole, as it were, is certainly not the man who can lead labor to a better day.

And the Stalinites? They are "for socialism," of course—and they intend to talk about it some time in the indefinite future. But, for the present, any mention of socialism, or even of such a sweeping plan of nationalization as proposed by President Martin, is the sheerest "leftism." For "extremism" of his sort Browder reserves his keenest sarcasm, such as it is. The C.P. is too "practical," too abjectly subservient to the New Deal administration, to fool around with such dangerous ideas.

The United Automobile Workers has come of

Beard Answers Browder On 'Collective Security'

(In the New Republic of February 2, there is a debate on "collective security" in which Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, champions the cause of the Roosevelt administration and Charles A. Beard, the famous historian, presents the case against the administration policy from his own viewpoint. The following paragraphs on the character of a war waged by the "great democracies" are taken from Dr. Beard's article. It is very significant, indeed, that the professed non-Marxist, Dr. Beard, has to defend the method and conclusions of Marxist realism against the self-styled "Marxist," Earl Browder.

—THE EDITOR.

NOW we come to the business of democratic ideology. Does anyone conversant with British history really believe that the operations of the British government since 1914, let us say, have been controlled by some conception of democracy, as distinguished from British interests in the Mediterranean, Africa and elsewhere? Or the operations of the French government? What did these governments do for democracy in Germany between 1919 and 1933? . . . Mr. Browder makes that civil war (in Spain) the acid test of democracy. All right. Then look at the way in which Congress and the Roosevelt administration violated the Madrid treaty of 1902 and every recognized principle of international law and comity, by putting an embargo on munitions to Spain—while continuing to recognize the Loyalist government. That action gives more insight into the realities of democratic ideology than all the fine words of President Roosevelt on democracy and peace. Still, after what Great Britain and the United States have done to the Loyalist government, Mr. Browder seems to see them collaborating for democracy in Spain. . . .

And, if it comes to another war for democracy against the three offenders, have we any ground for expecting beneficent results in the way of a universal democratic advance? All I ask anyone to consider on this point is the record, especially, the Versailles Treaty, the wars of the Allied and Associated powers on revolutionary Russia in 1917-18, and the state of democracy in Europe twenty years after the close of the triumph of the democratic powers. If any person can see hopes for democracy in another military and naval crusade for democracy, after looking at the fruits of the last crusade, then his mind passeth my understanding. Altho the new war would bring to business that "recovery" so longed for now, it would doubtless be followed by a ruinous collapse; and the probabilities are that we should then have universal fascism rather than universal democracy.

The alternative to fascism would be a communist or socialistic upheaval in the defeated countries at least—let us say Italy, Germany and Japan. And the probabilities are that British, French and American troops would be employed in efforts to put down such uprisings in the defeated countries, as in Russia after 1917. . . .

Finally there is the assumption that politics—democratic theory—can be separated from economics, that a line-up and a fight can be effected on purely ideological lines, and that the consequences of the line-up and fight can be kept on purely ideological lines. To my mind, this conception of human motivation and conduct is so unreal and fanciful as to deserve no consideration. And when the economic interests, passions, rivalries and ambitions of the so-called democratic powers are brought into the picture, the ideological view of the world seems to me utterly fantastic.

By Lambda

WORLD TODAY

The Story Behind The Collapse Of The People's Front in France

London, January 19, 1938.

THE recent cabinet crisis in France is directly attributable to the crisis in which the People's Front finds itself today. The cabinet crisis was deliberately provoked by the Radical-Socialists for the purpose of preventing the Communist Party from becoming part of the government and of increasing its conservative majority by including Flandin and his group in it. What is the reason for this realignment of forces? It is an attempt on the part of the employing class to lay the political basis for a strong anti-labor government in the future. The driving force behind these maneuvers is the big bourgeoisie which is utilizing the incipient economic depression to deal the labor movement a severe blow by wiping out the achievements of June 1936 and by smashing the trade unions. An additional factor that influenced the political scene is the investigation conducted by Dormoy, socialist Minister of the Interior, against the Cagoulauds which was about to reveal the close connections existing between the "200 families" of France and the fascist conspirators, between the military and fascist organizations.

Capital started the ball rolling by refusing to negotiate new wage agreements with the trade unions. It backed up its refusal by a further devaluation of the franc and by a more pronounced flight of capital. While it is true that the fall of the franc was not solely the result of politics, it was primarily a political move. Perhaps more important than the eventual outcome of the cabinet crisis is the course it took and the role that each individual party played in it.

The Radical-Socialists played a dual role to which they are admirably suited, being the traditional tool of the capitalists, and, at the same time, enjoying the support of large sections of the lower middle classes.

The Radical-Socialist leaders—not Chautemps alone, as the crisis proved—deliberately planned the destruction of the People's Front and tried to prevent the C.P. from assuming an official status within the French cabinet, aiming ultimately to replace the People's Front with a "National Front." Outwardly, the Radical-Socialist party organizations continued to pay lip-service to the program and of the People's Front and to the necessity of its perpetuation, in order to retain their petty-bourgeois and proletarian following. But the actions of their leaders served exclusively the interests of the bourgeoisie. The communists were assured by them that there was not the slightest intention of removing the C.P. from the coalition; the socialists were assured of the direct opposite. Thus they succeeded in keeping both in line. The dual role played by the Radical-Socialist party is sufficient proof that the time has come when decisive action on the part of the workers parties could bring about a split in the Radical-Socialist party, uniting its petty-bourgeois membership with the proletariat.

The Socialist Party, also, offered a decided contrast in the attitude of the leaders and of the rank-and-file membership. Leon Blum performed a great service for the French bourgeoisie when he declared his willingness to surround the People's Front with a National Front, as he put it—which, of course, is tantamount to the renunciation of the People's Front in favor of the National Front. And the bourgeoisie was grateful, as testified to by Temps, the leading conservative newspaper:

"Leon Blum gets the credit of showing the way out and removing obstacles by his courage alone." Chautemps is now continuing on the road paved for him by Leon Blum. It would have been less desirable had a Radical-Socialist minister proposed the solution of a National Front. No one could have made this marvelous idea more palatable to the French workers than the leader of the S.P., Leon Blum. At the National Council session of the S.P., however, Leon Blum and Paul Faure, for the first time in many years, found themselves in a minority. The majority was opposed to participation in another Chautemps cabinet without the C.P., and favored a new People's Front government under socialist leadership. Chautemps had asked the socialists to support his government and continue supporting

(Continued on Page 5)

Labor Notes and Facts

THRU Mrs. Elinore M. Herrick, regional director of the National Labor Relations Board, the N.L.R.B. in Washington made known last week a decision which, for the first time, is directed against the activities of an individual serving in an "advisory" capacity to business and industrial corporations in helping them evade the provisions of the Wagner Act. The decision sets a precedent for the whole of American industry and is in line with recent demands in labor circles that the idea of "unfair labor practices" be made to cover such "indirect" interference with the rights of self-organization and collective bargaining as well.

The N.L.R.B. ordered the Hopwood Refining Company of Brooklyn and the Monarch Refining Company of Jersey City to "cease and desist" from using the services of L. L. Balleisen, industrial secretary of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, for "the purpose of evading their obligations under the Wagner Act."

The decision declared that Mr. Balleisen had induced both companies to ask their employees to sign a contract characterized by the board as "in effect an anti-union or 'yellow-dog' contract." This contract, the board declared, was "cleverly disguised as a collective agreement" and was in violation of the Wagner Act.

MINIMUM WAGE LAWS FOR WOMEN

Minimum wage rates for female retail clerks in Utah and the District of Columbia go into effect in February, according to the Department of Labor.

The wage law becomes effective as a result of the decision of the Supreme Court last March upholding the constitutionality of the Washington (State) Minimum Wage Law, which Miss Perkins said "led to a wave of new minimum-wage legislation and the revival of old minimum-wage laws."

Minimum-wage laws for women are in effect in the following twenty-two States: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wisconsin—and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Similar bills are expected to be introduced this year to the State Legislatures of Kentucky, Michigan and Virginia.

SECONDARY BOYCOTT

The recent ruling of the Court of Appeals banning secondary boycotts of merchants who deal with non-union manufacturers, was criticized in an article published jointly by the January Yale Law Review and the International Juridical Association.

The article defends the right of workers to apply secondary boycotts, such as picketing stores to turn away customers and circulating unfair lists, as "the achievement of universal collective-bargaining sanctioned by the Wagner Act and similar state statutes."

At the same time, the author, Jerome R. Hellerstein, holds the term "secondary boycott," which is widely applied in labor cases in New York and other courts, to be "a loose and uncertain label" that should be discarded. It is used by the courts, he says, "indiscriminately to condemn a wide variety of labor activities."

This legal view is based on the theory that the retailer "is an innocent neutral being crushed by a labor dispute to which he is no party," the article declares.

Challenging this theory, the author holds that, "so long as a retailer continues to buy unfair goods or use unfair services, he is necessarily an ally of the unfair employer . . . and a party to the spoils

(concluded next week)

Students Union Becomes A Pro-War Organization

(Continued from Page 3)

fact that the advocates of the pledge can laboriously reinterpret it to mean everything from opposition to militarism to freedom for colonial peoples only testifies to the Talmudic skill of its upholders." Is it any wonder, then, that his speech was followed by a tumult of criticism from the floor which lasted for an extended period of time? Only a year or so ago, this same Joe Lash, in an article "The Meaning of the Oxford Pledge," mimeographed by the A.S.U., wrote: "In the United States, the pledge is taken because the chief danger of war in which this country will be involved seems to be a war with Japan over Chinese markets. Every boost in the war budget is justified in Congress by the so-called 'yellow peril.' American foreign policy is never so aggressive as when Japan commits an imperialist act of expansion into the Asiatic mainland. The present foreign policy of the United States in Asia will inevitably lead to war with Japan. This is the considered and unqualified testimony of Charles Beard and Nathaniel Peffer. It is in the light of this imperialist war danger that the Oxford Pledge is taken."

Who are the Talmudists, we would like to know?

Schuman Spills The Beans

During the heated discussions at the "Peace Commission" and at the concluding plenary session, the Y.C.L.ers tried to make it appear—in order to mislead and confuse the pacifists and liberals—that all those opposed to "collective security" were automatically in favor of an isolation policy. Norman Thomas made it clear, however, in a special symposium on the question, that the Oxford Pledge, far from representing isolationism, is, on the contrary, the symbol of the only effective kind of collective action, namely, the international cooperation of all anti-war forces, the labor movement particularly. In this same symposium, the sham "security" of the Stalinist program was revealed, to the great embarrassment of the Y.C.L., by the honest declaration of Frederick L. Schuman, professor of Political Science at Williams College, who had been invited to speak as an adherent of "collective security." He frankly stated that the road to peace lies only in "defending it by arms."

This bombshell, coupled with the pressure of the anti-war forces, forced the Stalinists to offer hastily "compromises," since it appeared that many sincere pacifists and liberals were not going to swallow in

one gulp the whole Y.C.L. program for war. The final resolution, embodying the "collective security" program, urged "American leadership in naming aggressors, employing embargoes against aggressors and organizing these efforts in international collaboration . . . but these steps would definitely not include military sanctions." The "compromise" consisted in the Stalinists agreeing to drop out of their original proposal the section calling for military sanctions. As Celeste Strack, Stalinist floor leader, significantly pointed out, she was in favor of certain military sanctions but she was willing, for the sake of "unity," to omit this part of the "collective security" program "for the present." So the Y.C.L. openly mobilizes the student movement behind American imperialism, ready for the next war "to defend democracy."

Rotten Compromises

Another "compromise" serves to illustrate the jingoism of the Stalinist program. The demand by the anti-war students that all American armed forces be withdrawn from the Orient was met with the organized opposition of the Y.C.L. machine, which argued that this "would give comfort to Japan." In this connection, "Joe Lash sprang to his feet and declared: 'I am sick and tired of having people stand up and say they are for the workers, the masses of China, and then, when anything is proposed to help China, they are on the other side!'" (quoted in the Daily Worker, January 1, 1938). The final "compromise" consisted of a general statement which asked the withdrawal of the United States troops from foreign soil and waters and carefully avoided mentioning the Far Eastern situation! This is an illustration of demagoguery in its most degenerate form. The voting machine recorded 248 to 111 on this question; the Stalinists marked down another "victory" on their ghastly roll of political crimes.

One final example of Stalinist "Trojan horsemanship": Gil Green, general secretary of the Y.C.L., made an offer to Al Hamilton of the Young People's Socialist League of a "satisfactory" peace resolution if the socialist youth would join the Y.C.L. in expelling the Trotskyites from the A.S.U.! This piece of political corruption was properly rejected by the socialists.

From the foregoing facts, it is obvious that the Y.C.L. stopped at nothing to make the A.S.U. an adjunct to the People's Front policy of the Communist International. In

(Continued on Page 6)

NEW WORKERS' SCHOOL

Spring Term - Beginning Feb. 14th

Offers the following Courses:

1. Since Lenin Died: Current Problems of Soviet Dictatorship WILL HERBERG Mondays—7:15-8:30 P.M. 8 Sessions—Fee \$1.75
2. New Problems of Trade Unionism I. BRILL Mondays—8:30-10:00 P.M. 6 Sessions—Fee \$1.50
3. Communism: What It Is and What It Is Not D. BENJAMIN Tuesdays—7:00 P.M. 8 Sessions—Fee \$1.75
4. Far East and Other Centers of World Conflict JIM CORK Fridays—7:00 to 8:30 P.M. 8 Sessions—Fee \$1.75
5. History in the Making COREY, LOVESTONE, WOLFE Fridays—8:30 P.M. 8 lectures—Fee \$1.75 Single Admission—\$0.25

Registrations Now Open — Catalogue on Request

BOOKS

C.I.O.: INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM IN ACTION, by J. Raymond Walsh. W. W. Norton and Company, New York, 1937.

MR. WALSH'S work offers an easy introduction to the present situation in the labor movement, but hardly more than that. It is marked through by a journalistic superficiality and a failure to grasp, not to say discuss, the deeper issues involved in the emergence and development of the C.I.O. And, without rhyme or reason, into some very queer vagaries entitled the "economics" and "politics" of the C.I.O.

The second chapter, "The Background of A Crisis," is fairly representative. It reads smoothly and easily; it provides a running account of the events that led up to the formation of the C.I.O.; it even contains a few ideas on the subject that have become commonplace in labor circles. But it is all painfully amateurish! Neither the Knights of Labor nor the Molly Maguires nor the A. F. of L. nor the C.I.O. is properly understood in its essential character or the role it played in its time. To say that "the Knights built upon a conviction that the worker's status had been fundamentally and irrevocably changed" is an error that no college student of labor problems would make. But what shall we say of the notion that "the essence of the split between the (trades) unions and the Knights is less a matter of irreconcilability of principle than of clarification"? Or that "intelligent compromise," that threadbare platitude, is the way out of the present crisis?

The four chapters that follow are just journalistic narrative, describing C.I.O. progress in steel, automobiles and miscellaneous fields. Here Mr. Walsh is at his best. Good also is the chapter "The Employer Fights Back." Merely mediocre is the section devoted to C.I.O. tactics. But positively dreadful are the last three chapters on the "economics," the "politics" and the "problems" of the C.I.O.

The chapter on "economics" is merely an irrelevant discussion of some of Professor Slichter's views which, the significant, perhaps, from Mr. Walsh's academic standpoint, are of little interest to the labor movement. It ends with a vision of a stagnating economy, shifting away from the production of the means of production, as the ideal of "strong unionism led by the C.I.O.!"

The chapter on "politics" is thoroughly Popular Frontist. It begins with the thesis that "essentially the New Deal and the C.I.O. are politico-economic twins"; it goes on to urge a "new liberal-labor party" and a "mature and equalitarian relationship between capital and labor"; and it concludes with the pious hope that, as Lewis' "understanding of society grows beyond the confines of the labor movement," he will "move towards conciliation" with the Roosevelt administration and its policies. An author with such ideas can hardly be expected to have the slightest understanding of the fundamental nature of fascism in its relation to the labor movement and Mr. Walsh hasn't, altho he attempts to discuss the subject at some length.

The chapter on "problems" is the emptiest and most amateurish of the lot, precisely because the subject requires some real knowledge of the current labor situation.

Evidently, good intentions, a Harvard instructorship in economics and an honest sympathy for labor are not qualifications enough for a book on the C.I.O.

APEX

FDR Pushes War Plans

The administration is definitely embarked on a "strong" foreign policy in the Far East, heading directly for war, Robert W. Horton declared in a special Washington despatch to the New York World-Telegram last week. The President's request for a record-breaking peace-time navy is regarded as the natural consequence of this aggressive policy, serving as the club in carrying it out.

The present administration course was reached as a result of a series of shifts of policy in the last six months. On September 5, Roosevelt warned Americans to quit China, adding that those remaining did so at their own risk. "The Navy Department was opposed to any such policy and, twenty days after the President had issued his warning, Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, head of the Asiatic fleet, took the unprecedented step of publicly countering the President with a statement that all Americans would be fully protected whether they heeded the warning to leave or not and would be under United States naval protection for the duration of the war." At that time, Washington declined comment but, since then, White House and State Department policy has gradually come into line with the attitude of the Navy Department, giving the impression that Admiral Yarnell's statement was not made without the knowledge and consent of the administration.

In Congress, the Roosevelt policy seems likely to meet with a great deal of questioning and opposition. Senator Johnson (R., Cal.), member of the Foreign Relations Committee, himself a big-navy man, fired the first shot last week by calling attention to the "striking parallel" between the present situation and the days of 1916-1917, just before Woodrow Wilson led this country into the World War. Senator Borah followed a few days later with another vigorous criticism of the present line of foreign policy, indicating also some suspicion of the government's armament program. In the House, a number of Representatives have already made clear their intention of forcing the administration to lay its cards on the table in the course of the discussion of the naval-appropriations bill.

Letter to the Editor On Our Dubinsky Editorial

WE have received the following letter from Samuel Mack, an officer of the New York Dressmakers Joint Board of the I.L.G.W.U.:

I understand that all statements appearing in the Workers Age may be discussed by your readers.

May I, therefore, take exception to your editorial statement that appeared in the January 22, 1938 issue of the Workers Age, "President David Dubinsky and the C.I.O."

You begin your editorial by stating that President Dubinsky was mistaken when he thought that peace was possible thru the recent negotiations in Washington between the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. committees. You further say: "However ready they may have been for strategic reasons to allow Green, Harrison and Woll to negotiate, the real powers of the A. F. of L., headed by Frey, Hutcheson and Wharton, never for a moment wavered in their determination to block any unity that did not mean the capitulation of the C.I.O."

Such statements, it seems to me, can be made by a person who either did not hear or read President Dubinsky's speech in Manhattan Opera House, or by one who wants to misrepresent Mr. Dubinsky's speech, or the writer believes that Mr. Dubinsky is not telling the truth of what really happened in Washington.

Mr. Dubinsky reported that after long negotiations, the A. F. of L. committee finally agreed upon and consented to our main demands which paved the way for possible peace. They agreed to:

1. Industrial organization for the basic industries.
2. That all the C.I.O. unions should stay out of the A. F. of L. until such time when all difficulties of the unions will be ironed out.
3. That the power of the council should be curbed and that a special convention of the A. F. of L. should be called for that purpose.

This was a concession to all and even a little more than the C.I.O. originally demanded. Why, then, was it rejected by Mr. Lewis and the C.I.O. committee? And, upon rejecting it, why did an agitation immediately begin, mostly from the

left, to becloud the issue and throw the entire blame upon the A. F. of L. The cry was: "They want us to betray the smaller unions"—the famous 10-to-22 cry.

And, most amusing of it all: "The A. F. of L. committee has no power to act." What power was there in question? Surely not the power to decide for the various Internationals. Didn't we know this at the beginning? Didn't we know that all the committee can do, is work out "basic principles" for peace? Haven't we read the constitution of the A. F. of L.?

Now, as to Mr. Dubinsky's right to speak. It is my opinion that it was Mr. Dubinsky's duty to bring these out into the open. Much too much is kept under cover and the membership at large does not know what is really going on. Much too little is discussed by our leaders for the sake of our membership. As a result of this, a situation has developed that, in order to find out what is doing in our house, we must read the New York Times or other capitalistic newspapers.

The value of Mr. Dubinsky's speech for the movement of peace, is perhaps not fully appreciated now. It will be so when the hope of the labor movement, peace, will be obtained.

Samuel Mack

We are particularly glad to publish and answer this letter because it raises, we think, questions that are basic to the problem of peace in the labor movement.

In the first place, we want to make it perfectly clear that we have never challenged President Dubinsky's right to speak. On the contrary, we believe that it was his obvious duty to present his views on so vital a subject to the leading officers of his union. Nor do we doubt for a moment that his address has value; it is always of value to speak out frankly and honestly, for only thru free and unhampered discussion in its ranks can labor hope to find the way to its goal thru all the confusion and difficulties of the present situation.

There are other matters on which we agree with President Dubinsky and we have said so. We agree with his denunciation of the sinister role played by the Stalinites in the C.I.O. We agree with his warning as to the disastrous consequences of an unbridled civil war in the ranks of labor. Where we disagree is primarily on the question whether there ever was any possibility of sound unity emerging from the recent A. F. of L.-C.I.O. negotiations at Washington and whether these prospects were blasted by the allegedly "irreconcilable attitude" of the C.I.O. leaders. It is certainly not a question of doubting President Dubinsky's word as to the facts, something which never entered our mind for a moment. It is a question of seeing things in a different light, of drawing different conclusions from the same set of facts.

This, the central issue of President Dubinsky's address and of our correspondent's letter, we will discuss at some length in the next issue of our paper.

Fourteen of the new N.E.C. are known members, while a number are followers of the "party line." Furthermore, the new administrative Committee is made up of 6 Stalinists, 1 Socialist, and 1 independent! This is the committee which makes decisions between meetings of the N.E.C. The facts speak for themselves. . . .

SUBSCRIBE NOW TO WORKERS AGE

Trade Union Notes

By Observer

A MIDST what amounted to a demonstration against the Communist Party, the United Mine Workers convention at Washington readopted the provision of its constitution barring from the miners union members of the "National Chamber of Commerce or the Ku Klux Klan or the Communist Party" among other forbidden organizations.

This prohibitory clause is an old one but it does not improve with age. No one will suspect us of having a particularly

soft spot in our heart for the Stalinites; in fact, we regard them as the most pernicious element in the labor movement today. Yet we believe that the U.M.W.A. ban is, at the very least, improper and ill-advised, for to close the doors of a union to groups of workers merely because of their political views or affiliations appears to us altogether out of line with the best interests and traditions of the trade-union movement of this country.

The essential strength of the labor movement lies in its all-embracing solidarity. If members of a union act in a way that is prejudicial to the welfare of the organization, let them be punished for it without political fear or favor. It is up to the union membership, furthermore, to decide for themselves which program they want to support and whom they want to entrust with union leadership. But to draw a line of discrimination on the basis of mere political belief or affiliation is at once an invasion of the democratic rights of the membership and a practice gravely detrimental to the unity and fighting power of the organization. The "Red" line of political discrimination is not much better, in principle or in fact, than the color line of racial discrimination. It is certainly unworthy of the leading union in the C.I.O., of the great organization to which many hundreds of thousands of workers, outside the coal industry as well as in it, look for inspiration and guidance.

Nor does it seem proper to throw the Communist Party, the Ku Klux Klan and the National Chamber of Commerce all in one pot. However unsavory may be the record of the C.P. in the labor movement it certainly is not to be classed with an outright employing-class organization, such as the National Chamber of Commerce, or with a semi-fascist outfit, such as the Ku Klux Klan.

It is no consolation that, after all, this discriminatory clause is not being enforced and is not likely to be as things stand. It is the principle of the thing that counts and the example it sets to other unions, and here the damage is done whether there is enforcement in the U.M.W.A. at the moment or not.

The miners convention, it seems to us, would have done much better had it taken advantage of the opportunity of revising the constitution to strike out the anti-communist clause altogether.

In this whole unfortunate affair, the attitude of the Stalinites themselves is positively nauseating. These people, who let out violent screams of indignant protest against "Red-baiting" when Dubinsky or Stolberg calls attention to their sinister intrigues, are as meek as a lamb when they are ignominiously barred from membership by name and coupled with the Ku Klux Klan and the National Chamber of Commerce! They even try to apologize for it! What a degrading spectacle of self-abasement, of crawling, abject servility! Where there is such an utter lack of decency and self-respect on their own part, how is it pos-

sible for them to win the respect of others? * * *

THE TRUTH CAN'T HURT

Tom Girdler tries to "justify" his ruthless hostility to organized labor by pointing to the charges of David Dubinsky and Benjamin Stolberg as to the "insidious communistic influences in the C.I.O." Of course, neither Stolberg nor Dubinsky ever said anything remotely resembling Girdler's version. The former proved that a certain section of the C.I.O. is "sick" because of Stalinist factional machinations; the latter emphasized that the practise of the Stalinites in pretending to speak "authoritatively" for the C.I.O. is doing untold damage to the industrial-union movement. But still there may be some who will reproach Dubinsky and Stolberg and say: "See, you shouldn't have said anything—Tom Girdler is making use of your words."

The truth of the matter, however, is that Tom Girdler is making use not of the words of Dubinsky or Stolberg but of the deeds of the Stalinites, who have managed to get a foot-hold in certain sections of the C.I.O. and are using it for their own factional advantage and the great detriment of the labor movement. Dubinsky and Stolberg are doing a public service in calling emphatic attention to this unhealthy situation so that it can most speedily be cured. Nothing is ever gained by suppressing the truth, except aid and comfort to those who thrive in chaos and darkness.

Last November, Louis Adamic pointed out in the Forum that the Stalinites were "hollow, pretentious stooges... for Tom Girdler." Now Tom Girdler himself is proving it. . . .

Literature

CIVIL WAR IN SPAIN

by Bertram D. Wolfe

25c per copy

PORTRAIT OF AMERICA

by Diego Rivera and Bertram D. Wolfe

Published at \$3.75
Our Price \$1.50

Special Offer

One year of Workers Age and a copy of Portrait of America \$2.00

131 West 33rd Street
New York City

In Coming Issues

BLAZING NEW TRAILS
by Jay Lovestone

BOURGEOIS DEFEATISM
IN THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR
from La Batalla

LABOR AND THE PRESIDENTIAL CRISIS
Homer Martin's Address at the Economic Conference

WAR AND REVOLUTION
(Some Lessons from History)
by J. Braun

REARMAMENT MEANS REACTION
by M. S. Mautner

BRITISH POLICY IN THE FAR EAST
by Jim Cork

THE PROBLEM OF MONOPOLY
By Lyman Fraser

STUDENTS UNION IS PRO-WAR BODY

(Continued from Page 5)

the special commissions which dealt with Political Action, Trade Unionism, Education, the Negro Problem, etc., the Stalinist machine again worked in systematic steamroller fashion. Most of the chairmen of these commissions were either Y.C.L.ers or followers of the "party line," whose function it was to see that only "desirable" resolutions were passed. Consequently, every of the resolutions that emerged from the commissions did so with the official approval of the C.P. This is significant because it puts the lie to the fervid insistence of the Stalinites that the convention was unimpeachably "democratic."

Such Stalinist "democracy" was adequately demonstrated in the Commission on Political Action. After having successfully hammered thru a nebulous concept of "labor parties" wholly in tune with the People's Front policy as applied in the United States by favoring a national coalition of "progressive forces on the political field," they went on to secure their grip by empowering the N.E.C. to determine which political groups the local A.S.U. chapters might affiliate with! It is significant that the newly elected N.E.C. is almost completely controlled by the Y.C.L.