

# Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. 7. No. 9.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1938

5 Cents a Copy

## Eden Resigns From Cabinet

### Quits In Protest Against Chamberlain's Extreme Pro-Fascist Policy

After a British cabinet crisis lasting several weeks, Anthony Eden resigned as Foreign Secretary last Sunday. With him resigned also Lord Cranborne, his associate in the Foreign Office.

Eden's resignation came as the conclusion of a sharp conflict over the attitude of the British government towards the fascist powers. Prime Minister Chamberlain, with a majority of the cabinet, advocated a policy of immediate "conciliation" towards Italy and Germany, coupled with a readiness to make substantial "concessions" to them. Among these would be the recognition of Italy's conquest of Ethiopia and the granting of belligerent rights to the Franco regime in Spain. What would be offered to Germany was not made clear but it was understood to include a free hand in Czechoslovakia and Austria and a more receptive attitude on the colonial question. While not differing as to fundamental objective or even substantially as to the concessions to be made to the fascist powers, Foreign Secretary Eden urged a more circumspect course, measuring how far Britain should go by the "reasonableness" of Germany and Italy.

## WAR BRINGS FASCISM

**I**F America becomes embroiled in war, it is safe to prophesy that the slogan will be to fight fascism. It is far superior to the democracy slogan of the last war. . . . While advocating this slogan, whatever administration happens to be in power at the time, it will be bound to put into operation the War Department's Industrial Mobilization Plan, which will set up one of the most colossal and audacious fascist plans yet tried."—Rose M. Stein: M-Day.

He also opposed the virtual scrapping of the League of Nations, implicit in Chamberlain's policy. With Eden were two other members of the cabinet.

Eden's resignation means that the Chamberlain policy will now be pushed with ever greater energy. It is believed that Lord Halifax, who recently acted as unofficial emissary to Hitler, will step into the Foreign Office.

The first fruits of the Chamberlain policy—which is but the traditional British foreign policy of the last few years, publicly avowed and vigorously executed—was the abandonment of Austria to Nazi Germany. Last week's sweeping changes in the Austrian cabinet,

## LAFOLLETTE, MARTIN AT MARCH 6 MEETING

### "Keep America Out Of War" Movement Grows

Over two hundred outstanding leaders in labor, political, civic, religious and cultural fields were announced last week as sponsors of the rapidly growing "Keep America Out of War" movement. Thru the cooperation of many organizations and prominent individuals, a nation-wide series of anti-war meetings are to be held March 6th. The New York meeting takes place at the Hippodrome, 6th Avenue and 43rd Street at 2:30 P. M. General admission is free, with reserved section tickets selling at 25c, 50c and \$1.

An impressive and representative series of speakers will address the mass rally on March 6th, with Homer Martin, president of the United Automobile Workers and Senator Robert M. LaFollette leading off. Norman Thomas of the Socialist Party, Bertram D. Wolfe of the Independent Communist Labor League, John T. Flynn, noted economist, Major-General Rivers, Oswald Garrison Villard and Ernest Meyers, are also scheduled to speak.

The appeal of the joint commit-

tee calls upon all to attend the mass-meeting and urges the following minimum program to "Keep America Out Of War":

1. The immediate removal of American ships and Marines from Chinese territory and evacuation of American nationals who, if they stay, stay at their own risk.

2. No increase in the army and navy.

3. The amendment of the Constitution, along the lines of the original Ludlow Amendment, so as to give to American citizens the democratic right to vote on a declaration of war.

4. Abandonment of all existing plans for industrial mobilization, and defeat of new plans for universal conscription, thus warning our militarists that the American people will not tolerate war abroad and war dictatorship at home.

5. American cooperation for international peace—but no alliance with any nation or group of nations for war, declared or undeclared, under any name or any pretext.

6. Concentration on the struggle against injustice, unemployment, bad housing and poverty at home, and a determination to seek our prosperity thru that struggle rather than in war trade.

whereby Nazis took over the key posts of police, justice and foreign affairs and Hitler became the virtual overlord of that country, were made possible only by British compliance, as the London newspapers frankly declared. Now Czechoslovakia is next on the list. The British press has already announced that Czechoslovakia has been "advised" to "yield" to Hitler's demands.

Thus, Tory Britain stands forth clearly as what it has been ever since the rise of fascism—the chief financial and diplomatic bulwark of fascist dictatorship in Europe! Great Britain, the "great democracy" upon which we are urged to rely for "collective security" against fascist aggression!

impossible those evils whose existence in past wars is well known. It is also conceivable that the outcome of a war so conducted might be defeat. In all plans for preparedness and policies to be pursued in event of war, it must never be overlooked that, while efficiency in war is desirable, effectiveness is mandatory."

The above-mentioned "justice" is incorporated in the Sheppard-Hill Bill, which, with the blessings of the War Department, provides a 95% tax on war profits. Certainly, business won't like such a tax even tho it means only the nuisance of some fraudulent bookkeeping. And, if business doesn't like it, it can demonstrate its discontent, as Du Pont and Bethlehem Steel did in 1917, by boycotting the army and navy until their terms were met. So the magic word "effectiveness" is conjured with; the military men get what they want—munitions—and business gets what it wants—bloated profits.

But, if the generals can't boss business, there is labor! What are the techniques for that?

### The Technique Of "Deferment"

Probably the simplest one was that used by France, Germany and England in the World War.

(Continued on Page 3)

## All-American Pact Planned

### U.S. Military Treaty With Latin-American States Unofficially Bared

A plan for a military and naval alliance between the United States of America and all Latin-American states is being considered by the State Department, unofficial reports from Washington indicated last week. Formally, the proposal is supposed to have originated with certain Latin-American governments, whose identity is unknown; in actual fact, however, its source is understood to be the American State Department itself. In what form the project will be officially raised, whether as coming for Washington or elsewhere, is not yet clear.

An "inter-American" military and naval alliance is an important part of American imperialist war strategy. It is aimed, in the first place, at meeting the challenge of "foreign" influences in certain Latin-American countries, such as Brazil, constituting a potential threat to American hegemony. In the second place, such a pact will serve to keep the "home front" protected, so to speak, while American imperialism extends its war-like operations in the Far East under

(Continued on Page 6)

## "Home Front" In War

by D. S.

**T**HE world has ceased asking "Will there be another war?" and has substituted the question "When will the next war come?"—sometimes almost hopefully as tho anxious to end the hell of waiting and fearing.

The task of fighting against war is of prime importance. But, close on its heels, treads another vital problem: when war comes, what will happen to labor and what must the organized workers do about it? It is from this angle that labor should study the various plans of the war and navy departments and the implementing bills introduced from time to time in Congress.

**The Industrial Mobilization Plan**  
Basic to all war plans for the "home front," is the Industrial Mobilization Plan, a joint product of army and navy, revised from time to time but remaining in essentials the same. A good deal of this Plan has been incorporated in the Sheppard-Hill Bill, generally and erroneously called the "war-profits bill," a hardy Congressional perennial.

By and large, it is not vitally important whether these and similar bills are passed or defeated in coming sessions of Congress since we can be very certain that, with a declaration of war, all the significant features of the army-navy scheme will be either railroaded thru a patriotic legislature or quietly palmed off by executive order. Military men had, in fact, kept the Industrial Mobilization Plan under wraps until the Nye munitions investigation disclosed it. They much prefer not to have it discussed until a war hysteria makes all intelligent discussion impossible.

It is rather over-simplification to

tag the label "fascist" on the Industrial Plan. Any outline for the economy of a nation at war is necessarily a composite of theoretical efficiency and practical exigencies, of lessons learned from past wars and other nations, of the nature, the technique and the duration of the conflict. (It is interesting, for example, to remember that, during the World War, the industries of America were utilized under an imitation of the German mobilization plan rather than any Allied scheme.) And it is apparent that a naval war (fought, say, on the "purely defensive" line down the middle of the Pacific as suggested by Earl Browder) would present very different problems on the home front than a land war with its vastly greater combatant mobilization.

What interests labor is the picture of what sort of a country the Fat Boys of the army and navy are going to create to wage their war. Being only demi-gods, they cannot make it quite in their own image—the slip being that they have to get along with a minimum of friction with capital and, much farther down the line, with labor. The ghastly business of the military man requires the things that business produces—shells and guns, ships and tanks, food and clothing and, finally, coffins and crosses. They get them by the simplest method of capitulation to the demands of business. This philosophy is succinctly expressed in the foreword to the 1936 edition of the Industrial Mobilization Plan, thus: "The objective of any warring nation is victory, immediate and complete. It is conceivable that a war might be conducted with such great regard for individual justice and administrative efficiency as to make

## Another Stalin Turn?

by Will Herberg

**T**HERE is widespread speculation as to the meaning of Stalin's sudden declaration—made in the typical Stalinist manner by indirection in a letter to some obscure youth—that the "final victory of socialism in the sense of complete guarantee against the restoration of bourgeois relations, is possible only on an international scale," that an attack of bourgeois states on the Soviet Union is "inevitable" and that "the serious aid of the international proletariat is the force without which the problem of socialism in one country cannot be solved." Not that there is anything particularly original in these ideas to anyone who is at all familiar with the fundamentals of Marxism, the old discussions in the C.P.S.U. on the question of socialism or the realities of the present situation. But for Stalin to make such statements in the face of the pronouncement of the seventh congress of the Comintern less than three years ago that "the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union is final and irrevocable"; for Stalin to make such statements after years of preaching the gospel of the People's Front and the glorious progressive mission of the "democratic" imperialist powers—this is sensation enough.

### The Root Of The Problem

What does it all mean? Stalin does not make statements without good cause nor does he say anything that is not spoken ex cathedra, in his capacity as the "Great Leader of the Peoples." To anyone who has carefully followed the turns and twists of the Stalinist course in the last few years and has acquired an understanding of its inner mechanism, it can mean only one thing: Stalin is mak-

ing the political preparations for a sharp change of Soviet foreign policy, to be followed inevitably by a similar shift in the line of the Comintern!

In the last period of time, the international position of the Soviet Union has grown worse and worse. In its foreign policy, the U.S.S.R. transformed itself, some years ago, into a mere auxiliary of the "great democracies"—and the Comintern sections, thru the People's Front line, into mere auxiliaries of bourgeois democracy at home. But the "great democracies" didn't seem to appreciate the beauties of "ideological" alignments; they preferred to conduct their diplomacy along the old familiar lines of imperialist power-politics. Thus, the much-heralded Franco-Soviet pact was never implemented and has now become a dead letter. Thus, the whole strategy of the British Foreign Office

(Continued on Page 2)

**Bertram D. Wolfe**

will speak on

**"THE SOVIET PURGE"**

**Friday, Feb. 25**

8:30 P. M.

**NEW WORKERS SCHOOL**  
131 West 33rd St.  
7th Floor

Admission 25c

# Viewed from the Left

By Politicus

## Old Deal Ways for New Deal Wars

HOW does a progressive, democratic administration, pledged to a New Deal for the American people, avowedly fighting to raise their living standards and aid the labor movement, championing peace and trumpeting its hatred of war, prepare to wage a reactionary war in the interests of its real master, finance-capital? It does so thru the preparation of oppressive legislation, designed to cripple the free and independent organizations of labor, to obliterate all traces of civil liberties and democratic rights, to prevent wages from keeping pace with the customary companion of war, inflated prices, to impose unbearable tax burdens upon the lower-income sections of the population in order to help finance the war. It prepares the ground for this military-fascist regime under the slogan: "Take the profits out of war!"

Two bills, sponsored by the Roosevelt administration, are now before Congress, the Sheppard-Hill bill and the Connally bill, contrived to carry out the plans outlined above. They are, be it noted, separate and apart from the Industrial Mobilization Plan of the War Department, discussed in Bertram D. Wolfe's series appearing elsewhere in this paper. It really matters little to our war-mongering government whether these bills are passed now as legislation "approved by the duly elected representatives of the people," except for the significant formal victory it gives to the jingo-imperialists, or whether the same effect is gained by Presidential decree under the Industrial Mobilization Plan, in the hysteria accompanying the declaration of war. What is most important, perhaps, is the openness of this "democratic" preparation for fascism and war, the utter unconcern with which the ruling employing class and its government ignore the desire for peace on the part of the masses of the people.

The Sheppard-Hill bill gives powers to the President to fix prices and wages, to "control" industrial organizations (i.e., fascize the unions) and to decide what is a "reasonable profit," already determined to be much higher than peace-time rates. This bill has been endorsed by the American Legion, among others, and is based upon the extensive testimony of Barney Baruch, chairman of the War Industries Board from 1917 to 1919. The Connally bill outlines a detailed system of taxation for "taking the profits out of war." At present, income-tax exemptions run from \$1,000 per single person to \$2,500 for married people, with \$500 for each dependent. But in war-time, it is planned that exemptions shall be \$800 per single person, \$1,500 for married persons, with \$250 for each dependent. Tax rates are 6% for incomes up to \$2,000; 9% up to \$3,000; 12% up to \$4,000; 15% up to \$5,000—which should give a pretty fair idea of who is to carry the burdens of the war and out of whose hide the profits are to be taken.

These bills make clear that the administration is preparing to wage a reactionary war by reactionary means; that it has no intentions running counter to the needs of the capitalist class, namely, to make war as profitable as possible for itself.

It is indeed impossible to separate profiteering from war. That is one of the reasons why the employing-class of this country wants a war: to bolster its profits; to get a temporary reprieve from the severity of continued and intensified depressions; to regain, thru the reactionary dictatorship to be imposed in war-time, that ground which it has lost to a free trade-union movement.

And the New Deal administration is the instrument thru which capital is quite content to operate for these reactionary ends, in re-

## Another Stalin Turn?

(Continued from Page 1)

has been to bolster up the fascist regimes as a bulwark against revolution, while, at the same time, striving to prevent their expansion in directions unwelcome to Empire interests. Today, both Britain and France are busily engaged in embracing a four-power pact to embrace the two "great democracies" together with Italy and Germany, excluding the U.S.S.R. and thereby hostile to it. As the net result of its new diplomatic course, the Soviet Union now stands virtually isolated, its foreign policy utterly discredited.

Some months ago, in a dispatch dated December 1, 1937, and published in the Workers' Age of January 8, 1938, our European correspondent, Lambda, stated:

"Soviet diplomacy, based as it has been on winning over the 'democratic' nations is completely bankrupt. It is by no means unlikely that another turn will be made if the situation continues which, in turn, will entail a change of policy in the C.I."

If it means anything at all of real significance, Stalin's "internationalist" declaration represents a forecast of such a shift in foreign policy and Comintern line. It may also, perhaps, be in the nature of a warning or a threat to the "great democracies" that, if they are going to leave him in the lurch, he will unleash the "dogs" of revolution against them. But, in any case, its relation to Soviet foreign policy is direct and immediate.

To what will it all lead? That is impossible to say at the present moment. Last March, Stalin made a somewhat similar pronouncement, altho by no means so "extreme."

# Lenin and "Compromises"

WE have received the following letter from a reader:

Being a subscriber to the Workers' Age, I carefully read the Age's criticisms of the Daily Worker in reference to Roosevelt's policies. However, I have just been reading Lenin's "Left-Wing Communism" and I would like to quote one section in particular: "It is possible to conquer this most powerful enemy (capitalism) only by exerting our efforts to the utmost and by necessarily, thoroughly, carefully, adventageously and skilfully taking advantage of every 'fissure,' however small, in the ranks of our enemies, of every antagonism of interests among the bourgeoisie of the various countries; by taking advantage of every possibility, however small, of gaining an ally among the masses, even tho this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable, and conditional" (Page 32, Little Lenin Library).

In my mind, I have been trying to apply this statement to the American scene and have wondered whether or not this would justify the official Communist Party attitude toward Roosevelt. If it will not be taking up too much of your

time, I would appreciate an answer, as I must confess I am not entirely clear.

P.S. I liked the Age's article on housing immensely!

Every quotation from Lenin, or from any other great Marxist "authority," can be understood only in its context, concretely in terms of time, place and circumstance. This applies also, of course, to the quotation brought forward by our correspondent. What did Lenin mean when he spoke of "taking advantage of every 'fissure' in the ranks of our enemies?" Let us turn to the pamphlet, "Left Communism," and see.

Lenin is here arguing against the German Lefts who want "to reject decisively all compromise with other parties, all policy of manoeuvring and compromise." The other parties they are referring to are the right-wing German Social-Democratic Party and the centrist Independent Socialist Party of Germany. As against the Left sectarians, Lenin points out that "the whole history of Bolshevism, both before and after the October revolution, is full of instances of manoeuvring, temporizing and compromising with other parties, bourgeois parties included."

Which other parties? The Mensheviks, the S.R.'s, sections of the bourgeois liberals. Insofar as Lenin here refers to working-class parties, he is urging the policy of the united labor front. Insofar as he refers to revolutionary petty-bourgeois or peasant parties, he is advocating a class alliance of proletariat and peasantry thru a block of their parties—compare the Bolshevik-Left S.R. regime immediately after the October revolution. Insofar as he refers to bourgeois elements, he has in mind the early collaboration between the Russian social-democrats and the so-called "legal Marxists" (Struve, Tugan-Baranovsky, etc.), a left-wing bourgeois liberal tendency, extremely hostile to Czarism.

Lenin then proceeds to the quotation given by our correspondent. Even "after the first socialist revolution of the proletariat," he points out, "the proletariat of that country for a long time remains weaker than the bourgeoisie. . . . It is possible to conquer this most powerful enemy only by . . ." and here the whole quotation follows. What does Lenin have in mind here? He is referring to the policy of the Soviet state in playing off one group of imperialist powers against another in order to save itself—compare Trotsky's proposals to the Allied representatives in December 1917, the Brest-Litovsk negotiations, etc. He is referring also the efforts of the Bolsheviks to win the support of masses of the peasantry, even the kulaks, against intervention and the danger of a landlord-capitalist

harinites? Will that be any safeguard for those who are going to meet the same fate tomorrow on the same "grounds"?—for, in the purge, there is no pause. Why, in his latest letter, Stalin virtually pronounces sentence of death upon those miserable Stalinists unfortunate enough to be caught repeating his own phrases about the "final, irrevocable victory of socialism" after the "Great Leader" happened to change his own mind on the subject! If Stalin's mass slaughter is not a mere act of madness, as it obviously is not, it is an act of outright political reaction brought about by the attempt to perpetuate an outworn and historically obsolete regime in the face of the demands of soviet progress. Stalin's blood-purge is an act of irrevocable political character; it has placed an indelible brand on Stalinism and all its works.

restoration. These tactics, Lenin says, apply "equally to the period before and after the conquest of political power by the proletariat." What does that mean?

It means, in the first place, a united labor front of working-class organizations of differing political tendencies on the basis of a common program against certain definite aspects of capitalist exploitation and oppression. It means an alliance between the working class, on the one hand, and the farmers and lower-middle class elements, on the other, against big business and the governmental regime which is the administrative committee of big business. It means that, if the capitalist class is divided, on such a question as social legislation, for example, it is the business of the working class to take advantage of this "fissure" by intervening, actively and independently, in favor of social legislation and thus, indirectly, perhaps, "aiding" one section of the bourgeoisie against the other.

But, in all such manoeuvring, there are two basic principles to which every proletarian party must hold tight if it is not to go lost: 1. The proletarian party must remain organizationally and politically independent, that is, it must retain its own program and basic aims intact, engaging only in such manoeuvres and making only such blocks and alliances as will advance both program and aims. In other words, the manoeuvring should result in the masses rallying behind the revolutionary socialists and not in the socialists trailing behind bourgeois or petty-bourgeois liberalism.

2. Every alliance or block must be against capitalism in some one of its aspects, no matter how limited, and, directly or by implication, against the governmental regime, against the government, or a demand upon the government, or a protest against the government, but it cannot be support of the bourgeois government and still remain compatible with that uncompromising class struggle that is inseparable from socialism.

These are principles reiterated by Lenin upon more than one occasion. How about the Communist Party attitude towards Roosevelt then? In supporting the Roosevelt administration as such, and not merely some particular piece of legislation, the C.P. supports not an oppositional section of the bourgeoisie against the ruling section—as Lenin collaborated with, but did not support, an oppositional section of the bourgeois liberals against the Czarist autocracy; it is supporting the ruling section of the bourgeoisie against the best interests of the masses. In supporting the Roosevelt administration as such, the C.P. is not winning masses of the people for its own socialist program; its own socialist program is ignored and forgotten, even by itself. By such support, it is actually falling in line behind the thoroughly bourgeois and increasingly reactionary policies of the administration, particularly in foreign policy and rearmament. In other words, it is not the C.P. which is "skilfully taking advantage of every 'fissure,' however small, in the ranks of our enemies"; actually, it is our enemies, the bourgeoisie, who are "skilfully taking advantage" of the big "fissure" in our ranks created by the C.P. abandoning the class struggle and coming out for the program of New Deal "liberalism."

Of course, the C.P. has its own calculation in the affair: it is simply acting on instructions of the Stalin clique, which, in turn, is simply extending and translating some of its own suicidal foreign policy. But, objectively, the net result is the same.

# Labor's Strategy In "Mixed" Wars

By BERTRAM D. WOLFE

(This is the fifth of a series of articles based on the report on "Problems in the Struggle Against War" delivered by Bertram D. Wolfe at the recent plenary session of the National Council of the I.C.L.L. Another article will appear in the next issue.—The Editor.)

TURN now to the "mixed war" question. I want to say that the question of "mixed" wars is not nearly as complicated as it sounds. Further, that it is not a burning question for us. It is a burning question in France, because there happens to be an alliance at present between the ruling class and the Soviet Union. Yet, it has some implications for us, besides merely theoretical ones.

The United States and Japan are rival imperialist powers. They have deep-going antagonisms. Between the Soviet Union and Japan, there is a deeper antagonism. Therefore, we are asked to believe that the United States is no longer an imperialist power. That is the Browderian logic. What it forgets is that the antagonisms between the United States and the Soviet Union are far deeper in the long run than those between the United States and Japan, and that the United States would gladly join with the Japanese ruling class to crush a proletarian revolution in Japan or in the U.S.A. or in China or to crush, if possible, the Soviet Union itself.

Nevertheless, for the moment, the international situation is such that the United States has three naval officers in Vladivostok conferring there with naval officers of the Soviet Union and the United States has secretly ordered a good part of its fleet to Honolulu and other sections to Australia and Singapore. So there are certain implications for us which make it necessary to examine, however briefly, the question of "mixed" war.

Even France is likely to renounce its alliance with the Soviet Union long before war comes or at the moment that war is declared. If you have any doubts, look at how the French People's Front government renounced its alliance with the People's Front government of Spain the moment that Spain got into difficulties with Italy and Germany. Moreover, the Franco-Soviet Pact is strained to the breaking point today. Yet, suppose it does not actually break before war begins. Then we can say with absolute certitude that France will surely betray that alliance during the war. It, too, as the war develops, would gladly join the German ruling class against the Soviet Union.

The confusion on this question, I think, comes largely from the use of an old time formula, the formula of revolutionary defeatism. The word defeatism is too simple a slogan for a "mixed" war. Rather than stress the defeat of its own bourgeoisie in the war, the proletariat in such a hypothetical situation should stress the overthrow of its own bourgeoisie for the purpose of developing a trustworthy alliance with the Russian proletariat for the victory of the proletarian revolution in France and for the victory of the proletarian revolution in Germany. I think if we stop using the word "defeatism" in this connection, the confusion will be dissipate.

I think that the question of "mixed" wars can be made theoretically simple in the following terms: 1. Imperialist powers follow imperialist politics in war as in peace.

2. When an imperialist power joins a proletarian power, it does not thereby become non-imperialist or progressive or revolutionary or proletarian.

3. Any more than a proletarian power becomes reactionary and imperialist or counter-revolutionary in such an alliance.

4. The action of the Stalin government on Spain is actually carrying out the one side of the error of which the Communist Party in the United States is carrying out the other side. That is to say, Stalinism in Spain, both thru the agency of the G.P.U. and the agency of the Spanish Communist Party, is actually attempting to live up to the conception that a proletarian government entering an alliance with imperialist powers must engage in counter-revolutionary activity. Whereas the other side, the logic of the French C.P., is that, once a proletarian government enters into an alliance with the ruling class of a country, then the working class of that country must enter into an alliance with that ruling class.

### The LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment

The third question is the question of the LaFollette-Ludlow amendment. Now, the LaFollette-Ludlow amendment has serious weaknesses and it is our duty to point out the weaknesses and shortcomings of any measure of capitalist democracy. Hence we must

# SCAPEGOATS IN SPAIN

The Communist Party of Spain recently expelled one of its leading members. Astigarrabias from the party on the following grounds:

"He endorsed the reactionary and defeatist policy of Aguirre in the Basque government. The big companies continue to be exploited by the capitalists. He failed to oppose the open support of the government to the capitalists. He prevented the Party in Euzkady (the Basque region) from reacting and, politically, he prevented the organization of the stiff defense of Bilbao and the Basque region."

Need we recall that, before the fall of Bilbao, the policy and activities of the Basque government were enthusiastically applauded by the Stalinist press of the world and that Astigarrabias was hailed as a hero while he was committing those crimes for which he is now expelled? Need we recall that those who, at that time, while it was not too late, raised their voice against the conduct of the Basque government as "reactionary and defeatist," were branded by the Stalinists in Spain and elsewhere as "Trotskyites" and "agents of Franco" and were jailed or shot if the Stalinists could lay their hands on them? After every disaster, a scapegoat is found but the real criminal remains—Stalinism!

point out the following: 1. That it won't be adopted. The ability of the bourgeoisie to sabotage (Continued on Page 6)

# Rearmament Is No Way Out of Crisis

By HOMER MARTIN

(We publish below in somewhat abridged form, the second part of the address delivered by Homer Martin, president of the United Automobile Workers of America, at the Economics Club of New York on February 2, 1938.—The Editor.)

I HAVE spoken about the necessity for private industry to find some channel to activate itself and invest new capital. This does not mean that anything in which money is invested is productive of social value or is a sound measure of bringing back a revival of business. The standard of living is raised thru the production of commodities which have a use value and which satisfy certain social needs. There are some who believe that, as long as our capital-goods industries are producing, it does not matter much what they are producing. They believe that mere activity of business for its own sake will keep the country prosperous. I do not subscribe to this point of view. For example, I do not think that building battleships and unheard-of expenditures for military purposes are sound methods of financing a business recovery.

The Naval Program And Business I noticed an article in Barron's Financial Weekly for January 24, with the following headline: "NAVAL PROGRAM PROMISES

BUSINESS. FIVE COMPANIES IN LINE TO PROFIT FROM INCREASED WARSHIP EXPENDITURES." To encourage the building of battleships purely for the sake of profit and business activity can lead this country only to economic, political and social bankruptcy. Whether the result is international war or not, if we do not have a war but go on building battleships ad infinitum, which must be junked almost immediately upon completion, we are merely pouring money and wealth into a bottomless pit.

On the other hand, if we produce these battleships for the purpose of international war, we are again inviting ruin for our whole economic system. Let us not forget the twenty-three billion dollars deficit of the United States, arising out of the last "war to end wars." When battleships and excessive armaments are produced, even tho we state that they are only to create jobs or business, we cannot, no matter how much we would like to, divorce ourselves from the political implications of armaments. If we must stimulate business by construction, let us build homes for that vast group, comprising more than one-third of our population, which is ill-housed. If we insist on producing something which has no social value in its own right, it is better to build dams in the wilderness than battleships. Dams in the wilderness do not involve us in wars.

I know that business men are in business to make money. I know that the making of money has in the past, up to about eight years ago, brought with it a more or less steady increase in human activity and increased possibilities for well-being in this country. If the "economic royalists" have come to the end of their rope and are no longer able to achieve that expansion in our standard of living, which has come with the making of money in the past, they have abandoned their way of life and their value to the community. I do not find it a happy thought that business must be subsidized by government deficit and that there are no new industries opening up for the C.I.O. to organize, but I do not believe that the failure of business men to open up those industries is the result of a conspiracy and is done with malice. I do not believe that the development of industry and business and the creation of our relatively advancing civilization depends upon the genius of a mere handful of industrialists and financiers. Nor do I believe that they have the power deliberately to create business recessions such as this one. . . .

Capitalism Now Parasitical The chief excuse for the existence of wealth and power is the creation of new wealth and new enterprise. When wealth and power is no longer able to create new human values, like the automobile or the radio, it becomes a parasite and a burden on society. It ceases to devote itself to the fulfillment of great objectives and becomes involved solely in perpetuating itself as wealth.

In all the success magazines, the implication is that it has been the Midas touch which has kept the country going, but those of you who remember the fable know that it was this same Midas touch which brought death to King Midas. I wonder whether business has not lost its creative touch, its capacity to create new social wealth. It is not the Midas touch any longer, either with or without the usual growing service to humanity. There just doesn't seem to be any Midas touch any more, except when some-

(Continued on Page 6)

# THE "HOME FRONT" IN WAR

## Labor After M-Day

(Continued from Page 1)

Elegantly called "deferment," it meant that every worker was subject to active service and made the front-line trenches a punishment cell—and often an execution chamber—for malcontents who agitated for a decent living at home. This idea is much thought of by Bernard Baruch who says: "The draft of men for industrial employment is not only impossible. It is wholly unnecessary. The work or fight method is a better way. It is compatible with our institutions and far more effective than any chingang or impressment that could be invented."

Military men are not noted for tact but even they have not the brazen nerve to propose such a technique—at least not in peace time. That it would have been used if the World War had lasted longer is most probable; that it will be used in the next war is very possible. But the Industrial Mobilization Plan dishes out a good deal of more soft soap with its regimentation. It speaks vaguely of "questions to be considered"—and I suppose, settled—such as "measures to prevent grievances of employers or employees, whether actual or imaginary, from interfering with war production" and again of the "necessity for the modification of the statutory work-day" and again of the "maintenance of maximum production in all war work and the suspension for the period of the actual emergency and a reasonable adjustment thereafter of restrictive regulations . . . which unreasonably limit production." Also proposed are the abolition of restrictions on women's and children's labor.

What can labor do? Mr. William Green, in a disgraceful speech that has not had the publicity it deserves, offered one solution. In essence, he said that he was against war but that, if there were a war, obviously labor mobilization would be needed but that, ". . . if labor

is to give the best service, then you cannot do the thing that is going to destroy the morale of labor and I cannot conceive of you taking the key men, the men that are needed to supply the army in the field, away from their positions of responsibility and service." Mr. Green is horse-trading—you can, he says, have anybody you want but leave, oh leave me, my dues-paying craft unionists.

Labor Mobilization And Fascism Labor mobilization for war is, in a certain sense, beyond fascism; in other respects, short of it. Control over labor and punishments for militant workers are more stringent than in any dictatorial state. But the control is primarily a military one and the military men are more intent on winning a war than on guaranteeing profits from sweated labor altho, of course, they have no objection to that either. Bluntly, the chains of a military dictatorship may be somewhat lighter than those of a business dictatorship. But not such. . . .

The gravest danger, of course, is the continuance of this thralldom in the post-war period—note that the Industrial Mobilization Plan speaks of "and a reasonable adjustment thereafter"—a continuance into a very genuinely fascist scheme.

What can labor do? Mr. William Green, in a disgraceful speech that has not had the publicity it deserves, offered one solution. In essence, he said that he was against war but that, if there were a war, obviously labor mobilization would be needed but that, ". . . if labor

SUBSCRIBE NOW TO WORKERS AGE

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...

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

AGAIN SECRET DIPLOMACY

THERE is nothing so brazen on the face of the earth as an imperialist government preparing for war and engaged in the mass deception of the people that such preparations imply.

For months now, liberals in Senate and House have been trying to get the administration to make a definite and official statement of its foreign policy.

In spite of all this seeming vigilance, the post-war foreign policy of England has been fundamentally consistent.

There is the gravest suspicion that the United States has reached a definite understanding, amounting to a naval agreement, with Great Britain for concerted action on behalf of their imperialist interests.

The Achilles heel of the British Empire lies in the Far East. To maintain the economic and political equilibrium of the Far East becomes, therefore, a life-and-death question for the British ruling class.

The administration is rushing full speed ahead with its rearmament program. What for? With what end in view? The country would like to know, and so would a large number of Congressmen.

We are not out for "aggression" but we are going to use our navy to "protect our commerce abroad," to obtain "fair treatment" for "our interests" and to "support our national policies."

The administration is asked what it wants its big navy for and it answers: "to support our national policies"—in other words, a blank check, for anything that the administration will decide to do will obviously become a "national policy."

Was there ever a more cynical expression of contemptuous disregard for popular sentiment? Behind the scenes, diplomatic and military preparations are under way for a new world slaughter.

BRITISH POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

By JIM CORK

OF all the criminal frauds generated by the People's Front line of dependence upon the capitalist "democracies," perhaps the grimmest and ghastliest of all is the appeal to England to help emancipate the oppressed Chinese masses.

Aim Of British Foreign Policy

In spite of all this seeming vigilance, the post-war foreign policy of England has been fundamentally consistent.

The Achilles heel of the British Empire lies in the Far East. To maintain the economic and political equilibrium of the Far East becomes, therefore, a life-and-death question for the British ruling class.

Leaving aside India and South China, for the moment, South-Eastern Asia includes British Malaya, French Indo-China, Siam, Dutch East Indies and the Philippine Islands.

There is, for instance, about half a billion of foreign capital invested in Malaya, most of it, of course, British capital.

are a few routine evasions, garnished with the pious phrases at which our sanctimonious Secretary of State is so adept.

entirely in London; its export and import trade still dominated by the British Empire, the Japan has made some uncomfortable inroads in recent years.

Throughout all South-Eastern Asia, Japanese competition has increased alarmingly in recent years, especially in textiles.

On the first rung, therefore, England has her considerable capital investment and trade interests to defend against Japan.

Imperial Communications And Defense

At least as important as the defense of her economic investments in the various parts of South-Eastern Asia, loom the questions of imperial communication and defense.

The road to India, most valuable part of the empire, must be protected by land and by sea. Hence, the importance of South China, the most direct land route to India from the West.

The Labor Party opposed the new constitution, which was only carried by a few hundred votes in the recent referendum.

"Fear was expressed lest a more independent Indo-China would be exposed to Japanese penetration, and it was declared that, 'if and when a government of the Left in France thinks fit to surrender its rights in Asia, British preferential rights on the Indo-China post must be reserved in advance.'"

While fear of possible anti-imperialist politics on the part of the French People's Front government was rather unwarranted, the note struck by Augur for the defense of British imperialist interests is quite apparent.

As for China itself, England's record of treachery here ought to make interesting reading for our trusting People's Frontiers.

By Lambda

WORLD TODAY

Special Correspondent Describes Irish Labor Party's Position

(We devote this week's column to an interesting report on the situation in Ireland by our Irish correspondent, T. Farrell. Another article dealing with Ireland will appear in the next issue.—THE EDITOR.)

Dublin, January 15, 1938.

DURING and after the World War of 1914-18, the struggle for Irish national liberation proved a severe hindrance to the aims and plans of British imperialism.

The announcement made on Thursday, January 13, that de Valera is to visit London and "talk things over" in order to settle the state of "Eire" is one of the final moves in the plan designed to bring in the whole of Ireland behind the war plans of the British National government.

De Valera has carefully prepared the road. For some time now, he has been openly acting in the interests of the British Foreign Office.

As the last general election not only did not give de Valera a majority but saw the emergence of the Irish Labor Party as a strong and growing political force, backed by the trade unions—so that de Valera's majority depends on Labor Party support in the long run—the maneuver is now to precipitate an early general election, either in February or March.

The Labor Party opposed the new constitution, which was only carried by a few hundred votes in the recent referendum.

"Fear was expressed lest a more independent Indo-China would be exposed to Japanese penetration, and it was declared that, 'if and when a government of the Left in France thinks fit to surrender its rights in Asia, British preferential rights on the Indo-China post must be reserved in advance.'"

The Communist Party plays a very small role in the present struggle, bound hand and foot, as it is, by People's Frontism.

BOOKS

U. S. A., by John Dos Passos. Harcourt Brace, New York, 1938. \$3.00.

THE three novels which form the trilogy, "U. S. A.," have already made their individual marks: "42nd Parallel," "1919" and "The Big Money."

What is the story that Dos Passos tells? It is the tale of a Wobly linyotyper with the itch of the frontier burning his heels, who takes it the easy way, down in Mexico City; of a damned good mechanic who, after 1919, stumbles into the Big Money and is swept along by it to his death; of a boy who wrote promising poetry at Harvard, acquired the title of Captain, and became a first-class copywriter and dipsomaniac; of a normally uninteresting man, uninterested in anything save the Big Money, who gets it; of the career of a well-to-do girl drifting from one nothingness to another and, finally, to the nothingness of suicide; of her friend who studies Art, and so becomes a successful interior decorator and in with those in the Big Money, which was what she wanted; of a social worker who gets into the labor movement through the steel strike and ends up denouncing the expelled "exceptionalists"; of a cheap, dumb babe, who becomes a movie queen; of a labor faker; of many who, in the America of the times, are minor and insignificant, such as some anti-war socialists.

It is a tale of the molding of people by inexorable social forces which they aren't even interested in and of which few have so much as heard.

The experimental aspects of his technique become, when one sees the work as a whole, not mere appendages but part and parcel of the central structure.

The triumph of "U. S. A." is primarily that it is a novel, not a textbook on political economy; that it is as huge and fertile as the America of which tells.

Youth Committee Fights Military Preparations

By JOE ELWOOD

LARGE sections of the youth movement are beginning to realize that some proper action must be taken against the new fraud of "collective security."

The Youth Committee for the Oxford Pledge proposes to launch a vigorous and comprehensive fight for peace based on the attitude embodied in the Oxford Pledge.

sense, of individualism and individuality, also he still uses the novel form. The clash between his concept and the fetters of literary heritage result, on the one hand, in his various experiments such as Camera-Eye, News-Reel and interjected biographies of men of the age, and on the other in the impression, held by many, that he is unable really to create characters.

It is a tale of the molding of people by inexorable social forces which they aren't even interested in and of which few have so much as heard.

The experimental aspects of his technique become, when one sees the work as a whole, not mere appendages but part and parcel of the central structure.

The triumph of "U. S. A." is primarily that it is a novel, not a textbook on political economy; that it is as huge and fertile as the America of which tells.

Labor Notes and Facts

85,000 Victims of Progress

THE displacement of 85,000 skilled steel workers from the industry is described by Harold J. Ruttenberg in the February 16 issue of the New Republic.

causing price increases, is obvious on the face of it.

Under the regulation of the Board, every woman who is called to work at all during any given week, will receive a minimum of \$14 in New York City, Westchester and Nassau Counties.

It is expected that this regulation, if approved by Industrial Commissioner Elmer F. Andrews, will cover 20,000 workers in 883 power laundries in the state and 2,000 more in hand-laundries in the New York City area.

territorial integrity of China and abide by the principle of the Open Door.

The last item is, of course, a brazen joker. What the offer amounts to is England and Japan closing the door in everybody else's face and partitioning China between themselves.

Two cases involving the powers of the National Labor Relations Board may be decided by the Supreme Court in the near future.

in face of this situation, in face of the record, the People's Front line of dependence upon the "democratic" imperialist powers for the emancipation of the oppressed colonial masses is the greatest hoax and betrayal ever perpetrated in the history of the struggle of the world's exploited.

There are three State labor-relations acts which expressly permit employee-representation plans in the definition of "labor organizations" entitled to be certified as bargaining agents.

## Trade Union Notes

By Observer

SOME time ago, it was pointed out in the columns of this paper that the split in the labor movement is significant not only in its division on the fundamental question of organizational strategy (industrial unionism) but also in the growing divergence between C.I.O. and A. F. of L. in general policy and attitude to current problems. Since that fateful convention at Atlantic City in 1935, the C.I.O. has gone forward, the A. F. of L. backward; the C.I.O. has advanced to new, more progressive positions, while the A. F. of L. has been retreating from positions it has itself reached in recent years.

How far this has gone can be judged from President William Green's address in Chicago two weeks ago. Mr. Green took up cudgels for business against "government interference," attacked the N.L.R.B. in grand style, and, in general, carried further the attitude that led the Executive Council recently to demand the repeal or modification of the capital-gains and undistributed-profits taxes. In fact, you wouldn't have known it was a labor leader speaking if you hadn't noticed the name; it sounded so very much like one of those ferocious "little business men" at their Washington jamboree.

Naturally, Mr. Green's remarks were hailed by Chicago anti-labor "business leaders" as a "new labor attitude," a "welcome departure," an "expression of sound thoughts," an "example of outstanding leadership" and so on and so on.

What does it mean? It means that control of the Executive Council, not merely organizational but political as well, has fallen into the hands of the ultra-reactionary wing composed of the die-hard craft-union chiefs of the stripe of Hutcheson and Frey, for whom even the New Deal is apparently too much. The advances in social outlook and policy, made by the A. F. of L. in the three or four years before 1935, are being gradually wiped out under a regime where Hutcheson calls the tune and Green dances at his command.

### SOME GOOD SENSE

Two weeks ago we commented on the mistake that, in our opinion, was made by the United Mine Workers convention in constitutionally barring from the organization "members of the Communist Party" along with Ku Klux Klanners and others. We are glad to note that Justice, official paper of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, shares our viewpoint. An editorial in the February 15 issue is devoted to the question, "Who May and Who May Not Be long," and, in the course of this editorial, President Dubinsky is quoted to the following effect:

"A union cannot distinguish between the political philosophies of the workers employed in its trade . . . Communists, as workers, are entitled to membership in a union, as well as people of any other political persuasion. . . . But communists must not be permitted to impose their 'party line' on the unions. . . . It is only . . . when they become destructive, that my quarrel with them begins."

There is sound trade-union sense on a very difficult question!

### PRES. DUBINSKY ON THE C.I.O.

Speaking of the I.L.G.W.U., we are glad to call special attention to the following remarks made by President David Dubinsky of the I.L.G.W.U. at a banquet in honor of Vice-President Katovsky in Cleveland on February 5:

### ATTENTION!

The entire first printing of "CIVIL WAR IN SPAIN" by Bertram D. Wolfe has been sold out.

Will all individuals or groups having extra copies return them at once to the New Workers School Bookshop, 131 West 33rd Street?

"Many people have misinterpreted my recent public statements in connection with the fratricidal struggle in labor's ranks. Many believe that I have attacked the C.I.O. and there are rumors that we are leaving the C.I.O. I want to make our position clear with the greatest emphasis. We will not leave the C.I.O. because we believe that it is today the only road to organization."

### BROUN THE HORNY-HANDED

In his column in the New Republic of February 2, Heywood Broun takes another swipe at Ben Stolberg by describing the latter's recent articles in the Scripps-Howard press as an attempt to "capitalize on the white-collar resentment of C.I.O. success." To say the least, this is a very queer indictment to make against a man who is one of the most effective journalistic champions of the C.I.O., who, in those very articles which Broun dislikes so much, describes the C.I.O. as "the most successful organizing movement of American labor, . . . changing American labor from primitive craft separatism to modern industrial unionism," possessing a program that is "simple, progressive, historically inevitable."

But the charge of "capitalizing white-collar resentment" sounds even queerer when it comes from such a horny-handed son of toil as Heywood Broun. Perhaps the hilarious Frankenstein-Thomas-Munger letter hit the nail right on the head in describing Broun's "mental makeup" as "more or less in keeping with (his) personal appearance." Figure it out for yourself!

## Arming Not Way Out of Crisis

(Continued from Page 3)  
body "touches" the government for more money.

### Labor Must Speak Up

Labor has not been articulate up until the present. Labor has had no voice in the affairs of the national economy. There was a time labor did not know and did not care much about how industry was run. But things have changed. Today organized labor is beginning to learn more about national affairs. It is beginning to inquire into why business cannot run itself, except by running itself into the ground periodically. Labor today asks for representation at the council tables in the interests of millions of those who toil and those who depend on them. There are some who do not welcome the advice and the presence of organized labor. There are some who would do all they can to repress it and drive it under ground. These are the people who are seeking in this depression to strike a blow at labor and undermine its organizations and its standards. We believe this is unwise and self-defeating. Industry must recognize and deal with labor as a conscious factor which cannot be left out of its plans and computations. Labor is seeking to make life more livable for itself and for society and will cooperate to this end if an intelligent program can be clearly outlined.

## How New Republic Lives Up to Its Liberal Creed

ON January 12, Sidney Hook sent the following letter to the New Republic:

In his attack upon Professor John Dewey in the columns of the New Republic (1 - 12 - 38), Heywood Broun not only exceeded the limits of *Narrenfreiheit* but was guilty of irresponsible misstatement of Prof. Dewey's position. Anyone who has examined the context of Professor Dewey's remarks in the Washington Post—which Broun admittedly has not done—will see that they bore upon the implications of the Trotsky Commission Report for America. They were illustrated by a direct reference to the use which the Communist Party and press were making of the Corcoran case in Minneapolis. Professor Dewey did not say that Communist Party members should be barred from the C.I.O. or any other labor union because of their views. He warned against factionalism and against the familiar Moscow tactics of frame-up and slander as deadly to the unity of the labor movement.

In asserting that the Stalinists are striving wholeheartedly for the unity of labor, Heywood Broun shows that it is he who is behind in his homework, not Professor Dewey. Part of the public oath which all members of the Communist Party are required to take is "to drive the Lovestoneites out of the labor movement" and "to drive the Trotskyites out of the labor movement." Since in effect anybody who opposes the Communist Party on important measures is labelled a Trotskyite, this means that every independent-thinking union member or leader is slated for railroad as soon as the Stalinists feel strong enough to get away with it. It requires considerable cheek for Heywood Broun to ask whether Professor Dewey "seriously means to contend that certain workers should be barred from union membership because of their political or economic views." This is precisely the view of the Communist Party as the above cited slogans prove.

Before Heywood Broun undertakes to whitewash the role of the Stalinists in the labor movement, let him explain the following:

1. The attempt of the Daily Worker to smear Minneapolis trade unionists of Drivers Local 544 by practically charging them with complicity in the assassination of Patrick Corcoran, on the ground of their alleged Trotskyist sympathies.

2. The use of phony affidavits by West Coast Stalinists in the C. I. O. to prove that Meyer Lewis, A. F. of L. representative, had hired R. J. Bell to kill Bridges despite the wire sent them by George Cole, regional director of the C. I. O., warning that Bell was "unreliable and no good."

3. The resolution of the Sailors Union of the Pacific condemning the Western Worker and the Communist Party for libelous assertions of gangsterism against its leaders and authorizing legal action against the Western Worker.

4. The resolution of the Central Labor Council of San Francisco condemning the Stalinists for attempted frame-up tactics.

5. The Communist Party campaign against Homer Martin and the "Lovestoneites" in the Auto Workers Union.

These are only some of the more outstanding incidents. I, for one, am in favor of Broun's suggestion that a neutral group of investigators be called together to consider how the Communist Party works for unity in the labor movement. Things have come to such a pass that it is impossible to expose the nefarious tactics of the Communist

Party without Broun, its unofficial trouble-shooter, crying "Red-baiting." If the Stalinists are Red, then Roosevelt is a Trotskyist. If Heywood Broun sees fit to join the hue-and-cry of the Communist Party against Homer Martin, a C. I. O. leader, why is it forbidden to criticize on the basis of authentic evidence the machinations of those Stalinists in the C. I. O. whose first loyalty is to the Communist Party and not to labor?

Sidney Hook

In its issue of February 16, the New Republic printed the first two paragraphs of this letter but omitted the rest, allegedly for reasons of space and relevance. The reader may judge for himself how sound these reasons are.

In the same issue of the New Republic, there is the following note in the section, "From the New Republic Mail Bag":

"Richard T. Frankenstein, assistant president, and R. J. Thomas, vice-president of the United Automobile Workers, with William L. Munger, managing editor of the United Automobile Worker, send us a letter addressed to Heywood Broun. They criticize Mr. Broun's comments about Homer Martin, especially those in his January 26 column in the New Republic, which they regard as 'unprincipled attacks on a tellow trade unionist.'" Just this and nothing more! The

## All-American Pact Planned

(Continued from Page 1)  
the mask of "collective security" in one form or another.

The unofficial announcement that such a naval and military alliance is being contemplated is to be closely connected with the "good-will" flight of six huge U. S. Army bombers, veritable flying fortresses, to South America to take part in the inauguration ceremonies of President Ortiz of Argentina. Such a demonstration of American military power is obviously intended to impress Latin America and the world that United States imperialism is still paramount in the New World.

In essence, an "inter-American" pact would be the military implementing of the Monroe Doctrine under modern conditions.

New Republic, which finds plenty of space editorially and in Broun's column to slander and abuse Homer Martin in the most indecent manner, cannot find space enough to print a letter of reply from the leading officers of the U. A. W.!

The New Republic deserves full credit for its courageous stand on the war question. But, in the way it has handled the letters of Sidney Hook and the U. A. W. leaders, it betrays more than a trace of Stalinized "liberalism": traditional liberal utility without the traditional saving grace of liberalism—tolerance and freedom of expression of opinion.

## Labor and "Mixed" War

(Continued from Page 3)  
age proposed amendments to the Constitution is limitless.

2. Even if it were adopted, it would never be carried out. The ruling class has no respect for its own democratic rules when they hinder its essential objectives.

3. That it implies a referendum and that the usual element of fraud in every election is present there.

Modern wars are not declared; they are started. They are first started, then sometimes declared, and then it is much too late for a referendum on whether we should declare war or not.

But, despite these negative criticisms of the weakness of the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment, there is a more important aspect to the idea than these.

First, the movement for the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment is essentially an anti-war movement and we have to treat it as such.

Secondly, the movement for the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment is a movement for the extension of democracy and we have to treat it as such. We are in favor, in my opinion, of a fight for the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment because it will help to rally the enemies of war, because today it is becoming a sort of dividing line between those opposed to war and those who are for war and who are denouncing it, beginning with Stimson and Landon and ending with Earl Browder. We are in favor of the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment because the fight for it will help to crystallize the anti-war movement. It will help to precipitate a discussion of the war danger. A good fight for it will

leave us with a basis for agitation on the immediate eve of a war. We are in favor of any amendment which gives the workers more say in the government, altho we have no illusions about the total say of the workers in the government. Only those who are merciless critics of the shams of capitalist democracy, can honestly criticize the weaknesses in the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment. All other criticism, whether from Browder, Landon, Roosevelt or Stimson, is mere war-mongering and hostility to democracy in any form.

For that reason, I think it is more important to support the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment than to criticize it. If it were really carried, we would have to develop our criticism further. We ought to state our criticisms even now. But that should not be our central activity on the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment. We must immediately carry a campaign for it into every trade union in this country and use it to expose the war-mongers, the opponents of popular rule, the treason of the Stalinites to the working class, to expose the Stalinist "democracy" which is hostile to the extension of democracy.

And, for once, we have an advantage over the war-mongers with something that is simple and clear and acceptable to the masses in the trade unions. Generally, in recent months, the Stalinites and other war-mongers have built on backwardness and lack of class consciousness. Their recklessly demagogic slogans have had the advantage of sounding plausible to backward workers. This time, we have the inside track, basing ourselves on the sound instincts of the masses. Let the war-mongers fight us on this in the trade unions. Let them oppose the right of those who have to fight the war to decide whether the war should be declared or not. Let them oppose the extension of American democracy. Let them propose the giving of absolute dictatorial power over the lives and fate of the masses to the President. Let them make that fight in the unions and see how far they will get.

### VANGUARD GROUP FORUM

James Rorty. WHAT PRICE MACCHIAVELLIANISM?, a discussion of the policies of Stalinist-liberal journalism.

Sunday, Feb. 27, 8:30 P.M.  
Vanguard Hall, 22 W. 17 St.  
Admission: 15c