

After the Wage Bill

an editorial

AT LAST a wage-hour bill has been passed! Rushed thru both houses after a compromise had been reached in the joint Congressional conference committee, it has now become the law of the land.

But what a bill! What a far cry from the first wage-hour bill introduced last year by Senator Black and Representative Connery!

Where the original bill placed a minimum-wage floor of 40 cents an hour and empowered the administrative board to set even higher rates, the final version, now embodied in law, reduces the minimum to 25 cents and gives the administrator power, without making it absolutely mandatory, to effect an increase up to the maximum of 40 cents within a period of seven years!

Where the original bill placed a ceiling of 40 hours for the work-week and allowed reductions down to 30 hours, the present law starts with a 44-hour maximum and provides for reductions down to 40 hours in three years, subject to numerous exemptions.

Thus, where the original bill would have guaranteed at least \$16 for a full week's work, the law as it stands guarantees only \$11. In general, it can be said that what last year's Black-Connery bill took as a starting point, as something to go beyond, the present wage-hour law takes as a far-off goal, as something to be achieved thru years of effort. This alone should indicate what a come-down there has been!

Nevertheless, the passage of even such a bill is an event of vast significance. The new wage-hour law will not, despite all ballyhoo, "restore prosperity" or reduce unemployment nor will it bring the possibility of a tolerable existence to more than a small fraction of those who lack it today. But, in spite of everything, it establishes the principle of wage-hour regulation as a legitimate function of the federal government. This is a big step forward and one that offers great possibilities for the future if labor proves capable of using its organized power effectively.

But we must not forget that even the principle of wage-hour legislation is not yet completely safe. No doubt there will be an appeal to the Supreme Court very soon. We must not relax our vigilance or let up on our pressure until this hurdle is safely cleared.

Labor must immediately begin a drive to get the next session of Congress to raise the shamefully low wage and hour standards in the present act to decent levels. Our slogan must be a 40-40 basis to start with and a minimum wage of \$16 a week should hours be further reduced.

The new law opens the way for all sorts of exemptions and "modifications," even disguised geographical differentials. Labor will have to be constantly on guard lest even the weak, uncertain protection of the new law be completely nullified in some such manner. Rigid enforcement is the very heart of wage-hour legislation.

The big job is only just beginning!

Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. 7, No. 26.

NEW YORK, N. Y. SATURDAY, JUNE 25, 1938.

5c a Copy

Kill Walsh Bill Change

Congress Defies Demand For Labor Rights On Government Work

Speaker Bankhead and other Democratic leaders succeeded last week in blocking a last-minute effort of organized labor to obtain a House vote on the bill to prevent government contracts being granted to concerns violating the Wagner Act. The bill, an amendment to the Walsh-Healy Act, was held up by the House Rules Committee, which refused to report it out and allow it to come to a vote in the House. John L. Lewis, chairman of the C.I.O., urged that the House rules be suspended in order to permit consideration of the measure but Speaker Bankhead declared that he would refuse to recognize any Representative seeking the floor for such a purpose. Bankhead's statement was made after conferring with Democratic Majority Leader Rayburn.

The proposed amendment to the Walsh-Healy Act would have prohibited all agencies of the federal government from placing orders or contracts with firms refusing to abide by the Wagner Act, according to a list drawn up by the Labor Department.

Stalinists in New Drive to Split Auto Workers Union

Closed Shop Pact In Aircraft Drive

The big drive of the United Automobile Workers to organize the aircraft industry was marked last week by the signature of a closed-shop agreement with the Brewster Aeronautical Corp. of New York. Accompanied by Frank Tucci, regional director, Homer Martin, the president of the union, concluded the negotiations and signed the contract for Local 365 of the U.A.W.

The contract affects 400 men. It provides wage increases of at least two cents an hour, a 40-hour week and time-and-a-half for overtime, Sunday and holiday work. The corporation is permitted to hire as it pleases but all men who are subject to the jurisdiction of the union are to become union members. Mr. Martin called this a "closed-shop, open-union contract."

Mr. Martin announced that the union planned to organize the entire aircraft industry. "There is no industry in America," he said, "in which the benefits of collective bargaining are needed more than in the aircraft industry."



HOMER MARTIN

The U.A.W. is determined to go right ahead consolidating its tremendous achievements in the auto field and reaching out into the aircraft industry, despite the sabotage and disruption of the Stalinists and their allies. The aircraft campaign will occupy the center of attention of the union leadership in the coming period.

Plans for a "broad revision" of official foreign policy by the next Congress to bring it more in line with the course in foreign affairs actually followed by the Administration in recent months, were laid by Senate Foreign Relations Committee before the adjournment of Congress last week. Senator Pittman, chairman of the committee, hinted that the Neutrality Act, which became law in January 1937, would be the special object of "study" in the light of the "changed world situation" since it was enacted.

Plan Shift in U.S. Policy

The ultimate purpose of this move on the part of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is to give official sanction to the Administration policy of an Anglo-American war alliance in the Far East under cover of the slogan of "collective security" or "quarantine the aggressor." The well-nigh universal opposition of the American people to such a war-breeding policy has hitherto stood in the way of all efforts to give it official recognition. But Administration leaders evidently believe that the opening of the next Congress will be a good time to make another big effort in this direction.

For the anti-war movement, this situation constitutes a challenge to immediate action. The period up

(Continued on Page 4)

Martin Suspends Five in the Crisis

By GEORGE F. MILES
(Our Michigan Correspondent)

Detroit, Mich. HARDLY two weeks have elapsed since the "unity"-caucus representatives in the International Executive Board of the United Automobile Workers spoke sweet words of "peace" and "harmony" but the first moment they believed they had secured a majority of the International Board, they threw caution, union discipline and union loyalty to the winds and promptly embarked upon a course of destructive warfare. "Martin will be surprised," gloated Richard Frankenstein, "to find that his majority has dwindled to a minority." Upon which, together with his Stalinist masters, he attempted a palace revolution by changing the agenda of the I.E.B. in order to make widespread changes in personnel.

Unrestrained War Against Union Frustrated in this attempt which resulted ultimately in the suspension of Frankenstein, Mortimer, Hall, Wells and Addes, the Stalinists and their career-boy allies have entered upon a course of unrestrained war against the union and its leadership. The constitution of the union is being trampled under foot by the opposition. Rump membership meetings and local officers gatherings are being called without regard for the most elementary concepts of union procedure. In addition, the suspended officers of the Board have moved to tie up all union funds, attempting thus to obstruct the normal functioning of the union in meeting the needs of the mass of the membership. Suspended Secretary-Treasurer Addes even tried to take steps to divert all mail from its rightful union destination to his own home. A campaign has been launched against payment of per-capita taxes to the International Union. More than that, the suspended oppositionists have called upon the locals to send dues payments to them!

These steps, notwithstanding the editorial sweet-oil which the Daily Worker continues to pour, spell preparations for a split and its inevitable result—dual unionism. President Dubinsky of the I.L.G. W.U. and United Mine Workers President John L. Lewis have had these tactics practised on their own organizations in the past and, in both cases, the result was the establishment of dual unions dominated by the Communist Party.

The present head-on collision with the union is in strange contrast to the lower-than-the-dust attitude of the Stalinists a little while ago. Naive people were taken in, really believing that the leopard had changed his spots. They scoffed at warnings to the effect

(Continued on Page 2)

Labor Misses Out

Outlook for the State Convention

By THOMAS GREGORY

THE first weeks of the present New York State constitutional convention are strangely reminiscent of the 1915 convention. In 1915, the Secretary of State opened the proceedings with a comparison between Europe and America:

"Theories of government are now being tested on the battlefields of Europe. In the state of New York, we test our theories in open debate, in representative assemblies such as this."

In April 1938, Judge Crane in his opening remarks referred to the "battling dictatorships" of Europe and voiced the prayer that the deliberations and actions of the present convention might prove to the world the workability of "democratic institutions."

In that year, as this year, the promise that the convention should be run on a non-partisan basis was voiced. The failure of any attempt to clothe this promise with even the guise of reality was speedily revealed this year by the distribution of committee chairmanships to Republicans only. That the former convention was not non-partisan is true. That the present one will prove far more partisan is probable. To the extent that political partisanship reflects a clash of interests, its scope and intensity will reflect the reality of that clash. Altho there are no representatives of the American

Labor Party, the Socialist Party or the Communist Party in the convention, the growth of social legislation under the national Democratic administration provides a real basis of difference between the Republican and Democratic programs. This was not true in 1915.

Traditions And Facts

Again, in the opening days of both conventions, a good deal was said of the great American traditions of personal liberty and freedom. One notes that these eulogies were voiced then as now by the very men who have most effectively battled against giving those words meaning for the great mass of American citizens, the farmers and the workers. "Tears for personal liberty," such as those ascribed recently to Walter Lippman, can no longer deceive either friends or foes, altho beautifully rehearsed, if they are found to gush forth at regular intervals between vicious onslaughts against modernizing our state machinery so that it may provide even a minimum of economic security to the workers.

In 1915, as today, the convention was controlled by the Republican party. Then, that party, ably guided by Elihu Root, was apparently supported by a Republican majority which controlled both the legislative and executive branches of the state government. Issues were not as clear as today. The forces

(Continued on Page 2)

Don't Miss the SYMPOSIUM-DINNER, June 23, Hotel Victoria

Viewed from the Left

By Politicus

The Crisis Congress

LAST Fall, this session of Congress was previewed under Roosevelt's five-point emergency legislative program. It seems difficult to remember back to that distant past when the recession was not even an assumption, before the reality of the new depression could make itself felt thru the remains of the 1936 boomlet. After the special emergency session of Congress had accomplished nothing, the regular session began with the White House under the curious impression that the severe economic crisis was but a temporary tail-spin, about which no-thing need be done since it would be over in a few weeks anyhow. Only after quite an alarming number of these weeks had passed did the Administration execute its about-face, limpingly to be sure, and begin its programmatic pre-tensions.

In this period has occurred the sharpest clash between the New Deal and the Democratic party, between Roosevelt's "reform program," and the Congressional Democracy's opposition thereto. The changed character of this struggle is indicated by this year's touchstone compared to last. Roosevelt's test of a New Dealer, 1938 model, is how he voted on the Reorganization Bill. In 1937, the vote on the Supreme Court Bill was what counted. Outside of the startling fact that at no time has the Administration made its loyalty test dependent upon a legislator's attitude towards such measures as the Wagner Labor Relations Act or wage-hour legislation, the shift in political attitude from 1937 to 1938 is here attested by these measures. For these two bills are forks in the road, leading in opposite directions. The court-reform bill was a weak and ineffectual attempt to assure the validity of social legislation. The reorganization bill, on the contrary, sought to "modernize the state," the coercive power of the employing class, by putting new and enlarged powers in the hands of the President, thus approaching the European road to fascism. The reorganization bill is tarred with the same reactionary brush as the Industrial Conscription Bill, which blueprints the military path to fascism in this country.

Yet this bill gave the country the strange spectacle of a reactionary measure raucously opposed by reactionaries, and was the most striking symbol of the new political forces developing in this second depression. For, despite devious detours and indirect relationship, the real division in Congress and in the Democratic party can be traced to the increasing severity of the economic crisis. Out of the first period of crisis came the politics of "reform" and of "pro-laborism," and the beginnings of independent labor politics. Out of the second period of capitalist crisis has come increasing conservatism, a struggle within the employing class as to which road to reaction is best, a struggle related to the rise and fall of war scares.

The basic division over methods of preserving capitalism, which early distinguished the New Deal and anti-New Deal groups, still remains, even tho the plane of antagonism shifts ever further and further to the right. The seriousness of the split, which has extended to the Democratic party itself, finds expression in the primary purges, by which the Roosevelt wing of the party hopes that, for the first time in history, the "progressives" will gain control of the party apparatus, able to decide who shall and who shall not have the party blessings. Thru this method, which has already failed in general, because it has failed in one or two particulars, the "left-wingers" hope to build a new par-

ty capable of passing a bona-fide wage-hour bill without splitting. In politics, of course, the illusion is sometimes as effective as the reality. The reality of Roosevelt's conservatism, of the reaction-inherent in the New Deal program, may not outweigh his popular association with "reform" and this situation might precipitate a party split in which he would carry the banner of progressivism. But such a split, aggravated by the crisis, molded as much by war preparations as by domestic difficulties, would not bring forth a movement which could even approach the 1933 New Deal in progressive tone and which has already given sufficient indication of its increasingly conservative political character.

Labor and the Convention

(Continued from Page 1)

which sought to secure a more progressive framework for our state government did not have the benefit of a Senator Wagner whose achievements in social legislation can no longer be brushed aside as "socialistic theory." Perhaps over-confidence led that convention to deny fuller representation to New York City and issue such a reactionary document that the people saw thru it and rejected it at the polls. Will the Republicans this year, embittered by their political defeats and their animosity against recent social legislation, repeat their errors of 1915?

Alfred E. Smith, one-time governor and one-time advocate of social legislation, has already suggested that the convention get a few important things done, such as the granting of greater home rule for New York City, and then close shop. With the obvious alliance between the Liberty League Democrats and the Republicans, it becomes increasingly unlikely that the convention will adopt constitutional changes to authorize or facilitate important social legislation, such as:

1. Maximum hour and minimum wage legislation for men and women.
2. Adequate public housing legislation with provisions for adequate financing by the state and its political subdivisions.
3. Extension of public control and ownership of public utilities.
4. Establishment of publicly-owned "yardstick" plants in the milk industry.
5. Extension of social insurance to provide minimum standards of security against old age, unemployment, accident and illness, with contributions from the state.

In the field of civil liberties, the danger is not limited to the failure to take any progressive steps. Constitutional amendments have been proposed under which membership in a radical organization would act as a bar to public office! Such suggestions are not unlike the McNaboe bill which was passed by the legislature at its last session but was vetoed by the governor. Such proposals constitute a serious threat to the entire labor movement, even tho the Communist

Stalinism in Auto Union

(Continued from Page 1)

that this "peace offensive" was, if anything, more dangerous since it tended to disarm the progressive unionists and thereby exposed the union to destruction.

Frankenstein's Deal

Thus, too little attention was paid at the time Mr. Frankenstein proposed his ever-so-peaceful "harmony program," to the article appearing in the April 26 issue of the Jewish Forward (widely read among the organized Jewish workers, especially in the garment trades). Captioned "Communist Intrigues Place Automobile Union In Precarious Position," the article goes on to say:

"We have learned thru most authoritative sources and first-hand information that a secret conference has been held in Detroit, between the outstanding leaders of the Communist Party and one of the highest elected officers of the automobile union. The conference was brought about with the aim of splitting the leadership of the union and seizing power and control. They told this leader that they would back him for president of the union and also offered him a political bribe.

"This secret conference," the sto-

Party, by its recent words and actions, may have become a candidate for the McNaboe brotherhood.

The A. F. of L., the C.I.O., and the American Labor Party have all issued programs recommending the adoption of amendments: to insure the right to trial by jury and to prohibit the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes; to provide that the writ of habeas corpus shall never be suspended; and to extend the safeguards of free speech and free press. It has also been urged that a constitutional amendment is needed to prohibit discrimination on the grounds of race, creed or color, since in this state such prohibitions have, up to the present, been limited to the Civil Rights Statute and, therefore, have never become a part of our basic law. Unfortunately, the temper and interests of the convention delegates, as indicated thus far, hold little promise for the serious consideration of such important measures to protect civil liberties.

Also there are daily dispatches from Albany concerning the deliberation or manouvers of the convention delegates, there is again, as in 1915, a frank boredom with the whole affair on the part of the general public. Perhaps it is too early to predict whether dramatic clashes will later excite general interest. It is already clear, however, that labor has no direct representation. The American Labor Party ran no ticket, having pledged its endorsement to "progressive" major-party candidates, such as Samuel Untermyer. That labor-party endorses will introduce its program does not indicate the extent to which they are committed or even concerned with it. More important, there is not even a small group committed to any political or economic philosophy to the left of the two major parties. The framework of our state government may be somewhat stretched by the presence of individual liberal Democrats, such as Senator Wagner. But it cannot be progressively forged so long as the workers of the state fail to secure or even seek their rightful place at the anvil.

The penalty for such inactivity will be that labor will again have to try to get a little here and a little there, will meet constitutional obstacles and extended and expensive court tests of all progressive legislation during the next twenty years. The experience of the past twenty-three years in this

ry continues, "was attended by William Z. Foster, one of the chief leaders of the Communist Party, William Weinstone, district organizer of the Communist Party in Michigan, and B. K. Gebert, a Polish communist who is the contact man between the Communist Party and the communists in the auto union, and Richard T. Frankenstein, the assistant president of the union."

It would be utterly pointless for us to engage in a serious polemic with these people whose favorite form of political activity is self-gratification thru revolutionary phrases. May we, however, hazard the guess that just as they have changed their minds a little on the war-referendum amendment (or there doubts in anyone's mind as to the essential accuracy of the above story, the most recent developments would tend to dissipate them. In his role as "harmony" man in the past and in his present role, Richard Frankenstein is the creature of the Communist Party.

What are the issues in the present auto-union outburst? Strangely enough, there are practically none. Only two weeks ago the International Executive Board voted unanimously to endorse the 20-point program proposed by President Martin. Since then, no matter how carefully one searches in the verbose and hysterical documents issued by the disrupters, not a single issue can be found that will stand up. Frankenstein's cry that President Martin has failed to carry out his own program—in two weeks!—is so much eye-wash.

In a letter to the membership under date of June 15, 1938, President Martin has the following to say of the immediate cause of the suspension of the five officers and the ensuing unbridled factionalism:

"As you know, for months the International Union has been in the midst of factional strife which has threatened its very existence. I have pointed out time and time again that the administration of the union must carry forward in such a way as to gain the respect of our members, the employers with whom we have contracts, and the general public. Our union has been dragged in the dust; its name has been blasphemed, its prestige irreparably injured by the factional attitude and the factional action of those in opposition to the administration. But, despite all these things, the May meeting of the International Executive Board came forth with a 20-point program which was unanimously adopted and voluntarily signed by every member of the International Executive Board. I and the majority of the I.E.B. members have kept this program to the letter, never once deviating from it; and we were of the opinion that all was well and that the union was headed forward, united at last on the basis of this program.

"To our great dismay and disappointment, certain International officers and Executive Board members on last Wednesday afternoon, June 8, 1938, in Detroit, repudiated the whole program by seeking, arbitrarily, without consultation, to

field, covering the fight against all wage and hour legislation, the fight against the prohibition of child labor, the fight against unemployment insurance, the fight against the panel choice of doctors under the Workmens Compensation Act, is there—but the chance to secure representation is gone. Let us at least watch Albany closely so that the interests of labor may be protected to the extent that public information and education may do so at this time.

(This is the second of two articles on New York State constitutional conventions. The first appeared in the last issue.—Editor.)

You Never Can Tell!

AFTER a rather shamefaced change of heart on the La Follette-Ludlow war-referendum amendment, the Trotskyist Socialist Appeal returns true to form in its June 11 issue with a violent if somewhat incoherent denunciation of the Washington National Anti-War Congress.

It would be utterly pointless for us to engage in a serious polemic with these people whose favorite form of political activity is self-gratification thru revolutionary phrases. May we, however, hazard the guess that just as they have changed their minds a little on the war-referendum amendment (or there doubts in anyone's mind as to the essential accuracy of the above story, the most recent developments would tend to dissipate them. In his role as "harmony" man in the past and in his present role, Richard Frankenstein is the creature of the Communist Party.

What are the issues in the present auto-union outburst? Strangely enough, there are practically none. Only two weeks ago the International Executive Board voted unanimously to endorse the 20-point program proposed by President Martin. Since then, no matter how carefully one searches in the verbose and hysterical documents issued by the disrupters, not a single issue can be found that will stand up. Frankenstein's cry that President Martin has failed to carry out his own program—in two weeks!—is so much eye-wash.

In a letter to the membership under date of June 15, 1938, President Martin has the following to say of the immediate cause of the suspension of the five officers and the ensuing unbridled factionalism:

"As you know, for months the International Union has been in the midst of factional strife which has threatened its very existence. I have pointed out time and time again that the administration of the union must carry forward in such a way as to gain the respect of our members, the employers with whom we have contracts, and the general public. Our union has been dragged in the dust; its name has been blasphemed, its prestige irreparably injured by the factional attitude and the factional action of those in opposition to the administration. But, despite all these things, the May meeting of the International Executive Board came forth with a 20-point program which was unanimously adopted and voluntarily signed by every member of the International Executive Board. I and the majority of the I.E.B. members have kept this program to the letter, never once deviating from it; and we were of the opinion that all was well and that the union was headed forward, united at last on the basis of this program.

(This is the second of two articles on New York State constitutional conventions. The first appeared in the last issue.—Editor.)

Czechoslovakia On Eve of Crisis

By FRANZ

(This is the first of a series of two articles on the present situation in Czechoslovakia, written by a leader of the Communist Opposition of that country. The next article will deal with the conditions in the Sudeten region, the results of the municipal elections and the situation in the labor movement.—Editor.)

Prague, Czechoslovakia, May 27, 1938.

ABOUT the actual events on Friday and Saturday, May 20 and 21, it is now possible to obtain a fairly clear picture. The press reported very little about these events, either from the domestic or the foreign angle. The press here is still subjected to a strong pro-censorship. Even government papers, such as the Ceske Slovo, the organ of the Benes party, are subjected to it.

Hitler-Henlein Plans

Today we know that, on Sunday, May 21, we were faced with an attempt at rebellion by the Henlein party as well as with an armed attack by the Third Reich, and that Europe was on the brink of a war. German troop concentrations were taking place along the Czechoslovakian border. Poland and Hungary were engaged in threatening troop movements. Henlein and other leading SDP (Sudeten German Party) functionaries were already in Germany prepared for what was to come.

It was clear that efforts were being made to parade the key-men of the "autonomous Sudeten German government" as an independent factor before the world public. The SDP was, in fact, already recognized internationally as an autonomous power. This was the purpose of Henlein's trip to London, his conferences with leading politicians and with Vansittart, the English government's adviser on foreign policy. But even the Prague government treats him as a "judicial personality," as the actual representative of the Sudeten Germans. They negotiate with him as one power does with another. The Statute of Nationalities, which has not yet been made public, will be submitted to him without being previously considered by parliament. Never have municipal elections had such a world echo; never hitherto have elections had such a decisive influence on peace and war as these municipal elections. The SDP wanted to use the municipal elections as a springboard to proclaim the factual autonomy of the Sudeten German districts. The report of the Berlin correspondent of the London Evening Standard on the plans of Hitler and Henlein is very instructive. Out of these city representatives, there was to be formed a "leaders council" which would establish itself as an autonomous power. The Prague government was to be deprived of its power in the Sudeten districts by driving out the Czech police and replacing it with Henlein's own force. The direction of these contemplated measures is clear.

During Friday night, the Prague government began military counter-measures. Police and gendarmerie, which had played only a passive role in previous weeks and had done nothing against the Henlein terror, were mobilized during the night. During the night, too, roads were blocked, guards marched up, and traffic control established on the roads. In order to carry out these measures, private persons were used, such as railway workers, civil servants and, to some extent, communists and social-democrats. On Sunday, a partial

mobilization of the army began. According to official statements, one year of the reserve and the supplementary reserve as well as the special troops were called to the colors. This went on until Wednesday. These troops have been called up for military manouvers lasting four weeks. Most of them have been transferred to the border districts.

The Diplomatic Background

Whether the Prague government carried out these big defense measures on its own cannot be judged definitely from here today. It is probable that they were applied in agreement with France and England, which was then started by France and England, had as its cause not only the Czechoslovakian tension but also the Spanish situation and the Franco-Italian crisis, which seriously affected England.

Certain it is that Hitler Germany, together with the Henlein party, looked to an "Austrian solution" of the Sudeten-German question. Hitler Germany was confirmed in that belief until May 21 by the passivity of the Prague government and by the British attitude. The fact that an "Austrian solution" did not take place has had a temporarily sobering effect on the Henlein crowd in the Sudeten region and, on the other side, it has aroused a mood of self-confident and militant nationalism in the Czechish districts.

It should be remembered that Britain exercised strong pressure not only on Berlin but also on Prague. We do not yet know how high the price will be which Prague will have to pay for England's intervention. But, from the political line which the Prague government has now adopted, it can be seen that this price will be fairly high. The preliminary negotiations which have taken place between the Hodza government and Henlein, it is said, have not yet dealt with the Statute of Nationalities. Both sides have demanded pre-conditions before entering upon the actual negotiations. The Henlein party demands demobilization and the withdrawal of the police and the gendarmerie from the Sudeten districts. According to government statements, the Statute of Nationalities was already definitely formulated. Now it has become known that it will have to be "revised."

Conflicts In The Cabinet

It is being said that at least four Henlein people are to enter the Prague government. The only condition which has been put up for this is the recognition of the "integrity of the state" and acceptance of the present course of foreign policy. Whether the cabinet was unanimous on this is not known. But there are rumors circulating among the social-democrats that there were and are strong differences of opinion inside the government camp. It is even said that prominent members of the cabinet will be sacrificed for others. Parliament was called to debate the Statute of Nationalities as well as an Enabling Act. This session has been postponed indefinitely. This fact points to the conclusion that there are two tendencies within the government: one which is willing to "come to an understanding" and one which is determined to fight. Which of them will get the upper hand will ultimately be decided not in Prague but in London and Paris. Czechoslovakia

(Continued on Page 4)

The Liberals and War

by Frank D. Slocum

New York City 1938 is not 1908.

An anti-war congress in 1908 would have been accorded a place second to none in columns of The Nation of that day.

But, to an anti-war congress in 1938, The Nation grudgingly gives a few lines with the sole purpose of belittling it.

Fascism has a terrible lot to answer for—not the least terrible thing being the fact that it has robbed some liberals of their wits. To read the comments of these, one would think that fascism was brought into the world by a stork, that it bears no relation whatever to the imperialism against which they once fought. Imperialists recognize fascism as imperialism's twentieth-century child, which will carry on the imperialist line under the only auspices under which it can be carried out—that of fascist dictatorship. Fascism already has succeeded in earning its father's

gratitude. The fear that it has evoked has caused liberals and renegade Marxists to resume the entente cordiale of World War days between them and the imperialists. Fascist imperialism is rendering the same service to them today that the autocratic imperialism of Germany ("Prussianism") did twenty years ago.

"Collective security" is again the cry—with necessary variations: "against autocracy" in 1914 and 1917; "against fascism" today—but not against imperialism, thanks to the duplicity of the Stalinists and the gullibility of their dupes. Imperialists know this slogan for what it is, not a war-preventing but a war-mongering slogan. The National Anti-War Congress has initiated a program to provide real security against war, knowing that real security of peoples against war is security against imperialism in all its manifestations, including war and fascism. It alone gives hope that 1938, or any succeeding year, will not be another 1917.

Role of the Strike In Union Building

By ALBERT EDMUND

THE C.I.O. has made 1937 remarkable in labor's striking history. Never before had the issue of union organization played such a predominant role in precipitating strikes as it did in 1937. About 58% of the strikes in 1937 were principally over issues of union organization. Nearly 60% of the total workers involved were in these union-organization disputes, and 78% of the total man-days idle resulted from them. And the C.I.O. has reason to be proud that 82% of the workers involved made partial or substantial gains as a result. It should be noted that in 1919 only 14% of the strikes were over the question of union recognition as compared with 58% for 1937. We have compared 1937 with 1919 because each represents the peak in the two active strike periods in the past twenty-two years. The first is the seven-year period, from 1916 thru 1922; the second is the N.R.A. and post-N.R.A. period, from 1933 thru 1937. Between these two lofty ranges of strike activity lies the valley of apathy from 1923 to 1932. In the single year 1919, there were more workers involved in strikes than in this whole Rip Van Winkle era. Altho the number of workers involved in strikes in 1937 (1,860,000) was less than half that in 1919 (4,160,000), it was greater than in any other year in the nation's history and there were more strikes in 1937 than in any one year, including 1919.

Causes Of Strikes In 1919 And Today

The chief cause for the widespread disputes in 1919 was the rising cost of living, which by 1920 was twice as high as in 1914. But in 1937, the direct and predominant factor was the accelerated growth of the trade-union movement on all fronts. Trade unionism, which was revitalized with the beginning of the N.R.A., made steady progress during the following years and culminated in the birth of the C.I.O. It was the C.I.O. that inspired the strikes of 1937, and these very strikes in turn swelled the membership of the C.I.O., so that it was actually involved in strikes affecting 60% of the workers on strike. Thus, it can be seen that practically all the

strikes resulting from the issue of union recognition involved C.I.O. unions.

The emergence of the C.I.O. was directly bound up with the organization of the mass-production industries and we therefore find that the strikes in the basic industries were led by C.I.O. unions. Approximately 57% of the workers involved in the 1937 strikes were in five industry groups: the automobile manufacturing industry, textiles and their products, iron and steel, coal mining, and transportation and communication. The strikes in four of these industries were led by C.I.O. unions, while only in the case of the transportation and communication industry, did the A. F. of L. play a leading part. But the transportation industry accounted for 7% of the workers affected by strikes; whereas the automobile industry alone was responsible for 20% of W., appointing administrative sub-committees, deciding immediate issues, etc. In both cases, provisions were made for the full exercise of the rights of the leading body; for example, members of the National Council may partake in the deliberations of the Action Committee at any time.

Role Of Trade-Union Youth

Perhaps more important than the actual structure decided upon were the perspectives implied in the discussions of the Commission on Organization. Some of these were dealt with in the previous article on the Y.C.A.W. program. That which was undoubtedly most strongly stressed centered around the problem of bringing trade-

(Continued on Page 5)

involved in strikes having 10,000 workers or more but excluding numerous smaller strikes. Experience has shown that only organizations forged in the heat of strike struggle are capable of independent and successful existence. Tho an already established union tries to avoid strikes as much as possible, to avoid strikes at the very outset of the union's existence may mean to avoid building the union altogether. The amazing growth of the C.I.O. in 1937 would have been impossible without the wonderful impetus supplied by that unique weapon of the working class—the strike.

Labor Youth Against War

By EDWARD CARROLL

IN the course of the bitter struggle within the A.S.U. between the Stalinist "collective-security" machine and the genuine anti-war forces, a Youth Committee for the Oxford Pledge was formed. This relatively small, oppositionist group was the origin of the present Youth Committee Against War.

After the Vassar Convention of the A.S.U. in December 1937, efforts were made to extend the organization of the youth, especially students, around the Oxford Pledge, and later around the Y.C.A.W. program. Gradually, larger responses were met with as the reaction against Stalinism crystallized in the student strike against war in April and on other occasions where the Stalinists showed their true jingo colors.

This reaction was made evident at the National Anti-War Congress at Washington, to which came 300-odd enthusiastic youth delegates and numerous observers. These represented thousands of youth from every part of the country, ready to cooperate in the fight against war.

Problem Of Organization

The problem confronting the extremely important Commission on Organization at the congress was to elaborate a framework whereby the anti-war work of the constituent organizations could be coordinated along national lines and the influence of the Y.C.A.W. expanded to groups not yet affiliated. It had to be decided by this commission which areas of organization were most important, which sections of the youth must be reached with the means of agitation and propaganda, and so on.

Concerning the structure of the Youth Commissions, it was decided that a National Council be constituted "to serve as the governing body of the Y.C.A.W. until the next congress." This large body is to be made up of delegates from the affiliated organizations and is to meet at least once each year. Provisions were made for expansion of the council as new forces are added. The executive arm of the Y.C.A.W. is the National Action Committee, a smaller, representative body responsible to the council, whose task it will be to coordinate the work of the Y.C.A.W., appointing administrative sub-committees, deciding immediate issues, etc. In both cases, provisions were made for the full exercise of the rights of the leading body; for example, members of the National Council may partake in the deliberations of the Action Committee at any time.

Role Of Trade-Union Youth

Perhaps more important than the actual structure decided upon were the perspectives implied in the discussions of the Commission on Organization. Some of these were dealt with in the previous article on the Y.C.A.W. program. That which was undoubtedly most strongly stressed centered around the problem of bringing trade-

(Continued on Page 5)

involved in strikes having 10,000 workers or more but excluding numerous smaller strikes. Experience has shown that only organizations forged in the heat of strike struggle are capable of independent and successful existence. Tho an already established union tries to avoid strikes as much as possible, to avoid strikes at the very outset of the union's existence may mean to avoid building the union altogether. The amazing growth of the C.I.O. in 1937 would have been impossible without the wonderful impetus supplied by that unique weapon of the working class—the strike.

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; \$0.60 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 June 25, 1938 No. 26

THE A.L.P. LOOKS AHEAD

THE prospect that the American Labor Party will, in the future, play a more independent role in the New York City Council, as indicated by Louis Hollander in a public address last week, is a very welcome one indeed. For recent events have shown that the tactics of coalition hitherto followed are hardly such as to redound greatly to the credit or welfare of the A.L.P. and the cause for which it stands.

To join with other groups in an alliance to elect LaGuardia mayor is one thing; to fuse with these diverse groups into a single permanent caucus, claiming to be the majority of the Council, is quite another. The former was necessary under the circumstances; the latter becomes a worse mistake the longer it is continued.

The so-called "majority" in the Council is a queer conglomeration, ranging all the way from the Laborites to such people as Abner C. Surpluss, who is as reactionary as any Tammanyite you could pick. In any such combination, it is not the A.L.P. that sets the tone or gives the political lead but its partners on the right, because everything must be accommodated to their conservative prejudices if the coalition is to be maintained. In a very real sense, this arrangement makes the A.L.P. the hostage or political prisoner of its Fusionist-Republican allies.

Just consider the position of the A.L.P. in the Council in recent months. Because it is the biggest of the anti-Tammany groups and because it is part of the so-called "majority," the impression is fixed in the public mind that it is the dominant group in the Council. For every dubious thing the Council does, for every bad law passed, it has to shoulder responsibility before the public, and usually shoulder it in silence. Yet it has not been able to take even the first step in carrying thru its own program because it never could muster the support or the votes of its supposed allies. A fine position for a party representing the progressive cause of labor to be in!

Take the most recent case in point. Councilman Surpluss, a member of the "majority," introduces a malicious resolution for an "investigation" of the relief system. He is eagerly backed by another Republican and by the entire Democratic delegation, while he is denounced by the A.L.P.—yet the "majority" block remains! Who can profit by a coalition in which the Laborites are tied to Mr. Surpluss and his like? Certainly not the A.L.P.!

A realization of the unenviable position into which the A.L.P. has been maneuvered in the Council is beginning to spread among the leadership of the party. There are signs of an increasing determination to have the party stand on its own feet, on its own program and principles. Every sincere friend of the A.L.P. will naturally welcome these tendencies. But the Stalinites just as naturally see things the other way. These people, who make it their profession to perpetuate every element of backwardness among the workers and hamper every effort at independent action, are aghast at the very notion of "splitting with the Fusionists." As far as they are concerned, the A.L.P. can go on forever being the tail to the Fusion-Republican kite! For, at bottom, the Stalinites don't want a labor party; they want a People's Front with the labor element serving as an obedient political auxiliary to its New Deal and other liberal allies.

Fortunately, sentiment in the A.L.P. runs in another and far healthier direction. The A.L.P. has before it the instructive experience of its five-man delegation at Albany, indicating that a policy of aggressive independence is worth more in the way of party prestige and power than all the "practical" coalition politics in the world. Why not apply some of this experience in the City Council? Let the A.L.P. take its stand frankly as a minority, committed to nothing but its own program. Let it join the Fusionists and Republicans in supporting the Mayor's policies when and if and to the degree that it agrees with them. But let it not for a moment surrender its independence and freedom of action for the sake of the mirage of a "majority" coalition that can bring nothing but trouble and discredit to labor.

Negro and Jew

An Editorial from The Crisis

(The article below appeared as an editorial in the June 1938 issue of The Crisis, the official magazine of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. It calls attention to a very serious problem that deserves careful consideration in all labor and liberal circles.—Editor.)

A NUMBER of inquiries have come to the N.A.A.C.P. in recent years about anti-Semitism among Negroes. Thoughtful Jewish leaders are concerned over occasional speeches and occurrences here and there.

We do not believe there is any real basis for their suspicions. Negroes do not hate Jews. Not only Negro leaders, but the Negro masses realize that race hatred is a vile and self-destructing thing. They have had this truth driven home to them thru generations of mistreatment at the hands of a controlling section of the white majority in this country.

But that does not mean that Negroes have not been puzzled and disturbed at times over the actions of some Jewish individuals and groups. In general, in the trade-union movement and in the radical political organizations, Negroes and Jews get along very well, with the Jews not only having sympathy for and understanding of the plight of the Negro, but actually doing something to ease the burden of prejudice.

Certain Jewish philanthropists have made substantial contributions to the financing of programs for Negro advancement and improvement, choosing, as is their right, the kind of movements they shall aid. But the Jewish middle class (upper and lower), the shopkeepers and merchants and the landlords, in many cases and in many localities, leave much to be desired. The story is still told in Harlem of the Jewish landlord who told his Negro tenants they ought to be glad to get an apartment with hardwood floors, tiled bathrooms and French doors—at any rental.

This middle-class attitude is illustrated by a liberal Jewish rabbi

who told the N.A.A.C.P. that members of his congregation informed him they did not want any sermons linking the plight of the Jew with the plight of the Negro. But this attitude ignores the fact that prejudice is virulent and uncontrollable; if it is condoned in one instance, it will fatten and entrench itself and shortly turn upon other victims.

Currently, the 165,000 Negro citizens of Baltimore, Md., are incensed over the flat refusal of department stores in that city to serve them—not ice-cream sodas and luncheons, but clothing, furniture, and the thousands of other items sold by such establishments. It happens that the majority of these stores are either owned or managed by Jews. The question, of course, is economic, not racial, but the anger of a hurt people leaps to the racial aspect.

Another sore point is that of employment. Negroes are rigidly proscribed in many establishments owned or managed by Jews. In this, the latter follow the pattern set by gentiles, but it does seem that Jewish employers might be peculiarly sympathetic to Negroes seeking to break out of the traditional job set aside for them. It is easy to forget, in this situation, that Jews themselves complain bitterly that, in many businesses run by their own people, Jews either are refused employment or are hired on a quota basis.

The whole question is a complex one, not to be solved by set formulas or by recrimination. American Jews come from many lands and have vastly different heritages. They do not react racially as a unit on any question, except, perhaps, on Hitler. Neither do Negroes, except, perhaps, on lynching. But the matter of the attitudes of Negroes and Jews toward each other deserves thoughtful attention both for the sake of each race's individual happiness and progress, and for the sake of the larger ideal of making our democracy work at a time when the forces of fascism are on the march all over the world.

Czechoslovakia in Crisis

(Continued from Page 3) slovakia exactly like Spain, has become a pawn in the clash of imperialist interests.

The internal political situation has definitely grown worse for the working class. In the present superheated atmosphere, the transition from formal democracy to an authoritarian regime goes on unnoticed. In the name of the struggle for democracy, parliamentarism is being undermined; in the name of the struggle against the menace of fascism and authoritarian National-Socialism, a system of authoritarian "democracy" is being introduced. Constant limitation of democratic rights and liberties is going on. All this has been made possible not least by the attitude of the Communist Party. However things will end, one thing is certain: things will never be again as they were before May 21. A completely new situation has arisen.

Hitler has only postponed his war offensive. The municipal elections, which will continue until June 12th, are to be a new start for the Henlein party. The internal and external tensions have not subsided. Definitely within a short time, they will again break out

3,000 NEW READERS FOR WORKERS AGE!

to new January must be utilized for intensive educational and organizational work to meet the new offensive of the Administration when Congress opens. The next few months will be the decisive period.

By Lambda

WORLD TODAY

(We publish below a report by our special Australian correspondent, Jack Ryan.—Editor.)

Sydney, Australia, May 10, 1938.

ON the eve of May Day, a state congress of New South Wales trade unions was held at Sidney. Such congresses are not held regularly but are usually convened by the Labor Council of New South Wales when something of importance confronts the trade-union movement. On this occasion, the matters brought to the agenda were: defence; the 40-hour week fight; national insurance; state monopoly of workers compensation insurance; and the question of unity, particularly in the Australian Labor Party. This last question was really the main reason for the congress, which was a display of strength of the unions opposed to the bureaucratic domination of J. T. Lang over the political movement. Unions supporting Mr. Lang refrained from sending representatives; consequently the discussions showed no friction.

Resolutions were carried directing the unions and labor councils to intensify the struggle for the 40-hour week, urging the state government to establish monopoly of workers compensation insurance, and condemning the portions of the Commonwealth government's national insurance proposals, wherein the workers are to be made to contribute to the fund. The latter scheme was heartily condemned as a manoeuvre to transfer the cost of old-age pensions and health services from the government to the workers.

The resolution carried on the question of war, or "defence," is in the form of an answer to press proposals for cooperation of trade-unions with the government. It runs:

"The trade-union movement would welcome a defense scheme linked to a foreign policy of collective security, assisting the Spanish and Chinese people and others to resist the fascist aggressors, and combining together the peaceful nations to maintain world peace. . . .

"The present policy of Chamberlain and Lyons has nothing in common with such a genuine peace policy. The policy of competitive armaments and rewards to aggressors is hastening the drift to world slaughter, which threatens the loss of countless millions of lives in warfare of unparalleled ferocity and bestiality. We declare we have no confidence whatever in the policy of the Lyons government and refuse to cooperate with them and their employers in their defense schemes. . . .

"The working class should resist, to the limit, any reintroduction of compulsory military training and, should the government try to impose it, we call upon the workers, farmers, civil servants and others to combine and render the whole system ineffective."

In other words, they will not cooperate with the government in preparing for war—unless it is war against fascist states! And, as this is the war British imperialism is most likely to wage, the government ought to be satisfied with this decision.

However, the resolution cannot be regarded as expressing the deep convictions of most of the leading delegates who were, not so long ago, in association with Lang, ardent and very backward isolationists.

In the fight against Lang and his dictatorship, the trade-union officials find the support of the Communist Party members very helpful, especially the C.P. officials of the Miners Federation, which has the largest single block of shares in the Labor Daily. Hence, they are willing to support the C.P. foreign policy, to them unimportant, in return for support in the faction fight, which is all important. Some of the delegates are not of this type, but make a practise of supporting the C.P. on international affairs because of a sincere desire to be militant and a disinclination to indulge in independent thinking on such matters.

Congress also decided to revive the Pan-Pacific Secretariat as a "permanent committee to co-ordinate anti-war and anti-fascist activity among workers bordering the Pacific." It was stated that contact had been established with Harry Bridges at San Francisco and A. McLagan, president of New Zealand Federation of Labor.

JACK RYAN

BOOKS

RED STAR OVER CHINA, by Edgar Snow. Random House, New York, 1938.

STRICTLY speaking there are two distinct stories told here. The first is an objective factual report about the former Chinese soviets. This part makes the book. From it emerges a dramatic tale—a story of the remarkable military achievements of the Red Army; a picture of the leading personalities of the Chinese Communist Party (Mao Tse-tung, Chou En-lai, Chu Teh); an account of the amazing exploits of the famous "Long March," in which the base of the Chinese soviets was literally transported thousands of miles; a description of the socio-economic foundation of the Chinese soviets; and, above all, an appreciation of the heroism and self-sacrifice of the Chinese peasants and workers. It would have remained a consistently worthwhile performance, especially because of the general lack of information on these vital matters, had the author not injected his personal opinion of events past and present, for example, of the defeat of the 1927 revolution, the present People's Front line in China, the perspectives for the future, etc. The unfortunate result is an indescribable hodge-podge of half-truths and scraps of information, on the one hand, and yawning gaps of knowledge and an amazing political naivete, on the other.

The second part especially fated the book to become a football among the various political factions interested in the Chinese question. The author has been accused of being a Trotskyite by the Stalinists and a barely-disguised People's Fronter by the Fourth Internationalists. Poor Snow deserves neither compliment! A liberal democrat with some slight reformist-socialist tendencies, he would quite naturally find himself thoro at home in the People's Front. It isn't that he is consciously playing the game of the Stalinites; rather is it that the latter, in dropping overboard the last vestiges of their Marxism and socialism, have approached and gone beyond his political viewpoint. Lacking, in addition, a basic understanding of the history, problems and prerequisites of the Chinese revolution, the author inevitably had to substitute gossip and superficial information for fundamental political analysis. The information was culled from all sides. The desire to be objective and impartial could hardly, however, save the author, lacking as he did a fundamental yardstick, from mistakes and inner contradictions. On page 147, for instance, he quotes, with obvious commendation, Mao Tse-tung's blame of Chen Tu-hsin (a Trotskyite) for the defeat of the Chinese Revolution of 1927. Yet, on page 376, he declares that the policy of the Communist International was responsible for the 1927 defeat. That, however, does not prevent Snow from being a good People's Fronter, the things which the People's Front is doing in China today are a repetition in crasser form of the disastrous mistakes of liquidating the class independence of the C.P., which were essentially responsible for the 1927 defeat. This lack of political insight is characteristic and typical of the analysis throught.

Had, therefore, the book been less "political," its mine of information could have been of some use to those with more understanding in such matters but lacking first-hand factual data. But, with things as they are, it makes it more difficult to separate the wheat from the chaff.

JIM CORK

Local 22 Education Dep't Classes in Commencement

DESCRIBED by Mark Starr, educational director of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union as "another great pioneering contribution to educational work by Local 22," the Commencement and Dance of Local 22's Educational Department was held on May 15 at Center Hotel, amid great enthusiasm and fellowship. This was the first commencement ever held by a union school—an other innovation in Local 22's exciting campaign to broaden and deepen, to formalize and dignify, its educational activities.

Over 2,000 people were present, mainly, as old-timers observed amazedly, "people who were never before seen at union affairs"—a tribute to the effectiveness of the new campaign to draw newer and younger elements into educational activities. The whole union has since been discussing the affair enthusiastically.

The commencement program was opened by the March of the Volunteers led by the Color Guard to the strains of the I.L.G.W.U. anthem. Sixty girls were in line and, as they marched down the aisle to the platform, the audience burst into spontaneous applause. The whole scene, the deposing of the flags, led by the big flag of the Educational Volunteers, was inspiring and impressive.

After the commencement address by Lewis Corey, educational director of Local 22, who emphasized

the two-fold character of workers education—development of the individual's talent and personality, and service to the union—the Local 22 Mandolin Orchestra gave a spirited rendition of several musical selections.

Elsie Gluck, years ago educational director of Local 25 (now Local 22), spoke on the early educational work, its sacrifices and inspirations, tying up the present with the achievements and traditions of the past.

The Local 22 Drama Group performed a one-act play, "Who is Getting Excited," by Florence Lasser. Then came the granting of scholarships and awards to outstanding students, another innovation by Local 22. Scholarships for the National Training Institute were granted to Helen Binder, Harriet Drayer, Yetta Horn, Blanche Lee, Miriam Spieschandler, Helen Swersky and Miriam Tane. Awards for general activity were granted to Pearl Davis, Bernice DeGregory, Nina Grafal, Helen Goldberg, Marion Koppelman, Elsie Leitner, Dorothy Riley and Thilie Zahn. The certificates were handed out by Lewis Corey and Mark Starr who substituted for Charles S. Zimmerman, secretary-manager of Local 22, who was unable to attend because of illness.

The commencement program ended with mass singing of labor songs by the Educational Volunteers, after which dancing became the order of the evening.

Stalinism in Auto Union

(Continued from Page 2) the C.I.O. and the waterfront workers on the West Coast.

Why was the national leadership of the U.O.P.W.A. (office workers), almost 100% C.P. in composition, forced to resort to the "reorganization" of the San Francisco local, thus forcing the local out of the organization completely?

Why does the C.P.-dominated International Fur Workers Union resort to periodic blood-baths against its opponents, the latest in Toronto? Why has it forced all the Toronto locals out of its organization and caused the merger of all oppositional elements in the union in New York, for the purpose of making their organization a union and not a political party?

Why did President Harvey Freming of the oil workers find it necessary to begin an open fight against the encroachments of the Communist Party in his organization?

Why does the International Ladies Garment Workers Union still find it necessary to put the Communist Party members in their place from time to time?

Why did the New York members of the painters locals rise in revolt against the Stalinist, Louis Weinstein, and refuse even to nominate him for reelection?

Why did the Steel Workers Organization Committee find it necessary, some months ago, to purge itself of most of the Communist Party organizers, thereby calling down on the heads of its leaders, a vicious and slanderous under-cover campaign?

Why does the United Mine Workers still retain in its constitution an expulsion clause against members of the Communist Party?

Why have practically all organizations of the C.I.O. withdrawn from the Wisconsin state organization and left it a narrow clique of C.P. factionalists?

Why did the Detroit Hotel and Restaurant Employees union find it necessary to rid itself of its C.P. disrupters if it was to survive?

Why? Is it all a case of "Love-stoneite factionalism," as they would like to have one believe in the case of the auto industry? Hardly! Everywhere it is a matter of ridding the organization of the disruptive curse of Stalinism, with its dictatorial behavior, its slanders of people who disagree with them, its conversion of every organization that it dominates into an appendage of the political philosophy currently expounded by the Moscow high priest. The struggle against Stalinism has thus become synonymous with the struggle to keep the trade unions free of all political interference and domination. In a sense, this has also become true of the attempt to cleanse the unions of racketeers and give them a clean, progressive leadership. How long ago was it that the C.P. made an alliance with outright racketeers in the painters and food workers unions?

A rather complicating factor is the fact that the Socialist Party element, after a period of independence of the Communist Party forces, has completely lost its balance once more and has again flopped into the ranks of the C.P. caucus. This is true at least to the extent that they go along completely with the C.P. in the immediate strategy and have been most aggressive in mobilizing resistance.

On the other hand, administration supporters are more than comforted by the spind response from the ranks, despite the fact that the opposition move came like a bolt from the blue. Financial assistance is streaming in, the W.P.A. organizing drive is proceeding, advances are being made in aircraft organization—President Martin has just announced a closed-shop agreement with an eastern aircraft firm. The membership seems to realize that, if stability and progress are to be achieved, two things must happen—the backbone of Stalinist resistance must be broken, and the career boys, who consider the labor movement, as a stepping-stone for their advancement, must be put in their place.

News of the AGE

MORE TRUTH THAN POETRY!

JOHNNY Prolet, you can depend. Reads the Age from beginning to end.

If his copy's amiss, he'd want to know why, No wonder he came with fire in his eye!

"Look here" he said, "you so-and-so, If my sub's expired, you should let me know. The issues I've missed now number four. I'll not stand for that," he began to roar,

Pleading not guilty, was of no avail. I simply claimed, "It must be the mail."

"Wait," Johnny cried, "I see a light! A Stalinist lives, on the third floor right!"

"Aha, there is dirty work afoot," I said, "The Gay-Pay-0o has raised its head." Johnny thought, and heaved a sigh, "There's more to it than meets the eye."

This C.P. gent has changed somewhat,— I note he talks to himself a lot, And sometimes, as he passes near, He actually forgets to sneer!

I have an idea, tho I am no sage, I'll bet a cookie he reads the Age." I replied at once: "We'll try him out, A little trick will leave no doubt.

From now on it will be fun To send two Ages instead of one." At fortnight later Johnny appeared Wearing a grin from ear to ear.

"You know," he said, "the trick worked fine— One Age is gone and the other is mine. And, more than that, when I walk the street, And sometimes the Stalinist I meet, He no longer avoids me, but instead He lightly smiles and nods his head."

So, dear readers, don't be amazed If a letter appears from one who was dazed, Who finds his head is now quite clear And no longer moves propelled from the rear.

Because the Workers Age has opened his eyes To the only road for the workers to rise.

MORE TRUTH WITHOUT POETRY

THIS jingle tells you how this particular Stalinist got his Age. But there are many thousand progressive workers throught the country that haven't got theirs. They need the Age and the Age needs them as readers. The campaign for 3,000 new subscribers is a rather modest move in this direction. But modest as it is, if you, who are our readers and friends, can help us immensely. Our paper is improving with each issue. It is a fine time to acquaint your friends and shopmates with the Workers Age. Why not donate a subscription? Better still, send us a few dollars—and for each dollar we'll supply a year's subscription to someone who will welcome it. There are hundreds of workers who have already become acquainted with the Workers Age and like it but can't afford to subscribe. We'd like to distribute the Age free by the hundreds of thousands, but unfortunately we have to depend on our own resources.

Do your bit—and it isn't asking very much! Donate one or more subscriptions, for yourself, for your friend, for some worker to whom the Age would mean a great deal.

Help us over the top with the big Age Drive!

Robert Macklin

Labor Youth Against War

(Continued from Page 3)

union youth into the organization. On several occasions, including the sessions of this commission, Minnie Lurye, trade-union leader who was elected vice-chairman of the Y.C.A.W. and member of the Action Committee, indicated why trade unionists are essential to an anti-war movement, why they are, in the last analysis, the decisive forces. There was full concurrence on this point. Yet it was observed that, unlike the adult organization (the Keep America Out of War Committee), there were too few young people at the congress coming from trade unions. Hence, the problem arose of reaching into the trade unions for these vital forces.

Two contributing causes may go to explain why this problem exists: (1) the origins of the Y.C.A.W. in the student movement, around the limited Oxford Pledge; and (2) the failure, after the Vassar convention of the A.S.U. and leading up to the Washington Congress, to conscientiously work towards the setting up of Y.C.A.W. groups in the trade unions and getting labor youth groups to affiliate. Partly due to the inadequacy of forces but also to lack of sufficient recognition of this prime need in the anti-war movement, expansion among student, Christian and general peace fields, was not paralleled by growth in the labor-youth field.

To remedy this shortcoming, it was suggested by Minnie Lurye that an agency of some sort be set up by the National Action Committee whose express purpose it should be to direct organization in the trade-union youth field. Speakers would be sent out to address local unions in the industrial centers over the country, appealing to the youth on behalf of the Y.C.A.W. Much work can also be done, as Alvae Hollister pointed out in her report to the initial youth session, among the unemployed youth who make up the "cannon-fodder for the next war." Agitation among these victims of capitalist decay is of paramount importance to this movement.

Energetic Action Needed

But verbal recognition alone will never do the trick. A trade-union bureau should be set up at once to energetically recruit among the thousands of youth in the factories, and among the farm laborers as well. Affiliation of Farmer Union Junior groups already provide the basis for work in the field. And it should not prove difficult to cooperate with the trade unionists of the adult Keep America Out of War Committee towards expanding anti-war youth work in the unions. It is to be hoped that the National Action Committee is already mapping a campaign along these lines.

With substantial forces to begin with and a militant program forged, the Y.C.A.W. will unquestionably prove a powerful fighter against the imperialist warmongers and their Stalinist stooges. Proper direction is imperative if the fight is to be won. This means, among other things, building a stronger trade-union youth section, spreading the call for cooperation of labor youth of every country in the struggle against imperialist war, working towards a bigger and more militant student anti-war strike. On such a basis, success is measurably sure.

(This is the second of two articles on the youth anti-war movement. The first article appeared in the last issue. —Editor.)

SUBSCRIBE!

CONVENTION OF A NEW BEGINNING

A Discussion Article by Will Herberg

THE July 4 convention of our Group will not be just the usual gathering to hear reports of activity, consider resolutions on this or that question and then map out policies in various fields. If our convention is to live up to the expectations that all of us place in it, it will be the Convention of a New Beginning, the embodiment of a new departure in the American labor movement.

Dissolution Of The Old Approach

The dissolution of our old approach is now an established fact. It is an inevitable consequence of the utter bankruptcy of post-war radicalism that we have witnessed in the last few years. As movements represented by their respective organizations, official social-democracy, communism and anarchism are bankrupt, bankrupt politically and morally, bankrupt even in terms of their own pretensions. Reformistic social-democracy was ready to sacrifice socialism for the sake of social reform, revolution for the sake of democracy; it only succeeded in opening the way to reaction and fascism. The Communist International was ready to carry thru with ruthlessness and determination a series of splits in the socialist movement for the sake of gaining revolutionary independence and freedom of action; it has now abandoned every pretense to revolutionary principles and has raised the surrender of its political independence in the People's Front into a sacred dogma. Anarchism always prided itself on its intransigence, its moral integrity and freedom from corruption; in Spain, anarchist ministerialism and the rotten politics of parliamentary compromise are flourishing in rank growth. What then is there left? Blind opportunism, political intrigue, moral corruption, bureaucracy! This is the pass to which the international workers movement, numbering many millions in its ranks, has come in this twentieth year of dreadful "peace"!

That there are forces of life and hope making themselves felt amidst the general political disintegration, the International Conference recently held at Paris, representing the independent socialist and communist elements as well as oppositionist tendencies in the social-democratic and Stalinist movements, is evidence enough. But these forces of life can realize their promise only if they have the courage to face the facts as they are, only if they have the courage to make the new departure so imperatively demanded today.

Futility Of Traditional American Radicalism

These ideas have already become current in our Group, although it is doubtful whether their full implications have been drawn. But there is another side of the question, perhaps even more significant in the long run, which we must now emphasize. It is about time to recognize, with all due respect to the past, that the whole traditional approach of American radicalism—the approach of the socialists, the communists, the I.W.W. and the socialist liberals alike—has been generally futile and wrong-headed from the very first. Traditional American radicalism has always looked abroad for inspiration, experience and guidance; its effort has been largely directed towards mechanically "translating" European approaches into American terms without much regard to relevancy or significance. This habitual tendency to imitate foreign patterns under conditions so vastly different, is the very hall-mark of traditional American radicalism and is striking

ing evidence of its profound alienation from American reality.

At the same time, traditional American radicalism has generally had a pronounced strain of sectarian dualism in its makeup. By and large, the mission of the radical group has been and still is conceived as the creation of a labor movement that would be a mere extended shadow of itself—apart from and, if necessary, opposed to the existing labor movement. We are all acquainted with trade-union dualism and its constant recurrence in American labor history. But political dualism is an equally persistent trait and equally dangerous, especially under present-day conditions. Political dualism has led radicals to picture an independent working-class political movement in America as a mass socialist party along conventional European lines. Very little understanding has been shown of the specific features of American development that make for independent labor politics in the form of a labor party as a political federation of trade unions. The indifference, suspicion, even hostility, manifested towards the labor-party idea in American radical circles, strongly persisting among the Trotskyites and in certain sections of the Socialist Party today, as well as the sinister

perversion of the idea by the Stalinists, constitute a striking indication of this fact.

Anti-Dualism And Anti-Sectarianism

For us, the very crux of the new departure must be a break with these unwholesome traditions. At bottom, the whole problem is that of the relation of our Group to the masses.

Our first principle must be anti-dualism. It must become our deep and abiding conviction that the great objectives of labor, immediate and ultimate alike, can be achieved only in and thru the labor movement as it is developing today in response to the needs of the workers. We do not want "our own" trade-union movement nor do we want "our own" political movement of labor. Nothing can be accomplished apart from, behind the back of or against the real labor movement. It is easier to say these words than to carry them out consistently, such is the weight of the dualistic tradition; but to apply this idea consistently in all its consequences is surely the very essence of our new approach.

With equal firmness do we take our stand against sectarianism. Our aim is not to remake the labor movement in our own image, in accordance with our own pet re-

ceptions, but to bring ourselves in line with the fundamental strivings, with the inner tendencies of the labor movement as it is and as it is becoming. Too often have American radicals tended to look upon the labor movement as a sort of field of operations for their doctrines if not as an auxiliary of their groups. We must make a clean break with any such notions. We are part of the labor movement, an organic and inseparable part—and the part is not greater than the whole!

Our Role In The Labor Movement

What is the role we aspire to in the light of this orientation? We want to make our Group the political concentration of the most militant and advanced elements in every trade union, in every labor organization, on every field of the labor struggle. We want to make our Group into an effective instrument to serve the labor movement as a militant, inspiring, leavening force on every front. We want to be in a position to give real assistance towards greater clarity and class consciousness, and therefore towards greater effectiveness in the class struggle. We want to help it towards the conscious assimilation of its own experiences, towards the

conscious understanding of its own fundamental aims and tendencies. Far be it from us to imply that there is nothing wrong with the labor movement as it is or that everything will take care of itself spontaneously, so to speak. Nothing of the sort. But the labor movement can be strengthened, improved and brought to higher levels of clarity and power only from within. And we aspire to be the force within that strives consciously towards this goal.

Someone once described our organization as the political "pep group" of the labor movement. I think this is a splendid characterization of at least one aspect of our role, and the most important aspect at that. If we can only live up to this characterization, then we will certainly go a long way towards the fulfillment of our mission.

But for this, we must keep our eyes on America. Our program, our strategic course, our policies and tactics must be drawn from our own social soil, from a systematic study of the conditions of the American class struggle in the light of Marxism. Of course, we must be ready to learn from experience abroad—but this experience must be evaluated in the light of American reality and transmuted into American terms before it can be of direct practical value to us in our work.

Our new orientation is an orientation of the most thoroughgoing, uncompromising independence. We have long lost our political kinship with official "communism," our tendency to look upon things from the point of view of their relation to Stalinism. But independence means much more. It means the full recognition that we are out on our own, out to build a really new type of socialist (or communist) movement in this country, along fundamentally new lines. In this task, we can expect little help, because we can expect little understanding, either from the Socialist Party or from the Trotskyites. Among certain socialists, there appears to be some faint notion of what a real revolutionary socialist movement in America should be like, but the general run of socialists, together with the Trotskyites, are poles apart from us on the question of orientation. We may agree, and do agree, on what is the issue but we disagree on what is so much more important, our fundamental outlook. The Trotskyites are consciously and belligerently dualistic, sectarian approach that has proved so futile in the past. For the Trotskyites, indeed, it is their special point of pride, as is natural with any sect of their character.

Cooperation with the socialists or Trotskyites on specific issues is, of course, possible and necessary. But, for the present at any rate, we cannot look in that direction for any real collaboration in laying the foundations of the new movement that conditions so imperatively demand.

With our new approach, we must appeal directly to the more advanced and progressive workers now coming to the fore everywhere in the labor movement. If our appeal reaches and influences Socialist Party members or Trotskyites or even Stalinists, we can only rejoice, but it is not on this that we pin our hope.

To clarify the new approach in all its implications, to make it a part of our very political existence: this is the task of the convention. It is a tremendous task but the whole future of our movement depends upon how it is faced and how it is accomplished.

Let us make it indeed the Convention of a New Beginning!

Problems of Single Party Regime

By J. S.

(The article below is presented as discussion material.—Editor.)

THE recent trials in the U.S.S.R., coupled with the foreign policy of the Soviet government and the line of the Communist International, has shaken the roots of our movement. All over the world, basic questions are being raised: Is this what we were fighting for? Is socialism being built in Russia? Are the events in Russia a necessary product of the dictatorship of the proletariat and, if so, should not the Russian experiment be avoided and a new theory adopted on the entire question of the dictatorship of the proletariat?

The raising and discussion of these and many similar questions in the open is a healthy sign. Only the dead or followers of the Stalin clique can remain silent and contented without trying to answer these questions. However, in our eagerness to avoid a repetition of the Russian experience, we must guard against the danger of going to the other extreme.

The Problem Of One Leading Party

Among the questions that have lately been raised in our group is whether it is necessary to have a one-party rule during the first transition stages after the revolution. Some comrades express the opinion that the debacle in Russia is due to the one-party system, that the one-party rule necessarily brought about bureaucracy and the Stalin clique. They, therefore, propose a coalition of all working-class parties and non-political bodies, such as trade unions, etc., during and after the seizure of power.

Struggle Between Lenin And The Mensheviks

One of the sharpest divisions between the Bolshevik and Menshevik groups in the Russian social-democratic party was on the question of the role of the party. Lenin, time and again, criticized and attacked the Menshevik leaders for their attitude on this question. He pointed out the necessity of building a strong, disciplined, well-knit organization, which would be fit to so much more important, our fundamental outlook. The Trotskyites are consciously and belligerently dualistic, sectarian approach that has proved so futile in the past. For the Trotskyites, indeed, it is their special point of pride, as is natural with any sect of their character.

During the early days of the Russian revolution, other socialist parties were permitted to exist and function. The Social-Revolutionists, anarchists, etc., had full democratic freedom. Yet it quite soon became necessary to suppress them, because their existence, at that time, and their armed attacks on the bolshevik leaders endangered the revolution.

It was always assumed as an axiom that the success of the revolution in Russia was due, to a great extent, to the existence and experience of the Bolshevik party. Is this no longer true? Would it have been possible to bring the Russian revolution to success had it not been for the existence of the Russian C.P.?

But, some comrades say, in Russia it was necessary to have a one-party rule due to the backwardness of the country. In more developed countries, it might be possible to establish a coalition government of all existing working-class parties and other class organizations, which government would bring the revolution to a successful conclusion and make it possible to avoid the situation that has developed in the U.S.S.R.

The revolution of 1917 spread over a great part of the European continent. Germany and Austria

overthrew their monarchies; in Italy, the workers took over the factories; in Hungary, there was established a Soviet government. What happened to all of them? What became of the revolutions? Were they successful? The revolutions were genuine. The revolutionary governments had completely collapsed. These countries were more developed than Russia; the working class, as a whole, was better organized in these countries than in Russia. Yet in all of these countries, the working class lost out. Had these countries had strong communist parties, might not history have been somewhat different?

Or let us take the present Spanish situation. According to the analysis of our comrades, the situation in Spain immediately after the rebel uprising was somewhat similar to the situation in Russia in 1918, during the struggle of the Russian proletariat against the Kornilov forces. We predicted the emergence of another soviet state with the defeat of Franco. The working class, thru its various parties and trade-union organs, was actually in control of the government.

Is the same true now? Has not the working class, under the traitorous leadership of the Spanish

Order of Business

National Convention of the Independent Communist Labor League
New York City
(July 2-4, 1938)

1. Opening of the convention—Greetings from the I.C.O., the P.O.U.M., the I.L.P., etc.
2. "The International Conference and Our International Perspectives." Reporter: Jay Lovestone.
3. "The New Orientation of Our Group and Our Program of Action." Reporter: Will Herberg.
4. Resolutions and other business.
5. Election of the National Committee.

Stalinists, restored power to the bourgeoisie? Will the victory of the Loyalist forces now mean the establishment of workers rule? Indeed, would not the perspective for Spain be much brighter if the C.P., with all its strength, had a correct line, or if the P.O.U.M. had the necessary strength to become the leading—yes, ruling—party in Spain? And assuming further that, under the present conditions in Spain, with the C.P. playing its traitorous role, and the P.O.U.M. being at the leadership

(Continued on Page 8)

Popular Front in the Colonial Lands

By JIM CORK

(We publish the article below as discussion material.—Editor.)

IN their discussion article in the May 21 issue of the Workers Age, Comrades F. and S. from Santiago, Chile, raise some fundamental questions regarding the People's Front in the colonial countries which deserve some comment. The agreeing with our criticism of the People's Front as applied to western imperialist countries, they regard it as a mechanical generalization on our part to oppose the People's Front in colonial countries as well. There, they claim, because of the difference in problems, the People's Front can be applied with success. The argument runs in part that, because of the difference in situations, there must be a different relation between the working class and the colonial bourgeoisie than in western capitalist countries.

Role Of Native Bourgeoisie

Now it is undoubtedly true that the native bourgeoisie can play a progressive role against imperialism for a time, and it is possible to march in a common front with them for that period. This fact was recognized by Lenin and the Comintern, long before the People's

Front found its unnatural home in the realm of communist theory and practice under such questionable tutelage.

In the long run, however, the colonial bourgeoisie fears the revolutionary drive of its own worker and peasant masses more than the oppression of world imperialism. It becomes necessary for the revolutionary proletarian party, therefore, never to give up its own organizational and ideological independence, to march with the colonial bourgeoisie so long as the latter are forced to tread an anti-imperialist path, but to prepare for the inevitable break with the bourgeoisie, and, by demonstrating the soundness of its program and by proving that it is the best fighter in the struggle against imperialism, win undisputed leadership over the masses when the inevitable break comes. It was above all else the fact that this was not done by the Chinese Communist Party that accounts for the disastrous defeats of 1925-28. The one lesson that can be drawn from these defeats is: "Communists, don't for a moment give up your revolutionary principles and independent organization."

People's Front In China

Now what is the People's Front line in China doing? A repetition of exactly the same mistakes that were made in 1925-28 only in a more extreme and crass form. In China as elsewhere, the People's Front has meant surrender of revolutionary principles and unity on the basis of the bourgeois program. The C.P. of China has given up the struggle against the landlords and usurers; it has given up the struggle for the agrarian revolution; it has destroyed whatever class character the soviets once had; it has surrendered the organizational independence of the former Red Army; in short, it has given up even the propaganda for socialism in its connection with the national emancipation struggle and has subordinated itself to the Kuomintang and its brand of "democracy." Internationally, it fights only against Japanese imperialism, not against world imperialism. Are quotations needed? I could supply F. and S. with reams of them. But the facts are so well known that I take it that quoting is unnecessary.

Secondly, in a colonial country at the present stage of development of world imperialism, can a successful struggle for national emancipation be carried thru on a bourgeois basis with the class leadership of yesterday can and must be laid aside.

The slogan of revolutionary unity should be revived, although no unity is possible without its proclamation. A period of united front, an attempt to work together harmoniously, a period of collaboration and clarification, as is going on internationally, is necessary in this country.

The unity of anti-Stalinist revolutionists would lay the foundation for a political party of size, prestige, ability, funds; a party that will take the ground from under the Stalinists, begin to take workers away from them in mass and leave their leaders with middle-class liberal allies, with Roosevelt, Hull and their imperialist friends in the Democratic party.

The I.C.L.L.—as well as the two other organizations which I believe can be our allies—is faced with an alternative of going forward in unity or holding aloft in pride—and in isolation—an unshredded banner of "revolutionary" purity.

(Continued on Page 8)

New York Goes Ahead

Report of the District Convention

By S. E.

THIRTY-NINE delegates representing every branch and trade group of the New York district of the Independent Communist Labor League met on Friday and Saturday, June 10 and 11, to hold the sessions of the most vital convention in the history of the New York organization.

On Friday evening, the delegates convened to hear the opening report delivered by Bertram D. Wolfe on the recently held congress of the Keep America Out Of War Committee and on the tasks of our organization in combating chauvinism in the labor movement and bringing to the struggle against war revolutionary clarity. Discussion on this and other reports was continued long into Saturday night.

Here was no ordinary "district convention" in the meaning that these words have come to have of late. There was no ordained line offered from above, which every delegate suddenly discovered was "correct" as characterized the recent convention of the Communist Party. There was no occupation of the delegates with factional maneuvers to obtain a given number of votes and positions for one group as against all others, as have marked most sessions of the Socialist Party during recent years. Nor was there the self-righteous parading of ultra-pure "revolutionary Marxism," refusing to allow its pollution by association with a growing labor movement and an awakening, aggressive anti-war movement, as is found in all shades of Trotskyites.

Here were a group of workers, in agreement on general principles around which our movement must be built, yet clarifying, arguing, debating, on the methods most effective in putting the principles into practice. United as the only revolutionary pro-labor party force in New York, the delegates debated seriously and expressed various opinions on the methods to be pursued in seeking to help the American Labor Party in the direction of independence from New Deal and Fusion alliances.

Among the other subjects discussed thoroughly in the few short hours devoted to the sessions, the trade-union problem played a prominent role. It was fitting that the report, given by the chairman of the Trade Union Committee of the I.C.L.L., should offer a general estimate of forces in the unions, particularly in the C.I.O., rather than details of concrete activities in particular unions and the actual work of our groups. It was necessary for the delegates to have this introductory discourse so that their concrete problems could be discussed. Here, again, the convention did not hear cut-and-dried reports of "what we are doing" in this union or that, but the unionists, speaking on the basis of their own experience, critically debated issues which were raised frankly and democratically before the convention.

The problem of the pernicious and destructive influence of Stalinism in the C.I.O. was carefully considered. Toy workers pointed to the moves attempted by the Stalinists to take C.I.O. shops, back to the A. F. of L., despite signed contracts, merely to embarrass the progressive union administration. Auto workers gave the details of the latest moves made by Stalinists, threatening the very existence of that powerful bulwark of industrial unionism. And delegates, at times sharply conflicting in opinions, hammered out the proper methods of work which is incumbent upon our group to follow in counteracting Stalinist influence in the unions.

Organization—build the I.C.L.L. to insure a firm foundation for progressive unionism, for the

AN APOLOGY

We regret the careless omission of the courtesy line below the cartoon in the June 11 issue of the Workers Age. The cartoon by Judah Drob was taken from the Socialist Call.

future of the labor-party movement, for the advancement of the promising anti-war movement, for the revolutionary struggle against capitalism—this was the one message above all others with which every delegate left the convention. It was for this purpose that a concrete plan of action, consisting of twenty-four points, was worked out and adopted by the convention.

An analysis of the delegates shows an encouraging distribution of forces in the trade-union movement among the representatives. Dressmakers, cloakmakers, knit-goods workers, pressers and other garment workers, were present, but no longer did the organization or its leadership resemble as much as in former years an "I.L.C.W.U. group." There were doll-and-toy unionists, Newspaper Guildsmen, teachers, painters, auto workers, utility workers, typographical workers, with numerous other fields represented. Of 39 delegates, over half (22 to be exact) hold official posts in their unions. This indicated dramatically before the convention the extent to which our members, working as constructive, pro-union communists, had won the confidence of the workers in their unions and been entrusted with important posts.

The election of a new district committee, reconstituted on a basis making for better coordination of the trade-union work with all other work of the I.C.L.L., was a fitting end to the deliberations. And, when the delegates rose to leave, the lusty voices of the youthful members, many of whom have come from the Y.C.L. to the I.C.L.L. only in the last year or two, could be heard singing the "Internationale." Tune and words immediately were picked up by all delegates, founders of the communist movement and those who have embraced revolutionary socialism only in recent years, coming out of the ranks of labor itself. For here was an organization where members could sing "The earth shall rise on new foundations," neither preceded nor followed by "The Star Spangled Banner."

On the One-Party Regime

(Continued from Page 7)

of the government, would not some steps have to be taken to prevent the counter-revolutionary activities of the C.P.? It would obviously be the P.O.U.M.'s duty to safeguard the revolution from betrayals.

Before discarding Bukharin's definition of a party and its role, we ought to more carefully analyze the various revolutions that have taken place before our very eyes. Did not the failures of all revolutions in 1918 prove that, in order for the working class to hold power, it is not only necessary to overthrow the existing government but also to take power and hold it against all attempts to wrest it on the part of enemies, within and without? Did not the various revolutions prove that, even tho the working class as a whole may be organized in trade unions and political parties, yet under certain conditions these same parties may stab the revolution in the back (social-democracy in Germany, etc.)? Did not these revolutions prove that, at the first stages of power, the worst enemies of the working class are its own vacillating and antagonistic groups? Was not the power in Spain given back to the bourgeoisie by the C.P. of Spain, which claims to be a working class party?

The working class does not all at once become conscious of a desire to seize power. Even during the revolution there are some sections of the proletariat and some working-class parties that are not ready to take power; others may be definitely opposed to it and fight on the side of the bourgeoisie. It is clear that such parties, even tho they may be composed of workers, do not represent the needs of the working class and, if they persist in their opposition, they have to be defeated just as the reactionary armies. After the revolution has been won and the gains consolidated, democratic opposition can and should be permitted, but during the revolution there must be only one unified command under the leadership of one unified party whose aim is to establish a workers government.

These, in my opinion, are some of the lessons of the revolutions of the past and present decades.

The reason for the multi-party theory is possibly due to the fact that the revolutionary section of the working class is broken up into many groups and grouplets, and each of these groups is afraid of facing the same fate as the Russian opposition, should they not be in the ruling party. There is a desire to preserve the possibility of participating in the revolution while being able to express opinions—that may not be dominant. But to confuse this with a multi-party system is wrong. Despite the divergence of opinion of the various left-wing groups as to immediate problems, they are not separate parties in the full sense of the word. As long as they adhere to the basic principles of changing the present social system and believe that this can be accomplished only thru the dictatorship of the proletariat, they are all groups of one revolutionary party, even tho they at present function separately due to the general situation in the labor movement.

Here too, the Russian revolution might serve as a good example. Trotsky had a group of his own. This group had many differences with Lenin and the Bolshevik party. Yet both groups had one ultimate aim—the victory of the socialist revolution thru the dictatorship of the proletariat. When the crucial moment arrived, these two groups united into one party. Trotsky's differences with Lenin were of a minor character and secondary to the interests of the move-

New England Politicians Ignore Vital Relief Need

By JACK LONG
(Our New England Correspondent)

Boston, Mass.

A BRIEF glance at the relief situation in Massachusetts is sufficient to indicate how terrible the situation is. With the number of unemployed in the state approaching 500,000, only 242,000 workers, less than half, are receiving any benefits from unemployment compensation or the W.P.A. Of this number 85,000 have now exhausted their right to further job-insurance payments. The business indices industries, the important industries, show a sharp drop in pay-rolls and employment, intensifying and aggravating the already bad relief situation.

One looks in vain to the Massachusetts legislature for measures that would alleviate the appalling plight of the unemployed. But these hard bitten politicians are only concerned with political patronage. Governor Hurley set the tone in an address to the State Relief Officers Association when he stated: "Federal funds shall be spent in the cities and towns to insure patronage." Every proposal to simplify the relief set-up is met by the most strenuous opposition from both the Republican and Democratic members of the legislature. At present, half of a column in the telephone book is needed to list the numerous and overlapping relief agencies. Thus, the Highway Department becomes a relief agency with \$8,000,000 allotted to insure its patronage. The Department of Public Welfare has its own little nest egg and so with other departments. Each department is under control of one or the other political factions. All proposals to eliminate the red tape is fought tooth and nail by these political vultures. It is unfortunate that the trade unions have not yet exhibited sufficiently active interest in the question. Both the unions and Labor's Non-Partisan League have a big job ahead; a fight against these conditions would win labor many supporters.

The Massachusetts state convention of the Communist Party, held in Boston, adopted as its political program, the policies of the Roosevelt administration in toto. Frank-feld, the party organizer, set as the "must" objective that "the un-organized Democratic front around Roosevelt in 1936 is transformed and developed into an organized,

ment. The differences could be ironed out within the party under a system of genuine democratic centralism.

Had the C.P. of Spain followed a revolutionary line and had it had inner democracy, there would be no basis for the P.O.U.M. to function as a separate party. The P.O.U.M. and all other revolutionary elements within the trade unions would find their places in the ranks of the party and there would be only one organization. They would be free to express their differences, if any, within the framework of the party while abiding by the majority decisions.

The present experiences of the Russian C.P. do not show a need for revision of Lenin's attitude on the role of the party, but rather emphasize the correctness of Lenin in his warnings against the danger of bureaucratization and against the methods employed by Stalin.

In rebuilding the international parties of the working class, great care will have to be taken to avoid a repetition of the Russian experience. Ways and means will have to be found to avoid the pitfalls of bureaucratization and bitter factionalism. The establishment of genuine inner-Party democracy, guaranteeing full freedom of opinion within the party, can be one of the methods to avoid a repetition of the Russian events.

conscious Democratic front in 1938." But all the efforts of the Stalinites to build up capitalist "democracy" as the progressive force, all efforts of their press to picture capitalist "democracy" as the road to peace, freedom and prosperity, are completely ignored by those who are really the masters of capitalist "democratic" politics. They just won't believe all the nice things the C.P. says about them. Thus, the Massachusetts commission appointed by the governor to investigate "subversive isms" slung into the C.P. in good old "democratic" fashion. The commission charges the Stalinites with all the traditional horrors used in Red scares—Moscow gold, fostering riots, Red uprisings, etc., etc. It seems as if these boys just won't join the Stalinite mutual-admiration society.

The report of the commission assumes a very serious aspect, however, when it utilizes the investigation of communism as a means of launching an attack on the trade unions. A good share of the report is devoted to "proving" that the C.I.O. unions are all led and controlled by Reds and that the unions are not concerned with the working conditions of their members but have some mysterious and ulterior motives that are, of course, "un-American." It is of particular interest to note the brazen attempt of the commission to divide the membership of the unions and to turn them against their leaders. The commission soft-soaps the workers, calling them "loyal citizens" and "mised innocents," and then specifically accuses the leadership of being Reds and deliberately hiding this from the members. The A. F. of L. unions are completely exonerated from these charges and taken under the protective wing of the hundred-percenters. It is against the most virile and dynamic section of labor, the C.I.O., that the commission's fury is directed.

There are encouraging indications that the organized workers in the textile mills are beginning to recover from the numbing effects of the depression. In the mill centers of Rhode Island, New Bedford, Lawrence and Lowell, defensive strikes against wage-cuts are occurring with increasing frequency.

! ? ? !

FROM the Daily Worker, June 6, quoting James W. Ford, Stalinist leader:

"The Communist Party honors the Jewish people for their part in the creation of world civilization. Heinrich Heine, Misha Elman, Yasha Heifetz, Yekudi Menuhim, and Albert Einstein and our own Ben Gold, great trade-union leader, and Mike Gold, outstanding proletarian writer, are among the thousands of Jews who have enriched society."

Heinrich Heine and . . . Mike Gold! Albert Einstein and . . . Ben Gold! Words fail us!

Popular Front And Colonies

(Continued from Page 7)

ership provided by the bourgeoisie? The answer is emphatically in the negative. How can you arouse the colonial masses for a long-time struggle against imperialism on the basis of maintaining the internal status-quo, which, for the great majority, means slavery and oppression? After all, for the Chinese peasant, his oppression by the landlord and money-lender is as immediate a brute fact as Japanese imperialist oppression. If the Chinese peasant cannot see national emancipation in terms of economic and social emancipation from the landlord, if the Chinese worker cannot be made to feel that national emancipation will break the stranglehold of the banker and industrialist, then their fighting morale cannot be kept up indefinitely. But the People's Front makes the struggle against the landlord, money-lender or banker taboo. Yes—all hail to the heroic struggle that the Chinese masses are putting up today! But the danger of exhaustion is real. Spain is a case in point. No, in the long run, the only successful guarantee of a struggle that will absorb all the energy and self-sacrifice that an oppressed people is capable of to the bitter end, is to infuse the struggle for national emancipation with the revolutionary social content of the destruction of the economic and class oppression of the workers and peasants. But the People's Front line makes that impossible.

People's Front And Imperialism

Comrades F. and S. say in their letter that the People's Front in colonial lands can "stop imperialists from getting a stranglehold on the colonial and backward countries." Now this claim is pretty similar to the one made by Mao Tse-tung, leader of the Chinese C. P., in answering the following question:

"If Japan is defeated and driven from China, do you think that the major problem of foreign imperialism will in general have been solved here?"

Mao answered: "Yes. If other imperialist powers do not act as Japan. . . ." (p. 85, "Red Star over China"; by Edgar Snow—which book F. and S. say gave them "food for thought"). Ah, but there's the rub! That "if" is a big as a mountain. If imperialist countries stop trying to act like imperialist countries always do. . . . Is Japan the only imperialism involved in the exploitation of the Chinese masses? Will not other imperialisms probably seek to compromise with Japanese imperialism to keep the Chinese masses in subjection rather than risk the danger of a potentially successful revolution in China? And, if for the sake of argument, we assume Japan is forced out, how does that force out other powers (England, U.S.A.) whose imperial existence will keep them in the Far East so long as they remain imperialistic? Are the Chinese masses better off under the English pound or American dollar than under the Japanese yen? The moral emerges clearly again. Emancipation is impossible without a successful struggle against all imperialisms, against imperialism as such. Admittedly, this makes the fight harder. But it's the only possible one!

Who Will Fool Whom?

We think further, that F. and S. are decidedly optimistic when they say: "We wonder how easy Chiang Kai-shek will find it to fool most of the Chinese people after this war, if it is successful. . . ."

Again I quote from one who, the comrades claim, gave them much food for thought:

THE CRACKS APPEAR

FROM a Paris cable published in the Daily Worker of May 18: "Thorez (secretary of the Communist Party of France) has opened a series of articles in L'Humanite, the communist central organ, discussing questions raised by Maurice Honel, communist member of the Chamber of Deputies.

"Wide sections of the workers, Honel said in an article in L'Humanite, were showing marked dissatisfaction with the course of the domestic and foreign policy of the Daladier government. . . .

"As a result, Honel said, many workers were advocating the formation of a 'workers front' or a 'revolutionary front' to replace the People's Front."

Apparently, large sections of the French working class are beginning to think clearly and find their bearings. And all of Thorez's articles won't succeed in keeping them confused forever. . . .

"Quite clearly, the Kuomintang will utilize to the fullest extent the benefits of the new communist policy to itself. With Nanking's authority now recognized by the only political party in China capable of challenging it, Chiang Kai-shek will continue to extend his military and economic power. . . . Improving his military position all around the Reds, he meanwhile extracts political compromises from them in return for his temporary toleration. Eventually, by skillful combination of political and economic tactics, he hopes so to weaken them politically that, when the moment is right for the final demand of their complete surrender (which he undoubtedly still aspires to secure), he may isolate the Red Army, fragmentize it on the basis of internal political dissensions and deal with the recalcitrant remnant as a purely regional military problem." ("Red Star Over China," by Edgar Snow, p. 444).

Let F. and S. get some food for thought from this. Snow is absolutely correct. Here, at least, he shows himself to be a political realist. What Snow made as a prophecy is already becoming a reality. The recent Kuomintang Congress made Chiang Kai-shek the supreme "Fuehrer." The Kuomintang is already extending its economic and political sway. Repeatedly has Chiang's publicity department come out with blasts amounting to the following: "Communism is impossible in China. We are glad to welcome the C.P.'s surrender of communism. So long as they are good boys and keep this up and don't deviate from the political principles of the Kuomintang, so long will we be good friends—but so soon as they renege, then. . . ."

I am not sufficiently acquainted with the concrete facts in Chile but I think F. and S. more than a little naive when they acclaim: "The right-wing crowd is crying already that the socialists and communists in Chile are going to swallow up the bourgeois radicals, as they are doing in Spain." Yes, in Spain, the C.P. swallowed many bourgeois radicals (why?), but bourgeois radicalism has swallowed communism. The latter fact is more significant than the former in partially explaining the disastrous turn of events in Spain. The fact is to be bemoaned and not acclaimed. And, as to the fact that two years ago, the "C.P. was outlawed as a party" and today "they are even being talked about in the right-wing press without too much unfavorable comment"—does not this rather damn the C.P. than vindicate its policy? F. and S. draw the wrong conclusions from these not insignificant facts!