

**VOTE SOCIALIST!**  
**NORMAN THOMAS**  
**FOR PRESIDENT**

# Workers Age

Weekly Paper of the Independent Labor League of America

**PROGRESSIVES SAVE TEACHERS**  
UNION . . . by Mark Starr . . . page 2.  
**PM WHITEWASHES TROTSKY MURDER**  
. . . by D. Graham . . . page 3.

Vol. 9, No. 34.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1940.

5 CENTS

## They Conscript Lives . . . But Don't Dare Touch Profits!

By ROBERT M. LAFOLLETTE

CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS are badly mistaken if they think that the American people will accept without protest the inconsistent attitudes embodied in the two major bills now pending before Congress. Both of the measures deal with national defense. One taxes corporation excess profits, the other conscripts human man-power, but entirely different treatment is accorded each.

The corporations are tenderly coddled and given alternative methods of computing their tax. They are allowed liberal amortization provisions, and the Vinson-Trammell Act limiting profits on government contracts is repealed.

Under the proposed bill, according to estimates of the Treasury Department, corporations will contribute only \$190,000,000 in additional excess-profits taxes this year, while fat profits are made from government defense appropriations which at present total about \$14,700,000,000. In fact, the amount of the tax collected under the bill is so negligible that it was suggested at the hearings that the tax feature of the bill was merely a sugar-coating to the public in granting further concessions to the corporations.

### CORPORATIONS CAN'T LOSE UNDER TWO PLANS

The people are being led to believe that this is an adequate and equitable tax bill. The facts are that with this bill enacted, the net deficit during the current fiscal year will be about \$5,600,000,000 instead of \$5,790,000,000! The expression "a mere drop in the bucket" can be applied very aptly.

No substantial amount of revenue can be raised under the bill because of its hybrid nature. It gives the corporation the option of paying according to a plan based on profits with relation to invested capital, or a plan based on earnings in excess of average earnings in the years 1936 to 1939 inclusive. Separately, the plans would raise \$600,000,000 and \$300,000,000, respectively, in 1940. Together in the same bill as optional taxes, the net yield would be only \$190,000,000.

The first plan is based on the theory used in the 1918 and subsequent acts. The second plan fails to take into account ability to pay, and allows corporations who earned high profits during the base period 1936-1939 to continue to earn those profits without additional taxes. One is a tax predicated on the basis of a long-time tax; the other, a temporary tax for a limited emergency. The gravest evil in the pending bill is the combination of the two, thus giving the corporations a "heads we win, tails the Treasury loses" option.

### NATION'S MANHOOD NOT TREATED SO TENDERLY

Why is the corporation treated with kid gloves? When the revenue act of 1940 was under consideration in June, I protested that individual income taxes were being increased in the aggregate by 37% and excise taxes by 35%, while corporation taxes were being increased in the aggregate by only 17%. According to a tabulation of the National City Bank of New York, published recently, corporation profits were 59% higher the first half of this year than the first half of last year.

The young manhood of America is not treated so tenderly in the conscription bill. No alternative plans are granted them. The conscripted men would sacrifice all social and economic ties, with an illusory guarantee that their jobs might be waiting for them upon the completion of training and service.

The need for compulsory military training has not been proven. On the other hand, the need for additional tax revenues and the desirability of preventing defense profiteering are clearly obvious to all. What, then, is the justification for a drastic policy of conscripting men while soft-pedaling the taxation of corporations? This is not the way to strengthen the faith of the people in their government. The conscription bill should be beaten and a real excess-profits tax enacted.

# Peace-Time Conscription Becomes Law

## Nazis Admit Britain Far From Beaten

Hitler Threatens Five Years War; Iron Guard Force King Carol to Abdicate

Marking the opening of the second year of war last week, Adolf Hitler declared in an address at Berlin that Germany was prepared for five years more of war, if necessary, to subdue Britain. In the end, he asserted, Britain would be crushed. His speech was notable for its unusual emotionalism and nervousness, seeming to betray a growing strain in Germany as a result of the indefinite protraction of the British campaign.

Outside observers took Hitler's words as a confession that the German air offensive against the British Isles had had little decisive effect so far and that the end was by no means in sight. An intensification of the Nazi attack was expected, but there seemed little likelihood of any attempt at direct invasion. In his speech, Hitler contented himself with a vague general threat: "We are coming."

The all-out air warfare threatened by the German dictator went into full swing immediately as German bombers multiplied their raids by day and night. But the damage of a military character inflicted by them was still not extensive, certainly not enough seriously to impede the British war effort either industrially or from the point of view of morale. The German formations were effectively broken up before they reached their goals, eyewitness accounts reported. The Royal Air Force continued its attack on important objectives in Germany and German-occupied territory on the continent.

From all indications, the Campaign of Britain, almost three months old last week, was settling down to a new kind of war of attrition—which may conceivably, but

## Hitler's Cheapest Victory . . .

"FOR I say to you—and I say it with all the solemnity of which I am capable—the integrity and institutions of the United States are indeed gravely threatened, and it is the bill now before the Senate (the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill) and the hysteria which bred it which create that threat.

"If you pass this bill, you slit the throat of the last democracy still living; you accord to Hitler his greatest and cheapest victory to date. On the headstone of American democracy, he will inscribe: 'Here lies the foremost victim of the war of nerves.'"—Senator Burton K. Wheeler, in an address to the Senate, August 13, 1940.

not probably, be superseded by the words as a confession that the German air offensive against the British Isles had had little decisive effect so far and that the end was by no means in sight. An intensification of the Nazi attack was expected, but there seemed little likelihood of any attempt at direct invasion. In his speech, Hitler contented himself with a vague general threat: "We are coming."

A very significant comment on the Campaign of Britain was made last week by an authoritative writer in the Stockholm Aftonbladet, one of the two chief pro-German Swedish dailies. This paper published a dispatch from its Berlin correspondent under the title, "Germany cannot gain victory by the air war." The correspondent said that this was the opinion of military circles in the German capital. The same circles believed, he said, that only through the landing of troops would it be possible to get even a compromise peace with Great Britain. The prospects of success of such an attempt at invasion were not discussed.

Quoting neutral opinion in Berlin, the paper said three theories pre- (Continued on Page 2)

## "PATRIOTISM" THAT PAYS



from The Brewery Worker

## House Passes Measure With 60-Day Delay

Legislation Goes to Conference for Adjustment of Differences Between Houses

Last week an epoch in American history came to an end. . . For the first time in the one hundred and sixty-four years of the life of the republic, a law providing for a system of peace-time military conscription—a system hitherto regarded as fundamentally un-American, as characteristic of the militaristic states of Europe—was adopted by Congress. Sober-minded Americans, rising above the hysteria of the moment, foresaw the most disastrous consequences to the economic, social and political life of the nation, and the cherished ideals of freedom and democracy. . .

Peace-time conscription came to America last week as the House of Representatives, by a vote of 263 to 149, adopted in modified form the Burke-Wadsworth bill. The week before, a somewhat different version of the same bill had been passed by a vote of 58 to 31. After passage in the House, the bill went to a conference committee of both houses for adjustment of differences, after which it would go to the White House for the President's signature and thus become law.

The chief difference between the House and Senate bills consisted in the amendment adopted by the lower house to delay the calling up of drafted men for sixty days, during which a voluntary recruiting drive would be pushed under stimulus of a Presidential proclamation. This amendment, sponsored by Representative Hamilton Fish and twice adopted by vote of the House, provided that the President should immediately issue a call for 400,000 recruits. If in 60 days, that number was not raised by voluntary enlistment, the difference should then be raised by a draft. Registration and classification would be put into operation without delay, however, as soon as the bill became law.

This amendment was denounced by Administration spokesmen as "throwing chaos" into the army's schedules and wrath of the voters to escape the "swardly" trick in the November elections (the 60 days would postpone application of the draft until just after election day). But these Administration leaders did not explain what business the army had to prepare schedules based on conscription before Congress had acted. Nor did they succeed in reconciling their gibes that the Fish amendment was designed as a political trick on the voters with their contention that the great majority of the people favored and even demanded peace-time conscription.

Another important difference between the House and Senate versions was in regard to the much-discussed "conscription of industry." The Senate provided that the President could take over and operate plants necessary for national defense where no satisfactory agreement could be reached with the owners, compensation to be awarded later by federal courts under condemnation proceedings and permanent ownership of the plant to remain with the government, on terms fixed by the President, with the offending heads of the concern subject to criminal indictment; the plants, however, would revert to the original owners at the end of the emergency.

Still another difference related to the age brackets of the draft. The Senate bill specified 21 to 31, but the House extended the limit to 45. The House also fixed the maximum number of conscripts serving at any time at 1,000,000 as against the Senate figure of 900,000.

Both bills provide that drafted men shall not serve anywhere outside (Continued on Page 4)

## F.D.R. Sends Destroyers To Britain, Gets Bases

Acts Without Consulting Congress or People; More Commitments Rumored

Washington, D. C. . . President Roosevelt precipitated another nation-wide sensation last week when he suddenly informed Congress that he had already completed arrangements for the transfer of fifty "over-age" destroyers to Great Britain in return for ninety-nine-year leases from Britain of sea and air bases at eight strategic continental and island points in this hemisphere.

The deal, with all its implications, was held by the President as the most important since Jefferson's purchase of the Louisiana territory in 1803. Nevertheless, Mr. Roosevelt did not present the matter to Congress, or the Senate, for consideration and approval, as Jefferson had done. He acted secretly on his own responsibility and confronted Congress and the people with an accomplished fact.

The President said he acted on the basis of a legal opinion submitted to him by his Attorney General, Robert Jackson.

Even among those who approved of the transfer of the destroyers to Britain as a means of aiding it in its fight against Hitler, there was considerable protest against Mr. Roosevelt's arbitrary, high-handed, unconstitutional methods in ignoring Congress and the people in a matter of such immense importance. There was also considerable uneasiness and misgiving as to the exact terms of the transaction. Rumors of further commitments by the United States, beyond the transfer of the destroyers, were rife. Raymond Clapper, well-known political commentator, gave expression to these questions in his column in the Scripps-Howard papers on September 4:

"One is tempted to question whether the fifty destroyers are all that Britain expects in payment. . . Some people here (in Washington) believe that a sequel to this transaction is to be our entry fully into the war after election. . .

"Attorney General Jackson's opinion knocked the mosquito boats out of the deal and left us giving only the fifty destroyers. Nevertheless, the note of British Ambassador Lothian mentions that the exchange is to be 'for naval and military equipment and material.' Secretary Hull mentions the transfer of fifty destroyers 'in consideration' of the British offer. Is it in 'full' consideration, or in payment on account? . . .

"To reassure the public that the destroyers would not be surrendered to Germany, Secretary Hull nailed down a commitment from Churchill based on the Prime Minister's June 4 speech to Commons in which he said the British fleet would, if British waters became untenable, be transferred overseas. But Churchill also said in the same sentence that, from overseas, the British fleet would 'carry on the struggle until in God's good time the New World, with all its power and might, sets forth to the liberation and rescue of the Old.' That suggests an expecta-

tion that eventually we will be in to help. . . Churchill said two weeks ago that the lease of bases would mean England and the United States would have to be somewhat mixed up together in some of their affairs and that he did not view this process with any misgivings. . . Thus, British statesmen apparently are trying to tell their people that an Anglo-American alliance is in the making and that they can expect us to join in the struggle."

## A. F. L. Shifts Its Stand on Wagner Act

Green Opposed to Smith Committee Proposals; Small Chance of Early Action

Washington, D. C. . . There is now much less likelihood than there has been in recent months for action being taken by Congress to amend or modify the Wagner Act in any vital respect. This sudden change in the situation is largely the result of the sudden shift in the attitude of the A. F. of L. leadership as signaled in the position taken by President William Green before the Senate Labor Committee recently.

After the session of this committee, it became definitely known—as was already suspected—that Mr. Green had withdrawn his support of amendments passed by the House and recommended by the Smith Committee, which investigated the Labor Board for that body. The A. F. of L. leader explained that he had endorsed the Smith amendments only with reservations and that, rather than have them pass without change, he would prefer to see them killed.

This was very welcome to Administration Senators. These legislators had long opposed any serious change in federal labor laws, but had expected the American Federation of Labor to support the Smith amendments with vigor. Instead, they learned from Mr. Green that his organization would be satisfied with an increase in Labor Board membership from three to five, and would like an amendment to permit the organization of craft unions in any plant where a majority of craftsmen wanted one. This amendment is violently opposed by the C.I.O.

Opponents of the Wagner Act and the Labor Board had not hoped that the Senate would accept all of the Smith Committee amendments, but they had hoped that a few, at least, would be approved. Mr. Green, however, opposed the bill's provision separating the Board's judicial and administrative functions, its definition of agricultural laborers exempt

# Knitgoods Contract Signed

Union Succeeds in Maintaining Conditions, Workers Gain Week's Vacation

Brooklyn, N. Y.

The knitgoods industry in Greater New York came to a standstill Thursday, August 22, as thousands of knitgoods workers in association, "independent," and open shops, walked out at the call of the Knitgoods Workers Union, Local 155, I.L.G.W.U.

Just before the stoppage, however, an agreement was reached between the union and the United Knitwear Manufacturers League, thereby averting a bitter struggle in the entire industry.

The negotiations between the union and the United Knitwear Manufacturers League covered a period of six weeks. A week before the stoppage, an agreement had finally been reached between the union and the League after a conference in the office of President Dubinsky, but the employers subsequently rejected the report of their own negotiators at a membership meeting of the League. The union thereupon got ready for a strike. The employers association then voted to accept the agreement previously reached.

The new agreement provides for the maintenance of the present working conditions in the industry, keeping intact the 35-hour week. An increase in working hours had been one of the demands of the employers. In addition, the union has won one week's vacation with pay for all workers. The knitted-textile-fabric and textile-trimming workers won a week's vacation with pay before the knitted-outerwear workers gained it thru in the new pact.

Contract ratification meetings were held on Friday, August 23, in Brooklyn and New York. The meetings were addressed by Vice-President Charles S. Zimmerman and Serafino Romualdi. The workers cheered Zimmerman's statement that in the struggles to complete the organization of the knitgoods industry, Local 155 could count on the

Bath, Maine

In the first outbreak of racialism ever known in this region, varnish was smeared over the store fronts and windows of eight Jewish-owned establishments before dawn last Saturday. The police were checking on Nazi sympathizers in their search for clues. Local K.K.K. groups, recently revived, were also suspected.



LOUIS NELSON

wholehearted support of the dress-makers.

After the agreement was read by Manager Nelson and a wide discussion took place, it was overwhelmingly endorsed by the workers at both meetings.

Following the settlement in the association shops, the union is concentrating its attention on the "independent" and the open shops. "The union," said Manager Nelson, "will insist that the same working conditions be established in all mills. The union has been recognized as a constructive, stabilizing force in the industry."

Norman Thomas, who addressed one of the strike meetings, hailed the union's demand for a vacation with pay as symbolic of the struggles of the labor movement for a better life for the working people. "I have heard," said Thomas, "that you have already settled with the association. You are to be congratulated that your power made it possible to win the 'Blitzkrieg' against the employers' association so quickly. While I oppose the Blitzkrieg of the dictators and rulers, I am always ready to support the Blitzkriegs of the workers for a better life."

Congratulating the workers on their past record, Thomas said: "I like this union. I like its spirit and its enthusiasm. I like the things you stand for and are now fighting for. You are carrying on the struggle for American democracy and American defense. Defense of America means more than just cre-

ating cannon. It means creating jobs and security. It means eliminating the 'Joads.' When America conquers unemployment, it will have the income to give the people decent living conditions and have enough for defense."

The union's attempt to bring stabilization into the knitgoods industry was brought into bold relief this week when a group of Ridgewood knitwear contractors organized to get better terms from the jobbers. These Ridgewood contractors, who operate small family units and are, in the main, non-union, have been mercilessly exploited by the jobbers. And so, emulating the union's attempt to win better con-

ditions for the workers, these contractors decided to utilize the same technique and followed suit. They called their stoppage Friday, August 23.

In commenting on this move Louis Nelson, stated: "The union is ready to cooperate with all elements seeking to bring healthy, normal conditions into the knitgoods industry. We think the contractors in Ridgewood have a right to demand more for themselves from the jobbers, but so do the workers. If these contractors are ready to come into the framework of collective bargaining, then their efforts will have a meaning and should bring results; otherwise, they are bound to fail."

## I.L.L.A. Holds National Committee Meeting

OVER the Labor Day week-end, a meeting of the National Committee of the Independent Labor League of America was held in New York City. The committee heard reports on and discussed two main points: (1) our policy on the war and the defense of America; and (2) the organizational situation and problems of the I.L.L.A.

On the first question, there were two reporters, Will Herberg and Bertram D. Wolfe, representing two different viewpoints. The committee adopted the following set of motions, introduced by Jay Lovestone:

"1. To accept the resolution presented by Will Herberg (published in the August 10 and 17, 1940 issues of the Workers Age) as the basis for the policy of the I.L.L.A.

"2. To recommend to the convention the adoption of the resolution as a basis.

"3. To endorse specifically the position taken by the resolution on the following questions as embodying a sound socialist position: (a) on national defense; (b) in its unqualified opposition to 'appeasement'; (c) in its attitude to the problem of hemisphere relations; and (d) in its position on keeping America out of war."

As against these motions, a motion was made to endorse the line of the report by Bertram D. Wolfe. This motion received five votes. There was one abstention. All the rest of the members of the committee voted for the Lovestone motions.

It was decided to hold a convention of the I.L.L.A. towards the end of the year.

After a report and discussion on the organizational problems of the I.L.L.A., it was decided to meet the difficulties of the present situation with a program of organizational activation, expanding educational activities and financial re-trenchment.

# Progressives Save Teachers Union from Stalinist Grip

By MARK STARR  
(Mark Starr is educational director of the I.L.G.W.U. and a vice-president of the American Federation of Teachers.—Editor.)

The general relief of their fellow-unionists throughout the United States, the members of the American Federation of Teachers—by the election, at the Buffalo convention, August 19-23, of a new set of vice-presidents, and the reelection of Dr. George S. Counts as president—demonstrated that they want a genuine trade union working in conjunction with the American Federation of Labor and with a policy correlated to the needs of the American labor movement and American teachers rather than the danger of being correlated by some few locals to an ever-changing outside "party line."

## ATTACK ON DR. COUNTS

Everybody was pleased with the exception of the Communist Party's Daily Worker—owned by the Three Little Old Ladies of Thirteenth Street. (You will remember their given names as Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania.) Its reports did not even make a normal attempt to be accurate. And on Sunday, August 18, its outlook had all seemed so rosy! In anticipation of some criticism from President Green of the A. F. of T., an "Educational Defense Committee" spontaneously sprang into existence with the most non-controversial and praiseworthy program. Next day, this "Defense Committee" just as suddenly became a political caucus to defeat George S. Counts as president. (The Three Little Old Ladies must be getting a little deaf, because they reported that Green and Thomas Lyons, president of the New York State Federation, were both "received coldly.")

However, on Monday, the Communist Party organ felt sure that by naming John L. DeBoer of Chicago, they had adroitly split that city's delegation. Next day, "news" to the Three Little Old Ladies consisted of the mimeo reply of Local 5 to Green's criticism. Having nauseated themselves by the overused name-calling device of "Red-baiting," "Lovestonites," "Trotskyites," etc., etc., the communists and their friends welcomed a new term of abuse, "intellectual goon-squad." All these names are applied to everybody that mentions Finland and Spain together or who affirms that a dictatorship exists in Soviet Russia or who notes the 100% correlation in the line of the Communist Party and the changes of policy made, for example, by Local 5.

## RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

In the struggle over resolutions, Philadelphia Local 192 wanted to exploit the legitimate anger against some of Thurman Arnold's actions to put the convention on record as asserting motivation of the Roosevelt Administration to smash the unions, while falsely asserting that the law had never been used against any big-business unit. After a spirited debate and a roll-call vote, Soviet Russia was listed with the dictatorships and an attempt to put the American Federation of Teachers into anti-help-for-British-unions column was frustrated when a roll-call was asked on an amendment to delete part of the anti-war resolution, which resolution remained with unfinished business—contrary to the bedtime story of the Three Little Old Ladies.

Local 5 leaders were counting on winning at Buffalo and staying over for the Council meeting and then going on to take the good name of the A. F. of T. into the "Emergency Peace Mobilization" conference at Chicago. Circumstantial evidence to this effect is a meeting an excursion to raise funds for the Chicago conference carried on by the local Buffalo "peace group" (Buffalo Courier-Express, August 26). At the

## Lewis-Hillman Clash Grows Acute in C.I.O. Leadership

By PHILIP PEARL  
Washington, D. C.

AN open break between Sidney Hillman and John L. Lewis is imminent. It is obvious now that they are secretly working against each other for control of the C.I.O. They are each seeking to line up support among C.I.O. affiliates for a showdown fight which will take place at the next C.I.O. convention, if not before.

Their differences are basic and irreconcilable. Organizationally, Lewis wants—as he always has wanted—to destroy the American Federation of Labor and become a one-man dictator over American labor. Hillman, on the other hand, appears to be anxious for labor peace and a reunited labor movement.

Politically, the split between the two C.I.O. leaders is even wider. Lewis hates Roosevelt and is willing to play even the Communist Party's game in a desperate effort to beat him. Hillman adores Roosevelt and he wants to commit the entire C.I.O. organization to support of the New Deal.

But more than all of this, the feud between the two men has now become implacable because Hillman refuses to take orders from Lewis and is pursuing a completely independent course. No one can do that and remain on good terms with Lewis. Through his career, he has demanded complete subservience from all his followers. He has kicked out life-long friends for a mere, momentary deviation from his personal policies. He is now trying to kick out Hillman.

But Hillman is evidently not going to submit quietly to a purge. If Lewis ousts him, Hillman is determined to take other C.I.O. unions with him. Thus, a bitter war is now smoldering within the ranks of the C.I.O. leadership. It flared into public notice a few weeks ago over an incident in connection with the defense program.

In his capacity as labor coordinator for the National Defense Advisory Commission, Hillman appointed a Labor Advisory Committee of sixteen members to consult with him and to help keep labor disputes from retarding the defense program. On this committee were seven representatives from A. F. of T. unions, seven from C.I.O. unions and two from independent railroad brotherhoods.

Characteristically, Lewis was not satisfied with this arrangement, which was more than fair to the C.I.O. because the C.I.O. has one member to every four of the A. F. of T.

So when James J. Matles, organization director of the C.I.O. United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, squawked over Hillman's failure to appoint a representative of his union to the committee, Lewis quickly sought to make political capital out of the complaint within the C.I.O. organization.

Matles first expressed indignation because Hillman said his union was "tinged with Red." This Hillman denies. But the question of veracity is immaterial because the fact is that the union is more than tinged that way. Then, Matles resented a hint from Hillman that the union ought to "square itself politically."

That, also, Hillman denies. But Lewis realized this was fine ammunition. So he quickly dispatched a letter to Hillman protesting against these charges of "practical disloyalty and political non-conformity" of a C.I.O. union. Such a thing, of course, would be impossible. But the letter to Hillman was just a formality. The real purpose in writing it was quickly revealed. Lewis sent copies of the Matles letter and his own to every member of the C.I.O. Executive Board.

What was the significance of this action? The intention, of course, was to accuse Hillman of disloyalty to the C.I.O. Lewis thought he could get the C.I.O. brothers and sisters sore at Hillman. The latter, however, was not caught napping. He replied to Lewis, sharply rejecting the protests and he also sent his letter to each member of the C.I.O. Executive Board. Hillman's purpose also was obvious. He was trying to get Lewis in wrong.

This sort of surreptitious knifing has been going on for some time and before long some one is going to get hurt. At the last C.I.O. convention, Hillman dared to object to Lewis's refusal to continue peace negotiations with the A. F. of T. and he also complained about communist influence in C.I.O. headquarters. This was done behind the closed doors of the C.I.O. Executive Board meeting. Lewis got so angry he threatened to resign as C.I.O. president and that gesture promptly quashed all opposition.

This year, we predict that if Lewis tries the same dodge, his resignation will be gratefully accepted.

## New York Pay Law Extends Coverage

Over 100,000 in 5 Fields Get Benefits

Albany, N. Y.

MORE than 100,000 women and minors in five industries of this state are beneficiaries today of the state minimum-wage law passed by the Legislature in 1937 after the U.S. Supreme Court had reversed itself and validated by a 5 to 4 vote this type of legislation in its decision on the Washington law. The industries covered are: laundry, cleaning and dyeing, restaurant, beauty service and candy.

Another 30,000 workers will come in soon when an order for hotels is approved, and surveys are being planned in 30 more lines of work, including retail trade, theatres and office cleaning. The necessity for surveys and public hearings keep the state from moving faster. The minimum-wage law is not automatic and universal like the Wagner Act or the wage and hour law. It is more like the N.R.A. Industries must be taken up one at a time, special boards named and exhaustive inquiries conducted before a wage order can be issued.

Under the old law, which was thrown out in 1936, there was only one wage order—for the laundry industry. It set a minimum of 31 cents an hour for a 40-hour week in the metropolitan areas and 27½ cents elsewhere.

The present laundry minimums reflect the upward trend of wages during the last three years. They are: 35 cents an hour with a basic 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime above 45 hours in the New York area and all communities of more than 18,000 population; 30 cents an hour elsewhere with the same work-week provisions.

Rates in other industries now covered are: Cleaning and dyeing: Metropolitan area, 36 cents an hour; elsewhere, 33 cents. Forty-hour week, time and a quarter for overtime. Beauty service: \$16.50 for 45-hour week; overtime, 37 cents an hour for beauticians, 33½ cents for maids. Double time after 48 hours in a week and time and a half after 8 hours in a day. Part-time workers get \$4 a day minimum. Restaurants: Waitresses, 20 cents an hour in metropolitan area; 18 cents upstate. Non-service workers, 29 cents and 28 cents for the two

divisions. Deductions for meals, tips, uniforms; etc. forbidden. Higher rates for part-time workers. Candy: Because of the seasonal nature of work, the order provides \$7 for two days employment, \$8.50 for three days. Base rate, 35 cents an hour.

Some of these rates are low, but it must be remembered that most of the workers are not protected by the federal wage and hour law—that they are the easiest victims for sweat-shop employers.

And the experience of over three years has not borne out the argument that "minimum wages soon become maximum," according to Kate Papert, acting director of the Division of Minimum Wages.

Her statistics of the laundry industry show that the median wage was \$14.76 a week in 1937. Last year, it was \$15.62. In 1937, 46.2% earned \$15 a week or more; now 63.6% are in that class.

The effect of the law in the beauty-parlor business was much more striking. Now 85% of the workers make \$15 a week or more. In 1937, only 35% earned that much.

Miss Papert's experience with employer cooperation parallels that of Wage and Hour Administration—most employers want to obey the law; a good many chiselers don't. From the latter the state has already collected more than \$50,000 for 9,000 workers.

unions, and so on were adopted.

The opposition group at the convention, controlled by the Stalinist forces, made a declaration thru its presidential candidate that it was a "vigorous and critical minority, that it was dissatisfied with the new administration and would exercise vigilance and alertness against it." Professor Counts, whose presidential address on the first day of the sessions, scholarly, profound and most thought-provoking, was one of the high lights of the entire convention, answered: "We welcome vigilance and criticism not only from your group but from all members and any other group that may arise." In his first year as president, Professor Counts visited 101 locals out of the 250 in the A. F. of T.; he has given concrete evidence that he stands for real democracy in the union and for a teachers union that will fight for the democratic method as a way of discussing and solving problems. The opposition showed that it meant to continue the fight in an organized factional manner by calling a caucus meeting at the end of the convention.

## ACHIEVEMENTS OF CONVENTION

Some of the results of the convention can be summarized as follows:

1. Stalinist domination was decisively defeated.
2. A strong, concrete and unequivocal resolution against totalitarianism and the existing dictatorships was adopted.
3. A progressive leadership, with Dr. Counts as president, was elected.
4. The existence of a strong anti-war and anti-conscription sentiment in the A. F. of T. was manifested.
5. An appreciation of the decisive importance of affiliation with the A. F. of T. and with the organized labor movement was shown.
6. The progressive forces of the convention became more consolidated and clarified as to issues.
7. The last two conventions (1939 and 1940) have proved of immense educational value to the delegates and representatives of the various locals in the country.
8. The Stalinist forces were given a definite set-back in their two main strongholds—New York and Philadelphia—where their candidates for vice-president—Charles Hendley and Mary Foley Grossman—were defeated.
9. Increased cooperation was brought about between the various forces opposed to the Stalinist-controlled administration of Local 5, New York. What is now needed is unification of these forces to accomplish in the New York organization what was done in the A. F. of T. nationally at the convention. The times and the tasks require unification of the Liberal, Independent and Socialist Party groups.
10. The chances are now better for winning the important Teachers Guild of New York back to the A. F. of T. This will have a decisive effect not only for reuniting the New York teachers-union movement, but for the establishment of a new teachers-union movement in the city.
11. The road has been opened for the more effective unification of the teachers of the country and for better relations with organized labor. The C. P. label is being erased by action of the A. F. of T. membership itself.
12. Leadership of the A. F. of T. has been won by forces committed to the democratic method, not only in letter but in spirit as well. This will make possible the effective tackling of the important teacher and social problems of the day.

## Communist Party Line and Teachers Union Local 5

(We publish below an interesting leaflet issued by the minority of the New Teachers Union Local 5 to the delegates of the American Federation of Teachers convention held recently in Buffalo, N. Y.—Editor.)

IN their speeches to the convention, Presidents Green and Lyons made pointed statements concerning communist domination of Local 5. There is no doubt that the issue raised by them is the crucial issue at this convention. Upon the outcome of that issue depends the existence and the further growth of the A. F. of T. The greatest obstacle in the path of the growth of the A. F. of T. is the political influence and reputation of the leadership of Local 5 and its effect on the national body.

In submitting the following facts, we wish to make clear the right of every member to his political opinion, but we oppose any political domination of the union. For the clarification of delegates we, a group of Local 5 delegates, present below an outline statement of facts indicating the close, uninterrupted parallel between the line of the Communist Party since 1930 and the policies advocated by the present leadership of Local 5 thruout that period. Delegates should note particularly that sudden changes in the party line were invariably followed by corresponding sudden changes in the policies of the leadership of Local 5.

### COMMUNIST PARTY LINE

1. (a) From 1930 to 1935, the Communist Party's main policy in the trade-union field was the establishment of dual unions and the undermining of the A. F. of T.

(b) In 1935, the communist movement suddenly dropped its dualist policy and switched to that of working within the A. F. of T.

2. (a) In 1935, the communist movement suddenly abandoned its "anti-capitalist" policy on war and adopted a policy of "collective security." In the United States, the American League Against War and Fascism, later called the American League for Peace and Democracy, dominated by the Communist Party, similarly adopted a program of "collective security."

(b) From 1936 to 1939, in accordance with its new Popular Front policy, the Communist Party supported Roosevelt and La Guardia.

(c) From 1935 to 1939, Communist Party literature was replete with a new "democratic" and "100% American" phraseology.

(d) From 1935 to 1939, the anti-Nazi boycott was an important plank in the Communist Party program.

(e) During this period, the Communist Party violently opposed the Ludlow amendment for a war referendum.

3. The world-shaking Stalin-Hitler pact, which unleashed the present world war, compelled the Communist Party precipitately to unload its "collective-security" program. A new isolationist program was suddenly embraced. The anti-Nazi boycott was dropped, as was anti-Nazi propaganda. Russia's invasion of Finland was called a "peace move." The American League for Peace and Democracy was doomed and liquidated.

4. The Communist Party supported the American Student Union which, from its very inception, followed the party line.

5. In the crucial internal fight in the American Labor Party in New York, following the Hitler-Stalin pact, the Communist Party organized a faction universally known as its creature.

6. Last year, the American Labor Party refused to endorse Michael Quill for councilman because of his reputation as a supporter of the Communist Party and his refusal to condemn the Hitler-Stalin pact.

7. A Jewish People's Committee was formed by the Communist Party ostensibly to represent Jewish opinion. Practically all accredited Jewish organizations denounced the Jewish People's Committee as a Communist Party organ and as not representing the Jewish people.

8. In accordance with its precipitate change on the war question, the Communist Party suddenly denounced Roosevelt as a war-monger and attacked the New Deal.

9. The newest "peace" move of the Communist Party is its call to an "Emergency Peace Mobilization Congress" in Chicago from August 31 to September 3.

During the last two years, as a direct result of the labeling of the union by the policies described above, 1,800 members dropped out of Local 5. Last year showed a definite net decline in membership. In a desperate attempt to remove the stigma, the leadership of Local 5 presented to the membership a resolution hypocritically "rejecting" Nazism, fascism, socialism and communism.

We urge the delegates to weigh the above facts carefully. The only weapon for honest progressive unionists against the devious maneuverings of a highly disciplined political block is plain, unvarnished truth. Irresponsible charges of "Red-baiting" and unprincipled attempts to heap together sincere critics within our own ranks with reactionaries on the outside are fully as pernicious as "Red-baiting" itself.

### LOCAL 5 ACTION

1. (a) During this period, the Rank and File group in Local 5, communist forerunner of the present administration, organized rival organizations in opposition to the New York Teachers Union and both in the press and in public meeting, attacked Local 5.

(b) At the same time, the forerunners of the present leadership of Local 5 suddenly ceased their public attacks on Local 5, dissolved their rival organizations and instructed their members to join the Teachers Union.

2. (a) The leadership of Local 5, over the opposition of a large number of members, carried its proposal to affiliate with the American League. At the expense of teacher issues, the leadership of Local 5 made "collective security" the central issue of the union during that period. Delegates who were present at the convention last year will recall vividly the pronounced "collective-security," anti-aggressor line of the caucus dominated by Local 5 leadership. These delegates now note not merely its strange absence at this convention, but the advocacy of a diametrically opposed policy.

(b) Local 5 suddenly altered its policy to follow suit. Delegates who were present at the convention last year will recall vividly the pro-Roosevelt line of the caucus dominated by Local 5 leadership. Delegates can now note its strange absence.

(c) The New York Teacher, official organ of Local 5, perfectly echoed this phraseology.

(d) The anti-Nazi boycott became an official Local 5 activity.

(e) The leadership of Local 5 violently opposed the Ludlow amendment.

3. At the very first union meeting after the pact, the leadership of Local 5 suddenly sprang upon the membership the proposal to disaffiliate from the American League and suddenly urged the avoidance of political questions in the union. This was done to avoid discussion of the Stalin-Hitler pact and the invasion of Finland. The anti-Nazi activity suddenly ceased. Anti-fascist material in the New York Teacher suddenly disappeared. The leadership suddenly reversed itself and supported the Ludlow amendment. During this entire period, the leadership of Local 5 refused to condemn the Hitler-Stalin pact and the invasion of Finland.

4. The administration of Local 5 gave unfailing official support to the American Student Union.

5. Bella Dodd and Charles Hendley, in their capacities as officers of the union, sponsored this faction and ran on its slate.

6. Despite its resolution to avoid politics, the leadership of Local 5 endorsed Quill's candidacy.

7. At its last educational conference, in the panel on Tolerance, the only speaker invited by Local 5 to present the Jewish point of view was a spokesman of the Jewish People's Committee. Accredited organizations such as the American Jewish Congress and the Bnai B'rith were not invited to send speakers and protested the inclusion of the Jewish People's Committee.

8. Immediately after President Roosevelt's proposals for increased national defense, the leadership of Local 5 suddenly injected into the agenda of a union meeting a telegram unconditionally opposing his proposal. As a direct result of this telegram there were 250 protest resignations from the union.

9. Only last week, the Executive Board members of Local 5 were suddenly asked to vote by mail on the highly controversial question of sending delegates to this congress. No information concerning its sponsorship was given. Mr. Hendley urged that delegates be sent.

MINORITY DELEGATES OF LOCAL 5

(Concluded in the next issue)

## Nazis Recognize Britain Is Still Far From Beaten

(Continued from page 1)

valued: first, a compromise peace when German air attacks reached their peak, but "it is England's turn now to make proposals"; second, a quick peace thru invasion; and third, victory thru the air war and blockade "since Germany is unable to stage a successful invasion."

The turmoil in the Balkans, precipitated by the new partition of Rumania, showed no sign of abatement last week. Indeed, in Rumania, King Carol's submission to the Berlin-Rome award of northern Transylvania to Hungary was followed by wide popular disturbances, fomented and exploited by the pro-Nazi Iron Guard. Carol attempted to head off the danger and save his crown by handing over dictatorial power to General Antonescu, fascist leader closely associated with the Iron Guard. But this move failed, for the Iron Guard attacks upon the king merely increased. In a few hours, he was stripped of most of his powers by the new dictator and then forced to abdicate in favor of his son, Michael. With the Iron Guard in control, Rumania fell completely under German domination.

meeting, Bella Dodd spoke as the "legislative representative of the American Federation of Teachers." The correction concerning the facts was sent to the Courier-Express by Irwin S. Kuenzli, but a denial never catches up to the original assertion and the clippings from local and national newspapers will tell of many similar instances which have given an entirely wrong impression about the relationship of the A. F. of T. to the labor movement.

The defeated opposition in the Daily Worker reports tried to cheer itself up by false statements about "100 proxies," despite the fact that its charming front, Gertrude Luchning, richer than anyone else, had four all for herself. (The writer was characterized as "David Dubinsky's man" altho the president of the I.L.G.W.U. did not know the educational director of the I.L.G.W.U. was to be present at Buffalo to represent Local 189, of which he had been a member since 1928.) But why try to overtake such misrepresentation? A reading of the issues of the communist daily from August 19 to August 23 is warmly recommended to any delegates who want to get the party line on the "Educational Defense Committee."

## Progressives Gain Big Victory at A.F.T. Meet

Reelect Counts, Repel C.P. Power Bid

By D. BENJAMIN  
(Concluded from Last Issue)

RESOLUTIONS and motions poured into the Resolutions Committee on various aspects of the war question. The majority of the Resolutions Committee recommended the following:

### RESOLUTION ON WAR

"1. That we stand firmly opposed to the involvement of the United States in the present war and to any steps which may lead this country into war, such as the relaxation of the neutrality legislation, and loans or credits to belligerents.

"2. That we oppose anti-alien legislation, curtailment of freedom of speech, restriction of the rights of trade unions, regimentation and militarization of education.

"3. That we support the maintenance and expansion of budgets for education, unemployment relief, W.P.A., health and other social needs of the American people.

"4. That we demand that defense education in vocational schools and the placing of young workers in defense industries be undertaken only with trade-union participation.

"5. That we favor adequate defense of our country. It is our position that defense is not only a matter of armaments and that an essential part of any program for defense must be the defense of our most precious possessions—the lives, liberties and well-being of the people. We consider that true defense cannot be achieved at the expense of

social legislation and civil liberties and must be linked with neutrality and the determination not to become involved in the war."

An amendment in favor of "aid to England short of war" was defeated in the committee.

A resolution to favor "immediate registration of all male citizens from the ages of 18 to 65" and to support "the principle of the selective draft" was defeated and in its place was substituted a resolution opposing "universal military conscription at this time" and favoring instead "an immediate and substantial raise in the pay of the army personnel, especially enlisted men" and "an immediate campaign for bringing the army up to the full quota thru voluntary enlistment."

The vote in the Resolutions Committee showed a division of opinion among the progressive delegates on these various questions. The main anti-war resolution, containing the five points enumerated above, was adopted by a standing vote of the convention after an attempt by some delegates to delete point one, calling upon the United States to stay out of war and not to take any steps leading in that direction. In addition, an amendment was passed calling for nationalization of the munitions industry. A roll call was demanded and was in the process when a motion to adjourn the convention was carried. This meant that the A. F. of T. officially did not take any stand on the war question or on such problems as conscription. Other resolutions for the defense of education, against the Thurman-Arnold attacks upon the trade

**SUBSCRIBE NOW!**  
**WORKERS AGE**  
131 West 33rd St., New York City  
I enclose \$1.00 for a year's subscription   
\$1.00 per year \$ .65 for six months  
Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

# How PM Whitewashes the G.P.U. Murder of Trotsky

## New Tabloid Fronts for Assassins in the Kremlin

By DONALD GRAHAM

THERE has not been the slightest doubt expressed in either the labor or general press of the United States that the murder of Leon Trotsky was perpetrated by Stalin through his International Murder, Inc., otherwise known as the G.P.U. However, there are two exceptions to this universally held opinion. The first, naturally, is the American organ of Stalin, the Daily Worker, which pretends that the murder was the work of a "disillusioned follower" of Trotsky. One can hardly expect a confession from the real murderer—just yet. What is worth noting is the second exception, PM, the much-heralded New York news tabloid. On August 23, one Frank Jellinek wrote with an air of finality and authority:

"No evidence whatever given out here connects Leon Trotsky's murder with the U.S.S.R.'s secret police, the local Communist Party or with the previous attempt on Trotsky's life." PM rushes in, with its Stalinist-packed staff, to defend the innocence of the G.P.U. and the Communist Party. The fact that all the evidence points the other way is completely ignored. One need but recall the sending of George Mink, G.P.U. agent with a notorious record of murder of revolutionary socialists in Barcelona, to Mexico well over a year ago in order to organize the murder of Trotsky, a fact exposed at that time not only in the Trotskyist press, and well known in all labor circles. Only three months ago, a well-prepared, heavily-financed machine-gun attack on Trotsky and his wife occurred, resulting in the murder of Sheldon Harte, one of Trotsky's guards. Almost a score of people took part. Everyone so far apprehended as a participant in that murderous expedition has been revealed as connected with the Communist Party, the G.P.U., or both.

But let us examine the evidence in the letter carried by Frank Jackson, the G.P.U. assassin, on his own person at the time of the murder of Trotsky. This letter is undoubtedly not unfamiliar to the writers of PM, for the Daily Worker joyously prints its contents in full. We quote from the Daily Worker report of the letter (far be it from us to take any "distorted" version):

- "Leon Trotsky had the support of the 'parliamentary committee' of a 'great nation' in his plots and intrigues, Frank Jackson, assassin of the counter-revolutionary leader, disclosed in a letter written on the eve of the attack."
- "Referring to Trotsky's finances, Jackson said: 'Perhaps the consul of the great nation who secretly visits him could answer this question.'"
- Trotsky "proposed that I go to Russia and organize there a series of attacks on different persons, particularly Stalin."
- Jackson "also linked Trotsky with the counter-revolutionary forces of Almazan, claiming that Trotsky had hinted at the expected murder of Avila Camacho and Lombardo Toledano."
- "He ended the letter by describing Trotsky's contempt for Sylvia Ageloff because she is a member in a leading position and that it was partly for her that he decided to 'remove the chief' who caused 'only great damage.'"

### STRICTLY A G.P.U. LETTER

If ever there was a letter written by the G.P.U., this is it. Only a year ago, Trotsky was in official Stalinist circles an "agent of Hitler." The Stalinist prosecutor in Moscow had even "discovered" that Trotsky had been an agent of Germany for almost twenty years! Now that Stalin has entered upon a close fraternal relationship with Hitler, Trotsky is suddenly discovered to be backed by the "parliamentary committee of a great nation," and financed by the "consul of the great nation who secretly visits him." The letter is so couched as to avoid any reference to Nazi Germany—we must not annoy "our friends," the fascists, now. Jackson is obviously referring to Great Britain. What other "great nation" has a parliament, much the less a parliamentary committee? If the U.S.A. were intended, it could only be a House committee or Senate committee.

And what astounding restraint is shown by this Jackson! He does not hesitate to murder his supposed "chief," and to carry with him for that purpose an alpenstock, a dagger and a revolver—but to name the country and the consul who have been backing Trotsky is too much for his sensitive soul! All this has a familiar ring. Anyone who recalls the Moscow "trials" can vividly recall how the officials of Stalin's government, with great diplomatic subtlety, would refrain from mentioning the name of the country supposedly financing the victim. Unnamed consuls also secretly moved about them. Jackson talks just like a G.P.U. prosecutor, like a Russian government agent, not like a shocked and disillusioned follower of Trotsky.

Let me give an example. Suppose Ralph Ingersoll, editor of PM, were convinced by a sweetheart of his to become a loyal follower of Earl Browder. Remember—I am only supposing! Ingersoll then finds that Browder is in the pay of the British government. Moreover, Browder urges him to murder Mrs. Trotsky,

President Roosevelt and William Green, and then to top it all, speaks in a venomous manner regarding the very sweetheart who introduced him to Browder. Shocked and disillusioned, Ingersoll decides to do something about it. What? Murder Browder? Or would not Ingersoll rather rush back to PM with a first-class political expose to intersperse among revelations regarding watered meat and ice-cream? But let us suppose Ingersoll decides to murder Browder. Would he carry with him a letter in which he talks like a Russian government official—saying that he has discovered that Browder is the agent of an "unnamed" government? Would the outraged Ingersoll hesitate in his last epistle to the world to reveal what consul he had discovered was financing the "chief?" The whole thing is so fantastic that no one who is not sub-moronic or corrupt could possibly believe such nonsense. Jackson's G.P.U. letter is for consumption by Russian peasants; and even they can see thru it—if they dare. Stalin's crudity increases in direct proportion to the number of his assassinations.

### MOSCOW TRIAL CHARGES REENACTED

That Trotsky should instruct Jackson to go to Russia to commit a "series" of murders of Russian leaders, and particularly Stalin, is similarly a G.P.U. fraud. It is deliberately concocted to give justification for Stalin's murder of Trotsky. It implies that Trotsky was a hopeless fool and that every reader of the Jackson letter is the same. Everyone knows that foreigners entering the U.S.S.R. are under careful observation by the G.P.U. Every citizen of Russia who is visited by a foreigner is also under close observation. But when the visitor to Russia is a supposed Belgian born in Persia, with a false American passport on one occasion and a fake Canadian passport on another, one who could have been observed visiting Trotsky frequently during the past six months, and who in addition has been in constant touch with Trotsky followers during the previous two years, the idea of accomplishing one murder in Russia, let alone a series, is simply outlandish. Such a "visitor" wouldn't get very far beyond the Russian border, and if he did, he would accomplish

# Arnold's "Anti-Trust" Drive Against Labor

## Arbitrary Restrictions Forced on Unions

By MATTHEW WOLL

ON March 15, 1938, Thurman Arnold, the present Assistant Attorney General, was placed in charge of the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice. On April 29 of that same year, the President presented a message to Congress in which he spoke of the dangers of concentration of wealth and economic power. He urged that a careful survey and inquiry be made into these developments. He also urged that an appropriation of sufficient size be set aside to carry out these purposes.

Now, in the President's message to Congress, there is not the slightest intimation that he had labor organizations in mind as a dangerous concentration of power. Reading his message through, there is not the slightest intimation that he complained of what labor had done or was doing. To the contrary, everyone had reason then—as well as reason now—to believe that the President meant the concentration of economic power in the hands of industrialists and financiers. Congress responded and labor did not raise its voice in objection. A large appropriation was made available to the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice under the supervision of Thurman Arnold and for the purpose of survey and inquiry.

### THURMAN ARNOLD STRIKES AT LABOR

Then things began to hum. Labor organizations were investigated everywhere. Prosecution upon prosecution followed. Up to March 30, 1940, 74 indictments were had in eleven cities with 985 organizations and individuals involved. Of these 985 organizations and individuals, 200 are union representatives and 58 are labor unions.

What has come to pass? Today, we find every old precedent, every old decision for the past fifty years, revived by Thurman Arnold. This tendency, combined with his conception of these laws and his procedure directed against labor, unless stopped will ultimately mean the destruction of our trade-union organizations.

It was on November 20, 1939, that Thurman Arnold released his infamous letter to the secretary of the Indianapolis Central Labor Union, wherein he defined his policy in the prosecution of what he conceived to be violators of the Sherman and Clayton anti-trust laws. Let me quote the paragraph of his letter giving his reasons for his present

nothing but get into a concentration camp everyone he spoke to, no matter how innocent. The editors of PM and the loyal disciples of Stalin need not lose any sleep at night worrying about the danger threatening the life of the Russian Fuehrer. He is no worse guarded than are the other Fuehrers and Duces. The likelihood of Stalin suffering a violent death comes not from some visitor to the Soviet Union but from a fair and long overdue trial at the hands of the Russian proletariat.

### FROM HITLER TO ALMAZAN

Jackson's letter links Trotsky to Almazan. Here again, the only people who have been able to see any connection between Trotsky and Almazan have been the Stalinists. For months, the Communist Party papers have carried on a lively campaign about a Trotsky-Almazan plot, with the purpose of having Trotsky driven out of Mexico. But never have they given an iota of proof. No other papers or organizations have been able to discover such a link. Not even the Mexican government, whose police have been in, near and around the Trotsky home during all this time, have been able to discover such a connection. All statements and articles of Trotsky have shown a rigid adherence to the policy of non-interference in the internal politics of Mexico. If Trotsky had any link with Almazan, it must have been not thru personal conferences, letters, articles, statements or speeches—but thru mental telepathy! Yet the "disillusioned follower of Trotsky" suddenly begins to talk like the Daily Worker and discovers a "link" and "hints" of assassination of Mexican officials, for no conceivable purpose or reason whatsoever. What could Trotsky accomplish by such nonsense except to provoke his expulsion from the only country that had given him a place of refuge? It is a policy simply ascribed to him by the G.P.U., not one that he could possibly, by any stretch of the imagination, have advocated.

### UNSUBSTANTIATED LETTER TECHNIQUE

In all this weird conglomeration of plots to murder outstanding officials in Mexico and Russia and of (Continued on Page 4)

# Will It All Come Down to Drafting the Unemployed?

By JOHN T. FLYNN

AS the weeks go by, the war-makers in America and the militarist groups become aware of the fact that their activities will have repercussions very unpleasant to large numbers of people. Take the man between 21 and 31 who owes money on a mortgage. How is he going to pay the interest with \$30 a month? Naturally, this is very disturbing to gentlemen who hold his mortgage notes. It's all right to take poor little George. But this will leave Mr. Big holding the bag—to a certain extent—on the mortgage notes. Naturally, he won't be able to foreclose because he will be denounced for shutting down on a man who is out defending his country. So while nothing can be done about poor George—who has been yanked out of his good \$25 a week job—something can be done for poor Mr. Big.

So we find a bill which provides that when George goes to war—or to the conscript camp—for a year the government will pay the interest on his mortgage and a special fund is set up for that purpose. The bill reads like a bill to help George. But I find real-estate interests in New York very much concerned about this measure—it looks awfully good to them.

But if we should pay the interest on George's mortgage note, shouldn't we pay the installment's on his life insurance? And what about Bill, who doesn't own any property and therefore is on no other obligations, perhaps his share of the rent on the family domicile? Shouldn't we do something for him, too? Should the whole family be penalized because Bill is young enough to get drafted? Why should we save Mr. Mortgage Noteholder and not Bill's family?

As the draft moves along and men are sought, first one and then another reason is going to be found to let this fellow and that out. The youth going to college, the young man studying for a profession, the young man who is doing important work, and so on. In the end, we will get around, as one of the generals has already intimated, to taking only the "unimportant" men.

Well, who are the unimportant men? Why, the fellow who has no job answers this description perfectly. Wouldn't it be odd if the conscription turned out to be a draft of the unemployed? And think how happy certain very respectable, conservative persons would be to see this measure of perfect "justice" meted out to those who have the misfortune to be out of jobs.

(This article is taken from the New York World-Telegram of August 28, 1940.—Editor.)

# White Group Heads Straight for War

## Employs Tricky "Step-at-a-Time" Strategy

(This article, although written before President Roosevelt's order to transfer the destroyers to Britain, is especially timely today.—Editor.)

Washington, D. C. ON August 12, Senator Claude Pepper predicted that 50 United States destroyers to Great Britain "as soon as Congress and the public became accustomed to the idea." The President, Mr. Pepper said, would find a legal way of doing it. The campaign to get the nation accustomed to the idea was already under way and was following a familiar pattern. First, there was a trickle of stories out of Washington. Concurrently, there was much behind-the-scenes activity to get big names to support the idea or to dissuade them from attacking it. Then General Pershing was brought forth to begin the open drive in earnest. By this time, William Allen White and his Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, the ice-breakers for all interventionist expeditions, were all over the map with word that the British fleet was all that separated the U. S. A. from the fate of Holland. Meantime, from the White House came silence as deep and meaningful as the silence on the third term. But in the New York Times of August 22, Arthur Krock reported: "In the matter of the destroyers, he (the President) has stayed in the background while a favorable build-up for the project was being made by many persons. Some of these are close enough to him to suggest that Mr. Roosevelt inspired or encouraged, certainly approved, their effort."

Four years ago, Mr. Roosevelt himself indicated that this sort of inspired build-up for a Presidential policy was to be expected. In his famous Chautauqua speech on August 14, 1936, he said: "Nevertheless, and I speak from long experience, the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State." But the crucial steps in U. S. foreign policy cannot be taken with complete disregard for public opinion. Hence the build-up. Few Washington observers doubt that Britain will get 50 or so destroyers or that Congress will not be consulted in the matter or that a "legal" way will be found or that the navy will certify that they "can be spared." Congress was not consulted on the formation of the Canadian-American Joint Board of Defense. In fact, the Administration seems to be intensely preoccupied with ways of avoiding Congress—even regarding policies on which there would be little likelihood of important opposition.

### GRAFT AND PRICE-FIXING

First of all, he will not tolerate systems of graft and extortion. To be sure, no one holds a brief for the grafter or the extortionist. Labor no more than any other body of right-minded citizens welcomes or cherishes such characters in our trade unions any more than we do in our social communities. But why must the Sherman and Clayton Acts be used to prosecute racketeers, grafters and extortionists? We have ample laws on our statute books without bringing in the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

The second is the enforcement of illegally fixed prices. Again we offer no complaint. We do not seek to fix prices of commodities or articles of trade and commerce. That is not our function. We hold no brief for those who endeavor to fix prices. But, mind you, he says "illegal fixing of prices," and yet Mr. Arnold does not define this "illegal fixing of prices." He would have us believe that there may be a legal fixation of prices, and that we may indulge in such a practise provided we meet a standard that will best suit his fancy.

Pray, then, that he might more (Continued on Page 4)

est on George's mortgage note, shouldn't we pay the installment's on his life insurance? And what about Bill, who doesn't own any property and therefore is on no other obligations, perhaps his share of the rent on the family domicile? Shouldn't we do something for him, too? Should the whole family be penalized because Bill is young enough to get drafted? Why should we save Mr. Mortgage Noteholder and not Bill's family?

As the draft moves along and men are sought, first one and then another reason is going to be found to let this fellow and that out. The youth going to college, the young man studying for a profession, the young man who is doing important work, and so on. In the end, we will get around, as one of the generals has already intimated, to taking only the "unimportant" men.

# Fraud Is King!

## Fraud rules the roost these days. Trickery has become a major power in national politics.

It was trickery to which President Roosevelt resorted last week in putting over the destroyer-transfer deal, trickery that would bring the blush of shame to the cheek of even the proverbial Philadelphia lawyer. The law says plainly: "It shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel, built, armed or equipped as a vessel of war . . . with any intent that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent power." Obviously, the "intent" refers to the "sending" of the vessel out of the United States for delivery to a belligerent power. But, on commission from the President, Attorney General Jackson conveniently discovered that the "intent" refers to the building of the vessel, and since the fifty destroyers were built twenty years ago, it's quite all right to sell them to a belligerent today! On that basis, the President can sell the entire U. S. navy if he feels like it!

Even those who approve the transfer of the destroyers in itself cannot but gag at the petty chicanery of the President's methods.

Or take the "great debate" over the alleged "conscript of industry" included in the Senate conscription bill. What a brazen fraud, both the proposal itself and much of the opposition to it! It does not "conscript" industry; it does no more than streamline federal condemnation procedure provided for in a statute passed during the Hoover regime. It is nothing but an election trick to render more palatable the vicious Burke-Wadsworth bill of which it is a part. On the other hand, Republicans who think it is quite all right to conscript young men throw up their hands in holy horror at the mere thought of conscripting wealth.

What a revolting spectacle!

Fraud is King!

# Farm Prices Linked To Workers Wages

## Survey Finds Interests Directly Related

By AUSTIN C. WEHRWEIN

REACTIONARY forces led by employers have tried to drive a wedge of jealous dissension between workers and farmers. By telling farmers that their interests are those of business—that they are in the same economic boat—these reactionary groups have made some farmers believe that if higher wages hurt industry's fat profits, they must, somehow, hurt the farmer's pocketbook, too.

Hammering this wedge home, these reactionary forces, whose interests are served by lower wages, have sought to use farmer groups as stalking horses in fighting labor legislation, unionization, and higher wages for city workers. They say, in effect: What hurts the worker, helps the farmer.

But objective statistics gathered by the University of Wisconsin show that in so running industry's errands, farmers in the long pull are only snatching businessmen's profits out of the fire, and in return are getting only burned fingers for their trouble.

In short, what helps the worker, helps the farmer:

Because what workers receive as salaries will determine what they can pay for farm products. . . .

Because higher wages create a wider market, and do not increase appreciably the cost of manufactured goods to the farmer. . . .

Because when they can, families buy more food, and pay higher prices. . . .

Because consumption of food products more than doubles when income rises from \$500 to \$1,000, and consumption of bottled milk and butter also more than doubles.

Because it is almost axiomatic that farm income goes up when city income goes up, and falls when city income declines. . . .

These are the conclusions reached in recently published studies by the University of Wisconsin Department of Agricultural Economics, based on careful statistical tabulations.

Professor D. S. Anderson, editor of the studies, believes that farmers must turn their attention toward the purchasing power of the consumer, and pay less attention to the split between the middleman, the retailer, and the farmer-producer.

"What the consumer can pay for farm products is the important factor in determining what the farmer can secure for his products," Professor Anderson explains. "These consumers live in cities and villages,

that lifting the embargo does not seem to be saving Britain, interventionist reasoning dictates sending 50 'old' destroyers. If 50 'old' destroyers do not save Britain, the inexorable logic of this reasoning would require the sending of 50 new destroyers, and then, in the words of Mr. White's committee, 'all other materials of war—airplanes, artillery pieces, and ships.' Obviously, the U. S. A. could not, if it followed this reasoning, stop at any point short of war. The ultimate logic of this course, perceived by the brighter and franker members of Mr. White's Committee, is to declare war now. But Americans would not now be receptive to an open campaign to get them 'accustomed to the idea' of an immediate declaration of war. Any way, such a campaign may never be necessary since a nation that has permitted itself to become entangled in the 'short-of-war' hoax will eventually find it almost impossible to adopt any other course but war.

When the emotionally satisfying destroyer proposal is viewed in its proper context, it is certainly no measure short of war in any sense of the term. And opposition to the proposal does not mean indifference to the fate of Britain or blindness to the implications of a German victory. It is based on the obvious fact that the proposal is an irretrievable step toward war and that U. S. involvement in foreign war would be the deadliest of all blows to democracy everywhere.

(Mr. Wehrwein is a contributor to the Progressive, published at Madison, Wisc., by the LaFollettes.—Editor.)

and about two-thirds of them are individual wage-earners and low-salaried workers. Here is the market for farm products and what these individual wage-earners and low-salaried workers receive as wages and salaries will determine what they can pay for farm products.

"We may wonder if a larger share of corporation receipts could not go to wage earners. This would mean a larger market for farm products without higher prices for things farmers buy."

If a complete embargo was placed on foreign farm products which compete with American products, "the prices our farmers received would be increased only a little," he points out.

Further, while something can be done by reducing marketing costs, "that alone will not give farmers a satisfactory income," he says.

When the wages of American wage earners were slashed in half between 1929 and 1932, the price they paid for butter was cut in half, Professor Anderson shows.

"Farmers frequently think of the wages of industrial workers as costs entering into the prices of things they buy. They should remember that these wages of industrial workers are also the market for their farm products."

"The amount a family spends for food varies with its income. There are over 4,000,000 families in the United States with incomes of less than \$500. The average yearly expenditure for food by these families was only \$203, but it was 44% of their total expenditures. This means that 14% of all the families in the United States spent only 5 cents per person per meal for food. Expenses for these families amounted to more than their average income—\$312 per family—so that their expenditures for food amounted to 65% of their total income."

"As income increases, expenditures for food increase. Families with incomes from \$1,000 to \$1,500 spent more than twice as much as families with incomes under \$500. Expenditures for food show a marked increase as income increases up to about \$3,500. These figures tell us that low-income families will increase their expenditures for food when their income increases. Families buy more food and pay higher prices when they can."

Consumption of dairy products more than doubles when income goes from \$500 to above \$1,000, and of the dairy products the amounts of butter and bottled milk consumed show the greatest increases, Professor Anderson says.

"Low-income families are willing to spend more money for food when they have it to spend. In the past, farm income has gone up when city consumers incomes went up, and has declined when consumer income declined. Until the incomes of families in the lower-income levels can be raised, there is not much prospect of increasing farm income by getting more money from consumers of farm products. Measures to increase the incomes of families in the low-income levels, families with incomes of less than \$100 a month, offer possibilities of greatly increasing farm income."

"Changes in the amount of money which consumers have spent for dairy products have followed changes in factory pay rolls, rather than changes in total production of manufactured dairy products.

"The history of dairy incomes during recent years suggests very strongly that only by increasing the incomes of the consumers of dairy products or by greater contributions by the government, either thru the purchase of dairy products for relief or thru some governmental program similar to parity payments, can dairy incomes be materially increased."

"While reducing supplies would raise prices, the higher prices might easily be offset by the smaller volume so that total receipts would not be increased."

(Mr. Wehrwein is a contributor to the Progressive, published at Madison, Wisc., by the LaFollettes.—Editor.)

# Workers Age

Organ of the National Council, Independent Labor League of America, 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Publishing Association. Subscription Rates: \$1.50 per year; \$0.85 for six months; 5c a copy. Foreign Rates: \$2.50; Canada \$1.75 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: LACKAWANNA 4-5282.  
WILL HERBERG, Editor

Vol. 9. SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1940. No. 34

## VOTE SOCIALIST!

End Hunger in the Midst of Plenty!  
Jobs and Security for All!  
Keep America Out of War!  
For Socialism, Peace and Freedom!

Vote for  
**Norman Thomas and Maynard Krueger**  
for President and Vice-President

## CREEPING DICTATORSHIP

SO President Roosevelt has gone ahead with the transfer of the fifty "over-age" destroyers to Britain, allegedly in return for the lease of sea and air bases on British possessions in this hemisphere. Some weeks ago, we pointed out why we regarded such a move as dangerous to the peace and security of the American people. There is no need to add anything now. But there is all the need in the world to raise a voice of protest against one aspect of the transaction that may well turn out to be the most sinister phase of the whole affair, and that is the President's high-handed, dictatorial methods, his studied contempt for the Constitution and for elementary democratic procedure, which has marked this latest action of his as it has most of his recent activities.

We can do no better than reprint some passages from the now-famous editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 2:

"Today, Congress is INFORMED of the agreement. Note well the word 'informed.' Altho the President referred to his under-cover deal as ranking in importance with the Louisiana Purchase, he is not asking Congress—the elected representatives of the people—to ratify his deal. He is TELLING them it already has been ratified by him—America's dictator.

"The President has passed down an edict that compares with the edicts forced down the throats of the Germans, Italians and Russians by Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin.

"He hands down an edict that eventually may result in the shedding of the blood of millions of Americans, that may result in transforming the United States into a goose-stepping, regimented slave state.

"Under our Constitution, treaties with foreign powers are not legal without the advice and consent of the Senate. This treaty, which history may define as the most momentous one ever made in our history, was put over without asking the Senate either for its advice or its consent. . . .

"If Roosevelt gets away with this, we may as well say good-by to our liberties and make up our mind that henceforth we live under a dictatorship.

"If Congress and the people do not rise in solemn wrath to stop Roosevelt now—at this moment—then the country deserves the stupendous tragedy that looms right around the corner."

How long is organized labor going to remain silent while creeping dictatorship overwhelms the nation? How long is it going to stagger drugged and helpless under the hypnotic spell of the Roosevelt myth? Labor has most to lose; it should be the first to make its voice heard!

## METHOD TO THEIR MADNESS

IN the recent debate on conscription, Senator Pepper demanded that the President be given the power to "suspend all statutes" in preparing for defense. Striking a melodramatic attitude, he shouted: "If this be dictatorship, make the most of it."

In the same debate, Senator Josh Lee wanted the President to have the power to take over the newspapers and radio for "propaganda."

Now, of course, you may say that Pepper and Lee are just screwballs, and you would be right. Politically, they are indeed on the lunatic fringe. But there is method in their madness and that method is made perfectly clear in the words of Josh Lee:

"Is it not a fact that Hitler is the first military genius in the history of the world to use the propaganda machine? He has used it so effectively that his wars have been won before his legions struck. That is why it is necessary for the government to have propaganda in case of an acute national crisis such as we would face if we were forced into a war with Hitler."

In short, in order to fight Hitlerism, let us copy it here at home. In order to defend democracy, let us begin by destroying what we still have of it. That is the theme song of Administration "defense" policy from President Roosevelt right down to Josh Lee.

## FOR SHAME!

ACCORDING to the press, some section or official of the American Labor Party has sent a telegram to Washington denouncing opponents of the destroyer-transfer deal as either "Fifth Columnists, cheap politicians or plain lunatics."

For shame, gentlemen, for shame!  
Senators Robert M. LaFollette and Burton K. Wheeler have opposed the destroyer transfer on the floor of the Senate and in their public utterances. Are they either "Fifth Columnists, cheap politicians or plain lunatics?"

Norman Thomas, the veteran socialist leader, has made clear his objections to the destroyer transfer. Is he either a "Fifth Columnist," a "cheap politician" or a "plain lunatic?"

According to a Gallup poll published in last week's New York Times, fully 40% of the American people oppose the destroyer deal. Are they all "Fifth Columnists, cheap politicians or plain lunatics?"

It will become an organization speaking in the name of labor, which has suffered so cruelly in the past from just such excesses, to join in the devil's game of whipping up a frenzy of hysteria, intolerance and repression.

THE most advanced case of war hysteria has been discovered in the Social Security Board in Washington. Board officials are working out plans for evacuating children from the Atlantic seaboard "in case of an attack." The job was decided upon by a group of ardent New Dealers who are now worrying themselves thin about the "social consequences" of the project. They have pierced the future so far as to foresee that the children might not be housed properly, that they might not have privies and that teachers might not be available to oversee them. They are deeply concerned about the number of railway cars on Washington sidings. They doubt that there are enough for the evacuation.

Another "social consequence" gives them less concern. By shifting and expanding the Board's existing machinery, they are satisfied it will be possible to take care of pensions for the widows and orphans of the next war.

AN Associated Press dispatch from Fort Myers, Fla., dated August 28, reads: "Assistant Postmaster Wayne Lewis got all his alien-registration machinery in order today and was all ready for business. The first 'customers' were two Negroes. 'Are you aliens?' Mr. Lewis asked. 'Yes, sir,' was the reply. 'Where were you born?' he inquired. 'In Georgia,' P. S. They were not registered."

Well, can you blame them for feeling like aliens!

## Simon Patino Visits Our Shores

# A Tale of Bolivian Tin

SOME weeks ago, Simon Patino, the Bolivian tin king who has not been near Bolivia in sixteen years, arrived in New York from France to help develop tin smelting in the U.S.A. as a defense measure. The U.S.A. has no tin of its own, but consumes half the world's output. More than 80% of U.S. tin imports are mined and smelted in the Far East, mainly in British Malaya. Most of the rest is mined in Bolivia—but shipped to England, smelted there and shipped back across the Atlantic. However, experts have often pointed out that, if necessary, Bolivia could provide enough virgin tin to fill American needs. If the U.S.A. possessed a smelting industry of its own based on Bolivian ore, there would be no necessity to depend on mines and smelters in Asia and Europe. Why, then, is there not a single tin smelter in the world's No. 1 tin-consuming country?

## CARDS STACKED BY THE BRITISH

During the World War, when the flow of tin from the Far East was threatened, two smelters were erected here to refine Bolivian ore. The U.S. industry was a technological success, tho it never amounted to more than 20% of consumption. But production fell rapidly after 1920 and by 1925 tin smelting in the U.S.A. had ceased entirely.

A generally accepted explanation—it is practically an official case—is that American labor costs were so high that American-smelted tin was unable to compete with the British product. Labor costs were higher, but that is less than half the story. The fact is that the American operators were in a game where the cards were stacked against them, and, ironically enough, all the good cards were held by the British.

What made U.S. tin smelting unprofitable was not so much the cost of labor as the cost of tin itself. U.S. smelters used only Bolivian ore. Bolivian ore, dug from lodes high in the Andes, is less pure and has always been far more expensive to mine and smelt than the tin of the rich alluvial deposits of the Far East, which can be mined by relatively cheap hydraulic processes. In England, the high cost of working Bolivian ore is minimized by mixing it with less expensive ores from Malaya or Nigeria.

But, if Far Eastern ores were cheap for the British, they were the opposite for Americans. Back in 1903, when an American company began negotiations for the purchase of Malayan ore to be smelted in the U.S.A., Sir Frank Swettenham, then High Commissioner of the Federated Malay States and Governor General of the Straits Settlements, caused a 40% ad-valorem duty to be imposed on the export of Malayan tin ore for refining in other than Malayan smelters. Later exemptions were granted to Empire smelters. In effect, this was an embargo, as Sir Frank himself admitted: "An American attempt to transfer this tin smelting to American soil and so obtain, in time, complete control of Malayan tin products was frustrated by imposing a prohibitive duty on exportation of tin ore and giving an equivalent rebate on all ore smelted in the Straits Colony." It was this duty, extended after the World War to Nigerian tin, rather than high labor costs, that froze out the American smelters.

## BACK HOME TO BOOTLE

The story is further complicated by the fact that the British themselves were interested in war-time American smelting. One of the two big smelters erected in the U.S.A. was owned by the Williams, Harvey and Company, at Jamaica Bay, Long Island. This 10,000-ton-a-year plant, put into operation in 1918, was the joint venture of the National Lead Company, an important tin consumer; Williams, Harvey and Company, Ltd., big British smelters in which National Lead had an interest; and the huge Patino interests of Bolivia, which have always been closely interlocked with both British interests and National Lead. This plant made money at war-time price levels, but after 1923, high costs forced transfer of all its operations back to Williams, Harvey and Company's smelters in the little town of Bootle outside Liverpool. Later, Williams, Harvey and Company was absorbed into a huge merger called Consolidated Tin Smelters Ltd., which is, in effect, the tin-smelting industry of England, in which Patino Mines and Enterprises, Consolidated, the Delaware-incorporated Bolivian interests, own a substantial share. Presumably, Patino is not going to ship his ore to the U.S.A. at the expense of his own investments in Britain unless (1) he is given a very favorable deal, or (2) he is fearful lest the English smelters be bombed by the Nazis.

The other important war-time smelter in the U.S.A. had been set up in 1916 at Perth Amboy, N. J. by the Guggenheim-controlled American Smelting and Refining Company. It made money in 1916 and 1917, hung on at a loss until 1925 in the hope of wangling a protective tariff on tin imports. In 1922, U.S. tin interests introduced a duty on metallic tin into the Fordney tariff bill, but it was killed in the Senate. In recent years, the State Depart-

ment has used its influence to squelch further attempts to impose such a duty.

## CARTEL AND "STOCK-PILE"

Thru their direct control of half the world's mine production and their even more extensive domination over smelting, British tin interests have for years operated a near monopoly, altho outside producers were always strong enough to influence the price set in London. In the late 1920's, faced with the fall in raw material prices that preceded the depression, British, Dutch and Bolivian operators formed the Tin Producers Association, a loosely organized cartel scheme to keep the price up by voluntary restriction of production. But the Association lacked authority. In 1931, after the onset of world-wide depression had forced the price of tin to a new low, the Association became the International Tin Committee (I.T.C.), which is an inter-governmental body whose members participate as representatives of the governments (including Bolivia) which control 90% of world production. Actually, the I.T.C. is ruled by London tin interests. By restricting production, it keeps the price at a level that in the past has drawn censure from the London Economist and protests from the U. S. State Department. The price is now upwards of \$260 a ton; conservative economists insist that tin can be sold profitably for much less than \$200 a ton. As monopolies go, the tin cartel has been a great success—for people who own tin mines and smelters.

A simple way to insure an adequate supply of tin for U.S. in-

dustry—and national defense—is by government accumulation of a "stock-pile" to be held in reserve against emergencies. Such a "stock-pile" might be adequate by itself, or it might serve as interim insurance until a U.S. smelting industry based on Bolivian tin could be set going. Early in June 1939, three months before the war started, Congress passed the Strategic Materials Act providing for the purchase of such raw materials as tin from which the U.S.A. might be cut off in time of war. Nothing was done about tin until a year later. On June 28, 1940, the Metals Reserve Company, a creation of the R.F.C., entered into a contract with the I.T.C. to buy all the tin produced in excess of regular consumer purchases at slightly under the world price. This belated attempt to create a "stock-pile" caused the I.T.C. to raise its production quotas. However, the tin is still in the ground and the fulfillment of the contract may eventually be dependent on Japanese policy in the Far East. For U.S. smelters, government subsidies coupled with technological improvements may reduce the cost differential between Far Eastern and Bolivian tin, but unless Japan does block shipments from Malaya (which U.S. consumers do not expect), Bolivian tin in the U.S. will be mixed with less expensive ores.

A strange tale, this story of Bolivian tin travelling across the ocean and back again from the mines in Bolivia to the industrial consumer in America. A tale particularly significant to those who feel that the welfare and security of the Americas depend so much on the creation of an integrated, self-sufficient economy in this hemisphere.

# Arnold's "Anti-Trust" Drive Against Labor

## Arbitrary Restrictions Forced on Unions

(Continued from Page 3)  
clearly define and mark out the line of demarcation between a legal and an illegal system of fixing prices, so that he will no longer leave anyone in doubt regarding this great economic and social problem.

However, it is in the following three prohibitions that the greatest damage to labor is to be found. In his third prohibition, Mr. Arnold makes clear that he will not tolerate the activities of a union to prevent the use of cheaper materials. "The use of cheaper materials," in the opinion of Thurman Arnold, may mean one thing; in labor's judgment, another: in the employer's mind, still another. It is a wide open and very broad term, this "use of cheaper materials."

To labor, it means the use of non-union materials, of sweatshop materials, of convict-made materials, of cheap foreign-made materials. If, perchance, in our negotiations or agreements with employers, we say that we will not work on a commodity or a material that is not manufactured or fabricated by union labor or by American labor, then immediately in the eyes of Thurman Arnold we are restraining trade and commerce and are therefore to be stigmatized as criminals and indicted under the law.

I might give other examples. We know that materials and commodities produced under union conditions and fair standards of employment do at times increase the cost of production, and in certain instances may affect the sales price. But to insist on such materials is a right that is granted to us by law, nor must special values be overlooked. Yet, now we are advised by Thurman Arnold that if we seek to protect ourselves against that form of competition and destruction of our industrial standards, then we are criminals in the eyes of the law and are to be prosecuted accordingly.

That is not all. If, in the course of our activities, we prevent or attempt to prevent the use of "improved equipment" and perchance run counter to the opinion and judgment of Thurman Arnold, again we are held accountable to be stigmatized as criminals thru the indictment procedure.

Here comes a new labor-saving device. As a general rule, labor has never prohibited or restrained the use of improved methods of production. But, here and there, a new device is created, and men anxious to maintain their opportunities of employment resist for a time the introduction of this improved method of production that threatens to throw them out of their jobs. Lo and behold, if they demand of the employer that in the introduction of a new machine or device he proceed slowly in order to absorb the men that will be thrown out of work, then immediately, for resorting to that form of self-preservation, they are to be branded as criminals in the eyes of Thurman Arnold and are to be prosecuted as such!

## RESISTANCE TO SPEED-UP BANNED

If they should oppose the introduction of "more efficient methods of production"—in other words, of speed-up methods, piece-rate systems, etc., etc.—then again they will

run counter to this law. Thus, organized labor and its leaders, because of efforts to safeguard their industry or calling, their health and well-being against inhuman methods of production, will be stigmatized as criminals and held out for public condemnation.

And then, the fourth classification: If, in Thurman Arnold's eyes, we seek to compel the hiring of "useless and unnecessary labor," we are to feel the lash of the federal government, the power of the whole United States as vested in the Department of Justice!

One wonders who might be the superman that can accurately define what is necessary or useful labor and that which is unnecessary and useless? Why, then, should such an arbitrary line of demarcation be placed against us, particularly at a time when there are over ten million people out of work, seeking opportunity for employment?

Is it not a fact that every one has called upon industry to employ our idle workers, and has not this appeal come from the highest authority in our land? No one has ever included in these appeals to industry a distinction between labor as useful and not useful, necessary and unnecessary. Then, too, is it not a fact that much of public work and all of relief work is encouraged not primarily because it is necessary or useful but because it is essential to provide our people with the necessities of life? Here, then, we find ourselves in a strange world of reasoning. Apparently what is done in the name of government is praiseworthy, but when it is undertaken by trade unions, then in the eyes of Mr. Arnold it becomes a crime!

(This is the third of a series of articles by Matthew Woll, vice-president of the A. F. of L., on "Labor and the Anti-Trust Laws."—Editor.)

# Peace-Time Draft Becomes Law As House Votes

(Continued from Page 1)

the western hemisphere or the territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippines. Exempt from registration under both bills are officials but not employees of the federal and state governments. Exempt from military service, but not from registration, are those conscientious objectors who can prove to the satisfaction of the Department of Justice that their objections are based on "legitimate" religious scruples. Exemptions and deferments will also be granted on grounds of dependents, indispensability to industry and agriculture, and the like.

Pay during the first four months of service will be \$21 a month, and for the next eight \$30 a month. The bills include certain vague provisions for the reinstatement into their jobs of drafted men after their term of service is over.

Evading the draft or assisting anyone to do so is punishable by up to five years imprisonment and \$10,000 fine, or both. The conscription bill was vigorously fought at every stage of the

# Is Britain Beginning to Learn the "French Lesson"?

(We publish below some interesting comments on recent developments in Great Britain by a conservative British businessman visiting this country. They are from Business Week, August 3, 1940.—Editor.)

OUR victory, of which I have no doubt, is more than anything dependent on the speed with which we move to the left, strange as this may sound from a Conservative. This is a point of view to which the whole government seems to have been persuaded by the French collapse. As one evidence of that, take note of the trend of social legislation—increased old-age pensions, increased minimum wages for agricultural workers, raising of the unemployment insurance level to include white collar workers, and milk at half-price to nursing mothers and children.

Myself, I think the interpretation currently put on the French collapse—that there was a powerful clique which preferred German domination to a socialist government—is more or less correct. I do not know how powerful people of similar outlook are in England, but the fact is that many are rightly afraid that the same thing might happen here.

# How PM Whitewashes Murder of Trotsky

## Tabloid Fronts for Assassins in the Kremlin

(Continued from Page 3)  
conspiracies with Almazan and mysterious foreign consuls, we have not one shred of objective evidence. We have nothing but the say-so of Stalin's pickax expert. He alone has discovered secret plots, secret visits of a consul, and secret financing by a "parliamentary committee." There is no one else to vouch for the truth of all these "secrets," nor are there any documents, articles or letters. Moreover, the assassin, shocked as he was by uncovering all these secrets, made sure not to inform anyone of these secrets until after the murder. Sylvia Ageloff, who was far more intimate with the Trotsky household than Jackson, and who was far longer in the Trotskyist movement, never discovered these "secrets." Apparently, the outraged and indignant Jackson never confided even in her the "secrets" he uncovered. The reason is obvious. If he had, the fact that there were no such plots, and together with that, the real role of Jackson as a Russian police stool-pigeon, would have been immediately revealed.

Trotsky, according to the Jackson-G.P.U., letter spoke of Sylvia Ageloff in such a derogatory manner as almost by this alone to provoke assassination. Yet, in spite of all these political and personal horrors, Jackson never appears to have been provoked into breaking off friendly relations with Trotsky. There were no indignant protests, no sharp disagreements, no harsh words, no quarrels. For a man provoked to the point of murder, the equanimity of Jackson is something to marvel at. When Jackson appeared at the Trotsky home on the day of the murder, Trotsky greeted him in the usual friendly manner. Jackson requested Trotsky to look over an article he had written. Without suspicion, Trotsky agreed, and went to his study with Jackson, without warning the guards. What is more, Trotsky apparently started to read the article, and permitted Jackson to get behind him. For, after the attack, Trotsky was under the impression that he had been shot. He never saw the weapon that had struck him. To behave in such a trusting manner with one who had refused to go to Russia on a gentle "mission" of murder, one who had discovered the supposed connections with a foreign government, and whose girl friend had been grossly insulted, is queer indeed. It is clear that the Jackson letter is a filthy G.P.U. fabrication from beginning to end.

## DAILY WORKER DISGUISED AND UNDISGUISED

Ralph Ingersoll, PM's editor, is reported to have answered the recent expose of the Stalinist flooding of the staff of that paper by declaring to his multimillionaire backers that discussion by a group of Senators and Representatives headed by Wheeler, Bennett Clark, LaFollette and Norris, who charged that not only was it not necessary for effective defense but that it would gravely impair the country's democratic institutions and encourage military regimentation and authoritarianism. It was also opposed by virtually all sections of the labor movement, including the A. F. of L., the C.I.O. and the railroad brotherhoods, as well as by peace societies, religious groups and women's and civic associations. On the other hand, both the President and Wendell Willkie supported the measure and urged its immediate adoption, and this attitude was shared by the leaders of both parties.

## Should Send Not Send Food.

Should Send Food 38%  
Should not send food 62%

"Approximately one voter in ten (10%) said he was undecided or without an opinion on the question. "With American farmers facing new crop surpluses this Fall, many observers have guessed that a strong demand for sending food supplies to Europe's needy would come from this quarter. Interestingly enough, however, the Institute survey shows farm voters even less favorable to such a policy than other groups in the population:

Should Send Food 35%  
Should Not Send Food 65%

Farm voters 35% 65%

"Analysis of the comments expressed by persons interviewed indicates that the two great objections in the minds of American voters are: (1) the belief that Germany would be helped, directly or indirectly, and (2) that American ships carrying such cargoes would be imperiled in entering the European war zone.

"In a supplementary question the Institute asked: 'Would you be willing to do this (send food), even if some of this food might go to the Germans?' The replies show that, with this contingency in view, only one voter in five would favor an attempt to relieve possible starvation in western Europe. The actual vote is:

Should send food 22%  
Should not send food 78%."



**KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR**  
By Norman Thomas and Bertram D. Wolfe  
\$1.50  
WORKERS AGE BOOKSHOP  
131 W. 33rd St., N. Y. C.