

# Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. 5, No. 23.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 1936

5 Cents a Copy

## Dressmakers Hear Discussion Of Labor Party

Symposium Of Local 22 Includes Lovestone, Hathaway, Tyler

More than 2000 dressmakers attended the final symposium of Local 22, where the three major political tendencies of the working class met to discuss the question of a Labor Party. Jay Lovestone represented the Communist Party (Opposition), Clarence Hathaway the Communist Party, and August Tyler the Socialist Party, substituting for Norman Thomas who sent a telegram excusing his absence.

Tyler, speaking for the Socialists, ascribed the failure of previous labor and farmer-labor parties, not to the tremendous waves of prosperity which drowned out class-consciousness, but to a lack of organizational basis and poor leadership. Explaining that the Socialist Party believed that "in time of crisis it was necessary to put forth a clear revolutionary platform," the differences between the S.P. and the C.P. prevented a united labor ticket for 1936.

Hathaway presented the C.P. position for 1936, the main slogan being defeat of the Republicans and its implied (alho denied) support of Roosevelt. Attacking the Socialist Party for its rejection of a united election ticket, he announced that the C.P. would run its own candidates. He then devoted some time to the identification of the Labor Party with the People's Front as an all-inclusive "anti-fascist" organization.

Jay Lovestone, secretary of the C.P.O., devoted much of his time to an exposition of the necessity of the Labor Party in America. As the next progressive step for the American workers, the independent political action of labor was inevitable in its own right, regardless of, and separate from, the existence of the People's Front in France, Spain, etc. For the immediate situation, the 1936 elections, once again in the name of the C.P.O., Lovestone raised the slogan of a united labor ticket with Tom Mooney for President. Tremendous applause swept the hall, greeting this proposal. To the fear of the Old Guard exhibited by the Militant Socialists, Lovestone ascribed the inability of both to reach this suggested solution, or even a C.P.-S.P. ticket for the elections. So important was a united labor ticket in the development of a labor party movement in this country, that even now, Lovestone said, the C.P.O. would spare no efforts to attempt to change the mind of the Socialist Party on this subject.

## ILLINOIS L.P. MEETS

CHICAGO, Ill.—The Illinois Labor Party has issued a call for a statewide convention to be held on July 4th and 5th, 1936.

The state Labor Party was organized on April 4th and 5th of this year at a conference of trade unions and with the cooperation of the Chicago and Cook County Labor Party. The conference, held in Peoria, ordered the calling of this convention in July in order to seek the affiliation of larger numbers of trade unions and other workers organizations.

## THEY DISCUSSED THE LABOR PARTY



Local 22 of the ILGWU held the final forum of its successful educational program last week, discussing the Labor Party. The speakers, reading from left to right, are: Clarence Hathaway of the Communist Party, Jay Lovestone of the Communist Party Opposition, and Gus Tyler of the Socialist Party.

## Socialist Split Leaves Issues Still Unsettled

Leftward Movement Halted by Compromises Used To Oust Old Guard; McLevy and Hoan Held New Dominant Right-Wing In Party

By JAY LOVESTONE

Nothing of a substantial political character, no serious political difference, was settled at the Cleveland convention of the Socialist Party. Organizationally, there was achieved a change thru the New York Old Guard "taking a walk" and the Militants consequently remaining the undisputed organization of the Socialist Party in the Empire State.

The deliberations and proceedings of the convention do however reflect an accentuation of some trends. In the main these are the following:

(1) The Militants headed by Mayor Hoan and Norman Thomas have squeezed out the New York Old Guard and taken over their organization posts and power.

(2) This job was performed not thru any political defeat inflicted on the New York Old Guard, not thru any sharp differentiation of policy and principle. On the contrary, it was achieved thru a series of caucus deals, convention trades, organization arrangements—all at the expense of leftward policy and revolutionary socialist principles. In fact, the Thomas faction in the national Militant powwow not only took away some organization posts from the N. Y. Old Guard, but also took over some political positions from the extreme right wing headed by Waldman. There is no doubt that it was only by doing the latter, only by allowing the political line of the S.P. to be dictated by such dyed-in-the-wool Rights as Hoan and Hoopes, that the Thomas Militants were able to register their organizational victory over Waldman and Company.

(3) The crisis in the Socialist Party is very far from being at an end; it is merely entering a new phase. Before this convention, the entire Right wing of the Party was inside; today one part is outside (Waldman) and another part, the bigger section and the one better rooted in the soil of the country (Milwaukee-Reading-Montana), is still inside. The latter exercises a greater ideological weight on the party policies than even before be-

cause the new leadership is dead scared lest there be another group taking a walk and thus there be dealt a mortal blow to the campaign aspirations of the S.P.

(4) It is for this reason primarily that the Cleveland convention resolutions indicate a turn to the right—a turn in force for some time but only accentuated by the fortunes of faction war as shared or denied at the convention. An examination of the decisions of the convention in regard to such basic questions as the road to power, the united front, the farmer-labor party ticket in 1936, work inside the trade unions, nature of the party organization itself, attitude towards imperialist war proves this to be the case.

(5) Never before was the Militant caucus so heterogeneous ideologically. Politically, it is a sort of Noah's Ark. It would appear that the guard at the entrance to this Ark was particularly lenient. Reflecting the "all-inclusive party" conception of Comrades Thomas and Felix, the Militant caucus now has within its ranks such outright reformists as Dan Hoan who has led his Wisconsin S.P. membership into the LaFollette Progressive Federation on an individual membership basis, some cynical infantile forces scattered in N. Y., some confused but well-meaning comrades eager to learn and fight and anxious to move leftward, some ultra-leftist sectarians who have drunk at the cesspool of Trotskyism, some very valuable worth-

(Continued on Page 3)

## Council Orders C. I. O. To Disband; Split Looms

Craft Unions Issue Ultimatum For Dissolution By June 3rd; Lewis and Hillman Refuse To Give Up Committee, Denying Dualism

FLASH!

San Francisco.—The General Executive Board of the I.L.G.W.U., now in session here, reapproved the Committee for Industrial Organization.

THE United Mine Workers of America added its official voice to the chorus of "NO" with which the ultimatum of the A. F. of L. is being received among the unions affiliated with the C.I.O.

In a letter to William Green, Thomas Kennedy, Secretary of the union declared that they "question the right and authority" of the Council to order the liquidation of such bodies as the C.I.O. The union, furthermore, refused "to accede to either the call or the request of the American Federation of Labor to discontinue its constructive and logical course of action."

June 3 may well go down as an historic date in the history of American trade unionism, for that is the expiration date set by the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor in its ultimatum to the unions comprising the Committee for Industrial Organization. Claiming that membership and participation in the C.I.O. constitutes open rebellion against the American Federation of Labor a letter was dispatched to each of the organizations calling upon it to withdraw from the C.I.O. by June 3. For some unexplained reason the letter was not signed by William Green but by a committee composed of George Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; G. M. Bugnizet, secretary of the Electrical Workers and Joseph M. Weber, president of the Federation of Musicians

Strategists in the labor movement are divided both as to the significance of the absence of Green's signature on the letter, as well as on the intent of the ultimatum. While some maintain that the former indicates that William Green is opposed to this abrupt action of the majority of the Council, others point to some recent speeches in which his attitude to the C.I.O. had become constantly sharper. As to the intent of the ultimatum some labor leaders insist that it is a maneuver intended to follow up on the apparent differences between President Dubinsky of the I.L.G.W.U. and the C.I.O. in relation to the proposal for organizing the steel industry, that it is an attempt to split the C.I.O. Others, however, take a more serious view of the whole situation. The steady growth of industrial union support in the various international and in the city and state bodies of the A. F. of L. is worrying the leaders of the A. F. of L. Especially the decisions of the Auto and Steel unions have illustrated how firmly the workers in these mass production industries adhere to the idea of industrial unionism. It is believed that the Council has decided that it may be too late to wait for the next convention of the A. F. of L. where any disciplinary action would require a two-thirds vote—something that the Council cannot possibly secure if the nine C.I.O. unions participate and vote.

Furthermore, the reports from

Washington indicate that the Executive Council strategy is directed at meeting precisely this difficulty. While the Council has no right to expel an international union, A. F. of L. leaders insist that it does have the right to suspend. *The suspended unions may then be denied the right to vote on any expulsion proposal.* If the A. F. of L. really does suspend the nine unions then there is no question that the Council could secure the necessary vote to expell.

Such action in expelling over one million members, among them the powerful United Mine Workers with its 620,000 would throw the whole trade union movement into a bitter fratricidal war, for there is no doubt that the expelled organizations would have to get together to defend their unions both against the encroachments of the craft unionists as well against the employers. It is not even excluded that such a policy of suspending the nine unions prior to the A. F. of L. convention might lead to a split even before the convention got under way.

Only two organizations have replied to this ultimatum of the Council. John L. Lewis, head of the Miners' union and the chief of the C.I.O. expressed doubt that Green would go as far as suspension, pointing out that the last convention of the A. F. of L. refused to adopt a resolution ordering the C.I.O. to disband. *"In the light of the action of that convention,"* Lewis continued, *"the head of the American Federation of Labor is wasting his time writing letters."*

The convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, now meeting in Cleveland answered the ultimatum with a rousing NO from the 500 delegates. The convention also adopted a resolution (1) approving the stand of its delegates at the last A. F. of L. convention, on industrial unionism; (2) endorsing the activity of the A.C.W. inside the C.I.O.; and (3) deciding to remain within the C.I.O. and work for the organization of the mass production industries along industrial lines.

Supporting the resolution for remaining within the C.I.O. President Hillman declared that *"there is absolutely nothing within the C.I.O. or that the C.I.O. is doing, that is contrary to the rules and laws of the A. F. of L."*

# PALESTINE - A POWDER KEG

By I. BRILL

There is again trouble in the British mandate colony in the Near East. Since the 19th of April, reports coming from Palestine tell a gruesome story of bloodshed and arson. To date, twenty-six Jews and twenty-two Arabs have been killed and the number wounded on both sides probably reaches 350. 950 Arabs and 45 Jews have been arrested. Jewish factories, homes and fields have been burned. In addition, ten thousand refugees from various parts of the country are gathered in the all-Jewish city of Tel-Aviv and are exposed to the danger of starvation.

The High Commissioner of Palestine, Sir Arthur Wauchope, introduced extraordinary severe curfew laws in all the trouble-stricken points and has greatly strengthened his military forces "in order to meet the recent outbreaks."

In fact, according to the Jerusalem correspondent of the New York Times, Joseph M. Levy, outbreaks or "disturbances is no longer the word to describe the situation in Palestine—it has now reached a state of actual rebellion directed mostly against the government . . ." And the same Zionist correspondent admits that "the fighting and Arab uprisings are now confined mostly to purely Arab towns."

### Basis of Arab Revolt

But what happened? What are the causes of the present revolt of the Arabian masses in Palestine?

The Jewish nationalistic press is trying hard to make the world believe that what is happening now in Palestine is a pure and simple old-style attack or pogrom on the Jews. And these pogroms are being made by a "handful of hoodlums" who are, of course, incited to such deeds by "Moscow agents". Simple isn't it?

Moreover, there are Zionist leaders who advise the Jewish masses to receive "calmly and confidently" the alarming news from Palestine, because outbreaks, disturbances and attacks on Jews in the Holy Land are and will be "inevitable" for the next 15 to 20 years—until the time when the Jews in Palestine will become a majority instead of a minority. "Whoever believes that it is possible to achieve in Palestine the goal to which we are striving, without the resistance on the part of the incited, native population, that one is simply blind and naive." (M. Grossman, president of the Jewish-State Party, in an article in the Day, May 2, 1936.)

### Hearst Sees "Moscow's Hand"

And Hitler's defender in the United States, Hearst, has his own interpretation of the Palestine events. On Saturday, May 16, the New York American and the Hearst newspapers throughout the country carried an editorial entitled "Pogroms in Palestine—Directed from Moscow", in which it is said:

"The Communist International has, by its own admission, despatched its assassins into the flourishing Jewish communities in Palestine, to strike down the Zionist pioneers, to set fire to their farms, to sack their stores, to kill and loot and destroy.

"And all this is being conducted under the guise of the 'United Front'!

"The 'united front' between the Stalinists and the Bedouins in Palestine is of the same mould as the 'united front' between the Stalinists and the misguided liberals of this country."

Strange as it may seem, the po-

litical language used in this editorial is strikingly similar to the language used by the "Socialist" Jewish Daily Forward!

The British government, however, does not seem to agree either with the Zionists or with Hearst, and the Forward as to who stirs up trouble in Palestine. Great Britain blames, not the Arab "hoodlums" but "Moscow" but Italy—Italy is responsible for the present unrest, not only in Palestine but also in Egypt.

To "solve" the Arab problem in Palestine, the Zionists of all shades, from the Revisionists to the Poale Zionists, demand a "strong hand" from British imperialism. They demand the immediate arrest of the leaders of the Arabian general strike and of the civil disobedience campaign; they demand that more Jews be added to the police and military forces; they urge "collective punishment" of a number of "guilty" Arabian villages; and, finally, they demand that the Government should permit and help to segregate completely the Jews from the Arabian economic and social life—a new ghetto in the Holy Land!

This is how the Zionists view the situation in Palestine.

### Arabians Present Their Case

Before examining the real facts, before analyzing the true reasons, national and social, for the rebellion of the Arab masses, let us first hear what an outstanding leader of these masses has to say. In an interview with the New York Times correspondent on May 25th Ibrahim el Shanti, editor of Arab daily, H Difaa, and the "power behind the whole Arab movement in Palestine", particularly the young generation, explains the aims of the Arabs in Palestine thus:

"The young Arabs of Palestine stand for a greater ideal than just saving the country from the Zionist danger.

"We have before us the task of forming an Arab federation, which must be realized. We have the task of creating a new civilization based on nations' rights of equity and equality. A world civilization based on class war, greediness and imperialism, has become outdated.

"Young Arabs consider Great Britain the power that cheated the leader of the Arab revolution, so that they look upon Britain as a source of enmity and Zionism as an offspring of that enmity."

And about the Jews in Palestine, el Shanti says:

"The only remedy whereby the Jews can save themselves is to live with the Arabs as they have lived for hundreds of years heretofore, to denounce the Balfour Declaration and to give up every political ambition.

"Better for them to know now that the Palestine problem will never be solved by a ruling power that is now giving them every help.

"To live here unmolested, they must first rely on Arab sympathy, not on destroyers now anchored in Jaffa waters."

That these aims are not a "pogrom" attitude, could easily be seen by everyone, who is not interested in besmirching the nationalism and social movement of the Arabs which is objectively a progressive movement.

Despite the fact that individual Arabian countries are ruled by different imperialist powers, they are all inter-connected by their geographic location and by their common language, history and traditions. The aim of the Arabian nationalist movement is two fold: To throw off the shackles of imperialism and to establish a federation of the Arab countries. The revolt

of the Arabs in Palestine is a part of this movement. It is a struggle for independence, for liberation from the imperialist yoke, whether it be British or French. The weakened position of Great Britain in the Mediterranean after the Italian annexation of Ethiopia, greatly encouraged the nationalist movement in Egypt and in a number of other Arab countries. And the negotiations that are now going on between Syria and France, with the aim to grant the former some sort of self-government, have also been an inspiring factor to the Arabs in the Palestine situation.

### Zionism—Tool of British Empire

To arrest the national aspirations of the Arabs in Palestine, Great Britain issued the Balfour Declaration, promising to establish a "national home for the Jewish people" in Palestine while at the same time "safeguarding" the civil rights of the Arab majority of the country. This cynical and tricky document was grabbed by Zionism as the solution of the Jewish problem, and since that day, November 2, 1917, Zionism has become a valuable tool in the hands of British imperialism in the Near East.

The methods, with which Zionism is trying to build a "national home" deserve the sharpest condemnation on the part of every progressive-minded person. Palestine, it should be remembered, is a small, poor, semi-feudal country, where the greater part of the land is owned by landlords. Most peasants there are exploited tenant farmers, heavily taxed and submerged in debts. These farmers are fighting desperately for land—the key question in Palestine. The Zionist organization, in buying the land from the rich land owners without the consent or the knowledge of the farmers toiling the land for generations, is making matters worse for the poor farmer, because now he is being completely driven off the land and in some cases even without compensation. But even when the peasant is not driven off the land, he suffers, indirectly, from the Zionist colonization just the same, because in order to get arable land, the Zionists pay exorbitant prices for it, and under the threat to sell the land to the Zionists, the Arab land owner forces his tenant farmer to pay a higher rental. This explains, I believe, one of the slogans in the present general strike: "Stop the sale of land to the Jews!"

This is one aspect of the Jewish-Arab problem. Next come the slogans under which Zionist colonization is being carried on. These slogans when applied in life, bring disastrous results. The slogans "conquer the work", "Jewish capital for Jewish labor", "buy Jewish products", lead to a boycott of Arab labor and products. And the Zionist trade unions are the champions in carrying out this "noble" work. Not only do they exclude Arabs from membership in their trade unions, but they also send pickets wherever Arab labor is employed. This dangerous policy is widening the gap between the Arab and Jewish toilers and is pouring oil on the flame of race hatred.

The conflict, the clash is now in the open, and with a force not known in Palestine before. Zionism is now reaping the fruits of its labor. It is only too bad that innocent Jews are victims for the sins committed by the Zionist leaders. With Karl Kautsky we say:

"We may . . . hope that the number of victims to the policy of Zionism will not be very great; this policy aims at bottom at nothing else than to transplant—at immense cost and with the greatest sacrifices of those concerned—enthusiastic Jews from regions in

# AT FIRST GLANCE

By Jay Lovestone

THE decision of Governor Lehman not to run for re-election to the governorship of New York will not be as tragic for the Democratic national campaign as some people think. Assuming for the sake of argument that Roosevelt will not succeed in "persuading" Lehman to change his mind and run again, we are sure that Farley and his outfit will get hold of a candidate who will be able to serve the Roosevelt presidential purposes at least as well—and in some respects even better.

To this conclusion we are led by the boom that is being manufactured to get Owen D. Young to run for the governorship of New York. We know of no better candidate. The support of Labor in the Empire state, Roosevelt need not worry about; the support of the middle class force he will have insofar as the cities go. In the rural sections he needs much help. From this angle, Owen D. Young is a better man than Lehman. But even more important is it that if Owen D. Young runs on the Democratic ticket in New York, it would help Roosevelt a lot with those sections of Big Business which have been growing rather skeptical of Roosevelt and his policies in certain fields.

Besides, making Young the Governor of New York in November of this year helps make Young real presidential timber later. The Democratic Party is badly in need of new timber for '40. More than that, there is every likelihood that many a financier and industrialist would cherish nothing more than to prepare the ground for so prominent a big business man as Owen D. Young getting into the White House.

For labor it is very important to note that such an avowed open-shopper and so generally reactionary a personage as Young is being groomed seriously for the leadership of Roosevelt's party in the biggest state. It affords us a welcome sidelight on the real nature of Roosevelt's progressivism and Newest Deals.

ROOSEVELT'S order increasing by 42% the duty on cotton goods, imported primarily from Japan, is an event of no small import in the realm of domestic as well as foreign politics. It is one stone hurled with the object of killing at least two birds.

Farley's agents have good noses for reality. They know the plight of the textile centers. They know that where times are bad, very bad, there the Republicans will be able to make serious inroads. The textile centers are such places. Preliminary trial pools have indicated that Roosevelt strength in such localities is nothing to gloat over. Farley is aware of the fact that something must be done, or at least a pretense must be made to do something, in order to remedy the aggravated situation. Hence, the order to make more difficult the importation of cotton goods and to make more easy the collection of Roosevelt votes.

But this decree against Japan, because of Uncle Sam's inability to come to a "gentlemen's agreement" with the Nipponese over the voluntary restriction of their textile exports to the U. S., is more than a maneuver of the moment. It reflects a basic phase of American economic life and foreign policy. Here is involved a fundamental antagonism between two powerful imperialist groups. It is not so simple a matter for the U. S. as Roosevelt's action might

which anti-Jewish pogroms are subsidizing, into a country where such pogroms are likely to ensue on a larger scale, if the Zionist program should be successful to any extent that is at all perceptible." (Kautsky, "Are the Jews a Race.")

NEXT WEEK  
"The Communists and Palestine"

tend to indicate. Should the U.S. tighten the screws against Japanese textiles, then, Japan will be compelled to reduce its purchases of cotton from the U. S. This would have the effect of sending King Cotton still further to the dumps.

In short, the president's order reveals with painful clarity not merely the antagonisms between the great imperialist powers but also the contradictions inherent within the capitalist countries. Clearly, every capitalist "solution" lets loose more and more forces of dissolution.

TO THOSE who have been sort of disturbed at the chain of reactionary decisions handed down by the Supreme Court, let us say nothing is impossible in the highest tribunal of the land. We are impelled to this conclusion on the basis of the great amount of time, energy and money which the various courts of the land have been spending in their heroic effort to get an exact measurement of a hair's breadth.

Finally, it would seem, the U.S. Supreme Court will be given the opportunity of rendering accurate justice. Before long, we are reliably informed, the highest tribunal of the land will declare (likely by a 5-4 vote) that a hair's breadth is precisely and exactly "one two-fiftieth of an inch" or "four one-thousandths". Let no one be so cynical as to fail to shriek "bravo" at such marvelous vision being displayed by the nine "judges of all judges" in the case of the Essex Razor Blade Corporation against the Gillette Safety Razor Company!

Equipped with such fine powers of distinction, the Supreme Court will undoubtedly exercise them in coming election campaign. We can count as unquestionable the fact that the Supreme Court will not only play an important part in the campaign as a problem, but will also play its own independent active role—in behalf of the most avowed, openly reactionary forces in the country. Between the philosophy of the dark-robed gentry infesting the chambers of the Supreme Court and the philosophy of the Black Legion there is perhaps only the above-mentioned hair's breadth difference. If anyone is in doubt about this, let him consult Chairman Fletcher of the Republican National Committee or some of the rock-ribbed supporters of president Roosevelt in the Solid South.

**SUBSCRIBE NOW!**

WORKERS AGE  
Box 58, Station "O"  
New York City.

Enclosed find \$.....

for a ..... months sub.

(\$1.50 one year, \$1.00 6 mos.)

Name .....

Address .....

City .....

State .....

# THE WORKERS AND ROOSEVELT'S RULE

By WILL HERBERG

This year, as rarely before in the recent history of the country, the Presidential elections are emerging as one of the most outstanding and widely discussed issues in the labor movement. Forced out of the rut of traditional attitudes by the sudden appearance of the Roosevelt issue as a labor question, the various tendencies in the labor movement are now in process of readjusting themselves politically to the new situation.

In the top leadership of the American Federation of Labor, there appear to be at least four distinct attitudes on the Roosevelt question on the elections generally. In the executive council, there are a few, headed by Hutcheson, who are outright Republicans and will probably serve on the regular Republican "Labor Committee" later on in the campaign. But, discretion being the better part of valor, they do not seem very eager to flaunt their views and are therefore driven to resort to peculiar dodges. Thus it is Hutcheson, the dyed-in-the-wool reactionary and Republican stalwart, who takes the occasion of the voiding of the Guffey Act to admonish Lewis and the U.M.W.A. "to stay in their own organization and use their economic strength and not depend on the government." To "depend on the government" means, of course, to enter into friendly relations with the New Deal and to this Hutcheson is unalterably opposed, both as a Republican and as a "rugged individualist" of the old Gopier school. But it is hardly likely that the protective coloration of "militant" phrases, so suddenly assumed and so clumsily worn, will avail him anything. Republican influences is not destined to be any great factor among the masses of the organized workers this year.

### The Attitude of the Labor Non-Partisan League

Distinct from all of three of these attitudes is the new Lewis policy of independent labor support of Roosevelt. The Labor Non-Partisan League is an organization of trade unions for political action. The appeal of the League is not just an appeal to "classless" American citizens of the Democratic persuasion but to trade unionists, to workers as workers. As such, the Lewis policy represents an advance not merely over the Republican standpoint of Hutcheson and the Democratic balhyhood of Dan Tobin but also over

# SOCIALIST PARTY CONVENTION LEFT MAJOR ISSUES UNSETTLED

(Continued from Page 1)

while revolutionary socialist forces who are hogtied by the conflicts and cross currents, and, finally, some centrists who are experts in dressing and perfuming right wing doctrines with left phrases—often ultra-left.

This situation was painfully revealed in the debate over the resolution dealing with the question of a farmer labor party. Such Old Guardists as Toole of Maryland, such Right Wingers as Jasper MacLevy of Connecticut joined hands with the leftist sectarians of Minnesota (Trotskyites) to battle against the Labor Party. The ideological level of this debate was not very gratifying. Thomas and Hoan finally carried the day and passed a resolution putting the S.P. on record for a Farmer-Labor Party by a vote of 109-64. Some Right Wingers from the Massachusetts delegation abstained from voting. There is good reason to believe that if Thomas and the New York Militants had not made some eleventh hour serious concessions in principle—by deleting the whole question as to the relation of the labor party to the problem or the seizure of power—the resolution would have had even a closer call and might even have become the basis for a serious crack-up at the convention. That we are justified in our evaluation will become clear when we examine the Farmer-Labor Party resolution adopted.

The ideological heterogeneity prevailing at the convention and gripping the party was rather crudely disclosed in the content of the election platform adopted. It smacks of pacifism, parliamentary cretinism, revolutionary aspirations, militant inspirations, technocracy and the Commonwealth Plan.

Of a similar hodge-podge character is the resolution on the war question.

Indicative of the desperate efforts made by Comrade Thomas and the New York Militants to capture the party posts and yet preserve the maximum amount of party unity is the nature of the revision of the Declaration of Principles—in the direction of less clarity and more confusion, in the way of blurring its original vague and contradictory content so that Dan Hoan and Hoopes and their like could accept it without any reservation or question. In this light it is interesting to note that Dan Hoan, while making one of his many pleas to the convention for harmony and calmness, stressed that at the Detroit convention the Declaration of Principles was adopted in an atmosphere of hysteria. He welcomed the opportunity to consider it anew and "improve" it in a different atmosphere. The new Declaration of Principles accepts the right wing's distorted conception of the theory of the historical inevitability of armed insurrection and on this basis repudiates it as a doctrine, belief in which is incompatible with membership. It is obvious that by such artful dodging no clarity is arrived at and that reformist purebred

son, we have Dan Tobin and his friends, old-line partisan Democrats, who, for their part, will find a place in the Democratic "Labor Committee." These people come out not merely for Roosevelt but for a straight Democratic ticket all along the line. In their approach there is no class angle at all; they make their appeal simply and solely as good Democrats. William Green, on the other hand, represents the more traditional position of the A. F. of L., the so-called "non-partisan" policy of "reward your friends and punish your enemies." There is, of course, no doubt that Green will support Roosevelt; nevertheless, a committee of the executive council will appear before both the Republican and Democratic conventions, scan their platforms on issues of concern to labor and make public a report with recommendations for political action. Roosevelt will be endorsed and so will a large number of other Democratic candidates, but here and there a Republican is likely to win official recognition as a "friend of labor." This is the old "non-partisan policy"—non-partisan as between the two parties of the employing class but quite partisan as against the parties of the working class!

Yet, while the Labor Non-Partisan League is a trade union organization for political action, the action it champions is support of Roosevelt, the banner-bearers of one of the two old-line capitalist parties of this country. The movement, therefore, still remains imprisoned in the vicious circle of the two-party system, is still vitiated by its subservience to capitalist politics. Class conscious workers, who understand the real interests of their class and can see beyond superficial appearances, cannot possibly go along with the Lewis policy but it would be folly not to recognize in it something distinct, something of an advance as compared with the traditional policy of the A. F. of L.

### The Socialist Party—Old Guard and Militants

The Socialist Party, as it stands today, also offers a wide variety of views on the Roosevelt question. In the Old Guard of New York, there is already manifest a fairly important division. The die-hard right wingers, of whom Louis Waldman is the spokesman, are for Roosevelt and make no bones about it. On May 7 Waldman was content to express his "admiration" for the President and to announce that, if the Socialist candidate proved unacceptable to him, he would support Roosevelt. (New York Herald-Tribune, May 7,

like Hoan and Hoopes are thus only armed for their struggle against revolutionary ideas maturing in the S. P.

In a similar fashion was the Declaration of Principles revised in so far as bourgeois democracy is concerned. The term "bogus democracy" used in the Detroit Declaration as an evaluation of bourgeois democracy was deleted this time.

Obviously the new Declaration is an even more expansive and flexible political document which can only breed more chaos. Scarcely had the convention approached its hour of adjournment when the sundry collected conflicting elements resting on the new Declaration of Principles almost wrecked the gathering and tore the situation wide open. We have in mind the tense moments occasioned by the consideration of the resolution on the united front. It was at this time that Hoopes who had been elected to the New NEC warned the convention that he would not serve on the NEC and that Reading would not remain in the Party if the majority report on the united front were adopted by the convention. It was at this time that peace-maker Dan Hoan stepped forward and asked the convention what it wanted, why it was fighting now that the New York issue was settled and they were given what they wanted in this matter. Comrade Thomas could save the situation—for a short time at most—by yielding to the proposal of Lewis to put the whole question of the united front to a referendum vote beginning December 31st.

Let no one have any illusions about the majority report on the united front question. It was not for a joint election campaign with

Thomas's effective statement in the May 9, 1936 issue of the Socialist Call suffers from the same fault. Nor is it sufficient to refute the pro-Roosevelt position by exclaiming, as does the Call of May 23, 1936: "As if a Socialist can possibly agree that there is reason for workers to support the candidacy of a representative of American capitalism! . . . Dedicated to the fight against the profit-system, Socialists will make no truce with its disciples." Socialists voted only a few weeks ago, and quite properly, for "representatives of capitalism" in France, for Herriot, for example on the second ballot. And Socialists in America have made and making a "truce" with "disciples of the profit-system" with LaFollette and the Wisconsin Progressives, to take an instance. The fact is that such sweeping absolutes, whatever place they may find in agitation, are certainly inadequate as a motivation of practical policy in a difficult situation. Something more concrete, something more specific to the situation in hand, is needed on which to base a realistic and revolutionary socialist attitude towards Roosevelt and the New Deal—and this has not been forthcoming from the Militant Socialists.

Of a piece with this abstract radicalism is Thomas's somewhat sarcastic recommendation that "those who want reforms . . . (should) stick to the Roosevelt administration." (Socialist Call, May 9, 1936). Surely Thomas will admit that, thru the development of a strong independent political movement of its own, labor can win much more significant concessions from the capitalist order than Roosevelt has hitherto found it necessary to grant. Such "extremist" formulations can only play into the hands of the pro-Roosevelt forces in the labor movement.

Thomas's effective statement in the May 9, 1936 issue of the Socialist Call suffers from the same fault. Nor is it sufficient to refute the pro-Roosevelt position by exclaiming, as does the Call of May 23, 1936: "As if a Socialist can possibly agree that there is reason for workers to support the candidacy of a representative of American capitalism! . . . Dedicated to the fight against the profit-system, Socialists will make no truce with its disciples." Socialists voted only a few weeks ago, and quite properly, for "representatives of capitalism" in France, for Herriot, for example on the second ballot. And Socialists in America have made and making a "truce" with "disciples of the profit-system" with LaFollette and the Wisconsin Progressives, to take an instance. The fact is that such sweeping absolutes, whatever place they may find in agitation, are certainly inadequate as a motivation of practical policy in a difficult situation. Something more concrete, something more specific to the situation in hand, is needed on which to base a realistic and revolutionary socialist attitude towards Roosevelt and the New Deal—and this has not been forthcoming from the Militant Socialists.

Of a piece with this abstract radicalism is Thomas's somewhat sarcastic recommendation that "those who want reforms . . . (should) stick to the Roosevelt administration." (Socialist Call, May 9, 1936). Surely Thomas will admit that, thru the development of a strong independent political movement of its own, labor can win much more significant concessions from the capitalist order than Roosevelt has hitherto found it necessary to grant. Such "extremist" formulations can only play into the hands of the pro-Roosevelt forces in the labor movement.

### NORMAN THOMAS



Socialist Presidential Candidate

man of the campaign committee of the S.P. has been in more anomalous positions before, politically speaking.

A few words as to the Waldman faction. It gave birth to the Social Democratic Federation—an open, uncamouflaged, outright, reformist organization. The Waldman outfit boasts of being against revolutionary socialism. It is proud in being called what it is—openly Right Wing, Social Democratic along the lines of Scheidemann, Wells, Noske, Stauning, Vandervelde. This Federation will not brook even the use of a left-sounding phrase to hide its devout faith in bourgeois democracy. Its main strength is in the Jewish Daily Forward Association machine thruout the country.

(Continued on Page 4)

# N.Y. Republicans Draft A "New Deal" Platform

Five New York Republican organizations, including the influential National Republican Club Inc., issued a proposed platform for their coming party convention this month, which on every major issue was practically a transcript of the 1932 New Deal platform. Even in certain planks criticizing Roosevelt, such as reduction of the Federal bureaucracy, the phraseology (and the insincerity) is identical with the Roosevelt campaign of 1932.

The chief point of difference between the Republicans and the administration, the question of relief, appears in very much weakened form. Despite the nonsense of state relief that they have demanded, the platform proposes "Federal loan to the states for relief", "Federal aid for a practical program of housing", "cooperation of government with agriculture, industry, and labor in provid-

ing jobs for unemployment", showing that, not merely would it be politically stupid to come out against federal relief, but that the American employers have come to agree that some national form of relief will be necessary for some time to come. The Labor program includes, "maintenance of labor's right of collective bargaining . . . without interference", "equality of opportunity and equal pay for equal work for men and women" (!), "uniform state laws and interstate compacts (!) for the establishment of minimum wages, maximum hours, abolition of sweatshops," etc.

Whether this New York wing of the G.O.P. will triumph at the convention remains to be seen. That such a program could be put forward however, indicates that the Liberty-Leaguers are as far from fascism, as they are from the White House.

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY CONVENTION

(Continued from Page 3)

Yet let no one make the mistake that even the Jewish Daily Forward Association is solidly with Waldman. Vladeck and Held will remain with the Party.

However, it would be folly to conclude that the Waldman Federation is limited to the above forces. It has some sort of an agreement with the Finnish Federation; it has the majority of the Jewish Verband, large blocs in Montana, Washington, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and practically all of Connecticut. Ideologically, Wisconsin and Reading are much closer to the Waldman setup than to the New York Militants, the Chicago organization, or such forces like Comrade Haggood, Comrade Fisher of Illinois, some of the New Jersey forces, and in many respects even Comrade Thomas. Waldman and his colleagues were unable to split the S.P. at Cleveland not because they did not want to but because Wisconsin which was the pivotal delegation would not come to an organization arrangement with them despite their ideological blood-brotherhood. Besides, not all of the Right Wing delegations were prepared at this time to go as far as Waldman's New York friends. Here it must be emphasized that Waldman went out of his way to make the political issues very sharp. This, one must grant regardless of how much one disagrees with his position. He minced no words politically; he sought no compromises organizationally. Had he been ready to offer himself in any way at all in either sense, he would today be inside the S.P. and very likely playing an even bigger role than before the convention.

Just now it appears that the strategy of Waldman is to have his Right Wing partners inside the SP prepare themselves for a later exit by sabotaging the party's work, particularly by interfering with the election campaign and capitalizing on the general chaotic and confused situation in the national organization. Of course, it is not at all excluded that, thru maneuvers or pressure by Hoan, Thomas and his Militants may make another herculean effort to restore to membership what they so warmly hailed at the convention as "our Right Wing." But no such move is likely until after the elections, despite the marked instability of the SP. How serious this instability is and how much of a free hand Dan Hoan has kept for himself is clearly shown by the

fact that he accepted the nomination for the NEC only *conditionally*, only on the basis that he would resign if pressure of work in Wisconsin would demand it. The New NEC or leadership is further weakened by the fact that it does not have a single member west of the Mississippi.

In summary, we must underscore that the fight for revolutionary socialism in the SP is far from over and is facing terrific obstacles. Undoubtedly, today, only a small minority of the membership is for revolutionary socialist principles. Even the best of the Militants, despite their protestations to the contrary, have not shown any clarity or consistency in their policies. At this convention, they did not even present their draft program about which they sang so many songs of praise as the model revolutionary document for the U. S. For them to have presented this document would have meant the loss of Wisconsin. For them to have lost Wisconsin would mean not to have been given the New York apparatus, the party machine in New York. That is why they made costly concession after concession in policy and principle.

The entire situation in the S.P. is further complicated and confused by the present ultra-right tactics of the Communist Party. It is the latter situation which enables the S.P. leadership to present their party as *apparently* to the left of the C.P. In words at least the new S.P. leadership can show some tangible evidence to substantiate their unfounded claim in substance. In principles the S.P., as a party continues reformist. Thru the use of certain revolutionary-sounding phrases, especially at a time when an ultra-right course is running riot in the C.P. and when the S.P. does not dare criticize frankly, the new N.E.C. is able to lead many workers to the false conclusion that the S.P. is now a revolutionary party and is even to the left of the C.P. How hollow such claims are will become clear particularly upon an examination of the basic resolutions adopted at Cleveland.

For those comrades in the S.P. who adhere to the principles of revolutionary socialism there is but one thing to do: Continue the struggle for such principles on a much more vigorous and more effective basis than ever before.

**JOIN  
COMMUNIST PARTY  
(OPPOSITION)**

## AN ANNOUNCEMENT

**I**N LINE with our editorial in last week's issue of Workers Age we begin to appear in four pages. We hope that with the assistance of our friends and readers it will be possible for us to return to the eight pages before the fall. That is up to our comrades and readers. If funds come in quickly enough we may be able to maintain the eight page weekly during the summer.

In the meantime we were forced to leave out a number of columns and cut down on the amount of news. Our readers will also bear with us if due to lack of space we are forced to postpone the continuation of series such as begun by Comrade George F. Miles and others.

## KNITGOOD SHOP CHAIRMEN MEET

The shop chairmen of the Joint Council Knitgoods Workers Union held a meeting on Tuesday, May 26th, at the Union headquarters. This meeting discussed and voted upon the demands which the Union would place before the employers in the coming General Strike in the month of July, 1936.

The meeting was marked by an enthusiastic spirit on the part of the shop chairmen and a determination that the agreement with the employers will be renewed with improved conditions for the knitgoods workers. The highlight of the meeting was the expression of unity and solidarity of all tendencies within the Union in support of the Union for the General Strike. Leaders of the tendencies in the Union rose and stated their agreement with the demands raised by the Union and pledged their wholehearted support to the Union in the coming strike. This expression of unity was greeted by the shop chairmen with repeated rounds of applause.

The chairmen's meeting laid plans for further meetings of active members of the Union in mobilization of the thousands of knitgoods workers of the Joint Council Knitgoods Workers Union for the coming General Strike. Brother Louis Nelson, Manager of the Union, made a report pointing out the vicious campaign of the employers' attempts to label the Union as a bunch of racketeers and their desperate attempts to confuse and demoralize the knitgoods workers in order to eliminate the Union as a factor in the industry. He further stated that he has no question in his mind that the answer of the knitgoods workers to the employers' attack will be a larger Union and a better agreement.

The meeting was concluded by an expression on the part of the shop chairmen to go back to their shops and inform the Union members of the plans made by the shop chairmen and to rally them in support of the Joint Council Knitgoods Workers Union.

## BRADLEY'S CAFETERIA

SEASONABLE  
FOOD  
AT  
REASONABLE  
PRICES

6th Ave. at 14th Street

## AROUND THE WORLD

**T**HE continued resistance of the Arabs in Palestine to the oppression of British imperialism, flared into open revolt against the troops hastily sent to Jerusalem by the British Foreign Office. Britain has sent about 3,000 troops from Egypt and now is shifting warships to that section in case necessity demands a landing party.

The general strike of the Arab masses has been extended to the Arabian press which, striking now for three days, will in the future publish no more government communiques. The answer of Wauchope, British High Commissioner, has been to more strictly enforce the curfew law and prepare, under instructions from the British Foreign Office, to "conduct a policy of more severe repressions." No steps have been taken to modify the immigration quotas as the Arabs requested. The Arabian youth movement, backbone of the revolt, demands that "every Arab youth become a martyr", signifying the intentions of fighting to a finish.

A BRITISH committee of liberals and intellectuals, the National Council for Civil Liberties, has issued a scathing indictment of British rule in North Ireland, the center of the Republican movement. The latter is illegal, dominance being maintained by a pro-British faction; this situation the report terms "un-British" showing a lack of acquaintance with British colonial methods. The government at Belfast immediately denied the accusation of the report in such a fashion as to essentially substantiate the document. Dawson Bates, a minister of the government, attempting to prove the "impartiality" of the government and its liberality claimed that "the only thing the government requires from its citizen is loyalty to the throne and Constitution and obedience to establish law." He further justified by implication the harsh methods of British dictatorship, by characterizing the situation prior to 1922 (triumph of Britain over the revolutionary independence movement) as a "state of anarchy, an organized criminal conspiracy being in existence to overthrow all lawful authority." To a ruling class its law represents the only possible law, all else being anarchy.

**UNDOUBTEDLY** the surprise of the Belgian elections was the show of strength by the Rexist (Fascist) Party. Participating in elections for the first time it secured 21 seats. The Socialist Party lost 3 seats retaining 70, while the Communist Party won 6 new seats to raise its representation to 9. The working class parties thus have to record a net gain of 3 places. Gains of left and right show that Belgium too begins to see the disintegration of the traditional democratic center.

The chief loser was the Catholic Party from which the Rexist split. It lost 16 seats, retaining only 63 and making it the second largest party. The liberals elected 23, a loss of one seat, while the Flemish Nationalists doubled their mandates to 16. Another interesting feature of the vote was the large number of blank ballots cast in Eupen and Malmédy, two German provinces secured by Belgium thru the Versailles Treaty.

Premier van Zeeland has answered the election returns by submitting his resignation. It is almost a certainty that the Socialist Emil Vandervelde will be asked to form a new government, since he represents the largest party in parliament.

**THE SHADOWS** of tariff wars, forecasting the bloody imperialist war to come, fell over the Pacific this week, when the United States considered plans for closing the Philippine textile markets to Japan. The encroachment of Japan in China in the form of "smuggling" in North China threatens the gains made by the U. S. in the recent financial deal arranged with the Nanking government.

The Chinese government, under

## PATRONIZE THE CANTON - CAFETERIA

46 GRAHAM AVENUE  
Corner Cook St.

The only 100% union house in  
the neighborhood

PURE FOOD  
MODERATE PRICES

"WHERE KNITGOODS  
WORKERS MEET"

## WORKERS AGE

Organ of the National Committee, Communist Party U. S. A. (Opposition). 51 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. Phone: GRamercy 5-8903.

Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Publishing Association. Subscription Rates: \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 for six months; 5c a copy. Foreign Rates: \$2.00 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.

Address mail to Box 68 Station "O" New York City.

Vol. V.

Saturday, June 6, 1936.

No. 23.