

Neutrality And War Danger

by Will Herberg

TAKING prudence for the better part of valor, the Administration has apparently decided to drop its plans for public hearings on the present neutrality legislation. The adverse popular reaction that followed the first hint that the neutrality statute was in danger, was so overwhelming that word immediately went forth from the State Department to go easy. Hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee were postponed indefinitely and, when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee met, the subject was not even mentioned. The Administration's retreat was unmistakable.

Yet the question is by no means settled, one way or the other. The problem of the type, scope and general validity of neutrality legislation still remains. Nor can it be doubted that the retreat of the Administration is merely strategic; the present law or any other that does not place full discretion in the hands of the Executive must necessarily be exceedingly distasteful to President Roosevelt to whom it quite naturally appears as an unwelcome obstacle to his war-making foreign policy. And Roosevelt has emphatically not accepted defeat, least of all in this field.

There can be little doubt that, whoever else may favor it for other reasons, our neutrality legislation finds strong, almost universal support among the great masses of the population, who regard it as a safeguard of peace and a barrier to war. This sentiment is an expression of the spontaneous "isolationism" so characteristic of the American people. That, however, does not absolve us from the duty of subjecting the problem to a critical analysis in the light of the realities of international politics. The road along which the masses are led to war is paved with shattered illusions.

The neutrality legislation dates from August 31, 1935, when Congress enacted a temporary measure in view of the Italo-Ethiopian war. On February 29, 1936, this was modified and extended to May 1, 1937. When Congress met in January 1937, there was talk of lengthy public hearings for a full discussion on proposals for a substitute act. Then, suddenly, Congress was thrown into a panic by the Administration's peremptory demand for immediate action in the Spanish situation. On January 8, 1937, there was, therefore, adopted at the behest of President Roosevelt, a joint resolution directly applying embargoes on the export of arms, ammunition and the implements of war to Spain and stipulating that the embargo could be lifted by the President only after the termination of the civil strife.

This resolution still stands. After adopting it, Congress held public hearings and, on May 1, 1937, enacted a general neutrality statute replacing the one of the year before. It requires the President to proclaim an embargo of arms, ammunition and implements of war and the extension of loans or credits to belligerents when he "finds" that a state of war exists; permits him to expand this list by the addition of essential articles of war, such as oil and cotton; authorizes him to require the purchase of these goods on a cash-and-carry basis; and gives him the right to bar Americans from travel on merchant ships of the belligerents. It applies these stipulations to international war and also to civil wars that may be regarded as "endan-

(Continued on Page 2)

Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. 7, No. 16.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, APRIL 16, 1938

5c a Copy

French Right Rule Set Up

Daladier Forms Cabinet As A Transition To "National Union"

A new cabinet, headed by Eduard Daladier, and openly abandoning the Popular Front as its basis of support, was formed last week to replace the short-lived regime of Leon Blum, forced to resign because of his humiliating defeat in the Senate by a vote of 223 to 40 on the question of special financial powers. The new cabinet is made up of Radical-Socialists and a number of allied groups outside the People's Front coalition. Such notorious reactionaries as Paul Reynaud and Albert Sarraut are included. The socialists refused to participate but promised "conditional and controlled support," upon which Daladier declares he does not have to depend. The new regime is distinctly hostile to the communists who will probably be in opposition.

Daladier himself designated his cabinet as a "stop-gap," pending the establishment of a government of "National Union" dedicated to the maintenance of capitalist order, restriction of labor rights and war. In fact, the cabinet is widely referred to as a "pre-fascist regime."

From the international standpoint, the most significant feature of the new situation is Daladier's notoriously "conciliatory" attitude to Nazi Germany and Bonnet's bitter anti-Sovietism. There will apparently take place an even closer alignment of the French Foreign Office behind the British policy of "wooing the dictators."

British-Italian Pact Is Completed

An Anglo-Italian treaty has already been framed and is now awaiting final formulation and formal announcement, according to London dispatches sent to the New York Times by Augur, generally regarded as a semi-official spokesman of the British Foreign Office. Even on Spain some agreement seems to have been reached, although it can hardly be regarded as definitive or permanent.

According to reports, the treaty covers all points at issue between the two powers: relations in the Mediterranean, fortification of naval bases, movements thru the Suez Canal, limitation of Italian troops in Africa, recognition of the Italian conquest of Ethiopia, relations in the Near East, and the "Spanish question."

On the "Spanish question," Mussolini said that he would consider the withdrawal of his troops only after Franco's complete victory. This proved acceptable to the British Foreign Office which not only "has no sympathy for the Spanish republicans" but expects Franco's victory in short order. The real problem, of course, is the conflict of Anglo-Italian imperialist interests in Spain. Although Italy is said to have given "a clear promise of disinterestedness in any Spanish territory in Europe or Africa," the British make no secret of their grave concern. British agents are busily at work strengthening British influence with Franco by promises of financial assistance

(Continued on Page 6)

House Kills Federal Bill

Reorganization Beaten By 204-196; Heavy Blow To Roosevelt Prestige

By a vote of 204 to 196, the House of Representatives last week killed the Administration's Reorganization Bill by recommitting it to the special Committee on Reorganization. The measure fell under the combined blows of the bipartisan anti-New Deal coalition in Congress, of large groups of Congressmen intent on saving their valuable patronage privileges endangered by the bill and of some elements who really feared the encroachment of Executive power upon the other branches of the government.

The bill came to the House from the Senate which had adopted the Administration proposal with some modifications. In the House, a num-

(Continued on Page 5)

NLRB Backs CIO On Signed Pacts

Board Orders Inland Steel Corp. To Sign Contracts For Agreements, Also Finds Republic Steel Guilty Of Violating Wagner Labor Act

In a decision acclaimed by labor leaders as of vast significance, the National Labor Relations Board ruled last week that an employer's refusal to sign a contract with a union, once an agreement had been reached as to terms, constituted a violation of the Wagner Act.

Holding that a written agreement between employer and employee is an "integral element" of collective bargaining, the board ordered the Inland Steel Co., of Chicago, to bargain with the Steel Workers Organizing Committee and, if an agreement was reached

on wages, hours and other conditions of employment, to sign a contract.

The ruling was confined to Inland Steel but was believed to be the forerunner of similar decisions against other "independent" steel companies which have refused to sign contracts with C.I.O., including Republic Steel Corp., Bethlehem Steel Co., National Steel Co., Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. and Weirton Steel Co., which produce about 25% of the national output.

A few days later, the N.L.R.B. made public another decision holding the Republic Steel Corp. guilty of violating the Wagner Act during the "little steel" strike and responsible for the deaths of three strikers as Massillon, Ohio, in rioting during the strike. The board ordered the company to cease and desist from interfering with the right of its employees to self-organization, to disestablish its company unions as collective-bargaining agencies and to reinstate with back-pay over 5,000 discharged strikers.

These decisions, which are likely to be appealed to the Supreme Court, establish a far-reaching precedent under the Wagner Act the C.I.O. in the "little steel" strike of last Summer.

Philip Murray, chairman of the S.W.O.C., hailed the Labor Board's decisions as support for the union's position. At the S.W.O.C. offices, it was said that the decisions would intensify the drive against "little steel."

Great Lovestone Meeting in N. Y.

The big hall in Hotel Center was jammed to suffocation on Thursday, April 7, as Jay Lovestone described before a rapt audience of 2,000 New Yorkers the political and labor situation in Europe as he had found it in the course of his recent trip there. A particularly striking impression was made by his first-hand report of the circumstances and events of the Hitler invasion in Austria; here he was drawing directly on his own experiences for he had been in Vienna during those fateful days and had been in close contact with the most important circles in the labor movement.

Lovestone's subject was "Europe Nears the Abyss." He showed how fascist aggression, aided and abetted by the imperialist intrigues of the "great democracies", was driving Europe to the brink of world war and barbarism, while the forces of labor stood demoralized and impotent because of the suicidal policies of the right-wing socialist and Stalinist leadership. In the same connection, he discussed the Moscow "trials" from the point of view of the light they cast on the character and role of the Stalin regime.

A collection was taken up, to which the audience contributed generously, for Austrian labor.

(Continued on Page 2)

UAW Debates War Issue

By GEORGE F. MILES

THE March 19 issue of the United Automobile Worker, official paper of the U.A.W., continues the discussion on labor's attitude to war in the form of an exchange of letters between Vice-President Wyndham Mortimer and the editor, William Munger.

In the letter referred to, Mr. Mortimer denies that he voted for, or is in agreement with, the position of the International Executive Board on war. On the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment, which the U.A.W. Board backs, Mr. Mortimer states: "It is my opinion the Ludlow Amendment is meaningless and, under present world conditions, is merely an attempt to confuse the public mind on the real issues at stake. . . . The effect of the Ludlow Amendment would be to assist the fascist nations rather than oppose them."

Mr. Mortimer also declares himself opposed to the withdrawal of American armed forces from China because that would make it "easier for fascist Japan to despoil the Chinese people."

Space does not permit reprinting in full Mr. Munger's lucid and enlightening discussion of the points raised in the letter. A few excerpts will suffice to illustrate the trend of the argument. Beginning with a consideration of the nature of war, Mr. Munger declares:

"War is simply the intensification and kindling into flame of conflicts and struggles carried on by the dominating interests of various countries with each other. "If we want to determine just what Great Britain or the United States, for example, is likely to do in case of war in China we ought to examine what policies have been pursued in China during peace time."

Mr. Munger then takes up the question of withdrawal of American troops:

"American, British or French workers have no interests in China which require protection by armed forces. Neither you nor I have invested any capital for the exploitation of coolie labor which we need to protect. The

United States Steel corporation, the Standard Oil company and a variety of other Wall Street concerns have invested capital in China.

"Certainly no one wants to see the Chinese workers enslaved by Japanese fascism. . . . Any armed forces which the United States, Great Britain or France would send to China would not be for the purpose of liberating the Chinese workers from the dominance of Japan but for the purpose of insuring the continuance of the imperialist domination of their own respective ruling group whose policies they carry out."

Especially effective is Munger's reply to the argument of "collective security."

"How can we depend upon the great democracies to take action against Japan in behalf of China when Japan herself could scarcely fire a gun without the war materials supplied her by American industrialists? Japan today is America's largest customer of scrap iron which is used for shrapnel to blow Chinese women and children to pieces. It is rather naive to expect that we can appeal to these same financiers, whose anti-labor practices the La Follette Committee is exposing every day, to join hands with American workers to free the workers of China from fascism."

"On the contrary, nothing is more certain than if a war breaks out involving the United States, we will have established in this country an all-powerful military dictatorship such as is proposed in the Sheppard-Hill or in the May bill. It is no aid to the workers in China to have the workers in America enslaved in the bonds of military-fascist dictatorship here at home."

"To me there is no evidence that J. P. Morgan, the Rockefellers, the duPonts or the Girdlers, have in any way changed their ideals or objectives since the World War. I find it difficult to believe that the munitions makers are going to don halos and fight for the liberation of the coolies of China when they are so unwilling to grant elementary concessions to

Viewed from the Left

By Politicus

Reorganization: De Facto and De Jure

THE MOST hypocritical of the anti-Roosevelt campaigns conducted by the Republicans and anti-New Deal Democrats appears to have reached its immediate goal. The Reorganization Bill, dedicated to the reform of structure of democratic government thru what amounts to a change in the character of the government by increasing Executive power, was killed because of Congressional desire for the retention of many of the favorite sources of patronage. As was pointed out in I. M. Hamilton's article appearing in last week's Workers Age, concentration of power in the hands of the President plus the erection of a cumbersome criss-crossing bureaucracy has been the tendency of American governmental development for the past four or five decades and has gone on thru Republican and Democratic regimes alike. The outmoded system of bureaus and departments, wasting the federal moneys and providing a rich source for Congressional nepotism, finds solution under capitalism, not thru elimination of bureaucracy and extension of democracy, but thru co-ordination of bureaucracy and the limitation of democracy.

Democracy, that is, capitalist democracy, modernizes itself out of the horse-and-buggy days, increases its administrative efficiency, only by concentrating more and more power in the hands of the Executive. In different countries, this takes different forms—all of which represent the transition stage of government by Executive decree, over the heads of parliament, congresses, and chambers of deputies, on the road to official concentration of complete power in the hands of the Executive, who ultimately becomes known as Fuehrer or Duce. No matter how many midnight statements Roosevelt unwittingly shocks the country with, the fact is that the exigencies of capitalist-class rule demand more and more the openly dictatorial forms of government, less and less the pretence at government by the people. Especially does this law operate with increased vigor in times of crisis: witness the abrogation of democracy during the World War; witness the "emergency" powers granted to Roosevelt in 1933; take stock of the powers mapped out for the Executive in the coming war thru the M-Day plans of the War Department and foreshadowed by the May Bill "Efficient government," cries the employing class. "Do something," joins in the chorus of the victims of the profit-system. And, so long as that "something" is not in consonance with labor's socialist aspirations, the government moves towards an increasing reaction which can only culminate in fascism.

It is the New Deal itself, an emergency government called upon to do something efficiently in our nine-year old crisis, which has brought sharply to the fore the question of increased Executive power. The hypocrisy of employing-class opposition to the Byrnes Bill, does not exclude or make less necessary a sincere labor opposition, not so much to the bill itself, which is significant only as a sign of the times, but to the trend which it indicates.

Consider the record of the Administration for the past few months and see whether this government is out for progressive reform or reaction.

The Ludlow Amendment: The most excited campaign that Roosevelt has yet waged was against the war-referendum proposal. It was easy for him to be "open" in those moves which the majority of the people supported, but here, facing the general opposition of the masses, he had to resort to behind-the-scenes pressure of

U.A.W. Debates War

(Continued from Page 1)

their own employees here in the United States."

Finally, Editor Munger takes to task Mr. Mortimer for his opposition to the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment:

"I notice you dislike in particular the LaFollette-Ludlow resolution. It is interesting, however, to note that you use almost the same argument which that noble champion of liberty, Senator Arthur A. Vandenberg, and that other equally doughty champion of democracy, Alfred M. Landon, used in their objections to the LaFollette-Ludlow resolution. There are some who rise in horror at the thought of a union agreement being consummated without the vote of the raters and file, who have oddly enough become the bitter enemies of a plan which would permit the rank and file of the country to decide whether or not they were going to allow themselves to be butchered some place thousands of miles from their homes."

T.V.A.: Word is now going round in Washington that the White House considers Arthur E. Morgan an honest man and an idealist. This of course is calculated to smooth over Roosevelt's actions in the case. The President's attitude from a juridical point of view, means that the heads of various governmental agencies are responsible not to Congress but to him; that they are, in fact, merely his agents to whom he has temporarily delegated his powers. Now pressure of all sorts has forced the passage of an investigation into T.V.A.—but why did Roosevelt first remove Morgan and then accede to an investigation? That is utilization and usurpation of Executive power with a vengeance.

Taxes and Reorganization: In the case of both these measures, testimony has been pouring in from Congressmen that they have not experienced such terrific political pressure from the Administration in a long time. A few Senators stated they had received wires from home, from political big-shots, advising them to vote "yes" on reorganization because the sender had been informed that the particular state would fare badly in the way of W.P.A. grants if the contrary occurred.

THE MOSCOW "TRIALS" AND OUR ORIENTATION

By M. Y.

(We publish below a discussion article by M. Y., a member of the New York organization of the I.C.L.L.—The Editor.)

THE bloody purge of the flower of Bolshevism, the living active participants in the October Revolution, is the culmination of a distortion of the purpose and intent of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union.

So absorbed have class-conscious, revolutionary-minded workers become in the "socialist" successes and the terrific pace of industrialization, that the ugly features of the dictatorship, since the death of Lenin, have been ignored and even justified.

The secrecy surrounding the activities and politics played by the responsible leaders of the C.P.S.U. has for too long a time blinded and kept from view the sinister forces developing inside the state machine.

It is at this time very difficult to coolly appraise all the factors leading to the present tragic end of the entire Bolshevik cadre. The mere fact that Lenin in his Testament expressed fear of the possibility of such a development, and warned against it, indicates that the elements making for the present catastrophe were there from the very beginning. The dogma and sanctity of a single-party dictatorship must be seriously reevaluated. It is this question which divided us from the P.O.U.M. for quite some time.

A Costly Lesson

Communists of all political shades, including our group, consciously or not, have for too long lost their sense of reality and become attached to the Russian experiences and practices. Despite the fact that our organization made heroic efforts to be realistic and objective and, in the last few years, even boasted of actually functioning as an independent force, free from outside influence, we have to admit now that we have failed miserably.

After existing outside the filthy atmosphere of the Comintern for nine long years, we are now first turning away with disgust and contempt from the platitudes of the "correctness of the Stalinist general line."

The redeeming feature in the inquisition trials is that they served as an eye-opener as to the real nature and political meaning of Stalinism. Stalinism stands exposed as the most dangerous and reactionary force in the labor movement. And it was such for a long time, only we were tardy in realizing it.

The New Orientation

The coming convention promises to be the most important event in the life of our organization. A healthy feeling and a sense of genuine independence, an anxiety for a sound approach to all problems of the labor movement, pervades the membership. And the initiative this time comes from the top. James Thorpe, in the discussion article in the Age of March 26, points a finger at some sore spots in the political life of the group. If the new approach is to mean something, we will have to get away from the political snobbishness and coarseness of the past. The group's participation in the international conference in Paris, Lovestone's report to the plenum, which appeared in the Age of March 19-26, are a sure indication in what direction the wind is blowing. The former approach or lack of approach to the so-called "Russian question"—not to offend anybody in the C.P.S.U. (which meant in reality supporting Stalin)

* For further discussion of the question, see the article, "Folly of 'Isolationism,'" in the March 26, 1938 issue of the Workers Age.

—has been finally and definitely discarded.

S.P. And Trotskyites

The convention will have to speak clearly regarding our attitude to the Socialist Party and the Trotskyites. This new orientation will inevitably change our attitude to these organizations. With respect to the Trotskyites: While the trials have broken down considerably the political hostility existing in the past, differences on major political questions in the United States still exist. Unfortunately, the trials did not have the same sobering effect on the Trotskyites. The trials in fact have given them an apparently greater justification for their sectarianism on the most immediate and burning problem of the day. We are still far apart on such questions as the C.I.O., labor party, anti-war movement. It is paradoxical, the people who incessantly shout for a 4th International still cling to a good many stupidities of the Comintern. Will they ever learn?

With respect to the S.P.: It has

Neutrality Law and War

(Continued from Page 1)

gering the peace of the United States." It is this statute and the January 8 joint resolution on Spain that are now being so vigorously discussed.

Efficacy Of Neutrality Legislation

The first question we must ask is naturally: Can neutrality legislation, in its present shape or in an improved form, really be relied upon to keep this country out of war? Unfortunately, the facts do not permit any such conclusion. Countries do not plunge into war thru carelessness or primarily as a result of thoughtless "entanglements" resulting from war-time commerce. Modern states join in war under the pressure of imperialistic interests that do not depend fundamentally either for their force or their direction upon war trade, altho, of course, such trade may act as a strong contributory and aggravating factor. All of the most ingeniously contrived neutrality laws in the world will not amount to very much once the dominant imperialist groups come to feel that their vital interests can best be defended or promoted by entry into war; all such statutory restrictions will be brushed aside as so many cobwebs. The United States has emerged as a major force in the world's economics and politics; it is in fact the world's outstanding imperialist power—the tentacles of Wall Street reach into every corner of the globe. What binds the United States to the "danger spots" of the world and therefore creates the danger of American involvement in war, is not the giddy spree of war-time trade but the imperialistic drive rooted in the country's peacetime economics and generated by the long-term forces at work in the capitalistic system at its present stage of maturity. The investments, commercial privileges and financial profits and prospects of American big-business groups abroad, developed over several decades, especially since the World War, constitute the material stakes in the game of war and peace. Of one thing we may be sure: Let any great war break out in Europe or Asia and it will require more than neutrality legislation on the statute books to keep America out.

Neutrality legislation, therefore,

cannot be relied upon to keep America out of war and for us to look to such legislation to achieve this result is to invite disaster. The only way in which the danger of war may be met at all is by exerting overwhelming mass pressure on the government. Wars are made by governments and governments are not immune to popular pressure. If, in any crisis, a sufficiently powerful movement can be mobilized in opposition to war and to the foreign policy making for war, then the government may be forced to hesitate, to think twice and, perhaps, even to turn aside. And, since all "big" wars are today world wars in their very nature, the only way to meet the menace of such wars with real effectiveness is to develop an international anti-war movement of such sweep and power as to become a factor in the game of international politics.

Some Questions

Neutrality legislation is no real defense against involvement in war; of that there can hardly be any doubt. But that in itself does not answer the question whether such legislation may not play a useful though modest part in the effort to hamper and restrict the war-making policies of the Administration. Shall the neutrality law be applied in the present Far Eastern crisis? Shall it be retained altogether? If so, shall it be retained unchanged or shall it be modified? And modified in which direction—by making it more mandatory, by giving greater discretion to the President, by eliminating certain aspects of its aspects, by adding others? There are over thirty bills pending to abolish, modify or extend the scope of the neutrality acts. What should be our attitude from the point of view of labor's struggle against war? These problems I shall consider in future articles.

! ? ? !

HOW a bourgeois and a "communist" paper report the same event, the suicide of Major Fey:

"MINISTER WHO DESTROYED SOCIALISTS COMMITTS SUICIDE"—Manchester Guardian, March 17, 1938.

"AUSTRIAN PATRIOT LEADER'S SUICIDE"—Daily Worker (London), March 17, 1938.

experienced crisis after crisis and split after split in the last few years. This party has lost heavily in membership and influence. In the trade-union field, it has no conscious policy of its own, with the result that, in some unions, it follows our group and, in the automobile union, it follows the C.P. Unfortunately, we did not succeed in attracting the disillusioned and disappointed S.P. members, who either go to the Trotskyites or drop out of the labor movement completely. The convention will have to give serious thought to this problem.

By JAY LOVESTONE

(We publish below the first section of the speech made by Jay Lovestone at the recent International Conference at Paris. The second section will follow in the next issue.—The Editor.)

UNDER the guidance of Lenin and thru the inspiration of the Russian revolution, we, now in the International Communist Opposition, broke with social-democracy on two main grounds. These were: the attitude towards imperialist war and the evaluation of bourgeois democracy. As revolutionists, we have maintained and continue to maintain that to make the slightest concession towards the support of imperialist war and to bend in the least degree towards the support of bourgeois democracy as a political system, as a state form, means to defend capitalism as a social system, to work for the perpetuation of capitalist rule.

Against The Poison Of Reformism

In making this break that I have mentioned, we also emphasized that it was the primary duty of revolutionists, in every country, first of all to defeat their own bourgeoisie. As a corollary of this, we emphasize with equal force, as we have always done, that an organic part of this struggle to defeat our own bourgeoisie is the task of defeating our own reformists and social-chauvinists. It is on this score that we fight with such vigor against the toxin of reformism now being inculcated into the laboring masses by the Comintern. Obviously, I am not going into any details as to the concrete tactics to be employed by the respective organizations in their struggle against capitalism and against the reformists who, in the ranks of labor, defend bourgeois rule. I am merely underscoring a general orientation.

But you will be interested, I am sure, to learn from a general point of view how the People's Front ideology and policy operate in the United States, for whom it works and against whom it works in a country like ours where bourgeois democracy as a political system is still vigorous. You will undoubtedly be interested to learn something about the ravages of the poison of the People's Front in a land where only the first beginnings of a critical attitude towards and distrust of bourgeois democracy and capitalism are to be noted in working-class ranks.

In the United States are in the initial stages of the development of a mass independent working-class movement on a national scale. We are only at the beginning of a crystallization of the class movement of the proletariat as a distinct movement, as a class-conscious force. Herein lies the fundamental, the decisive, significance of the C.I.O. In its potentialities, the latter is far more than an industrial-union movement, the far be it from me to minimize the basic import even of such a movement itself. Herein lies the real significance of the trend towards a labor party. Here is a trend towards independent working-class action; here is an accentuation of the first beginnings of revolutionary disillusionment—vague, confused, hesitant, unclear to it be—with bourgeois, with parliamentary, democracy as a political system.

Stalinists To The Rescue Of Capitalism

But precisely at this time does the Communist Party rush to the rescue of capitalism, to bolster bourgeois democracy, to mislead the workers, to help the exploiting class perpetuate its rule. And why? On the ground that it is conceivable that we could have the working class treated than it is being treated today! At a time when outstanding trade-union leaders, like

John L. Lewis, who are far from being communists, are manifesting and developing a healthy critical attitude towards Roosevelt and his Administration, the Communist Party dedicates itself to the sacred cause of defending Roosevelt and his policies and program!

Take the case of Lenin Memorial Day in the United States this year. What has the Communist Party done with this day, insofar as the labor movement is concerned? In the city of Baltimore, it issues a leaflet captioned: "Why a Lenin Memorial Meeting?" This leaflet says in part: "Lenin would hail Secretary Ickes and Assistant Attorney General Jackson for their battle against the American 'Sixty Families' of fascist monopolists." This may appear to be, and is, silly. But it is also tragic. A Communist Party, a working-class party, hailing an attorney general! You know who an attorney general is; you know what his jobs are; you know what a police department, operating on a national scale, is; you know against whom such departments operate and in whose behalf they always operate in the last resort. And if, in France, Stalin's orders are to fight, not against capitalism as a system but against "Two Hundred Families," then in America the ideology is mechanically transferred to a fight against "Sixty Families." You see, we have bigger and better plutocrats in the United States and that is why we have less of them, Stalin and Browder would have you believe.

However, do not think for a moment we have here reached the depths of Stalinist degradation and degeneration. The Communist Party of the United States, in the spirit of the People's Front and on the basis of the People's Front approach and program, continues to desecrate Lenin Memorial Day. This anti-proletarian outburst bearing the stamp of the Mariam Land State Committee of the Communist Party continues to shriek: "And it is a fear of the spirit of Lenin that is abroad in the world today that prevents the coming royalists of America from carrying thru their threats to assassinate President Roosevelt."

I suppose that the only comment one can legitimately make on this piece of perfidy is: "Let no one else resort to assassinations. Only Stalin should and may. As an expert in this business, he must have a

(Continued on Page 5)

CZECH LIBERALS PROTEST PURGE

(We have received the following declaration on the recent Moscow "trial" from a group of outstanding authors, artists and scientists of Czechoslovakia.—THE EDITOR.)

IN view of the new Moscow trial, we believe it to be our duty to declare publicly that the judicial methods used against former leaders of the November Revolution and outstanding scientists can not convince us in the least. We have never been able to place any confidence in the allegation that the majority of Lenin's colleagues were traitors to socialism and spies of foreign powers.

As friends of the Soviet Union and of the international labor movement, we join with the protest sent to Moscow by the French League for the Rights of Man.

(signed): Fr. Bidlo, painter; Boh. Brouk, writer; Vaclav Cerny, writer; J. L. Fischer, Karl University; Dr. L. Goerlich, physician; Fr. Halas, poet; Jar. Jezek, composer; Vaclav Kaplicky, writer; Fr. Kovarna, Karl University; Jan Noha, poet; K. Reiner, composer; Jar. Seifert, poet; Prof. Theodor Hartwig; K. Teiger, writer; Tiyen, painter.

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT IN AMERICA

America for Mooney Pardon

The following results are from a nation-wide survey of public opinion on the Mooney case, as conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion.

DO YOU THINK TOM MOONEY WAS GUILTY?		SHOULD HE BE PARDONED AND RELEASED FROM PRISON?			
	Yes	No			
United States	47%	53%	United States	64%	36%
Sections			Sections		
New England States	51%	49%	New England States	66%	34%
Middle Atlantic	31	69	Middle Atlantic States	77	23
East Central States	48	52	East Central States	58	42
West Central States	54	46	West Central States	57	43
Southern States	60	40	Southern States	52	48
Rocky Mountain States	69	31	Rocky Mountain States	65	35
Rocky Mountain States	48	52	Pacific Coast States	55	45
Pacific Coast States	52	48	California	55	45
California	52	48			

Social Security Reform Needed

By ABRAHAM EPSTEIN

(The article below first appeared in the July 1937 issue of the Call of Youth, paper of the Young Circle League. It is especially significant today in view of the discussion on amending the Social Security Act.—THE EDITOR.)

THE major implications of the Social Security Act stand out best by an analysis of what is involved in the ten insurance and welfare programs embodied in the Social Security Act. Understanding is facilitated when these ten programs are grouped into the three categories into which they fall: (a) The federal grants-in-aid for state welfare programs; (b) the national contributory old-age insurance plan; and (c) the tax-credit device for the encouragement of state unemployment insurance laws.

Of the ten provisions in the Act, eight deal with grants-in-aid to states. The most important of these provide for federal assistance to states which establish systems of pensions for needy men and women over 65 years of age, for the needy blind and for needy dependent children under 16 years of age. These provisions are all essential and sound. Grants-in-aid to states afford the only practicable means of providing for present destitution because many states are unable alone to cope with these problems. Applied with great success in many fields from the first days of the republic, the passage of the Social Security Act has encouraged practically all states to take advantage of the federal grants by enacting new laws or by liberalizing their previous statutes. The inadequacy of the amounts allowed and the other deficiencies of these programs, while deplorable, present no fundamental handicaps.

The dangerous implications of the Act lie in its insurance provisions for old-age and unemployment. Both of these programs fail to meet the basic objectives sought. The Act does not provide protection for individual workers in old age because:

Dangerous Weaknesses

1. Since the average monthly insurance annuity which most workers will be able to receive under the present Act during the next twenty years will be less than \$30, the present program cannot possibly meet the needs of the aged for almost a generation to come. An insured worker must earn \$100 per month uninterruptedly for twenty years to get a pension of \$32.50 a month. With sickness, strikes and unemployment cutting into this period, most workers will have to wait twenty-five or thirty

years for such pensions. Few men or women working today will live to receive the maximum pension of \$85 monthly which will go only to those who have earned \$3,000 every single year for 43 years. The insurance plan provides nothing for the insured man's wife if she is not a wage-earner. The old-age insurance system cannot, therefore, meet the problem of old-age dependency for the next generation.

2. Far from enhancing national security, the present system may aggravate our existing insecurity. Our old-age insurance system does not distribute the cost of old-age dependency upon all elements of society. By levying regressive taxes on payrolls, it places the burden entirely upon the wage-earners and consumers of the nation, relieving the wealthy from their share of the social burden of old-age dependency which, thru the poor laws, they have helped to carry for over 300 years. The heavy taxes on workers wages and employers payrolls—which will be passed on to workers as consumers in the form of increased prices—can only tend to reduce further the present low purchasing power. The payroll taxes may also intensify employers efforts to reduce their labor costs by accelerating the replacement of men by machines.

3. The Act also places a back-breaking burden upon the younger and better paid workers. These workers as taxpayers have to pay their share for the non-contributory pensions, must provide fully for their own annuities and, in addition, pay higher premiums in order that those now old and in middle age may receive the small annuities to be granted to them. Higher-paid young workers entering the system when the 6% rate goes into effect in 1949 will, with their employers, pay premium rates much higher than would be required by a private insurance company for similar annuities. Thus, a worker of 20 entering the system in 1949 and earning \$250 monthly could, with his employer's contribution, purchase a private annuity of \$147.35 monthly as against the \$85 monthly maximum under the federal plan.

4. Grave dangers also inhere in the huge reserves contemplated under the old-age insurance plan, estimated to reach \$47,000,000,000 by 1980. Of course, it is not unlikely that Congress may dissipate these reserves for other purposes. If accumulated, however, these huge funds which may be invested only in government obligations will place a premium on increasing the governmental debt, not to speak of its effects on the national economy, when all governmental bonds are

Imperialism And Brazil

By ELLEN WARD

(Concluded from last week)

TO combat the rise of the Internationalist elements, a united front of left, liberal elements, was attempted in 1935 under the name of "National Liberation Alliance," captained by the now famous Carlos Prestes so long a prisoner, and under the leadership of the Communist Party. The program of this Alliance contained the following planks: 1. suspension of payments on the foreign debt; 2. government control of public utilities; 3. division of the large landed estates; 4. separation of Church and state; 5. the 8-hour day for labor; 6. establishment of a minimum wage; and 7. social insurance.

Before we set down what happened to this alliance and to its program, we want to call the reader's attention to the fact that the above was enunciated in the period before the People's Front madness set in to build a Tower of Babel among the workers.

In November 1935, shortly after the enunciation of the above program, two Brazilian states revolted on purely local issues of autonomy, as they have frequently done during the past century. The Alliance, with a great romantic yen for strength and power, decided to support this purely political clique revolt. As might have been expected this silly adventurism led to disastrous results. The central government was able to decimate the movement and all of its leading spirits. From this blow, the movement has not yet recovered. A few months after the failings, the Communist Party issued an underground manifesto in which it blandly announced: "In Brazil the time is not yet ripe for a workers and peasants dictatorship much less for a proletarian dictatorship," and it urged upon the Brazilian people the formation of the Popular Front!

The U. S. A. In Brazil

Despite the aggressive penetration of European fascist ideology, the largest business concerns in Brazil are still American. The United States is still Brazil's principal market, taking 50% of all her exports; 54% of her coffee and an even higher percentage of the better grades; 80% of her cocoa and 83% of all her rubber. From these few figures, it is obvious how much the economic welfare of Brazil depends upon the United States. And, whether landowner-capitalist democracy or military dictatorship attempts to guide the destinies of Brazil, these facts tie her to the United States, and the American State Department has known how to use the full force of its pressure. Today Hull works with greater caution and discretion in the affairs of Latin America because he must seek not to offend at a time when he is so eager to win active allies—but he succeeds just the same in making his meaning clear: the protection of American imperialist interests is first and foremost on the State Department calendar. And on this question there are no two groups in the State Department, as Harry Gan-

nes of the Daily Worker would lead us to believe. The Stalinists have divided every department of our government into two groups: Group 1, the "economic royalists," and Group 2, those who are ready

(Continued on Page 6)

withdrawing from banks, insurance companies, trust funds and private investors.

The unemployment-insurance scheme established by the Act also offers little or no security to the

(Continued on Page 4)

WORKERS AGE

Organ of the National Council, Independent Communist Labor League. 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Publishers...

Vol. 7. April 16, 1938 No. 16.

MAY DAY

It is already clear that the so-called "United May Day demonstration" this year in New York and other cities will be in all senses of the term strictly a Stalinist affair.

How, indeed, would it be possible for any self-respecting, militant labor organization to join with the Stalinites in a May Day demonstration? Under what banners is the American Communist Party demonstrating on May Day this year?

Were anything more needed to dramatize the utter degradation of May Day in the hands of Stalinism, one look at the Daily Worker's May Day greetings blank would be enough.

By its own acts, Stalinism has made it impossible to collaborate with it even on May Day when it should be possible for all sections of the labor movement to show a solid front to the employing class.

The advanced labor organizations of this country, those that have come to realize the significance of May Day, will find a way of celebrating the day apart from the Stalinites.

Bukharin Never Plotted With the Left S.R.'s

By Dr. J. STEINBERG

(The author of the article below was Commissar for Justice in the first Soviet government after the October Revolution. He represented the Left Social-Revolutionaries who, at that time, cooperated with the Bolsheviks in the government.)

IN the recent Moscow trials, two former leading members of the Left Social-Revolutionaries—Kamkov and Karelin—were made to testify against Bukharin.

Karelin was a member of the Central Committee of the Left S.R. in 1918 but, after two years in prison, left the party and retired from all political activities.

Kamkov was the leader of the Left S.-R. after 1917 and was an active participant in the October Revolution. Following the signing of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, he became an opponent of the policy of Lenin and Trotsky.

At the trial on March 7, Kamkov is said to have declared (Kamkov, March 9) that an agreement for common struggle against the Soviet government of Lenin had been concluded between Bukharin and his friends (the "Left Communists") and the Left S.-R. Karelin explained that the Central Committee of the Left S.-R. knew about the plot to assassinate Lenin

in August 1918, and that Dora Kaplan acted on the common instructions of Bukharin, the Right S.-R. and the Left S.-R.

At that time I was an active member of the Central Committee of the Left S.-R. and a member of the Soviet government. On the basis of my exact information, I declare categorically:

1. Never, either in an official or any other meeting of the Central Committee of the Left S.-R., was the question of the arrest, destruction or murder of Lenin, Stalin or Sverdlov discussed.

2. Never did either the Central Committee of the Left S.-R. or any member of that party have any connection with the attempt of Dora Kaplan on Lenin in August, 1918. The attempt was made on her own responsibility without even the knowledge of her own party, the Right S.-R., and without any connection with Bukharin or the Left S.-R.

3. Never has there been a "block" of the Right S.-R., the Left S.-R. and the Left Communists round Bukharin.

The Social-Revolutionary party split into two parts during the October Revolution. The left wing, together with the Bolsheviks, founded the Soviet republic, while the right wing fought bitterly against the new state.

Still less was there any possibility in August 1918 for a block of the Left S.-R. with Bukharin. After July 1918, and the persecution of the Left S.-R., all political cooperation with the Bolsheviks ended abruptly. In fact, Bukharin and his Left Communists were absolutely at one with Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin in denouncing the Left S.-R.

Social Security Reforms

(Continued from Page 3) unemployed because:

1. It makes no provisions whatsoever for the existing unemployed. Those now out of work cannot possibly benefit until they are first reabsorbed and then discharged by private industry.

2. Insignificant protection is afforded even for the unemployed in the future because the ultimate 3% levy on payrolls, effective in 1938, will rarely permit more than about ten weeks of benefits.

3. The underlying anti-social and uneconomic characteristics of the old-age insurance plan are also found in unemployment insurance provisions. Here, too, the government seeks to escape its responsibility for future unemployment.

4. The Act also goes out of its way to complicate the administration of unemployment insurance. Every state is at present duplicat-

ing the federal tax and administration. Instead of promoting adequacy and uniformity, the federal Act encourages a confusing variety of systems, regardless of their efficacy. At best, it can bring about only a miscellany of 48 divergent state plans causing endless confusion, inequality between states, disparity between workers and employers in the different states and bad feeling on the part of the unemployed.

Amendments Imperative

The Act's present insurance provisions thus give little protection to the aged and the unemployed. They may even aggravate present conditions by diminishing mass purchasing power thru the withdrawal of immediate income and thru higher prices. Moreover, the high taxes now levied on employers and employees for the limited program, resulting from the government's refusal to participate in the cost and its desire to build up unnecessary large reserves, is now becoming a serious handicap in extending the program to other phases of insecurity such as illness, for instance, which in normal times constitutes the chief cause of dependency.

Every state is at present duplicating the federal tax and administration. Instead of promoting adequacy and uniformity, the federal Act encourages a confusing variety of systems, regardless of their efficacy.

By Lambda

WORLD TODAY Revolutionary Left Of French S.P. Denounces "National Union"

(We publish below the declaration of the Revolutionary Left (Pivert) tendency of the French Socialist Party in connection with the decisions of the National Council session of March 12, 1938. The resolution of the Revolutionary Left against the National Union—in French politics an all-inclusive national front of bourgeoisie and proletariat—was adopted by the Seine Federation, which includes Paris and is the most important in the party.—The Editor.)

DOWN WITH THE NATIONAL UNION! (Declaration of the Minority)

UNALTERABLY devoted to the principles of the class struggle embodied in the fundamental program of the Socialist Party, the Revolutionary Left repudiates the National Union under whatever pretext or in whatever form it is put forward.

Consequently, it condemns the formal violation of the pledges made in 1936 and the disastrous culmination of a policy of weakness and abdication that has just been sanctioned by the vote of the National Council of the party.

The Revolutionary Left refuses to view the international situation except in relation to the class interests of the workers. It proclaims that the duty of national defense does not fall upon the masses of the workers as long as they have not won the economic and political rule of the country.

It emphasizes the fact that fascist intervention in revolutionary Spain, struggling for its national independence and social liberation, did not call forth any attempt at National Union, altho recent events in Central Europe are claimed to render it indispensable.

The Revolutionary Left refuses absolutely to join this political alliance with the blind and selfish bourgeoisie, which contrived the monstrous Versailles Treaty, which facilitated the advent of Hitlerism, which provoked gigantic rearmament and has aggravated, beyond all measure, the danger of war.

It considers that the decision of the National Council of the party is not in accord with the real will of the militants of the party, or the vital interests of the proletariat, or the effective defense of liberty and peace.

Only a determined offensive of the French popular masses, directed by their class organizations, against those really responsible for the present tragic situation, can protect liberty and peace.

Only the expropriation of the economic and financial oligarchy, which is favorable to international fascism, can protect our liberties.

Only the redistribution of the sources of material wealth, seized from capitalism, can remove the social base of fascist imperialism, and protect peace.

The Revolutionary Left proclaims its will to remain loyal, at whatever cost, to international socialism, to its revolutionary policies, to the lessons of the working-class experience of the last twenty years, in the course of which all attempts at collaboration between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie brought about the weakening of the socialist movement, terrible defeats and the inevitable victory of our worst enemies, the fascists.

First signatures: DEIXONNE, federal secretary of Cantal, delegate to National Council; BROUSSEAUDIER, federal secretary of Alpes-Maritimes, delegate to the National Council; CHEVALDONNE, delegate to the National Council from Loiret; BENOIT, federal secretary of the Vosges; MIDON, federal secretary of Meurthe-et-Moselle; PASQUIS, propaganda secretary of the Orme; SOULES, member of the Administrative Committee of the party (C.A.P.); MODIANO, member of the C.A.P.; DEGEZ, member of the C.A.P.; FLOUTARD, member of the C.A.P.; LUCIEN HERARD, member of the C.A.P.; MARCEAU PIVERT, federal secretary of the Seine and member of the Bureau of the party; LEVANT, alternate member of the C.A.P.; BERTHE FOUCHERE, alternate member of the C.A.P.

(Special reports from Austria and Czechoslovakia and a discussion of the Polish-Lithuanian situation will be featured in this column in coming issues of the Workers Age.—The Editor.)

BOOKS

THE TRIPLE THINKERS, by Edmund Wilson. Harcourt, Brace and Co. New York, 1938.

CRITICS like Edmund Wilson are rare in our time, and for quite other reasons, would be rarer still in any other epoch. He possesses, as do few critics of our day, sufficient erudition to read Greek, Latin, French, Russian and other works in the original, and to communicate something of their native flavor to the uninitiated reader.

These ten essays in literary criticism include a gentle spoofing of the movement, misnamed "Humanism," as incarnated in the pedantic person of Paul Elmer More; a sociological analysis of the reasons for the decline of verse as a form of written expression; an illuminating essay on Pushkin illustrated by Wilson's own transcriptions; examinations of the work of Henry James, A. E. Housman, John Jay Chapman and Samuel Butler in terms of the social and psychological conflicts weighing upon them; a discussion of Flaubert's politics in relation to the France of his day; an exposure of the shoddiness of Bernard Shaw's social theories, coupled with a sound appreciation of their critical value and a perhaps too generous estimate of his qualities as an artist; and a rather slender but meaty discussion of the subject of "Marxism and Literature."

Here, as elsewhere in the book, one can feel how Wilson has been saddened by Stalinist bureaucratic degeneration and its demoralizing effect upon literature, history, science and other forms of intellectual activity. Marx and Engels, he points out, were never the fathers of the monstrosities of New Masses "criticism." Nor do the principles of Marxism enable us to decide whether to accept or reject a work of art, nor their memorizing, or even mastery, make a good artist or critic out of a bad one.

"Marxism by itself," he declares at one point, "can tell us nothing whatever about the goodness or badness of a work of art." Of course, any critic who would try to use "Marxism by itself" to measure works of art, probably could tell us nothing worth while about anything. But the throwing of light on the historical origins and social significance of a work of art, can help to deepen our critical understanding and appreciation of both work and author.

This and any other book reviewed in these columns may be obtained at the New Workers School Bookshop, 131 West 33rd Street.

People's Front In America

(Continued from Page 3)

free trade to decide who is to be assassinated." And we might add that the Communist Party could very well say and actually does say, when it utters the above: "Lenin is dead! Long live Roosevelt!"

The Communist Party of the United States, in line with the People's Front strategy and betrayal of Marxist-Leninist principles, continues: "The American Communist Party, armed with the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, is rapidly forging, together with all progressives, a mighty People's Front to hurl back the 'Sixty Families' who are scheming to throttle American democracy. Fellow Americans, this is your party. . . . This is the party of a greater, happier, freer America. . . . Maryland lovers of democracy! . . . The spirit of Lenin and Lincoln and Jefferson marches forward again to peace, prosperity and democracy. Communism is 'Twentieth Century Americanism.'"

People's Front Reaction

These are ugly words. The German social-democracy in its darkest days spoke with less crudeness and crassness, with less vulgarity in its betrayal of Marxism. The People's Front and its class-collaboration policies pursued by the Communist Party, only tend to diffuse the growing class consciousness and the spirit of class independence now developing in the ranks of the American workers. It is such propaganda, it is such service to the exploiters and oppressors of the proletariat, that helps beyond measure to confuse and to paralyze the workers ranks. It is the People's Front ideology and its anti-proletarian principles that tend to undermine the two basic prerequisites for the development of a class-conscious labor movement in the United States.

AS a straw in the wind, the answer recently given editorially by the Freiheit, official Jewish organ of the Communist Party of the United States, to a reader inquiring about Leon Blum's political line, may prove significant. We quote from the April 2 issue:

"It is obviously correct to write, as you do, that Blum is carrying thru a policy which is basically the policy of Scheidemann and Noske. Whether in this way he will be able to carry favor with the fascists so that they should spare him, we do not know. Not every Scheidemann was able to escape the fury of fascism. Many of the social-democratic leaders, who earlier refused to suppress fascism and aided the storm-troopers against the workers, later on themselves learned to know the taste of Hitlerism. It is only too bad that, even among these, there are many who have not learned anything. Just as Blum has not learned anything from the experiences of Severing and Noske. It is clear that their policy can only lead the workers and progressive people to disaster."

This is plain enough. We would only like to ask one question: If Blum's policy is "basically the policy of Scheidemann and Noske," if it "aids the storm-troopers against the workers," if it can "only lead to disaster," why does the Communist Party of France support the Blum government? Why is it a partner to the People's Front on which the Blum government is based? Out of its own mouth does Stalinism stand condemned!

Another question: Is the Stalinist Comintern preparing to make another "swing to the left" now that the Soviet foreign policy on which the ultra-right People's Front course was based, has gone bankrupt? Are we going to be treated to another, even more degraded and degenerate version of the "third period," this time bearing all the marks of the preceding epoch of Popular Frontism?

Labor Notes and Facts

A GRAPHIC picture of the distribution of income in an American small town is given in the survey recently conducted by Fortune Magazine in Oskaloosa, Iowa. Here is the cash income of the people of this town of 3,054 families arranged by income groups:

Table with 3 columns: Income Group, No. of Families, Total Income. Rows include Over \$5,000, \$2,601-\$5,000, \$1,561-\$2,600, \$601-\$1,500, Below \$600, No cash income, and a total for 3,054 families with \$3,485,539 total income.

In other words, in this typical town, 1,246 families out of a total of 3,054, or about 40% have a cash income below \$12 a week. Remember, this means families not individuals. Several people may be working in the family but its total cash income does not reach \$12 a week!

In examining the other end of the scale, the high-income group, we must remember that many of the capitalists who make their

principles, can only estimate the present economic crisis and the breakdown of the Roosevelt reform program in the following way: "The organizers of sabotage are organizing treason. This is not an alarmist fantasy. It is simple truth. The economic royalists are preparing to overthrow the Roosevelt Administration, overthrow the vote of the American people, overthrow democracy" (Daily Worker, December 6, 1937).

Heinous crimes! Nothing to laugh at, idiotic tho it be, comrades. Immeasurable pain and tragic losses flow out of such policies!

The Presidential Message

Just a word about the message recently delivered by President Roosevelt. That was the message the President delivered at the opening of Congress. It was more than a typical Roosevelt message; it was a declaration of policy of the President of the United States. In it, he threw out more than a hint in behalf of "responsibility for labor unions." You must know that, under this slogan, the most reactionary elements are seeking to devitalize, to cripple, the trade unions by making their organizations and treasuries liable to legal seizure at the behest of employers against whom struggles are conducted. In this same message, the President also proposed a lowering of the wage-scale for workers in the building-trades industries. The New York Times, certainly an organ of big capital and not of Stalin's darlings, the smaller, good People's Front capitalists, hailed the President's message as "reassuring." The Daily Worker, the organ of the People's Front of the United States, hailed this message of Roosevelt's as "encouraging."

Now, if you can find out the difference between "reassuring" and "encouraging," you will be able to learn the difference between the class interests the New York Times represents and those class interests which the Daily Worker defends today. The Daily Worker is, of course, the official organ of Stalin's corporation in the United States.

Incidentally, let me say that Roosevelt is the leader of the Democratic party, which has its big base in the Solid South where Negroes are treated to the most typical and specific American form of justice, via the rope—are lynched. Try to imagine how much support the Negro laborer and the Negro farmer should give to a party, calling itself the Communist Party, which has so uncritical and so slavish an attitude towards the official leader of the Democratic party.

Now to the question of imperialist war.

money out of Oskaloosa do not live there because it is, after all, only a small town and they naturally prefer the big-town centers. Nevertheless, we note that the 61 richest families, or less than 2% of the total, have a combined income of \$499,624, or nearly 50% more than the combined income of the poorest 1,246 families (incomes below \$600 a year), who constitute about 40% of the total. The 2% at the top have a total income 50% higher than the 40% at the bottom!

LABOR CONDITIONS IN PATERSON

Labor conditions in the Paterson silk industry were described recently by H. J. Rubenstein, impartial chairman of the silk-manufacturing industry, as so depressed as to cause envy among the operators of sub-standard mills in the South.

"Weavers in Paterson, who had for years operated two looms, are now required to operate four, five and six," Rubenstein said.

"These are not improved machines; they are the looms of yesterday, the only difference being that on this triple load wages have been considerably reduced. Earnings for the increased load are below what they were two years ago on the two-loom system."

Altho there is a collective agreement calling for an \$18 weekly minimum for weavers, Rubenstein declared, "in an industry so demoralized, there is many a slip between pact and pay."

"I have come across instances where workers pleaded to be discharged from their jobs so they might be put on the relief rolls. In a slack season, a weaver reduced to operating one loom can at best earn about 65 cents a day. The better part of the year is slack time, and there are many, many weeks of total idleness."

Applicants eligible for benefits under the State Unemployment Insurance Law who have lost their jobs because of a strike, lockout or other industrial controversy in the establishment in which they were employed will not be subject to a waiting period of more than three weeks after the controversy is ended, Elmer F. Andrews, Industrial Commissioner, announced recently.

FEDERAL BILL OUT

(Continued from Page 1) ber of amendments were offered as concessions and, at the last moment, an appeal was made by Administration spokesmen in the name of "confidence in the President." The defeat therefore came as a heavy blow to the President's prestige. It is rumored that Roosevelt intends to bring the issue of confidence to the people in the 1938 primary campaigns; in this connection, the huge new "spending" program proposed by the President acquires extraordinary political significance.

Trade Union Notes

By Observer

LAST week, there were reported on this page the recent developments in the handbag and pocketbook workers union where the Stalinites, having broken their "united front" with the Laderman administration, brazenly helped bring the notorious Ossip Wolinsky back into the organization, making him a "honorary member" and "advisor" to New York Local 1, of which Harry Gevertzman, a known Stalinite, is manager.

Now, suddenly, the Daily Worker (April 6) comes out with a story, full of incoherent attacks on the Laderman administration of the International, actually blaming the latter elements for Wolinsky's return to the union! But here the Daily Worker overreaches itself; it conveniently "overlooks" the report of Local 1's meeting in the Freiheit, the C.P.'s Jewish organ, on Thursday, March 31. For that report, written by Sol Herz, openly gloried in the success of the Stalinites in putting over Wolinsky, hailing it as a big victory over the Laderman group. And, in the Daily Worker story itself, there is a virtual confession to the same effect: "Gevertzman, pointing to the obvious sentiment for Wolinsky (a sentiment stimulated and organized by the Stalinites themselves.—Observer), announced that he . . . would work with all forces . . ." Need more be said?

Now the Stalinites are trying to cover up. What's the matter? Is the Wolinsky affair already beginning to have its kick-back? Is Wolinsky already threatening to double-cross his Stalinist allies? Or is the resentment among the pocketbook workers and in the labor movement generally at this piece of filthy union politics beginning to worry the Daily Worker? Whatever it is, it's no use for the Stalinites to cry "Stop thief"; they have been caught red-handed and they just won't be able to squirm out of it!

AGAIN THE FEDERMAN CASE

We have received the following letter from a progressive furrier in New York:

"In the Workers Age of March 12, in the column, Trade Union Notes, G. F. Miles answers the 'liberal' columnist, Heywood Brown, who pretends to think that the action of the U.A.W. board leads to fascism. I wonder what Mr. Brown would say if he were a member of the furriers union under C.P. domination. It seems to me that, if the Guild president were opposed to the Gold administration, it would not take him very long to come to a different opinion on the question of fascism.

"As to the Federman case, which Miles discusses in the same article: I fully agree that the leadership of the International Fur Workers Union wanted to get rid of Federman in order to put C.P. people in control of the locals in Toronto. I also believe that all methods used to discredit Federman and his followers were largely manufactured. Gold stops at nothing in his campaign of extermination of his political enemies. In the furriers union, if you are not a 'yes man,' you stand no chance to hold office in the union. There were sharp disagreements between Gold and Federman. Under all circumstances, Gold had to get rid of Federman and replace him with the C.P. disciple, Mr. Klig. Yet, in spite of that, it is not necessary for us to give Federman a clear bill of health. We who are acquainted with the Federman case only from administration reports and newspaper accounts, are in no position to pass judgment as to the guilt or innocence of Federman. I have no disagreements with Brother Miles as to his exposing the conduct and behavior of the Stalinites in unions where they are in the saddle. I don't think Brother Miles exaggerated in the Federman case the misconduct of Gold and the G.E.B. I believe, however, that Federman made a grave error by not fighting his battle thru the C.

I.O. instead of running to the A. F. of L. To me, Federman, as well as the leadership of the International Fur Workers Union, are not vindicated unless proven so by a committee of the labor movement, to which both sides would agree. I hope Brother Miles does not object to this.

As a progressive furrier, I am compelled to write without signing my name, because only Stalinites may write in their press anything they wish against the "Love-stoneite-Trotskyite fascists" but, should a progressive attempt to be critical of the Gold administration, he will be denounced as a 'spy' and 'traitor' damaging the negotiations with the bosses."

Progressive Furrier

Imperialism In Brazil

(Continued from Page 3)

to run and fight for "democracy" in the new "collective-security" crusade. And so, in their "profound" analysis, they have found that Sumner Welles is the "economic royalist" in the State Department, while Hull is bolstering up Litvinov. But this analysis seems hardly to be borne out by the facts, for it appears that precisely Sumner Welles, whose first care since the coup has been Vargas of Brazil, has greeted with satisfaction the suppression of the pro-German Integralista party. Only a few days ago, Vargas himself arrested the leading figures of this party. The New York Times of March 22 carried a dispatch under a Berlin dateline, quoting from the Nazi Diplomatische Korrespondenz a vigorous attack upon the Vargas regime. We are going to let Gannes figure that out in his next column.

England In Brazil

Where does England stand in Brazil? Despite the fact that the Italian government has endowed several chairs in the University of Sao Paulo and despite the fascist press, which continues to magnify the Hitler regime as the greatest bulwark against Bolshevism and democracy, England is still in full control of Brazil's public utilities. She owns its largest mines and its largest cotton and coffee plantations and England is only second to the United States as a market for Brazil's products.

The joint campaign of England and the United States is now in full swing. They have arranged for regular short-wave broadcasts which will scramble the sounds coming from Germany and Italy and give precedence to their own propaganda; they have organized regular press and cable propaganda to combat the "nuisance" of the Mussolini-Hitler combine. They are determined to keep the Integralistas from seizing power, for such an eventuality would make it difficult to keep their hands on Brazil's priceless store of raw materials. They feel they can play ball with Vargas. They find in him another good, old-fashioned Latin American dictator—a la Juan Vicente Gomez of Venezuela. They are used to deal with such men. As a matter of fact American and British imperialisms prefer men like Vargas to democratic regimes in the semi-colonial countries. They prefer them because they can

Frisco Office Union Is Menaced by CP Wrecking

By T. C.

San Francisco, Cal.

SUFFERING a big defeat in the last elections, the Communist Party fraction in the San Francisco local of the United Office and Professional Workers Union, operating thru the so-called "non-partisan" caucus, seems bent upon destroying the organization in order to discredit its present progressive leadership.

The Stalinist union-smashing campaign is proceeding simultaneously on many fronts. First, is the continued factional disruption within the union. By steady injection of political issues which have nothing to do with the immediate problems confronting the union, including resolutions from the League for Peace and Democracy, the C.P. fraction maintains a constant state of turmoil within the union, hampering all constructive work. Their disruption has reached the point where they are willing to resort to any tricks in order to drag out meetings interminably. The result is that the non-political elements refuse to attend meetings or leave the hall in disgust, enab-

ling the Stalinist fraction to cram thru its program.

Stalinist sabotage includes the factional use of both the C.I.O. regional and Office Workers International officials. Harry Bridges, regional C.I.O. director, and Louis Goldblatt, former youth organizer for the C.P., Bridges's lieutenant and head of the Warehousemen's Union, are constantly interfering in the internal affairs of the union. Goldblatt recently threatened the withdrawal of warehouse office workers from the union!

A small organization struggling against tremendous odds, particularly during the current depression, the office-workers union here recently voted to ask for a temporary waiver of the high per-capita tax paid to the International. Such waivers have been granted freely by the International to other locals where the Stalinist fraction is in the saddle. The C.P. group in the San Francisco local, however, bitterly attacked this proposal. Leo Allen, International organizer, who as in San Francisco working in close cooperation with Bridges and Goldblatt to hamper and discredit the progressive leadership, refused to recommend that the International concede the request of the rank and file, tho fully acquainted with the facts that make the request necessary.

Recently the Stalinist machine up and down the Coast launched an intensive whispering campaign. The object of its slander is the whole leadership of the progressive group but the main fire is concentrated upon Ernest Norbeck, a socialist and business agent of the San Francisco local. The burden of this whispering campaign is that the union is in the hands of "Trotskyites," that Norbeck is a "Trotskyist," an "agent of the reactionary A. F. of L. bureaucracy" and is plotting to drag the union back into the A. F. of L. Norbeck is not only one of the pioneers who organized and built up the union, but also, as an outstanding advocate of industrial unionism, was one of the leaders who headed the march into the C.I.O.

This slander campaign, the unscrupulousness of which is being fully exposed by the progressive group, is already proving a boomerang. Responsibility for a "rule-or-ruin" policy is being placed squarely where it belongs by the increasingly aggressive rank and file of the progressive forces—upon the shoulders of the C.P. "non-partisans."

The whole nature of the Stalinist tactics are revealed by a remark of a C.P.er within the union to one of its organizers who adheres to the position of the progressive group. This young woman, a member of the Communist Party, in commenting on the recent Moscow trials, said: "They were rats and they deserved what they got. And (with a meaningful glance at the organizer) there are rats here too and when the time comes they will get it."

(This concludes the second article in Ellen Ward's series, "Fascism Over Latin America." The third article, dealing with Argentina, will appear in the next issue.—The Editor.)

PROGRESSIVES SWEEP CHEVY ELECTIONS IN FLINT

Flint, Mich.

Following up their recent sweeping victory in the general elections of Flint Local 156, United Automobile Workers, the progressives scored another big triumph last week in the divisional elections of the Chevrolet plant here. With over 2,400 workers voting, the entire progressive slate, with one exception, emerged victorious. Only one adherent of the "unity" caucus was chosen as committeeman as against twelve officers and committeemen from the progressive

slate. Harry Mangold, leading progressive and candidate for chairman, was swept in by a three-to-one majority. The progressive candidates for vice-chairman, recording secretary, sergeant-at-arms, guide, executive-board members and five of the six top bargaining-committeemen, were also elected.

SUBSCRIBE NOW TO WORKERS AGE

FACTIONAL BIAS RUN AMUCK!

IN its special anti-war issue (April 2, 1938), the Trotskyist Socialist Appeal takes occasion again to denounce the "Keep America Out of War" movement as "pacifistic," "popular frontist" and what not. We have no great desire to enter into a polemical discussion with the Trotskyites, which would be as futile as superfluous; in their exalted state of ultra-revolutionary self-intoxication, they are immune to ordinary political logic and common-sense. But again, as we pointed out not long ago (March 26) in these columns, there is a curious discrepancy between the high-flown, grandiloquence of their phrases and the rather modest character of their actions. Let us add another bit of evidence.

In the issue above mentioned, the Appeal launches a vigorous attack upon "pacifism," under which it arbitrarily includes such utterly diverse and even hostile movements as the American League for Peace and Democracy and the "Keep America Out of War" Committee. "There is a common feature in all of these organizations," we are told. "All of them advocate a program against war which is separated from a program against capitalism." It makes no difference that the Stalinist League is brazenly for "collective security" and war, while the "Keep America Out of War" movement is vigorously opposed to such a program: to the Trotskyites, both are the same and both are "pacifist"—because both are non-Trotskyist!

In the same issue of the paper, however, there is a much-featured resolution of the Minneapolis Central Labor Union, hailed editorially as "blazing a trail for militant action by the entire labor movement against the war plans of the imperialist government in Washington." What is there in this marvellous, trail-blazing resolution? Except for one point, not one thing that is not already included in the statement and program of the "Keep America Out of War" movement! And that one point is: "Firm opposition to any war launched by the government." But, only a few weeks ago, the Trotskyites denounced this very idea, when embodied in exactly the same form in the Oxford Pledge, as "pacifistic" and refused to participate in the Youth Committee for the Oxford Pledge on that ground! Why does it become so sacred and "trail-blazing" once it is part of the Minneapolis resolution?

Furthermore, what is there in the Minneapolis resolution that involves a "program against capitalism" in any sense in which the "Keep America Out of War" program and the Oxford Pledge do not? Go thru the documents with the politically finest tooth comb and you will find nothing. But, for the Trotskyites, the former "blazes a trail for militant action," while the latter "sows illusions, leaving the masses helpless in the face of war!"

What is this but ingrained factional bias and political unscrupulousness that are a mere travesty of genuine revolutionary intransigence?

BRITISH-ITALIAN PACT IS COMPLETED

(Continued from Page 1)

which the latter so badly needs. In high rebel circles, moreover, there seems to be a certain readiness to reach an understanding with England in view of its big holdings in Spain and its financial power. "It is expected," a Bilbao dispatch to the New York Times reports, "that the British doubts regarding German and Italian influence here will be dispelled soon after the war ends. . . . The Spanish say that they expect good relations with Great Britain . . ."