

VOTE SOCIALIST!  
NORMAN THOMAS  
FOR PRESIDENT

# Workers Age

Official Publication of the Independent Labor League of America

STAKES IN THE ELECTIONS

By Will Herberg ..... page 4

ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE: A

BRITISH VIEW ..... page 3

Vol. 9, No. 35.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1940.

5 CENTS

## What Is New in the Present World Crisis?

By JAY LOVESTONE

MORE than ever, no one should today allow past postulates to stand in the way of a realistic approach to and appraisal of the world in crisis. We are living thru a cataclysmic reshuffling of the social and political atoms.

Sober realization of the facts, of things as they are and as they are shaping up—in short, of the new in the situation since September 1939, or even since April 1940—is the first prerequisite for calm examination and objective reevaluation. To do anything else, particularly in regard to life-and-death questions like war and social revolution, can lead only to fallacy in conclusion and folly in action. Hence, before proposing a definite and concrete program, I will recount the most important new developments. These are:

1. Europe—and therefore the world—of 1918-1939 is ended and cannot return. 2. The sort of victory envisaged at the outset of World War II by what was once France and by what is still England cannot take place, is now entirely out of the realm of the practical and even the possible.

3. But there still can be a victory of the sort envisaged, hoped for and dreamt of by Hitler at the beginning of this war.

4. At best, England is only resisting, fighting to live on until German military power and economic strength collapse. Should the latter ever happen, then we would have a situation in which British imperialism could not impose crushing terms. The English ruling class has not a decisive victory left in it. Only to the extent that the British working class can enhance its influence on war policies, strategy and aims is there a chance of beating back the Hitler onslaught. Therefore, failure of the Nazi imperialist plans cannot add to the prestige of British imperialism and the power of its ruling class. Not even, the attempted belated marriage with Wall Street imperialism can restore vitality and virility to what was once the ambitious and proud empire of Queen Victoria.

5. In the past, we made a fetish, a sterile dogma, out of the notion that it is the ruling classes and only the ruling classes that always want war, and that the working classes, the people, never want war. A year overcrowded with tragic history has smashed to smithereens this once cherished shibboleth of ours. On the whole, Britain's ruling class was not enthusiastic about going to war against Nazi Germany. In France, the ruling class did not want war because it feared that a victory over Nazi imperialism might entail a victory for the French people over French imperialism as well. In England, today, it is the English people, led by the working class, that is responsible for the appeasers being shoved aside and for the war with Hitler being waged more vigorously than ever. The British proletariat is the conscience and the backbone of the magnificent and stirring resistance to the Hitler hordes which were but yesterday considered an unassailable, annihilating, invincible force.

Here are representative, authoritative findings and unchallengeable facts to confirm this conclusion.

Fenner Brockway, secretary of the Independent Labor Party of England, tells us: "In Britain, the mass feeling is in favor of the prosecution of the war against German Nazism, but there is at the same time a stronger feeling against the ruling class than ever before. This feeling is concentrated at the moment against the Chamberlain section, but it goes much further than that—it is a disbelief in the competence of the ruling class and in the genuineness of its opposition to Nazism. This disbelief is likely to grow. Churchill has been regarded as a competent war leader, but in the mass working-class movement suspicion of Churchill is deep. . . . Opposition to Nazism will persist, but it will be accompanied by an extending opposition to the British ruling class and, unless the Labor ministers insist on the destruction of the power of the possessing class, the Labor leadership will share in the distrust. . . ." (Left, July 1940).

Obviously, the I.L.P. does not hold to the moth-eaten conclusion that energetic support of the war—which Churchill is today the nominal leader—is a brake on the development of social revolution in England. Actually, this support and drive have become the dynamo of social revolution in England. In the light of this, the following United Press cable from London is entirely clear and of timely import:

"The original text of the speech of Viscount Halifax, the Foreign Secretary, today was changed in many places only a few minutes before he stepped before the microphone, and various sentences that might have been interpreted in some quarters as a bid for Chancellor Hitler to make a new and more generous peace offer were stricken out.

"As he spoke, Lord Halifax seemed to falter momentarily at these revised portions of his manuscript" (N. Y. Times, July 23, 1940).

And but two months after the first Munich (1938), that energetic spokesman of the French ruling class, Thierry Maulnier, brazenly proclaimed: "A victory of the French arms would have been not so much a victory for France as a victory of the principles rightly regarded as leading straight to the ruin of France and of civilization" (Continued on Page 4)

# FDR Moves to Anglo-U.S. War Alliance

## We Are Forced to Retreat...

BEGINNING with this issue, the Workers Age ceases to appear weekly. For the rest of the year at any rate, it will appear bi-weekly, once every other week.

This is a serious set-back for us, a big retreat. But it is unavoidable. The difficulties of the present situation leave no other way out.

There is no use in recounting these difficulties that weigh so heavily upon us—the depression and confusion in the ranks of organized labor, the jingoistic war hysteria, the unpopularity of our political position in regard to the war and the Roosevelt Administration among large sections of the labor movement, the spreading panic and fear of governmental repressions. . . . Every serious-minded radical and socialist understands the situation and what it means for our movement.

We are forced to retreat and retrench, to tighten our lines and prepare for a new advance under more favorable conditions. But for us to continue functioning even on the new basis will require the unceasing, devoted aid of every reader of this paper, of every member and

friend of the I.L.L.A. Never was there a time when this assistance was more necessary than today—never when it was more a question of life or death for the Workers Age.

In plain words, unless we get prompt aid from the friends and readers of the Workers Age—and get this aid in a hurry—there is real danger that we may be obliged to suspend publication altogether! It is not necessary to try to picture what that would mean. If you prize this paper, if you value the work of clarification and education it has done in the last decade, if you believe it is needed more than ever in these critical days, our words will not be necessary.

We make this straight appeal to you. If you want this paper to survive and carry on in these dark days when its services are more vital than ever, YOU MUST HELP! IT'S UP TO YOU!

SEND IN EVERY CENT YOU CAN SPARE! GET SUBSCRIPTIONS! MAKE COLLECTIONS AMONG YOUR FRIENDS AND FELLOW-WORKERS. EVERY NICKEL COUNTS!

## Stalinists, Supported by Lewis, Split State C.I.O.

### C. P.-Led Minority Bolts Convention; Haywood Gives Blessing to Secession

Rochester, N. Y.

The New York State Industrial Union Council, the state-wide body of the C.I.O. in this state, was split wide open last week as the result of an attempt by a number of Stalinist union leaders to seize control of the annual convention of the organization meeting here and block endorsement of President Roosevelt and condemnation of Soviet Russia and communism along with other totalitarian states and forces. The Stalinist faction received the open and direct support of John L. Lewis and the national C.I.O.

Violent disorder, including rioting and a number of hand-to-hand encounters, marked the sessions of the convention. It was clear from the beginning that the delegates were divided into a majority faction, led by the representatives of Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and a minority faction, made up of the communist-controlled C.I.O. unions such as the United Transport Workers, the National Maritime Union, the United

Radio and Electrical Workers Union, the Newspaper Guild, the office workers, the furriers, and the like. The exact relation of forces was difficult to determine because bona-fide membership figures are unavailable for many C.I.O. unions, especially those under Stalinist domination, but there seemed little doubt that the majority had the backing of unions embracing about three-quarters of the C.I.O. membership in this state. The C.I.O. claims 950,000 members in New York State, but no figures on per-capita dues payments have been issued to support this estimate.

The clash broke out immediately after the first session was called to order by Gustave Strebel, president of the State Industrial Union Council, and centered around the report of the credentials committee. The committee report challenged over 90 of the delegates of the Stalinist-controlled unions, and the minority made a large number of challenges on its part as well. The session became so riotous that it was bro-

(Continued on Page 2)

## Peace-Time Draft F.D.R. Makes Labor Plea To Teamsters

### Conference Report Accepted As Differences Between Two Houses Are Adjusted

Washington, D. C.

Ending the most momentous deliberation Washington has witnessed since the neutrality debates, the Senate and the House last week gave final approval to the first peace-time military conscription law in American history. The vote on the report of the conference of the two houses was 47 to 25 in the Senate and 232 to 124 in the House.

In its final form, the Burke-Wadsworth measure makes about 16,500,000 men, from 21 to 35 years of age inclusive, liable to one year military training and service. The bill also empowers the government to take over on a rental basis industrial plants refusing to "cooperate" with the defense program, with fines and prison sentences for recalcitrants.

Immediately after the passage of the bill, it was dispatched to the White House for the President's signature. The President soon after issued a message asking for nearly \$1,750,000,000 in cash and more than \$200,000,000 in contract authorizations, largely to finance the conscription program. October 16 was fixed as registration day.

As adopted by both houses, the measure represents a modification of the bills adopted by the House and the Senate separately. The Senate had fixed the age limits from 21 to 31; the House, from 21 to 45; the final range was 21 to 35. The House had provided for a 60-day delay in the induction of the men; this was eliminated in the conference. There was also some adjustment on the "draft-industry" clause.

"But," there are some who say, "better go to war now while England is still fighting, than to fight alone tomorrow." That assumes an inevitable attack upon us by a triumphant Hitler. It is a fate which can be averted by sound statesmanship and proper defense without shameful "appeasement." Indeed, if we are attacked by either Germany or Japan it will be because of our unrealistic and suicidal policy, not to be redeemed by any nobility of words and intentions.

This, I say, not from any confidence in Hitler's promises, but from a realistic examination of his problems and ours. Before he can begin his war on us, he must arrange to organize and police an embittered Europe. He must get production from sullen workers in conquered lands. Somehow, he must look out for the famine and plague which attend great wars. He must obtain a secure settlement not only with his jealous jackal Mussolini, but his suspicious and ambitious temporary ally, Joseph Stalin, lord not only of Russia but of communists everywhere.

Then he must assemble such an armada as earlier conquerors never imagined to transport troops, tanks, trucks—all the baggage of modern war. He must fight our navy in our waters thousands of miles from his bases. He must land against air and coast defenses—a thing which in the first World War the Allies could not do against the poorly armed Turks.

For Ambassador Bullitt and others to talk as if the Atlantic Ocean is a highway is vicious nonsense. Is Hitler some German Moses

### Pledges Maintenance of Reforms, No Foreign War; Parley Opposes Conscription

Washington, D. C.

President Roosevelt delivered the "labor" speech of his campaign here last week before the convention of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the A.F. of L.'s biggest affiliate.

Over 1,500 delegates, representing about 500,000 members of the union, heard Mr. Roosevelt pledge the maintenance and extension of New Deal social and labor legislation in the present nation-defense effort. Collective bargaining, wage-hour legislation, social security and other New Deal gains must be protected, and "we haven't gone the length of the road yet," the President added.

The President repudiated charges that he was leading the country into war. "I have one supreme determination," he declared toward the close of his address, "to do all that I can to keep war away from these shores for all time." He reiterated his pledge that "we will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas except in case of attack."

Just before the President spoke, the convention adopted a resolution opposing peace-time conscription as involving the "menace of the regimentation of labor."

Unanimously, the convention also adopted a resolution endorsing President Roosevelt for a third term. Daniel J. Tobin, president of the Brotherhood, is head of the Democratic Labor Committee.

The big issue before the teamsters convention was the request of President Tobin for vastly increased powers over local unions and local officers. Mr. Tobin received the power to remove dishonest officers and appoint trustees in their places. But there was sharp opposition to the recommendations of the Constitution Committee to give the president power to compel locals to arbitrate under penalty of dissolution and to approve or disapprove all wage scales and by-laws of local unions. There was also strong opposition to the proposal to give the president supervision over all strikes and lockouts and power "to declare any strike or lockout illegal if not in conformity with the law of the International Union." These latter proposals were referred back to committee.

We begin with destroyers and then go on and on—how far?

We are now giving Great Britain enormous aid by guaranteeing the protection of Canada; by patrolling, in Britain's behalf, more than our own, the Far East with our navy; and by continuing a gold-purchase policy of no advantage but much loss to us, which subsidizes her to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Also, we changed our law to open all our mines and factories to the Allies. Whatever some of us thought of that policy, we do not dream of imposing an embargo now. But, we insistently ask, how much further can we go either in aiding Britain directly, or in protecting Shanghai and the

(Continued on Page 4)

## Joint Use of Bases in Far East Rumored

Talk of "Anglo-American Union" in Commons; Nazis Make No Gain on Britain

Further evidence that the main line of the Roosevelt Administration's foreign policy today is step-by-step consolidation of an Anglo-American war alliance disguised as a measure of national defense, came to light last week with reports from Washington of diplomatic conversations between Secretary of State Hull and representatives of the British Empire on the joint use of naval and air bases in the Far Pacific and other parts of the world. Among the bases, Singapore was particularly mentioned.

No official information as to these conversations was given out in Washington but it was understood that they centered around joint base-use arrangements embracing South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. This was only one of the steps, it was said, being considered in the direction of "informal but closer cooperation of the English-speaking parts of the world."

In the British Parliament, at the same time, Clement Attlee, spokesman of the Churchill Cabinet, was questioned as to the possibility of a complete Anglo-American union. Attlee gave no definite answer aside from stating that the matter would receive thorough consideration, but the fact that such a question could be asked, with the obvious approval of the government, was taken as a clear indication of which way the wind was blowing.

In Washington, it was said that no final decision on the conversations with Britain was expected until November, that is, until after the elections.

Despite efforts of administration spokesmen to link up the step towards a British alliance with the needs of American national defense, informed observers pointed out that not only had the two matters nothing to do with each other but that they were in actual conflict at certain points. The defense of America, even conceived in its broadest scope as the defense of the entire western hemisphere against invasion or attack, required no "arrangements" as to bases in the Far East or in South Africa, they stressed. On the contrary, the extension of American defense lines through such far-flung commitments would certainly render them weaker and more vulnerable, and the entire American position much less secure. That it all had no meaning in terms of genuine defense, practically all responsible military opinion agreed.

It was obvious, in fact, that what the Administration was actually thinking of and planning for was not the defense of America or of the western hemisphere, but involvement in a foreign war in Europe or Asia. Not national defense was the controlling consideration but the protection of the threatened interests of British and American big business imperialism in the Far East and other fields of exploitation.

In addition, it was clear that an Anglo-American alliance, no matter how "informal," would turn the United States into Britain's partner in the war and would make it virtually impossible to save this country from being swallowed up in the slaughter.

From Britain, too, came a pro-

(Continued on Page 2)

# Socialists and the War

By NORMAN THOMAS

NO one who follows closely the news of the day, certainly no one who has listened to the recent speeches of the President's spokesmen, Ambassador Bullitt and Henry Wallace—speeches even closer to hysteria in delivery than in language—can doubt the Administration's intention to make its foreign policy a leading issue in this election. President Roosevelt is presented to us at one and the same time as our best guarantee of peace thru preparedness, and the sole bulwark of a militant democracy, the chief if not the only "unyielding" foe of Hitler and Hitlerism.

Very well, let us look at the record, calmly and fairly, because of the magnitude of the issues involved and their tragic importance to every man, woman and child in America. That record shows beyond reasonable doubt that President Roosevelt's foreign policy has not been consistent or unyielding, but dangerously inconsistent and contradictory; that so far from his guaranteeing our peace, he may quite possibly put us in war even before the election. He is, I think, more likely to blunder into the war under the delusion that he is taking "steps short of war" in Europe, Asia or South America, than deliberately to put us in. We are more likely to be caught sneaking in the back door to war than boldly marching in the front door, but it will be war and the effect of the back-door entrance will be even more injurious to the national morale.

The one way for the American people—if they do not want war—to prevent its possibility from becoming a probability or a certainty, is that immediately they make it unmistakably clear to the President and to Congress that for the sake alike of their sons, their homes, and their liberties, they intend to stay out of Europe's and Asia's wars,

and make their own democracy work.

### RECORD OF ANTI-FASCISM

Like all true socialists, I have opposed fascism and every form of totalitarianism from the beginning. We denounced Mussolini in the days when a Wall Street loan and the friendship of the British Foreign Office confirmed him in power. From the Versailles Peace Conference down to Hitler's triumph in 1933, we urged incessantly those policies toward a liberal Germany which would have prevented the rise of Hitler. After he came to power and shocked the conscience of mankind by his treatment of Jews, socialists, and those Catholics and Protestants who rejected his religion of the state, I helped to form the American Friends of German Freedom. At the same time, Winston Churchill was expressing the pious hope that in their hour of need the English people might find a man who would do for them what Hitler had done for the Germans, and the British Tory ruling class was fatuously nurturing Nazi power as a bulwark against communism. When fascism brutally fastened its power in Spain by German and Italian arms and troops, we supported the cause of the Spanish people. We sharply criticized Roosevelt's following of the British leadership in a policy of hypocritical "non-intervention" which really gave actual aid to Franco. I refer, of course, to the President's embargo on arms for the Loyalist government at the very time that he permitted Italy and Germany to buy whatever they wanted from this country.

Our sympathies have always been with the victims of fascist aggression, the individuals as well as the nations. Repeatedly, I urged greater liberality of sanctuary for them in America. Publicly, before the col-

lapse of France, I suggested American assumption of responsibility for the care of refugees in Europe or in this hemisphere. We socialists have made unmistakably plain our present intense hope that the British people will beat off the Nazi invader. This is hardly a record of friendship for fascism!

But we have steadfastly opposed American participation in this war. Why? Because we were and are persuaded that such participation would do infinitely more to spread fascism or totalitarianism in its worst form in this last great area where democracy may yet prevail, than to defeat it in Europe.

Participation in the war would inevitably mean the coming of a fascism of our own in its propaganda, censorship and conscription to hold the nation in line. It is absurd to say that we could fight such a war and keep, or even regain, our democracy. Any lingering doubts on that score should be resolved by our record in these months of hysteria while we still are not belligerents. The Supreme Court legalized a religion of the state in the case of Jehovah's Witnesses and the mob in more than fifty towns made these poor sectarians their victims. Congress gave us an Alien and Sedition Law far more potentially dangerous to our liberties than any wartime legislation of the last war. Now we are rushing into peace-time conscription for which there is no military necessity. It is a principle which is vital to totalitarianism, and entirely alien to our democracy. Not content with the vast new powers the Senate bill gives the President, his friends and mouthpieces, like Senator Pepper from Florida—a state where the revived Ku Klux Klan flourishes—cry out for full dictatorial powers for him. In the name of resisting Hitler, they would create a domestic Hitlerism. Let us get involved in

war, and democracy's last chance to develop in orderly fashion and learn to solve its own problems will be gone, not to return in our generation, or our children's.

### DANGER OF INVASION

"But," there are some who say, "better go to war now while England is still fighting, than to fight alone tomorrow." That assumes an inevitable attack upon us by a triumphant Hitler. It is a fate which can be averted by sound statesmanship and proper defense without shameful "appeasement." Indeed, if we are attacked by either Germany or Japan it will be because of our unrealistic and suicidal policy, not to be redeemed by any nobility of words and intentions.

This, I say, not from any confidence in Hitler's promises, but from a realistic examination of his problems and ours. Before he can begin his war on us, he must arrange to organize and police an embittered Europe. He must get production from sullen workers in conquered lands. Somehow, he must look out for the famine and plague which attend great wars. He must obtain a secure settlement not only with his jealous jackal Mussolini, but his suspicious and ambitious temporary ally, Joseph Stalin, lord not only of Russia but of communists everywhere.

Then he must assemble such an armada as earlier conquerors never imagined to transport troops, tanks, trucks—all the baggage of modern war. He must fight our navy in our waters thousands of miles from his bases. He must land against air and coast defenses—a thing which in the first World War the Allies could not do against the poorly armed Turks.



# Defense Program No Solution for Jobless

### Basic Economic Problems Remain Unsolved

Washington, D. C. JUDGING by the recent debate on conscription and taxation, there is a bland assumption widely held that the defense program will solve a major part of this country's unemployment and underconsumption problem. Much of the discussion has circled around the change in our customary way of life bound to occur with the setting up in peacetime of a vast military machine. That change has been described primarily in terms of restrictions upon the freedom we have enjoyed as individual citizens. Senators Norris, La Follette, Nye, the two Clarks and the others have rightly hammered away at the dangers of fastening a militarized exercise of power upon the nation at this time—especially with the military hierarchy so open to question as to its judgment and methods.

There can be no exaggeration of these dangers, and the officials of the railroad brotherhoods followed the true American tradition in reaffirming thru letters to Senators LaFollette and Johnson of Colorado the deep concern of their membership over these dangers. The brotherhoods have a membership of somewhat over a million. That membership is noted for its intelligence and alertness. With their families, that membership represents a block of voters somewhere between four and five million—voters who can accurately be classified as a true cross-section of the common people of the United States. Since Congress, under the spur of a mass hysteria manufactured by those in positions of power both within and without the government, has disregarded the voice of the railroad brotherhoods, and the voice of C.I.O. and A. F. of L., on these profoundly important matters, labor and the common people of our land are justified in saying that democracy at this crucial point has ceased to function in the nation.

But of parallel moment to the voting citizenry of the land is the economic effect of the defense program. The tacit assumption that the building of airplanes, tanks, ships and other instruments of war is going to make our economic machine suddenly work smoothly is part of the suave but inciting propaganda the Bill Bullitts of this Administration are trying to put across. Nor are those in the Willie crows corner averse to playing the same game. The facts are, of course, that the defense program as now apparently taking shape not only imperils our civil liberties but will fail to make any great dent on unemployment and the twin problems of distribution of purchasing power and increased production of wealth. You cannot eat armaments, as the German workers long ago found out.

### GILT-EDGE TRUSTEES

The industries which are being entrusted with the fabricating of our defense weapons are limited in number and are to a high degree examples of large concentrations of economic power. Due to technological developments of the past two decades, these industries can work the limit of capacity and expand capacity considerably without absorbing even as much as half of the more than 10,000,000 unemployed. This is admitted by most students, who also point out that the indirect employment effect thru sub-contracts and sub-sub-contracts will not boost the number very materially.

Add to this the fact that the spokesmen of these huge pools of economic power are talking to the government as trustees of their own associated invested capital rather than as trustees of the public interest, and you see deeply a disturbing series of developments immediately ahead. You see these pools of capital forcing the government to give them terms which will greatly enlarge their capital holdings and thus increase and strengthen their economic hold upon the country. The railroad brotherhoods act for the people as a whole by stressing again and again the unpatriotic performance of these defense-industry spokesmen.

With the Senate agreeing to conscription at the same time the House acted on taxation legislation handing defense industry just what it asked for, it is not to be wondered at that economists and political scientists who are not swept off their feet by emotion look at the domestic picture of this country with gloomy foreboding. Defense of the country can be accomplished adequately only if the national well-being is served more and more fully so that the people will have a society and institutions firing them with enthusiastic desire to defend. Additions to concentrations of economic power which in the 1920's and early 1930's plainly demonstrated their incapacity to act even in their own interest, to say nothing of the public interest, are the very reverse of moves the government should encourage.

### NOT QUESTION OF JUSTICE

It is easy and natural to get into a lather over the picture of greed here in Washington. It is full of unfairness and hypocrisy and deceit. But the point is not how sick the deal may be which the big boys are

putting over under the cloak of the crisis. The point is that the outcome of their deal, as a matter of sheer practicality, will not work and cannot work with the methods of democracy. It leads inevitably to the rapid spread of the authoritarian technique—a technique which industry itself uses in its own private domain. Underconsumption—the tell-tale sign of failure of our society as it has been run—can only be met by increased production and distribution of the goods the people need. The defense program at this stage turns its back completely on this problem. Relief expenditures and governmental social services generally are cut. Expansion of low-cost housing, extension of badly needed health facilities, extension of social-security benefits to cover vast multitudes of workers not now covered—these and allied moves in the direction of increased production are mentioned scarcely at all by the Administration. When put forward by Senator Wagner or someone else, they receive little or no encouragement from the political leaders.

### LABOR BAITERS AND HATERS

It is not without significance that foremost among the industries with which the National Defense Commission is doing or intends to do business on a vast scale are those which have taken the lead in opposing the National Labor Relations Act, designed to give labor something approaching itself against the great aggregations of capital. And it is not a little ominous to find William Knudsen of the Defense Commission—into whose hands President Roosevelt seems to have placed top power—issuing a statement not long ago on the Pacific Coast warning labor to watch its step?

# Progressives Save Teachers Union from Stalinist Grip

### A.F.T. Can Now Make Real Progress in Organizing Educators

By MARK STARR

(Continued from Last Issue) NOW comes the job of understanding and mastering the peculiar problem of organizing the teachers of the United States. There are hundreds of thousands of teachers in this country disgracefully underpaid and insecure.

Too many of the past members of the A. F. of T. are "unjelled liberals." They quote Voltaire about the right of an opponent to have his say at all times but close their eyes to the fact that their generosity is exploited by the devotees of the modern "Red" edition of Peter the Great in order to suppress liberalism and democracy as an outworn bourgeoisie fetish. When Dr. Harry J. Carman, Dr. Ordway Tead and Joseph Schlossberg of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers protested against the victimization of Bertrand Russell, they came into court with clean hands because they would protest also the certain exclusion of Bertrand Russell from Soviet universities, if by any freak he were proposed there. The A. F. of T. must also be above logical reproach. We support Rugg because he is fighting for facts and does not suppress them.

In the Teachers Union, too often, individual professors have let their inhibitions take a holiday in compensation for their suppression in school life. They spend years tracing the use of the definite article in Chaucer or teach Latin and Greek or Browning's poetry or some abstract natural science. They smart in indignation against the petty tyrannies of school superintendents, of college presidents and boards of trustees. They are hence naturally sympathetic with minority groups, no matter what the ulterior motives of those groups may be. In some cases, they are youngsters who are sowing their intellectual wild oats. Others are honest liberals but confused. Some are raw recruits to progress, who rush to make up for lost time. Other cases include the climbing college professor and administrator who mistakenly think that the support of the most vociferous radical elements in the existing teachers leadership in New York will help them to secure the deserved goal of their ambition to become a college president. (We appeal to them to see the folly of their ways and retrace their steps into more constructive activity.) Others are just plain psychologically maladjusted cases who are kept on the campus as Exhibit A to prove that academic freedom exists and also are used to show how freakish and impossible such radicals are. The fact that such belong to the Teachers Union often prevents normal teachers and professors from joining.

The problem is how to get around these obstacles and to make the union representative of the school teachers, how to push a program of activity in defense of the teacher without any strings attached.

# Red-Caps Launch Union Drive on Three Fronts

Chicago, Ill.

SWINGING into high gear with coordinated organizational precision and efficiency, the United Transport Service Employees of America is in the midst of completing preparations for its frontal attack upon the railway industry in the attempt to secure the well-being of the nation's red-caps, station porters and washers.

With over twenty-five railroad companies covered by contracts which control approximately \$2,000,000 annually in wages, the U.T.S.E.A. is mobilizing its entire membership for an effective campaign on three major fronts: namely, the 10c bag-fee controversy before the Interstate Commerce Commission; the \$5,000,000 wage-recovery suit before the federal courts; and the jurisdictional case before the National Mediation Board.

The hearings on the 10c baggage fee is a result of a complaint filed by a passenger, and the U.T.S.E.A. entered the proceedings supporting the passenger's contention as to the illegality of the fee. In addition, the U.T.S.E.A. seeks to determine the status of many of its contracts negotiated on the basis of the bag charge. In connection with this hearing, the union plans to have the Commission issue subpoenas for nearly fifty witnesses, many of them employees of the various railroad companies. The union has also inaugurated a campaign to secure over 300,000 protest signatures among railroad passengers.

The wage-recovery suit is scheduled for a hearing during the latter part of September in the U. S. District Court at Chicago. Altogether nine similar suits have been filed in various federal court districts, the pivotal suit is maintained in the Northern Illinois district. Recently, additional suits were filed against the Columbus Union Depot Company and the Indianapolis Terminal Com-

# Anti-Trust Laws and Jurisdictional Fights

### Arnold Program Means Control of Unions

By MATTHEW WOLL

(This is the fourth of a series of articles on "Labor and the Anti-Trust Laws" by Matthew Woll, vice-president of the American Federation of Labor.—Editor.)

AND now comes the fifth and last of the restrictions imposed by Thurman Arnold on the unions. It is a restriction that would be humorous were it not so tragic, indicating not only Mr. Arnold's

failure to understand our national economy and industrial relations but also the innocence of mind of a man who is seeking now to guide our industrial life and relations. For Mr. Arnold tells us that he will not tolerate a situation wherein one labor organization may quarrel with another over jurisdictional lines!

Of course, we are no more anxious to enter into jurisdictional controversies than is any group in the country. But how can we prevent these controversies from arising? They don't exist only in the labor movement; they exist in industrial management as well. We are as regretful that we have these jurisdictional differences as is any man, and labor has attempted, as best it can, to overcome these difficulties by voluntary methods, realizing that if we attempted to apply compulsory methods, there would follow immediately compulsory labor.

Thurman Arnold believes this is a very simple problem. But we who are engaged in industry can well understand why men quarrel over lines of jurisdiction. A new process comes in. It throws out of work a certain number of men. These workers are anxious to maintain their means and source of livelihood; they are anxious to safeguard their skill, the occupation by which they have gained their livelihood up to that moment. And we can also see the ambition of others in seeking to further their opportunities of employment.

IT'S VERY SIMPLE TO MR. ARNOLD!

That is only one of the many phases of the struggle of life, a struggle of opportunity for employment. But Thurman Arnold, in a conference I had with him recently, said: "This is a simple problem, a very simple problem. Your organizations must find a way to settle these jurisdictional strikes and if they don't find one, then I shall apply the Sherman and the Clayton anti-trust laws and compel labor to settle their disputes or prosecute them criminally under these acts."

"Well," I said to Mr. Arnold, "if you feel you can settle the problem that easily, you have no conception of the fundamental problems involved. Such a statement betrays the fact that you have no conception of industrial relations, of labor relations in our industrial life. But assuming there might be some validity to your contention, here we have a situation where Organization A and Organization B are in conflict over a certain activity or process. They fail to settle their differences at the conference table. They refuse to permit any one coming in to settle the dispute. Ultimately, one organization decides to take the initiative and says: 'We will refuse to work unless this work is granted to us,' and its members go on strike. You then tell me that you will indicate that organization for going on strike and yet you will have failed to examine which of the two parties was in the right or in the wrong?"

"Oh, I am not concerned about that," he said.

IS STRIKING THE CRIME?

"Very well," I continued, "let us follow up this case. Supposing the organization that went on strike to enforce its jurisdiction had on its side every right, every justice, every principle of fairness and equity, and that the other organization was entirely in the wrong, was actuated by erroneous motives, bad purposes, criminal intent, yet you would leave that organization free and unmoled and prosecute the striking organization because it dared to assert its rightful claims, and thus you would stigmatize it as a criminal organization or combination because it has ventured to assert its right and because it was in the right?"

"Well," he said, "they had better get together and settle their difficulties."

Is that the sort of reasoning that is to govern American labor?

Then, too, Mr. Arnold intends that the same reasoning and procedure is to be applied where there is a legitimate system of collective bargaining involved. That means this: If two organizations are fighting each other in the same trade or calling or industry, the organization that goes on strike, whether right or wrong, is to be prosecuted under this act! And, so, if we are in conflict with the C.I.O., we are to be punished and to be treated as criminals because we are trying to maintain our established system of collective bargaining.

I shall not go into a further analysis of the application of these classes of cases but you can readily see what we are confronted with and the character of the mind that is now applying the force of the national government against our labor organizations.

Concluding my conversation with Mr. Arnold on the subject of jurisdictional controversies, I said: "Supposing the objective is one that is right for an organization to secure and they applied the means of the strike to secure that, you say you are not interested in the means, and yet it is upon the means that you would predicate your indictment. Thus you see how unsound, how illogical, how unwarrantable is this entire procedure."

To all of this he answered that I failed utterly to grasp what he real-

# Fleming Denies Short Work-Week Hampers Defense

New York City

THE charge that the forty-hour week law was responsible for the collapse of France in the face of German attack was branded as "grossly misleading" by Colonel Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, in an address last week before the convention of the International Association of Government Labor Officials in session here.

Colonel Fleming pointed out that that law had been in effect for only about two years, while the Nazis did not abandon their forty-eight-hour week themselves until January 1, 1939, or nine months before the invasion of Poland.

Colonel Fleming described as "foolish talk" a suggestion in a National Industrial Conference Board report that a "sixty-hour week [would mean] an increase in productive effectiveness of 50%."

American army authorities had reported to the contrary in the World War, according to Colonel Fleming, who added that "the British have found out during the present war that long hours of work are inefficient. Even Germany found during the present war that it would have to cut the work-week because long hours were causing such a lot of sickness and industrial stoppages as to be a serious threat to production."

"The argument that a serious labor shortage in some of the skilled trades necessitates longer hours of work is, likewise, to my way of thinking, misguided," Colonel Fleming added. "There are today eight or ten million Americans looking for work."

"To compete with the totalitarian nations we must make this economic machine work. Only by doing this can we hope to preserve democracy. Freedom cannot be bought by arms alone. Its price is also measured in terms of human welfare. The wage-and-hour law is one of our weapons in that fight."

"We must become a hard-hitting economic machine, not of slaves, but of free men. The work we must do, besides the pressing job of turning out guns, airplanes, tanks and battleships, is the work of making democracy mean something to the millions of Americans who will be called upon to give their utmost to defend it."

Isidore Lubin, United States Commissioner of Labor Statistics, asserted that the country should be able to prosecute its \$16,000,000,000 national-defense program "without lowering the standards of living."

He further said: "In fact, I believe we should be able to raise our standards of living during this national emergency."

Robert J. Watt of the A. F. of L. explained organized labor's attitude when he said: "It wants a full share of participation and representation in the operation of the national-defense program."

en off, and conferences were held with Allan Haywood, personal representative of John L. Lewis. But Haywood, on instructions from Lewis, openly sided with the Stalinist minority and no adjustment could possibly be reached. The Stalinist leaders gave themselves away when they declared themselves ready to agree to the withdrawal of all challenges by both sides provided the majority withdrew its proposed resolution for the endorsement of President Roosevelt. When this was refused, the minority proposed that the question of support of President Roosevelt be left to a committee of the national C.I.O. When the majority insisted on the right of the convention to make its own decisions, the negotiations were broken off.

Fists flew at the stormy gathering that preceded the bolt of the Stalinist minority. The break came when it was clear that the delegates following the Amalgamated lead had won control of the convention. Most of the minority delegates thereupon

ly intended by his procedure and campaign.

It is evident from the foregoing that what he is really doing is to throw a protecting arm around company unions which are held unlawful by the law of the land. When he says an established system of collective bargaining must not be interfered with, he does not even qualify that in any way.

### GESTAPO CONTROL OF UNIONS

Finally, he would set up against labor a Gestapo system. In his address to the Temporary National Economic Committee, he proposed to set up a federal police system with agents of his Department in all of the principal cities in the United States to check on what he considers violations of the Sherman and Clayton Acts and to receive complaints from those alleged to be suffering annoyance or disturbance at the hands of labor organizations!

Thus, he would create a whole army of subordinates for the purpose of inquiring into every complaint made against labor, of investigating its affairs and constantly holding over labor the threat of prosecution.

He has embodied that very idea and conception in a consent decree in a plasters case in Pittsburgh, reading as follows:

"That for the purpose of securing compliance with this decree, authorized representatives of the Department of Justice shall upon the request of the Attorney General or an Assistant Attorney General be permitted access to the ledger accounts, correspondence, memoranda and other records and documents in the possession or control of the defendants or any of them relating to any of the matters contained in this decree; that any authorized representative of the Department of Justice shall, subject to the reasonable convenience of the defendants, be permitted to interview officers or employees of defendants; that defendants (or union), upon written request of the Attorney General, shall submit such reports with respect to any of the matters contained in this decree as may from time to time be necessary for the proper enforcement of this decree."

Now if you want regulation of trade unions, you have it in this decree, which is established and has been approved under the kind guidance of Mr. Arnold. That is what is involved in the whole procedure.

walked out and were joined by those excluded under the report of the credentials committee. Separate sessions were then held by the two factions. Mr. Haywood announced John L. Lewis's support of the Stalinist minority group in a public statement. He branded the majority convention as "illegal" and said that the whole matter would be brought before the Executive Board of the national C.I.O. The majority leaders issued a declaration in which they insisted that neither Mr. Lewis nor Mr. Haywood had any right or authority to interfere in the affairs of the state C.I.O.

The majority convention passed the resolution endorsing President Roosevelt as well as a resolution denouncing Soviet Russia and communism by name and grouping them with German Hitlerism and Italian fascism as embodiments of the totalitarian menace. The sense of the gathering was well expressed in a statement by Mr. Strehel warning "Black-Shirt Mussolini, Blood-Dripping Hitler and Assassin Stalin to keep their hands off the American labor movement."

Mr. Strehel was re-elected president and John McMahon of the Textile Workers Union was named to succeed Hugh Thompson, regional director of western New York, as secretary-treasurer. A full slate of vice-presidents was also chosen. The minority convention named a committee to seek a charter from John L. Lewis for the new state organization.

# Stalinists Act to Split State C.I.O.

### C.P.-Led Minority Bolts Convention

(Continued from page 1)

en off, and conferences were held with Allan Haywood, personal representative of John L. Lewis. But Haywood, on instructions from Lewis, openly sided with the Stalinist minority and no adjustment could possibly be reached. The Stalinist leaders gave themselves away when they declared themselves ready to agree to the withdrawal of all challenges by both sides provided the majority withdrew its proposed resolution for the endorsement of President Roosevelt. When this was refused, the minority proposed that the question of support of President Roosevelt be left to a committee of the national C.I.O. When the majority insisted on the right of the convention to make its own decisions, the negotiations were broken off.


Fists flew at the stormy gathering that preceded the bolt of the Stalinist minority. The break came when it was clear that the delegates following the Amalgamated lead had won control of the convention. Most of the minority delegates thereupon

ly intended by his procedure and campaign.

It is evident from the foregoing that what he is really doing is to throw a protecting arm around company unions which are held unlawful by the law of the land. When he says an established system of collective bargaining must not be interfered with, he does not even qualify that in any way.

Exactly which C.I.O. affiliates adhered to one state C.I.O. organization or the other could not be told because many delegations were divided, and in more than one case different officers of the same union were to be found on the rival executive boards. The lines will probably be drawn more tightly in the coming weeks when the C.I.O. affiliates in this state will have the opportunity to act on the situation and determine their adherence.

The developments at the New York convention are bound to have a decisive effect on the national C.I.O. situation, where a sharp cleavage between John L. Lewis and Sidney Hillman, each with his own backing of C.I.O. unions, has been growing in recent months.



Benefit of  
**WORKERS AGE**  
Special Performance  
**ESTHER'KE**  
Yiddish Art Theatre  
Second Ave. at 4th St.  
Friday Evening,  
November 15th, 1940

\$1 A YEAR SUB TO  
**WORKERS AGE**  
6 mos. 60¢  
subscribe now!



# Anglo-American Alliance: A British Socialist View

I. L. P. Warns Against Reactionary Effects

(What do British international socialists think of the Anglo-American alliance that is now in the making on both sides of the Atlantic? We are glad to present to our readers the leading article in the August 29, 1940 issue of the New Leader, official paper of the British Independent Labor Party. The article is entitled: "Which Is It To Be—European Revolution Or U.S.A. Alliance?"—Editor.)

THE real significance of Mr. Churchill's speech forecasting the growing unification of Britain and the United States of America, has not been realized.

It was preceded by America's support, "short of men," of Britain's war effort; the disposal of U. S. naval ships to Britain; the appointment of the Duke of Windsor to the governorship of the Bahamas; and the conclusion of a defense pact between the U. S. and Canadian governments. It has followed by an agreement to lease naval bases to the U.S.A. in Newfoundland and the West Indies.

Mr. Churchill has the virtue of seeing clearly. He recognizes that these steps will lead to others. Before the end of the war, we may see a unification of Britain and the U. S. not dissimilar to the proposal made to France before its collapse. It is our duty to understand the implications of this development.

America is the most powerful capitalist country in the world. Its ruling class recognizes that a victorious Germany would be its one rival at the end of the war.

If this all-powerful capitalist country becomes united with Britain one thing is certain. It will not allow a workers social revolution in Europe.

From the beginning of this war, there have been two alternative courses. Either Britain, a very changed Britain, could ally herself with the revolutionary anti-Nazi elements on the continent of Europe, and so deliberately work for the ending of Nazism by the social revolution; or it could seek to establish an alliance with America, determining to overthrow the Nazi government by a more powerful capitalist combination. The move towards unification with America means a victory for those who support the second of these courses.

America prides itself on its political democracy, and this ideological basis will be used to justify British-American unity. But in no country in the world is capitalist domination more ruthless when its privileges are threatened.

The savagery with which strikes are suppressed is beyond anything we know in this country. The contrast between the luxury of the possessing class and the poverty of the lowest-paid workers is greater even than in Britain. Behind the two great capitalist parties in America are millionaire vested interests more mighty than any we know here.

With the American socialists, with great sections of the American people, we have the closest sense of unity. They are opposing their capitalist class as we are opposing ours. They will be the first to recognize the danger of British-American capitalist unity.

The British ruling class sees its one hope of retaining its privileges by combining with the American ruling class. In this way, at one and the same time, an ally will be won in the struggle against German imperialism and both Europe and Britain will be saved from a social revolution.

The workers, however, should see that their interests lie in the alternative policy of making Britain a socialist country and winning the peoples of Europe as allies in the overthrow of Nazism.

It is no accident that the British government is refusing every opportunity to make allies of the tens of millions of workers, peasants, and middle class, who under the rule of Hitler hate Hitlerism no less than we do.

If Britain were socialist, if it were freed of its social inequalities, if freedom were extended to India and to the colonial peoples, these millions in Nazi-occupied territories and in Germany itself could become a Fifth Column for Revolution greater than the Nazis have ever been able to organize for fascism.

The manner in which the anti-Nazi refugees have been treated in this country is sufficient indication that the British ruling class has no desire to make allies of those who are opposed to Nazism on anti-capitalist grounds.

We are now at the parting of ways. Either a capitalist Britain becomes an ally of capitalist America, or the workers press forward with the determination to make Britain socialist in alliance with the masses of Europe.

It is our duty to see clearly what is happening. The first steps have been taken towards the establishment of the strongest capitalist combination the world has yet seen. Our reply must be to work unceasingly for the ending of British capitalism; for the ending, in association with the Indian people and the colonial workers, of British imperialism.

Then we shall have the right to sound the call for the encouragement of the social revolution in Europe and for the extension of socialism to all parts of the world.

# Labor Interests and "Short-of-War" Aid

Expansion of Help to Britain Advocated

By PETER ROSS

I think Lovestone should be commended for his timely discussion of labor's attitude to the present war and to the basic problem facing all of us, namely, the question of aid to England. He was the first to challenge sharply the I.L.L.A.'s prevailing attitude that the outcome of the war is not of paramount importance to the interests of the working class. I feel that if his position is not accepted, the I.L.L.A. will be guilty of dangerous and sterile sectarianism.

In line with what Lovestone has said, I want to make the following summary statements that should, in my opinion, be incorporated in any resolution the I.L.L.A. will adopt on the question:

1. It makes a DECISIVE difference (not merely a difference) who wins the war. A victory for Hitler would mean a great defeat to the international working class (and an absolute defeat for the British workers).
2. We must support all genuine efforts to aid England in her present struggle.
3. Such efforts, by our own government and by the independent action of labor, may mean the difference between victory and defeat for England.
4. A British victory may postpone for many years a war between Germany and the United States. A defeat for Britain would make such a war inevitable in the near future.
5. In the present situation, the action of our government in coming to the aid of Britain (even though for its own imperialist interest) is decisive and in the interest of the working class.

6. No matter what the U. S. has done, or may do, to aid England (short of declaration of war), Germany will not challenge such acts. Germany cannot afford to do so. Declarations of war are not determined by the legality of certain acts, but by the relation of forces. Today, Germany must passively accept the discriminatory acts of the American government. This discrimination in favor of England we should welcome and support.

7. Those who fear that aid to England will lead to war should categorically refuse to support any and all steps that may discriminate against one of the belligerents—the evacuation of English children, pegging the pound, granting favorable trade agreements, selling planes, etc. Those who fear that aid to England may lead to war with Germany should campaign for strict neutrality or for equal treatment of both belligerents. For any step, no matter how apparently insignificant (the evacuation of British children, for example) that favors one belligerent as against another may potentially be a cause for a declaration of war.

8. I personally am not a pacifist or an isolationist. I think that fascism is not just imperialism. It is imperialism plus "counter-revolution on the march." It can never be sated. A Hitler victory would solidify his hold over Europe and strengthen his influence in the rest of the world. On the other hand, in agreement with Lovestone, I feel that a British victory would not only stop the march of fascism but would have the possibilities of giving a new lease on life to the revolutionary movement not only in Greater Germany but in the victorious British Empire.

9. Hence, I think we are wrong to oppose the sale of destroyers to England. Such sale will not weaken the U. S. A. and will help Britain. I think we should favor an extension of American aid to Britain. (I am sure the I. L. P. will not protest.)

10. The American labor movement, independently, should also take steps to help British labor by sending it money, medical supplies, etc.

In other words, we should react to the present war in the same way that we reacted to the fight in Spain. We should offer critical support to the British government, and, like the I.L.P., be ever watchful against those in the present British government who may be ready to capitulate, "appease" or betray.

These opinions reflect a radical change in my views on the present war between Britain and Germany.

## British Labor and the War

# Socialism and War Morale

By "LEVELLER"

("Leveller" is a well-known English socialist and a parliamentary candidate of the British Labor Party.—Editor.)

London, England

ONE subject occupies much space in newspapers and in parliamentary reports these days—that of keeping up the "nation's morale." So far, the suggestions from high quarters have ranged from free symphony concerts to "snooters" and silent columns; while from slightly less influential circles, the main suggestion has been that the best way to boost the national morale is to get rid of the Men of Munich.

Naturally, those who know the only practical answer have not been consulted. Any mining village could tell our Duff Coopers how a community can endure empty bellies and terrorism with courage and fortitude. In the 1926 lock-out, miners and their families endured starvation, calumny—remember, Mr. Duff Cooper?—the batons of the police and the abuse of the press for over seven months with scarce a break in their ranks.

They stood all this because they knew what they were fighting for, because they knew whom they were fighting, because they had a voice and a vote in the conduct of the fight and because all shared alike the same hardships and difficulties.

If their leaders had refused to tell them what were the aims of the struggle, had lived on the fat of the land while the men and their families were starving, had refused the men a vote or a voice in the decisions of the fight, then the unity of the miners would have been broken and the mine-owners would have had an easy victory.

### WHY THE PROBLEM OF MORALE

There would be no problem of "keeping up the national morale" if all, from the rank-and-file soldier down to the biggest of big business men, all shared the same dangers, suffered the same scarcity, and enjoyed the same say in the running of the nation's industries and services. How far we are at present removed from this state of things can be gauged by the difference in income of bosses and workmen, leaders and led, statesmen and soldiers.

It is this gulf, which widens with growing difficulties, that will make mock of efforts to strengthen the morale of the people. The Labor Party members in the House of Commons bear constant, too often unwilling, witness to the unreality of the claim that all are making the same sacrifices and bearing the same burdens. A Labor Party opposition in the House to a government which has the support of the party, and which includes the party leaders in its cabinet, would be a farce, were it not for the fact that there still remain in the real world outside outstanding differences, constantly being forced up from below by the very conditions under which people are living. The government claims to represent a united House; often it seems to be balancing between the opposing parties in the House, differences that are not personal, but class differences. There are still rich and poor in Britain, and the rich still retain their main control over industries, the banks and the newspapers, as they did in peacetime.

Let Mr. Marchbanks, leader of the railwaymen, speak. "I have heard enough," he wrote last week, "about the gathering strength of the reaction in the Tory party to make me—unduly perhaps—apprehensive about changes in the War Cabinet." He was writing about the addition of Lord Beaverbrook to the War Cabinet, but, willy-nilly, he bears witness to the existence of differences in the legislature and the councils of state.

Let us see things clearly. The Labor men are needed in the government; without them, the masses of working people would never have surrendered their rights and leisure as they have done. Their being in the cabinet has postponed sweeping

solves the select guardians of a secret fund of knowledge. Many branches of mathematics (not all, of course, due to the inherent difficulty of the subject), the now profound mysteries, could yield their secrets to persons of normal intelligence willing to apply themselves, provided a different approach to the entire subject was instituted. That is why the popularizations of science and mathematics by men with a social conscience and a humanistic outlook, of the types of Hogben and Hyman Levy, are all to the good, despite certain shortcomings from the viewpoint of the expert.

The present book falls under such a category. It deals with numbers, ordinary numbers, funny numbers, infinite numbers; with geometries, plane and fancy, Euclidean and non-Euclidean; with mathematical symbols as Pi, i and e; with puzzles and paradoxes and games, ordinary and mathematically involved; with logarithms, that enormous saver of human labor; with the problems of chance and statistics; with the problems of change and the calculus; and with many more things on the way, funny, interesting and important. The book is simply and wittily written. Some parts are harder than others, a few very difficult. Much of it is accessible to people of normal intelligence who are willing to expend a certain amount of mental effort. For those with even a layman's interest in mathematics, the book is a must. For what it will repay in fun, interest and knowledge is in direct proportion to the effort put into it!

sh Empire. But even an imperialist victory for Britain without revolutionary consequences would be of paramount importance to the working class as compared with a Hitler victory.

9. Hence, I think we are wrong to oppose the sale of destroyers to England. Such sale will not weaken the U. S. A. and will help Britain. I think we should favor an extension of American aid to Britain. (I am sure the I. L. P. will not protest.)

10. The American labor movement, independently, should also take steps to help British labor by sending it money, medical supplies, etc.

In other words, we should react to the present war in the same way that we reacted to the fight in Spain. We should offer critical support to the British government, and, like the I.L.P., be ever watchful against those in the present British government who may be ready to capitulate, "appease" or betray.

These opinions reflect a radical change in my views on the present war between Britain and Germany.



—New Leader (London)

increases on the taxation of mainly working-class incomes—postponed it, not prevented it. Meanwhile, big business continues to get its representatives firmly in controlling jobs in the war effort; and legislation reducing the rights and freedom of the people mounts month by month. "Reaction in the Tory party," says Mr. Marchbanks, "gathers strength." Can the organized workers, in such circumstances, allow themselves to be off their guard for one moment?

### TALK OF "UNITY" NOT ENOUGH

Other factors, too, indicate that mere talk of national unity will not, in itself, remove the possibility of a future open clash between organized labor and reactionary forces in our midst.

The workers have grown in stature and understanding in the last few months; their indispensability has given them new strength and confidence; their unions have grown in numbers until, in spite of the immense man-power drain, the figures approach a record height.

They see for themselves how much of the employer's power remains, in spite of talk of the government "taking over everything," and in spite of the unions willingly accepting drastic restrictions of their rights and hard-won standards.

It is facts, not speeches, that count in the long run. Facts, life itself, the things met on the job, the way things work out over the store-counter and in the factory—that's how most people sort out the right policy from the wrong one, and those that worry about "morale" might well think this over.

The workers need to draw the lessons of their experiences now—to recognize that their aim must remain, as always, to get control for the community of the nation's resources. Until they do, they and their families will remain in danger from reaction within and without the country. The need today is for greater democratic discussion among all sections of the organized labor movement, particularly in the factories, to hammer out now the forward policy for beating fascism and reaction and building a new world of peace and plenty.

# How Does Latin America Feel About the British Base Deal? Perpetuation of Foreign Influence Feared

ONE aspect of President Roosevelt's sensational acquisition of Atlantic air and naval bases from Great Britain in exchange for fifty "over-age" destroyers has been almost completely ignored by the press, and yet it is an aspect that is of prime importance to this country from many angles, including the angle of hemisphere security and defense. What does Latin America think of Mr. Roosevelt's great stroke of business? Bryce Oliver, well-known news commentator, discusses this question in an article in a recent issue of the New Leader, the New York social-democratic paper. This article is all the more significant in that the New Leader is a fanatical supporter of the Administration, above all, of its foreign and defense policies.

"Having been for many years intimate with the ideas and aspirations of patriotic Brazilians, Venezuelans and Colombians," Mr. Oliver declares, "I feel that I am qualified to warn that despite surface appearances and possible official statements, the nationals of these important and growing republics will be something less than lukewarm to the connotations for them which are involved in the leasing of British naval bases, on the strategic islands and the mainland of British Guiana, to the United States. . . .

"Whatever individual Brazilians may have felt about the war, it has been the feeling in Rio de Janeiro that the Guianas must fall into the hands of Brazil. The establishment now of United States naval bases on the guardian islands and on the mainland itself blasts the hopes of Brazil. The United States bases will protect not only the United States and South American interests but will serve to perpetuate British empire control.

"Both great democracies are regarded in South American nations as imperialist, and the partnership of American naval force and British civil administration would seem to end forever, in the minds of South American leaders, the hopes long held of some day ending extra-continental influence on the nations of Latin America.

"The same sentiments stirring in Brazil are undoubtedly stirring in Venezuela, the cradle of Latin-American liberty. Since my first contact with political leaders in Caracas twenty years ago, it has been made entirely clear to me that if ever the grip of the British empire were shaken along the coast of northern South America, Venezuela would fully expect that rich Trinidad, with its oil, cocoa and pitch, would fall like a ripe apple to Venezuela. Geographically, Trinidad is Venezuela.

"A strong swimmer might cross the narrow gulf that separates the island from the Venezuelan mainland, and since the start of the war, with its uncertainties for the British empire, the Caracas government has looked longingly forward to the acquisition of a great commercial port—Port of Spain. This hope is now blasted by the partnership of United States naval might supporting the perpetuation of British civil control of the island.

"According to rumors in Washington, the transfer of naval bases to the United States fleet is not yet complete, and one may guess that this nation still has to acquire the Dutch island of Curacao, another geographical part of Venezuela, and with it Willemstad, the richest oil port in the world. If the hard-driving, progressive government at Caracas has been gambling the future on the eventual acquisition of Curacao as the natural right of a sovereign nation, one can scarcely blame them. But if the United States takes a ninety-nine-year lease on a naval base at Willemstad, we guarantee the continuation of Dutch control. . . . It is the end of the Venezuelan dream.

"For Colombia, the whole deal also means the end of a dream—the eventual ability to shake loose from all foreign domination."

Isn't it about time that the American people asked themselves some very pertinent questions?

Is the defense of America really promoted by the underwriting of the British and Dutch empires in this hemisphere and the frustration of the legitimate national aspirations of great Latin American peoples?

Is hemisphere unity, so vital for our defense, enhanced by such a policy—a policy that makes us the watch-dog of British empire interests and fosters bitterness and hostility against us among the nations to the south?

Does not the welfare, the security of the Americas rather require the closest bond of mutual good-will in this hemisphere—and the exclusion of foreign imperialism from any foothold or influence within its bounds, or, as Bryce Oliver puts it, "the ending of extra-continental influence on the nations of Latin America?"

Senator Pepper undertook to explain his views more fully. Senators Wheeler, Overton, Adams, Connally, Hatch and Clark of Missouri joined in the ensuing discussion.

Senator Bone did not "regret" the discussion. He participated in the exchanges thruout and asked questions of Senator Pepper. If he regretted anything, it was the fact that the country had reached a stage where such a discussion could take place. Mr. Kluckhohn's quotation from Senator Bone was cut off in the middle of a sentence. What Senator Bone said was:

"I never thought I should live long enough to find the Senate of the United States, calmly or otherwise—perhaps more otherwise than calmly—debating the question whether or not, while the country is at peace, we should give the President of the United States the supreme power of a dictator, because that is what it would imply—the war-time powers, whether they are lawful powers or not."

Nor did Senator Barkley say that the discussion was irrelevant, as Mr. Kluckhohn implied. Senator Barkley simply moved for a recess.

This Senatorial discussion of the President's war-time powers will probably find its way into history text-books—the probably not for twenty years. But historians, for whom the Times likes to think it is being edited, will have to look for it in the Congressional Record. Librarians will be lax in their duty unless they insert notices in their bound volumes of the New York Times warning historians to look elsewhere for an accurate account of the spirit and substance of the Senate debate on peace-time conscription.

# U.S. Press Sank Low in Reporting Draft Fight

New York Times Led Assault on Fair Play

THE final vote in the Senate on the Burke-Wadsworth bill closed one of the brightest chapters in the history of representative government and one of the darkest episodes in the annals of U. S. journalism. At a time when representative government is everywhere in question, the Senate debate on conscription provided striking proof of the intelligence, the sincerity and the sense of democratic responsibility with which a freely elected legislature can face a great decision. The decision itself may have been a blow to democracy, but the process of reaching it was democracy's triumph.

Those who would save liberty by such devices as peace-time conscription have not bothered to point to the debate as an example of what they want to preserve. They have instead begrudged 96 Senators fourteen days of searching discussion of a measure which meant a fundamental move never before undertaken in the history of the republic.

Columnist Mark Sullivan was an exception. The ardent advocate of the Burke-Wadsworth bill, he wrote on August 31: "The debate was very thorough, and was of high quality. It was, in the judgment of this writer, the American form of government—that is, government by representatives, democratically chosen—functioning admirably; functioning as well as any American Congress ever functioned, as well as any parliamentary body ever functioned anywhere."

The debate should have aroused pride in representative government; yet young men who will be expected to acquire respect for democracy from top sergeants could hardly have realized this by reading about it in their newspapers. More or less deliberately, the impression was created that opponents of an immediate draft were blind fools or "Fifth Column" stooges who wanted to leave the country unprepared in the face of obvious danger.

### THE TIMES IN THE LEAD

Leading the journalistic assault was the New York Times. We have already exposed the Times's methods in these columns, not because the Times is the only paper that abandoned fair play, but because its news columns are regarded as unsullied, because it led the fight for peace-time conscription and because it is the most influential newspaper in America. When the Times, in what it regards as a service to democracy, makes its news columns a catchall for war propaganda, there is little hope for other newspapers whose pretensions to impartiality are less unctuous and less deserved.

The Times's coverage of the Senate debate was in the form of daily exhortations to action from its correspondent, Frank L. Kluckhohn. What the Senate said or did during the debate was reported as sim-

ply so much waste of time. Mr. Kluckhohn's story of August 21 was headlined: "Draft Bill Action Is Demanded Now, Senate Is Warned." Yet on that day, things had happened in the annals of U. S. journalism. At a time when representative government is everywhere in question, the Senate debate on conscription provided striking proof of the intelligence, the sincerity and the sense of democratic responsibility with which a freely elected legislature can face a great decision. The decision itself may have been a blow to democracy, but the process of reaching it was democracy's triumph.

Those who would save liberty by such devices as peace-time conscription have not bothered to point to the debate as an example of what they want to preserve. They have instead begrudged 96 Senators fourteen days of searching discussion of a measure which meant a fundamental move never before undertaken in the history of the republic.

Columnist Mark Sullivan was an exception. The ardent advocate of the Burke-Wadsworth bill, he wrote on August 31: "The debate was very thorough, and was of high quality. It was, in the judgment of this writer, the American form of government—that is, government by representatives, democratically chosen—functioning admirably; functioning as well as any American Congress ever functioned, as well as any parliamentary body ever functioned anywhere."

The debate should have aroused pride in representative government; yet young men who will be expected to acquire respect for democracy from top sergeants could hardly have realized this by reading about it in their newspapers. More or less deliberately, the impression was created that opponents of an immediate draft were blind fools or "Fifth Column" stooges who wanted to leave the country unprepared in the face of obvious danger.

### THE TIMES IN THE LEAD

Leading the journalistic assault was the New York Times. We have already exposed the Times's methods in these columns, not because the Times is the only paper that abandoned fair play, but because its news columns are regarded as unsullied, because it led the fight for peace-time conscription and because it is the most influential newspaper in America. When the Times, in what it regards as a service to democracy, makes its news columns a catchall for war propaganda, there is little hope for other newspapers whose pretensions to impartiality are less unctuous and less deserved.

The Times's coverage of the Senate debate was in the form of daily exhortations to action from its correspondent, Frank L. Kluckhohn. What the Senate said or did during the debate was reported as sim-

## Capitalism Is Defeatist . . .

"NO capitalist government goes into war intent on victory at any price. It seeks victory on conditions—and those conditions are the maintenance or increase of its own power.

"There is one price it will never pay, if victory can only be won at the cost of such a shift of social power that capitalism itself is endangered, it will seek peace on terms, almost any terms. If anyone doubted that, France has supplied the final proof."—New Leader, official paper of the British Independent Labor Party.

## Discussion of Our Policy on the War

In the Next Issue: WHAT IS FASCISM? By B. D. Wolfe

ANOTHER VIEW ON THE DESTROYER TRANSFER By B. Herman

ON AID TO BRITAIN By Will Herberg

THE REAL ISSUES BEFORE US By Jay Lovestone



# Workers Age

Organ of the National Council, Independent Labor League of America, 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published biweekly by the Workers Age Publishing Association. Subscription \$1.00 per year; \$6.00 for six months; 5c a copy. Foreign Rates: \$2.00; Canada \$1.50 per year.

Entered as second class matter Nov. 5, 1934, at the Post Office New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879. Phone: LACKAWANNA 4-5282.

WILL HERBERG, Editor

Vol. 9. SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1940. No. 35

## VOTE SOCIALIST!

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

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

## A DANGEROUS GAME

"APPEASEMENT" is a dangerous and contemptible policy, but even more dangerous and contemptible is that kind of political strategy that tries to exploit the very justified popular aversion to "appeasement" for narrow partisan purposes by hanging that label on to everything and everybody you don't happen to like. For then the very word ceases to have a meaning and can no longer serve as the symbol of a very real and very serious menace.

Practically everybody in politics has been guilty of this vicious practice. Roosevelt and Willkie, who are alike in their foreign policies as two peas in a pod, have denounced each other as "appeasers", and the pro-war "liberals" are throwing the same epithet at such tried and tested anti-fascists as Oswald Garrison Villard and Norman Thomas. But perhaps the worst example of such impermissible tactics comes from the President's address to the teamsters convention last week.

Declared Mr. Roosevelt: "Let us have an end to the sort of appeasement which seeks to keep us helpless by playing on fear and by indirect sabotage of all progress we are making."

This is certainly a new definition of "appeasement", concocted by Mr. Roosevelt to serve his own political purposes. To "play on fear" is "appeasement"? But who has been playing on the fear of the American people if not Mr. Roosevelt himself? Has he already forgotten his radio address a few months ago in which he tried to work up an invasion scare among the midwestern farmers by presenting them with a schedule of air flights according to which Omaha lay exposed to the Nazi bombers? Has there ever been a cheaper attempt at panic-mongering in recent years?

According to Mr. Roosevelt, "indirect sabotage of all the progress we are making" is just another form of "appeasement". What does that mean? It means that any one opposing Roosevelt's policies, domestic or foreign, is an "appeaser". Apparently, partisanship when directed against Mr. Roosevelt is "appeasement", but when directed in his favor is patriotism.

There are many people in this country who don't think that Mr. Roosevelt has been making any progress in the last few years. Under the new definition, they are "appeasers". There are others who think that whatever progress Mr. Roosevelt has made on the domestic field has been more than offset by his disastrous foreign policy. They are "appeasers" too. Apparently, only Mr. Ickes and his true-blue third-term cohorts can escape that shameful imputation.

In any rational sense, "appeasement" means a policy of feeding concession after concession to the totalitarian dictators in the futile hope of buying them off or diverting their fury. Experience has shown how self-defeating, how suicidal such a policy really is. But if anyone has to do any explaining away on that score, it is Mr. Roosevelt himself. We have not yet forgotten how Mr. Roosevelt aided and abetted the Anglo-French strangulation of the Spanish republic thru his arms embargo against Loyalist Spain, as dirty a piece of "appeasement" as Mr. Chamberlain can boast of. Nor have we forgotten Mr. Roosevelt's participation in the events that led to Munich and his public blessing of that fatal "settlement". And how long since Mr. Roosevelt was engaged in a little "appeasement" deal of his own, offering everything in sight to buy off Mussolini? Such costly blunders—to use the mildest terms—cannot be wiped off the slate by bluster, rhetoric and empty threats. At any rate, Mr. Roosevelt should be the last one to cast stones. . . .

The problem of "appeasement" is a grave and immediate one. It must be faced by the American people courageously and realistically. But the kind of tactics in which Mr. Roosevelt—and Mr. Willkie too—have been indulging is not going to help in this task.

## THE NEW IN THE WORLD CRISIS

(Continued from Page 1)

itself. . . . Furthermore, W. Somerset Maugham, recently returned from occupied and Vichy France, lets an even dirtier cat out of the bag when he says:

"Big business was in close relations with Germany, and among the aristocracy and the prosperous bourgeoisie there were many, very many, who had an admiration for Hitler and Mussolini because they thought the dictators had saved their respective countries from the horrors of Russian communism. They hardly made a secret of their conviction that, if they had to choose between a victory for Germany and the Bolshevism which they foresaw as a result of the war, they preferred a German victory. . . ." (Red Book, October 1940).

6. We used to say that going to war nowadays automatically spells for all democratic countries an extreme rightward trend—an inevitable, swift trend towards totalitarianism. One year of war has bombed to bits this once sacred dogma of ours. In England, the trend has not been all to the right. The I.L.P. has continually, openly and vigorously criticized the British government for undemocratic practices. Important sections of the Labor Party—especially the group around Laski and Bevan and the Tribune—have been making continuous telling criticism of the Churchill government and its spark-plug, the Labor members. What is more, England under fire has not given up its social services; it has even extended and improved some of them. Today, a great historical debate is gripping such influential organs as the London Times, the London Economist, the Daily Express and the Evening Standard about the need of a fundamental social reorganization and a new social dynamic. Now, I am not attaching to the contents of this discussion, aptly called by Fenner Brockway "Fleet Street revolution," so much significance. It is to the factors and forces making for such a discussion [while Goering's bombers unceasingly pour hell on London] that I attach the real significance.

That consequences of colossal historical significance are now in the making in England—should the Nazis be halted—is eloquently brought home to us by the I.L.P. paper. Left, when it says:

"But if the invasion happens, and if it is beaten back, England will, in the process, have travelled a long distance towards becoming a socialist country. The tremendous effort of defeating the invasion will only be possible if we lever the pro-Nazi out of the key positions, unblimp the fighting forces, deal ruthlessly with the 'rights' of private property and introduce sufficient social equality to check discontent and thus get the last ounce of energy out of the working class. At the moment we are in an anomalous position in which a semi-socialist government rules over a reactionary administration, and a people which is solidly anti-Nazi finds itself thwarted at every turn by a governing class unwilling to pay the price of victory. . . .

"If the invasion fails to come off but remains a possibility, there is still a good chance of bringing into being a real People's Army, capable in time of exerting a political influence on the regular forces. The Local Defense Volunteers is already a million strong, and in spite of its sedentary character it will not be long before it is a serious fighting force. Probably, its numbers will increase, or other similar formations will arise. The significance of such armies is that they are created from below by the spontaneous effort of the people and almost against the will of the government, like the trade-union militias in Spain. They are an expression of the fact that the ordinary man will fight for his home even when he is unenthusiastic about foreign wars. But effective home defense is impossible without social reconstruction and this fact is now very near the surface of the public consciousness" (Left, August 1940, pp. 227, 231).

I beg the indulgence of the reader for this barrage of quotations. But I think

# What Are the Stakes in the Coming Elections?

By WILL HERBERG

WHAT are the stakes in the elections? What do the masses of the people of this country stand to gain or lose depending on whether Franklin D. Roosevelt or Wendell Willkie is elected President in November? These are questions that must be asked and answered before we can form any opinion at all on the political situation.

There are many in the labor movement who regard such questions as hardly worth asking. To them Roosevelt and progress, even Roosevelt and democracy, are synonymous. They are absolutely convinced that a Republican victory at the polls would usher in a period of such ruthless reaction that all the gains of the past decade would be lost and labor would be reduced to a state of helplessness and subjection. Some even talk of "fascism" following a Willkie victory, in the loose way such terms are habitually used. To these men, sincere in their beliefs, it is a difference between day and night, almost between freedom and slavery.

Such a viewpoint will not, of course, bear up under examination. Roosevelt is not quite an angel of light, nor is Willkie altogether a demon of darkness. Neither their parties, platforms nor supporting forces differ in such a way that the fate of America, or of organized labor in America, can be said to depend on the outcome of the elections. Yet the fact that millions of men and women throughout the country really believe that the balance is in itself a political force of immense importance. It may prove to be the single biggest factor in the campaign.

## LITTLE DIFFERENCE IN PLATFORMS

It is not necessary to share this extreme, almost superstitious view to recognize that there is indeed some margin of political difference between the two old-party candidates. It would be futile to search for this difference in the party platforms. In the first place, party platforms don't mean anything any more in terms of practical policy to be followed; as so many commentators

pointed out during the recent conventions, these platforms and the "pledges" they embody are thrown into the waste-basket before the ink is dry. In the second place, despite everything party spokesmen may say, there really is no major difference between the two platforms on any essential point. The Democratic document is naturally a defense of the New Deal, while the Republican document is quite as naturally a denunciation of it and of the Roosevelt Administration—but almost entirely in general terms. A point-by-point analysis will show, I believe, only secondary differences, where there are any such at all.

The slim margin of difference in the platforms has been further reduced by Mr. Willkie's recent pronouncements, which have been of a character described in the press as "distinctly New Dealish." Even such a thoroughly pro-Roosevelt journal as the Nation cannot help recognizing this in reporting on Willkie's acceptance address ("Wendell Willkie's Speech," by Freda Kirchwey, Aug. 24, 1940):

"Wendell Willkie, as everyone expected, pronounced himself totally opposed to the New Deal and then swallowed it almost whole. The parts he rejected are the parts that penalize business, particularly the Administration's tax measures. But he favors regulation of 'the forces of free enterprise.' He is opposed to monopoly. He believes in collective bargaining protected by law, and in minimum-wage and maximum-hour requirements which should 'constantly rise.' He believes in federal regulation of interstate utilities, stock markets and banks. He supports federal pensions and adequate old-age and unemployment benefits. He believes in relief for the farmer, thru 'parity of prices' if possible. He believes in encouraging cooperative enterprises and in rural electrification. He believes that 'those whom private industry cannot support must be supported by government agency, whether federal or state.' And he doesn't stop there. He also favors the Administration's foreign policy. . . . He accepts the principle of selective service and of increased defense.

"But a Republican candidate can-

not run for office exclusively on the Democratic record and platform; and Mr. Willkie expressed as much divergence from the New Deal as his basic agreement permitted. . . . In the nature of the case, this "divergence" could only be minor and secondary—as much as his basic agreement permitted."

## FORCES AND MEN BEHIND CANDIDATES

In what direction, then, shall we look to find the difference that does exist between Roosevelt and Willkie as candidates for the Presidency? Not in the platforms on which they stand or in the pronouncements they have made, but in the social forces backing them as well as in the men around them. Without in any way overlooking individual exceptions here and there, it cannot be denied that big-business reaction is very largely behind Willkie while most of the liberal and labor forces in this country are to be found in the Roosevelt camp. Roosevelt has his big-business supporters, of course, and his Hagues, Kelly-Nashes and Crumps, while Willkie is backed by a number of sincere liberals, not to speak of the die-hard Republican labor leaders; but by and large, the distinction undoubtedly holds. To the degree that the social composition of a candidate's mass support has an influence on the policies he will pursue if elected—and such pressure cannot be discounted or ignored—to that degree, very largely, can we legitimately speak of a margin of difference in the outcome of the elections.

Yet even this distinction is rather superficial. For there seem to me to be two basic factors in the present situation that override all other considerations. They operate in different directions but between them they tend to fix pretty narrow limits to the possible variations of policy of the next administration, whatever it may be.

## NEW DEAL REFORMS HERE TO STAY

On the one hand, the major New Deal reforms have become so firmly embedded in the social and economic fabric of the country that any attempt to uproot them or wipe

them out would involve a disturbance of major proportions. Let us remember that these reforms were not instituted out of the goodness of Mr. Roosevelt's heart or torn from the ruling class thru powerful mass struggles. They were instituted because in the view of the Administration they were necessary to bring a measure of stability and health to our economic system, to permit it to continue functioning under the new conditions. By and large, these reforms have already become an integral part of the social and economic order; they are as little open to serious question as the income-tax legislation, once hailed and denounced with the same fervor as many New Deal measures are today.

Let any one candidly ask himself which of the New Deal reforms would be abolished or destroyed under a Republican administration. Social security? There is almost universal agreement that it is here to stay. Securities and stock-market regulation? Not the slightest doubt of its survival under any circumstances. Farm aid? All Republican spokesmen have eagerly promised its continuance, even its extension. The wage-and-hour law? Mr. Willkie has proclaimed his support of this legislation, even insisting that minimum standards should "constantly rise." Unemployment relief? The most the Republicans demand is turning over its administration to the states, something very undesirable, it is true, but by no means calling the institution itself into question. The Wagner Act? Under a Republican regime, there would be some drastic modifications, but so would there be if Roosevelt were re-elected. Of course, all this is largely a matter of probabilities and speculation, but it seems to me that there is no escaping the conclusion that the major New Deal reforms are definitely here to stay and no longer depend for their survival on the outcome of the elections. They have already become a permanent, organic part of our system. They are not at stake in the elections.

## MILITARIZATION OF AMERICAN LIFE

On the other hand, whoever occupies the White House for the next four years, Roosevelt or Willkie, the

trend towards the militarization of social, economic and political life in this country will continue, transforming all governmental activities, institutions and practices in the process. Progressive reform legislation will be largely forgotten. Social-welfare expenditures will be slashed to the bone in favor of a sky-rocketing "defense" budget. Federal agencies, boards and bureaus of all sorts, no matter what their original function, will be turned to purposes of military regimentation and control, or at least will be operated with such purposes in mind. Everything will be integrated into the Wehrwirtschaft (war economy) that is now emerging in this country. This will be the case whether Willkie or Roosevelt is victorious in November; it is already increasingly the case today. The trend is clear and neither Roosevelt nor Willkie has the remotest intention or desire to set himself against it.

For, despite their mutual denunciations, they are in almost complete agreement on foreign and "defense" policy. They are both extreme interventionists, both equally militaristic and imperialistic in their ways of thinking. Willkie's endorsement of the President's "short-of-war" fraud and of peace-time conscription should be proof enough.

In broad outline, this is the balance-sheet. Yes, there is some margin of difference, but it is a narrow and disappearing one. It cannot be ignored, but neither can the fate of the country be made to depend upon it. In fact, I think it is not too much to say that the actual margin of difference between the two parties and candidates is narrower and less significant today than it has been at any time since 1928.

Whether it be Roosevelt or Willkie in November, this country is in for some pretty dark days ahead. The only real hope would be a strong, united, independent labor movement, capable of giving the lead to all progressive, forward-looking sections of the population. But worshipping, uncritical support of Roosevelt—or of Willkie either, for that matter, although Willkie is getting relatively little of it from labor—is hardly the road in that direction.

# The Socialists and the War

## Thomas Charges Roosevelt Policies Lead to Danger

(Continued from page 1)

Dutch East Indies from Japan, and not be at war?

## RECORD OF F.D.R.'S FOREIGN POLICY

This examination of the war and our relations to it has been the necessary background for a more detailed analysis of the President's policy. I criticize it precisely because it has neither guaranteed our peace nor successfully weakened Hitler. Briefly, what the President has succeeded in doing is to put us on the brink of war without preparing us for it, and to encourage first the Allies and now England, to expect far more than he has yet dared or been able to do.

To go back to the beginning of his Administration, the President gave us a foretaste of his policy by first praising extravagantly the Lon-

don Economic Conference and its usefulness, and then with sudden vehemence utterly destroying it. He ran true to form when he gave in 1936 the Chautauqua speech, which is still the bible of the so-called "isolationists," and followed it the next year by the Chicago speech, which is the bible of the interventionists. He signed and praised the neutrality law, which two years later he denounced. He demanded its repeal on grounds which were not his real ones; he talked of more effective neutrality when he meant aid to the Allies. He and his spokesmen now denounce "appeasement" at Munich. His Charlottesville, Va., speech furiously denouncing Mussolini, refers to promises of concessions to that dictator by the Allies transmitted thru himself, which were intended to "appease" the Italian tyrant. In thinly veiled lan-

guage, he has scored the Japanese aggression in the Far East, but he never did what he could have done to cut her off from American war supplies. He even continued the purchase of Japanese gold—as he did of Russian gold during the invasion of Finland.

Until the Blitzkrieg began last May, he was apparently blissfully content with the armaments he had got out of the seven or eight billion dollars Congress had given him. He led us to believe we could patrol the Far East in the interests of western rather than Japanese imperialism and throw our weight on the side of righteousness in Europe without sending troops abroad. After the Blitzkrieg began, he told Congress and the people that we could not defend Omaha, which should begin practicing blackouts to prepare against the coming of bombers, traveling, it would appear on a tourist schedule for fair-weather flights. (Actually, bombers require bases, elaborately equipped with thirty men on the ground to each ship in the air.)

Even after this appeal to panic, the President asked Congress for less than two billion dollars and then advised it to go home. It didn't go home and he has since asked for and got billions more. He then decided that straightway we must have conscription with full powers for him to send regulars, guardsmen or conscript soldiers, anywhere he desired, at least in this hemisphere, without further authorization.

neighbors is all to the good. Properly handled, mutual defense arrangements with Canada, and American lease of bases in British territory may serve the cause of peace rather than war. But does the President conceive them as steps toward that Anglo-American alliance at which Prime Minister Churchill plainly hinted? Are we to underwrite the British Empire around the world? Or are we to build our own in South America by occupying Brazil before Hitler gets there?

These questions may eventually be answered with the blood of our sons. If the man who leaves us in the dark about them while he conscripts our sons is, as Mr. Wallace would have us believe, our one hope of peace and democracy, then is that hope near to despair.

It is wishful thinking to turn for assurance from the President to Mr. Willkie. The latter has declared his agreement with the President an all possible aid to Britain short of war, and his endorsement made possible the enactment of peace-time military conscription of men, no matter how much he may deplore the last-minute attempt to provide also under certain conditions for the conscription of property. Never yet has Mr. Willkie said anything to show better insight into our foreign problems than the President's. His acceptance speech was a painful effort to keep Senator Taft and Walter Lippman in the same party. In the Republican party and its victory I see no ground for confidence.

I have seen in Hanson W. Baldwin's in the August Harpers. He believes that a properly equipped regular army of 400,000 without conscripts could protect our shores and such other parts of the hemisphere as may be necessary for our safety.

Any real defense of this continent, much more of this hemisphere, requires economic and cultural cooperation. The United States cannot police South American countries more remote from us than Europe, nor can it prevent the normal processes of trade by insisting that they must trade with us. We do not want to buy, in dealing with sensitive neighbors and the more distant South American countries, we must realize that too great a display of force will invite fear of us as "the Colossus of the North," not friendship for a good neighbor. It will invite Latin American intrigue with European dictators, not true cooperation with our nation.

3. I should watch for any possible opportunity to mediate for peace. That does not mean dictation of its terms. Still less does it mean "appeasement" in the sense that American and American businessmen should become partners with Hitler in the fruits of exploitation. It does mean recognition of realities. The mind shudders to contemplate the costs of the indefinite continuance of the war now raging. No one can exaggerate the destructive power of daily air raids and the competition in wholesale starvation, on the one side of Great Britain, and on the other of the European continent.

I do not speak of certainties. I speak of possibilities which an America not lost in panic or caught up in its own imperialism or nascent fascism might embrace.

But I end on a note of certainty. The greatest service the land of the Pilgrim Fathers, of Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln can render her own sons and the world is to become the land of a successful democracy, of peace, freedom and fraternity. Of that kind of a land our fathers dreamed. That dream we can fulfill if we will harness our machinery to production for life, not death—to peace, not war.

\* With this we must disagree. In our opinion, it is ill-advised and dangerous under existing conditions to urge American mediation in the war. In the first place, any serious effort at mediation on the part of the United States government would throw this country more fully into the entanglements of European power-politics than it has been since 1919. It would make it practically mandatory upon the United States to underwrite any "peace" settlement that might emerge from such mediation, and this would, of course, open the way for immediate involvement in any European war crisis of the future. In the second place, attempts at mediation by the United States at this particular moment are probably just what the Nazis in Germany and the "appeasers" in Britain would like, especially if Hitler fails to crush Britain in the coming months and is faced with the unwelcome prospects of a long-drawn-out war of attrition.

2. We would make it plain to the whole world that we will defend our homes, that we will gladly cooperate in all that makes for lasting and honorable peace, but that, as far as possible, we will insulate ourselves from the wars of other nations.

The best military plan of defense

that facts, even in the not always palest formal of quotations, are more conducive to sound evaluation than the sweetest sentimentalism or the highest revolutionary-sounding phrase.

7. Another new factor that we had not reckoned with when the war broke out is the policy and the ability of victorious Nazi imperialism to impose its fascist state form (thru puppet regimes) on even its strongest opponent in defeat. Today, not only Luxembourg and Norway but also what was once mighty France have had imposed on them fascist regimes. Several democratic countries have been defeated by the Nazi imperialist buccaners, but in not a single one of them have we had a revolution. In all of them, counter-revolution is triumphant—that is, a fascist and not a working-class regime has taken power. As a result of these Nazi triumphs, labor organizations totalling more than 15 million members on the continent of Europe have been utterly destroyed. Defeat of the capitalist regimes in the democratic countries did not open the doors to social revolution. It slammed such doors in our face and opened the gates for the most savage reaction—fascist counter-revolution. On the other hand, defeat of the Nazi regime, while not in itself necessarily insuring the triumph of socialism in Germany, would certainly tend to have the opposite effect. It would provide the first prerequisite (the smashing of Nazi power) for the outbreak of revolutionary struggles not only in Germany but throughout Europe. Obviously, the blackest reactionaries in France were not so shortsighted when they dreaded serious effort to defeat the Nazis.

Let those who say that it makes no difference who wins this war, and those who waste so much heat and spend so much energy hurling papal warnings against our exaggerating the differences between the consequences of a Nazi victory (British defeat) and those of a British victory (Nazi defeat) ponder the above.

8. As a result of the crushing Nazi triumph to date, the world is confronted with a situation in which it has to retrace many steps. If Nazi imperialism stays victorious, then we will be facing a situation in which many nations—once big as well as small—will be fighting for the restoration of their national freedom and entity. Vanquished France and conquered England will be in the same position as humbled Holland, overrun Norway and devoured Denmark—all striving to restore their national independence.

9. Within the last few months, U. S. imperialism has begun a terrific expansion of its military power in order to play a new and evermore vital role in the arena of world politics. The more quickly England [with its mighty labor movement playing the pivotal role in the war effort] is able to hurl back Hitler's air and land legions, the less likelihood is there of Wall Street getting a voice and even veto in the peace settlement, in the affairs of Europe steeped in social revolution after the Nazi military machine is wrecked.

10. Last, but very far from least, among the new phenomena developed in the last year is the present pitiful status of the free and independent labor movement. As a result of Hitler's onrush, the specific gravity of the international labor movement has moved westward. Should the Nazis overwhelm England, it would mean the end of the entire British labor movement—just as it has meant the doom of labor on the European continent. Then the western hemisphere would have the only significant bona-fide and free labor movement.

It is imperative that we keep the above new factors and forces in mind, that we ponder their potentialities before we seek to answer: What are the issues in our discussion of the international situation, of war, of fascism, of socialism? What is the duty of American labor to itself, to its country, to the world labor movement?

—Editor.