

In the Next Issue:
WHAT ARE THE REAL ISSUES?
By WILL HERBERG

Workers Age

Official Publication of the Independent Labor League of America

LABOR'S ROLE IN DEFENSE . . . by Matthew Woll . . . page 2.

REMARKS ON NATURE OF FASCISM . . . by Donald Graham . . . page 3.

Vol. 9, No. 39.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1940.

5 CENTS

After the Elections: Some Lessons and Tasks . . .

WHATEVER else may be said about the results of the elections, this much at least is certain—President Roosevelt owes his victory very largely to the support of labor and allied groups throughout the country. In the pivotal state of New York, the American Labor Party's 350,000 votes more than covered the President's greatly reduced lead. In the key industrial states of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Massachusetts, Illinois and New Jersey, his majorities, some of them very narrow, obviously came from the organized labor vote and were obtained largely thru the efforts of organized labor. Labor's crucial, decisive role in this election is a fact and, whatever opinion one may have of the wisdom of the course it followed, the fact itself must be recognized. From this fact, certain conclusions follow.

In his pre-election appeal for Wilkie, John L. Lewis solemnly pledged that should Mr. Roosevelt be reelected, he would resign as president of the C.I.O. Well, Mr. Roosevelt has been reelected, and it is now up to Mr. Lewis to resign. It is the best service he could render the labor movement at this time. Already, however, there are moves under way, inspired by Mr. Lewis's henchmen and the Stalinists, to "persuade" him to continue as head of the C.I.O., to "draft" him for another term in office, or something of the sort. There are also indications that Mr. Lewis is calculating on putting over a formal resignation that will leave him in effectual control of the C.I.O. All these schemes must be blocked. If labor is to achieve unity in the critical period ahead, the influence of Lewis and his Stalinist allies must be broken once and for all. Lewis must go!

Organized labor gave its enthusiastic support to President Roosevelt because it was afraid of what would happen to the great labor and social reforms of the last seven years under a utilities executive, fronting for big-business reaction, as President. Labor supported Roosevelt because, rightly or wrongly, it put full trust in his pledge to protect and advance the interests of the masses of the people, to keep the country out of foreign war, to preserve the gains of labor and the social legislation of the New Deal in the national-defense effort. Now it is for labor to see that the Administration redeems these pledges. It will not be easy. Sober realism, vigilance and a greater measure of independence are the chief needs of the hour for labor.

From a long-range standpoint, perhaps the most important lesson of the election is this—that if ever a labor party is to emerge in the near future, it will have to come from the ranks of the workers who stood in the fore of the campaign to reelect President Roosevelt, for, aside from a handful of socialists and radicals, they are undoubtedly the most advanced, the most conscious section of the American working class. All plans and programs looking towards a labor party must take this fundamental fact into consideration. To ignore, overlook or refuse to build on it would be sheerest self-isolation.

Stalin Tightens Ties With Fascist Axis

From A London Air Shelter

(We present below a very interesting letter from a London correspondent. —Editor.)

London, September 18, 1940.

My dear Lovestones:
YOUR letter received, but in the rush of things there has been little time to do much beyond going to work and then returning home and snatching a sound sleep between air-raid warnings. You will have heard of the delayed-action bomb outside of St. Paul's Cathedral. We were three days away from the flat, but we moved into the flat of a friend who had a very good library and so we made up for lost time. Now we take the air-raid warnings as a matter of course. They seem to work to a schedule and so we know that at or around 8:30 P. M. we must prepare for the evening and the night ahead of us.

COOPERATION UNDER FIRE

We take a camp bed into the air-raid shelter from where I am writing this letter. We are all tenants of the flat building and we cooperate, and so we have our tea and biscuits when the moment demands it, which is very often. A small contribution of sixpence a week assures us of adequate supplies of tea and we have a surplus which we hand out to the luckless night traveler caught out in a raid.

There are interesting conversations held thru the night. There is much discussion of the trend of present-day events. The middle class seem to show more trust in the ultimate outcome of things than many others. To the middle-class person the hope is in the Labor Party, but it is more of a protest against the inefficiency of the Conservative party than a recognition of the necessity for a profound social change. Among the workers who come into the shelter is the unskilled worker who has no particular vocation. He is profoundly grateful for the tea and shelter. He feels that the world is full of kind people and the war demonstrates how kind people can be. It is interesting to note the pained reaction of the middle-class man to the attitude of this type of worker. He feels the latter ought to be more self-assertive and cannot understand why a man should be thankful for only a bed in a well-ventilated shelter and a cup of tea. "You ought to see the place I live in" is an answer beyond the understanding of the middle-class person, who feels there is no place like your own home. The fetish of the middle class is the stark reality of the working class and the division is not so easily spanned.

LONG WAR FORESEEN

This war is not going to be a short one. The issues, even within the orbit of present-day relations, are too vital and far-reaching in their potentialities to permit of a compromise. The attempt to sustain the system by a reversion to the past will fail and any military endeavor on its behalf would also fail. But life is not so logical as that and so we may expect surprises. But with the full weight of America behind us, we cannot lose.

ALL SUPPORT WAR EFFORT

We occasionally have civil servants. They have a much clearer conception of the situation. They understand the war. I HAVE MET NO ONE WHO IS OPPOSED TO THE WAR AS A WAR. The deter-

mination to carry the war thru is around 99.9%. There is no social program that sums up the attitude of mind of the various social groups. I believe it will develop, for there is resentment—even in the Church of England—against the suggestion of ultra-Tory organs that social programs should not be discussed during the war. I feel that the Labor Party will emerge the strongest party in the country. There is no other alternate party to the Tory party. If I were to tell you of the people in high places who are now very pro-Labor, you would be surprised.

LONG WAR FORESEEN

This war is not going to be a short one. The issues, even within the orbit of present-day relations, are too vital and far-reaching in their potentialities to permit of a compromise. The attempt to sustain the system by a reversion to the past will fail and any military endeavor on its behalf would also fail. But life is not so logical as that and so we may expect surprises. But with the full weight of America behind us, we cannot lose.

The Soviet Union will be in this war before very long. There is no neutrality in this war, just as in the normal development of the economic conflict there is no neutrality. The logic—the savage logic, if I may say so—will compel the U.S.S.R. to enter a war it sought to exploit and now cannot much longer avoid. As to whether that will be good for

them I do not care to say because the question seems superfluous. You do not ask a man caught in a storm if getting soaked is good for him.

OLD PHRASES NGW USELESS

So all around us there is this conflict raging in increasing tenacity. What can we do about it? Can we avoid it? Or must we become a part of it and realize that thru the strength of our forces we may direct it into those channels thru which we may eventually find that desired haven in which war is not alone illogical but impossible. I know that one can raise himself up and with hands clasped pray to the god of Karl Marx and his successors and, in the mummbling of political precepts, remain pure at heart with not a grain of dust of the changing world to stain our garments. I would like to believe that this is in some way possible, but sitting in an air-raid shelter, I cannot give myself the luxury of even thinking of it in terms of reality, much less believing it is so.

There is not much else to tell you at the moment, except to tell you that I am in the best of health, getting lots of sleep, irregular but adequate quantities of sleep. There are children in our air-raid shelter who would welcome comics from the New York papers. I would welcome as many as you can raise among your friends.

My regards to all and all of the best to you.
As ever,
J. C.

Molotov Visit Points to Far-Flung Deal

British Destroy Large Part Of Italian Fleet in Daring Raid; Greeks Press Gains

The fascist Axis consolidated its position somewhat on the diplomatic front last week but suffered heavy reverses on the fighting front in Greece and the Mediterranean. Thru a daring British air raid on the Italian fleet at Taranto, Italy's naval power was virtually crippled at one blow.

The Russo-German alliance reached a new stage when Russian Premier-Foreign Minister Molotov, acting for Dictator Stalin, visited Berlin for a series of far-reaching "discussions" with Dictator Hitler and the Berlin Foreign Office. Official communiques were brief and formal, indicating merely, in the words of the Red Star, Russian army paper, a "strengthening and development of Soviet-German relations in the interests of both countries." Informed observers, studying the situation, were of the opinion that the talks at Berlin ranged over two continents and touched on questions of immediate decisive importance:

1. The Berlin-Moscow Axis, recently somewhat strained by Hitler's push in the Balkans, was reconsolidated by at least a temporary settlement of outstanding issues. Recent efforts of Britain and the United States to "appease" Stalin were thus proved to be quite futile.

2. Russia's place in the Nazi "New Order in Europe" was discussed, especially as relating to the Balkans and the Near East. In all probability, Moscow's claims were met by an arrangement whereby Russia would establish some form of "protectorate" over Turkey with full control of the Dardanelles.

3. In the Far East, Germany undertook to serve as middleman in bringing about a rapprochement between Russia and Japan by the terms of which China and adjacent regions would be parceled out into spheres of influence for Moscow and Tokyo. Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist government at Chungking would be abandoned by Russia—the relations between the two are already quite sharp—and a new puppet regime set up to consummate the deal.

Of great significance in this respect was the reaction of the Japanese press to Molotov's visit to Berlin. Whereas hitherto a Russo-German rapprochement had been viewed with terror by Japanese publicists, this time the Hitler-Molotov talks were actually hailed in all Tokyo papers as foreshadowing an expansion and strengthening of the fascist Axis. Negotiations for a far-reaching agreement with Russia were reported as under way both in Moscow and Tokyo.

Virtually all the active operations of the war, aside from the continued bombing of England by the German Luftwaffe and of Germany by the R.A.F., were limited to the Mediterranean and Near Eastern theater of war last week. Here the British scored a terrific victory as a result of a spectacular air raid on the Italian fleet anchored at the base harbor of Taranto. According to an official report to the House of Commons, the British Fleet Air Arm put half of Mussolini's battleships out of action. Bombers reports, confirmed by reconnaissance plane photographs, indicated that three Italian battleships were crippled, two cruisers listed heavily in pools of oil and two fleet auxiliaries were partly submerged. The British also

EDUCATION—FOR WHAT?

By WILL HERBERG

I HAVE before me a press bulletin of the American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, a research and policy organization with headquarters in Washington, D. C. It is an article by Frances V. Rummel, a high-school teacher of French, introducing the findings and conclusions contained in Dr. Howard M. Bell's study, "Matching Youth and Jobs," just published by the Council. I don't know what impression Miss Rummel's article and Dr. Bell's book will make on others; as for myself, I must say that I certainly was shocked and depressed. But let the reader judge for himself. I wish I could quote Miss Rummel's article entire, but I must restrict myself to some characteristic passages:

OF WHAT GOOD IS OUR EDUCATION?

"Every teacher at one time or another asks himself a searching question that goes something like this: 'What am I doing to prepare Evelyn and Tom for the turbulent world that lies beyond the classroom windows?' . . . Before I left teaching last year, I asked myself the question many times and always with growing concern. Most of the thirty-five pupils in front of me were potential truck-drivers, cooks, laundry workers, subway guards, department-store wrappers, butchers. And what were they learning in my room? Esoteric refinements of French syntax, not to mention pseudo-native accent, neither of which they would remember a day after high-school graduation, when eight out of ten of them would go immediately into the job market. . . . It is not fair to suggest that language is the only subject whose waste may be great. I'll let other teachers of other subjects speak for themselves. But I believe, so far as my subject is concerned, that the American Youth Commission is right in . . . suggesting that the public high school has not got over its high-toned beginnings when the elite smoothed its benches preparing for medicine, law and the ministry. . . . 'Far too many of our young pupils have no taste for manual labor. Time and time again, in talking with pupils, I have observed that regardless of circumstances or aptitude, Evelyn and Tom have their heads full of professional dreams and trust in fairy-tale endings. But why shouldn't they? . . . Hasn't the average high school encouraged this visionary attitude, by negative if not by positive implications? . . . There is no intention here to suggest that the high school should try to stop a boy's day-dreaming entirely. . . . Any wholesale throttling of ambition would be an unthinkable violation of our democratic ways. At the same time, teachers may gently pull air castles and day-dreams into a focus that has some elements of reality. . . ."

"Howard M. Bell's comments on the situation appear in 'Matching Youth and Jobs,' prepared for the American Youth Commission, and published by the American Council on Education. The book defines problems in education that have been hankering for definition, and it presents forthright, logical answers to critical questions imposed on an industrial society by a school system which—for all our prattling about keeping up with the times—is still generally classical. . . .

"High-school teachers may learn from 'Matching Youth and Jobs' some of the conditions of our industrial society which make it practically for them to warn Evelyn and Tom in time of the following facts: 'In the opinion of employers and analysts, almost half the jobs in American business and industry demand nothing in the way of 'education' beyond ability to speak, read and write. Two-thirds of all jobs can be filled by persons who have had only eighth-grade education or less. The remaining third require some formal education beyond elementary school. . . .

"In spite of the great American penchant for talking about 'rugged individualism' and 'man-made opportunity,' the era when these phrases rang with meaning is drawing its last breath. Tom's grandfather may have been a craftsman proud of his art in fashioning and making shoes; but if Tom follows his trade, he will be responsible for a single monotonous operation in an assembly line—punching eyelets for laces or trimming the tongue. Tom's morale is likely to be far more sound, after he begins pounding the pavement job-hunting, if he has been told about the assembly line. Better still, he'll know how and where to look for a job making shoes. . . .

USEFUL FOR WHAT . . . ?

Now I don't for a moment doubt that French is being taught in high school in some such way as Miss Rummel describes: "Esoteric refinements of syntax, not to mention pseudo-native accent. . . ." Nor do I doubt that many other subjects are being taught the same way, in the same futile and wasteful manner. But that is not the question; the real issue goes much deeper. Granted that high-school education, like all education, should be useful, the question remains—useful for what? Useful in making a living? But Miss Rummel points out that "two-thirds of all jobs can be filled by persons who have had only eighth-grade education or less." If education is to serve the purpose merely of training boys and girls to make a living, then apparently all education beyond elementary school is wasted on two-thirds of them. From Miss Rummel's article and from Dr. Bell's study, it would seem

Conscientious Objectors Given Year in Prison

Eight Theological Students Are First Victims of Preparedness Legislation

New York City.

The first prison sentences to be meted out under the new war-preparedness legislation were handed down last week when eight divinity students were given terms of a year and a day by Federal Judge Mandelbaum for violating the Selective Service Act. They were the Union Theological Seminary students who had refused to register for the draft on conscientious grounds and had been indicted by a federal grand jury not long after. Since they had pleaded guilty, there was no jury trial.

Their refusal to register had nothing to do with considerations of their own personal fate for, as divinity students, these young men would have been exempted under the draft law anyway. Their action was motivated by a conscientious conviction against taking part in any procedure or arrangement serving a military purpose.

Against the instructions of his clients, Kenneth Walsler, their lawyer, pleaded for leniency and asked that a suspended sentence be given. The court, however, sentenced them to prison terms. Ernest Angell, chairman of the National Committee on Conscientious Objectors, said that the sentence was "much more severe than that which would have been meted out to a non-registrant in England even in war-time."

that high-school education has another purpose, a rather sad one—in Miss Rummel's own words, "gently to pull the air castles and day-dreams [of the students] into a focus that has some elements of reality." The day of open frontiers, of boundless aspiration and achievement, of "man-made opportunity" is gone, our very practical educators tell us; the great bulk of our youth are doomed to be tied down for life to performing "a single monotonous operation in an assembly line" or to some trade equally monotonous and humdrum. Let's recognize the fact and frankly adapt our educational program to it. At least then our youth won't be filled with impossible ambitions leading to inevitable heart-sickening disillusionment. In other words, words rather crude perhaps but not unfair to the Bell-Rummel thesis, education should teach the boys and girls of the lower-income groups to know their station in society and to rest content in it.

We are familiar with the warnings that certain rather dubious "friends" of the Negro have been accustomed to voice against giving the Negro youth a liberal education. "After you've gone and educated them," they say, "what then? With things as they are, where will these young

AFL, CIO Opens Conventions; Labor Faces Big Problems

War Economy Issues Throw Shadow Over Both Gatherings; Fight Against Lewis Regime and Stalinists Seen at CIO Meet

Atlantic City, N. J.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations has just opened its most momentous gathering in the five years of its existence. The events of the past few months and the off-the-record talk of the leaders and delegations here make it clear that anything may happen at this annual convention of the industrial union federation—but probably will not.

The C.I.O. is split wide open. Of course, there has been a wide rift in the leadership for quite a while over a lot of questions, but not until the New York State C.I.O. convention in October and Lewis's pre-election swing to Wilkie did the rift become public and official. Now it seems that things are moving towards a showdown.

Naturally, everybody here is asking what Lewis will do. In view of Roosevelt's reelection, he is obliged to make a gesture at redeeming his pledge and offering his resignation. What will happen then? The Stalinist affiliates and officials in the C.I.O. have already launched a move to "draft" him, that is, to refuse to accept his resignation, on the ground C.I.O. But from all indications, Lewis's strategy will be something different. He will insist on resigning, it is said. If he does, Philip Murray seems slated for the job, and everybody is agreed that, despite their differences on the elections, Lewis and Murray will continue to work together as part of the closely-knit "official family" of the United Mine Workers. So it seems that for all the terrific blow that his political escape has dealt to his prestige, Lewis will continue to hold the strings of the C.I.O. in his hands. You can't write him off as easily as some people seem to think.

What will the other faction, grouped around the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, do? Sidney Hillman, as a Defense Commissioner, may not even be present at the convention. His lieutenants have come here with a program demanding democracy in the C.I.O., unity with the A. F. of L., and a curb on Stalinism. This is a program of war to the bitter end as far as Lewis is concerned, and the Amalgamated people are not likely to get anywhere with it as long as Lewis continues to have anything to say about it. And he still continues to have a lot to say. Thru his U.M.W. people and Stalinist stooges he has a tight grip on this convention. Will the Amalgamated and its associates bolt the C.I.O.? This is far from certain. The general impression seems to be that when all the shouting is over, they will remain within the C.I.O., at least for the time being. This is by no

Washington, D. C.

The annual convention of the American Federation of Labor that opened its sessions at New Orleans on November 18 faces a series of situations and problems calling for some first-rate thinking and planning. It is the purpose of this article to mention a number of the vital issues that confront the Federation gathering and indicate some of the policies that may emerge from the convention.

It is no secret that there is mounting bitterness in the A. F. of L. about the unsatisfactory relations between the Federation and the government on national defense. In the last war, the A. F. of L. was the very center of labor policy. Today, because of the divided state of the labor movement and for other reasons of a political nature, the A. F. of L. as such is rather in the shade, although a number of high A. F. of L. officials do occupy key positions. In some quarters, there is a tendency to blame President Green and to make unfavorable comparisons between him and President Gompers in World War days. However that may be, everybody in the A. F. of L. resents a situation where organized labor has to "live by the grace of Sidney Hillman." Perhaps this whole issue will not even be discussed officially at the convention, but it is safe to say that it will be a controlling problem that will occupy a great deal of the thought and deliberations of the top officials.

As far as resolutions are concerned, those dealing with national defense will probably run along the following lines, demanding:

1. Adequate representation of labor in formulating and administering national-defense measures.
2. No "dilution" or lowering of existing standards except by conference and agreement with the unions concerned.
3. National standards mutually acceptable to labor and employers for training in defense production.
4. No reduction or undermining of wage-hour or other social-legislation standards.
5. Payment of dismissal wages under defense contracts and in the readjustment period after the emergency is over.

The larger questions of foreign policy in which these problems are embedded are not likely to receive extensive or important discussion at the convention. The traditional A. F. of L. position will almost cer-

tainly be reaffirmed: aid to Britain "short of war," no involvement in war, "adequate" national defense. Conscriptio, as the law of the land, is already a dead issue for most A. F. of L. leaders, although there probably will be some consideration of the many difficult problems arising out of the impact of the draft on labor organization. The selective and deferment features of the law may be made to work out in very different ways as far as labor is concerned.

MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION
Without question, a record membership will be reported to the convention, for the membership of the A. F. of L. is now higher than it has ever been in history, well above four million. The Federation leaders believe that membership will increase even more rapidly in coming months because of the national-defense effort. They believe this increase will be largely automatic, as it was during the World War—thru new workers taken on in unionized industries as well as thru new unions formed under the protection of federal laws. They are therefore not planning to initiate any big drives for membership during the "emergency" period. Strikes for organizing purposes will not be approved, nor will big money be appropriated for membership campaigns. This is the way practically all influential A. F. of L. leaders look at it.

There are some, however, who believe that such strategy is a big mistake. They do not believe that World War conditions will be du-

(Continued on Page 2)

Here's the Score:

THE table below presents the results of the last three Presidential elections in terms of the two major parties. The Democratic Presidential candidate in each case was Franklin D. Roosevelt; the Republican was Herbert Hoover in 1932, Alfred M. Landon in 1936, and Wendell L. Willkie in 1940.

	DEMOCRATIC PARTY		REPUBLICAN PARTY	
1940	Popular vote	26,913,000 (54.9%)	22,067,000 (45.1%)	
	States	38	10	
	Electoral vote	449	82	
1936	Popular vote	27,476,000 (62.2%)	16,679,000 (37.8%)	
	States	46	2	
	Electoral vote	523	8	
1932	Popular vote	22,821,000 (59.1%)	15,761,000 (40.9%)	
	States	42	6	
	Electoral vote	472	59	

elements of reality. . . .

(Continued on Page 3)

Labor's Role and Tasks in Defense

By MATTHEW WOLL

(The following paragraphs are from an address on "Labor's Part in National Defense" recently delivered by Matthew Woll, vice-president of the A. F. of L., at the Rand School in New York City.—Editor.)

WHAT then are our duties and responsibilities as citizens of a free nation? Most assuredly, it is that in a world which has been rocked to its foundation by a totalitarian revolution it would be utterly folly not to prepare to make America impregnable against any attack from whatever quarter or on whatever pretext. There must be national defense adequate to the protection of our continental and hemispheric zone of interests—a defense founded on contemporary technology of war.

The challenge to us is to save America from the fate overshadowing the very few remaining democracies abroad. The challenge to us is to realize the necessity to prepare for whatever betides our people.

It is quite true that in dealing with the defense of our country as well as of the western hemisphere, we have to deal with three unknown factors: the outcome of the conflict abroad, the timetable of the totalitarian governments, and the trend of public opinion. We are confident of this country's ability to prevent either an internal or external totalitarian penetration and we are fairly optimistic no such penetration can take place in South and Central America. Nevertheless, we view with apprehension the attitude and actions of one or more of the governments in South America.

It is likewise true that in undertaking the defense of our neighbors in South and Central America, we may here and there give encouragement and support to republics that are merely democratic in name and dictatorial in fact. Nevertheless, if we maintain our democratic processes in our dealings and relations with the nations to the South of us, we can be of tremendous service in furthering a democratic spirit in such countries dominated by petty tyrants, and workers of invaluable help to the probers of all South and Central America.

WARNERS AGAINST WAR PSYCHOLOGY Above all else, we should and ever must be mindful that as a nation, we are not at war. We are still at peace with all nations of the world. Our preparations for defense should have for their first and principal objective the prevention of war. Whatever may be the personal feelings of each and every one of us—and while free to manifest these feelings—as a government we must be careful not to substitute a diplomacy of abuse for a diplomacy of firm correctness. Yes, let the world understand our might, but let them as well realize our sense of right and love of peace.

It is important, moreover, that we do not let a preparedness policy and psychology lead us into the adoption of measures only justified in a state of war. We must be careful that in our effort to protect our liberties and freedom against foreign attack, we do not leave them defenseless against attack from within.

We are not unmindful that a constantly increasing pressure for military preparedness may and does threaten some of the fundamentals of our structure as a democracy.

The full use of our material resources, the construction of naval vessels, airplanes, tanks, guns and war material, is but a part of national preparedness. Full realization of any goal set for the production of material to be used in the creation of adequate national defense necessarily involves the creation of an army large and strong and efficient enough to man our defenses and to resist successfully any attempt by any enemy, however large or powerful it might be, to set foot on our homeland. We would have preferred that the government had attempted to mobilize an adequate man-power for national defense by the voluntary enlistment plan rather than by the compulsory method of conscription. We should have preferred the Swiss system of citizen soldiery—a proven democratic, efficient and inexpensive system. The draft system recently adopted and put into operation is not a system to maintain a citizen soldiery. It is a system to transform a citizen soldiery into a standing army and possibly into an expeditionary force.

DANGERS OF CONSCRIPTION

The system adopted proposes to take a million men away from their jobs for at least a year, during which time they will be trained as professional soldiers. At the end of a year, the nation must either continue to maintain that standing army or return most of these men, skilled in militarism, to their respective communities either to find jobs or replace others in jobs. In any event, they may become a menace to our industrial and political peace and safety. Thus, we have good reason to fear that a temporary entry into a system of militarism in time of peace will develop into a permanent system and thus be fraught with all the dangers inherent in such military systems.

Then, too, there is embraced the extreme danger that this compulsory system of military training may be used for other purposes of

Peace and Democracy Are Not Built on Want....

PEACE and democracy are not built on want and hunger. Recent United States reports reveal that net profits of the 400 leading American corporations were 58.6% higher in the first six months of 1940 than in the same period of 1939. Payrolls rose only 13% according to U. S. Department of Labor figures.

The effect on the working population of this disparity between profits and wages can be seen more clearly when it is noted that 45,000,000 people are "living below the safety line right now," according to Miss Harriet Elliott, consumer commissioner on the National Defense Advisory Commission.

The September Economic Outlook, C.I.O. publication, analyzing a study made by the Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics at the University of California, reports that an average family of five should have an income of \$2,184 a year to live at an acceptable level. Yet "one-third of the families in the U.S.A. averaged \$471 a year," the Outlook finds. "The next one-third averaged \$1,078 while the upper third averaged only about \$3,000 a year. Actually 86% of our entire population has an average income of less than the minimum budget for a wage-earner's family as estimated by the Heller Committee."

Industrial conscription and control over workers as well as their standards and conditions of employment. During our participation in the World War, control was exercised over labor as well as over industry. Working conditions were standardized as well, and employers urged not to advertise for labor but to turn instead to the national government for help. Altho workers were not actually forced to remain on their jobs, indirect controls served to allocate labor to activities deemed essential.

The danger is that labor may lose much of its peace-time freedom under the emergencies of our defense program. Indeed, we have already been cautioned against strikes against the government. This may soon be followed by a warning against strikes in plants engaged in defense production and transportation even though the private ownership and control. It must be evident that if the government will dominate and control business of every essential type and character and of materials and services that enter therein, then a strike of any kind will be against the government and will be dealt with accordingly.

Then, too, legislative standards relating to minimum wages, hours of work, industrial relations as embraced in the National Labor Relations Act, child labor and other legislative standards for safety and security, are being jeopardized and treated with slight consideration in the interests of the "emergency"

and of a possible war. Standards of work and working conditions secured thru collective action are being likewise jeopardized.

In pledging support to our government in defense, we insist, however, upon the assurance that social, industrial and economic standards thus far attained, whether in public or in private employment, will be maintained. In return, we assume in a full measure the task and responsibility for service of the highest order in industry.

STANDARDS MUST BE MAINTAINED

Here in America we have built up a high standard of living under our democratic institutions. Workers and their families have come to enjoy these higher standards of living. It means to them the whole of their economic and social life. Democracy has thus become endeared to them. They must be assured that in the defense of our democratic institutions, they are not to suffer a loss or a lowering in their standards of work and living.

The American standard of living is the product of high wages to producers and low prices to consumers. The road to national safety lies in maintaining and constantly increasing real wages. The way to accomplish that is by ever improving our methods and processes of production and of distribution. The only way that industry can expand is by ever raising the standards of living and

not by lowering wages or by increasing the hours of service.

Then, too, in any program for national defense we must embrace consideration for those already unemployed or perhaps to become unemployed by a shifting of economic endeavors made essential by military requirements. This problem of unemployment is one of the most difficult of all economic problems presented for solution. We are confident that all demands for skilled and semi-skilled workers can be met in a reasonable way, if properly registered and mobilized. We believe, therefore, no change should be made in our employment situation until those who are idle are accorded an opportunity to work and earn a living under prevailing standards of employment and compensation.

We believe our first duty is to absorb the unemployed; then, if necessary, and only then, to work beyond scheduled hours of work and at overtime rates.

PERIL OF GROWING BUREOCRACY

With the growth of industrial and governmental forces and controls, we must continue to add unceasing protection from abuse and exploitation. We must be liberal in reward to those who add service, material or spiritual wealth, to our land. It is vital that opportunity in life shall be preserved; that the frontier of initiative and of enterprise shall not be closed; that the future shall not be burdened by unbearable debt; that our lives and opportunities shall not be unduly circumscribed and limited; that our individual liberties and responsible constitutional government, as opposed to un-American regimentation and bureaucratic domination, be avoided at all times. What good will we have accomplished if, in our planning for national defense, we have failed to safeguard the very principles that underlie our freedom as citizens of our great American democracy?

Finally, our task in America is not alone that of arms and munitions, of planes and tanks, of dreadnaughts and destroyers, of international trends and commerce. These are important; but they are not wholly sufficient unto themselves. There is the task of strengthening the inner spirit of America, of deepening the sources of our faith, of seeing anew the path along which our destiny lies.

We have taken for granted democracy and freedom in America. We have failed to appreciate fully the counsel of the revolutionary fathers that: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Liberty is not a heritage but a fresh conquest for each generation. And that conquest we must make right speedily. We must make it by strengthening and invigorating our democracy by banishing racial and religious intolerances. We must see to it that the basic freedoms to speak, to print, to assemble and to worship are not abridged either by those who are sworn to uphold them or by those who would use them to cloak malicious acts.

NEW DYNAMIC FOR DEMOCRACY

It is important to remember, much as we may condemn totalitarianism for its methods and objectives, that totalitarianism abroad is a result of conditions and causes in post-War Europe. So, too, let us be mindful that the menace to American democracy is not alone from without, but as well from within. We are immensely rich in national resources, not seriously dependent upon other countries for our own prosperity. Yet we have a great problem of unemployment. We cannot hope indefinitely to shift the burden of carrying nine to ten millions of unemployed, together with an increasing number of aged and disabled, upon the shoulders of an ever proportionately lessening number of employed without serious reckoning. We cannot look forward with complacency and unconcern to the two and one quarter million youngsters released each year from our schools, colleges and universities into community life without hope of doing something useful—something which potentially enlarges the possibility of human happiness, welfare or knowledge.

It is evident the movement of destruction is rampant throughout the world. The philosophy of despair has its fantastic adherents everywhere. And the lean body is easy prey to the teachings of progress. Those who see wisely into the future must, if we are to be saved from fires more consuming than those we have known, so shape our course as to offer this hideous wrath of destruction no foothold.

This is a time when all of us must take counsel together not of our fears but of our faith in those immutable principles of liberty and democracy which, after all, undergird our civilization. American labor is making its contribution to the economic, religious, social and cultural foundation and security of our democracy which can hardly be overestimated. Labor's contribution to American democracy has been impressive, far-reaching and continuous. It is a contribution which begins with the very beginning of America and will continue so long as America continues to exist. For the labor movement par-takes of democracy. Democracy is the life of the labor movement; it is as well one of its surest guarantors.

Youth Anti-War Committee Issues Call for Convention

(We publish below the call of the Youth Committee Against War for its Fourth National Youth Anti-War Congress to be held during the Christmas holidays at some midwestern college not yet determined. The T.C.A.W. is an affiliate of the Keep America Out of War Congress with offices at 22 East 17 Street, New York City. The call is signed by Fay Bennett, executive secretary.—Editor.)

New York City.

AMERICA has taken long strides down the road to war. In our headlong plunge, we have reached many of the outposts of domestic dictatorship. We have not increased nor made any plans to improve the level of living of our people.

Openly and avowedly, our vast productive resources are being turned toward destructive purposes; our youth are being forced into military service; our educational institutions are being militarized; our economy is being bound up with that of a warring British Empire; our policy is increasingly that of a belligerent.

Instead of a war on poverty, hunger, disease, oppression, we are being brought to the brink of a war that will increase these dread enemies of mankind's progress.

Instead of providing succor to the suffering peoples of warring and conquered nations, our entry into war would increase the area of suffering.

While every sacrifice is demanded of workers, farmers, consumers and young people, manufacturers do not accept war production orders until their profits are assured.

If America goes to war, it will not be fighting to preserve democracy or to extend it. It is not even now building the kind of society in which democracy can flourish and defend itself. Instead, it is taking steps which will strangle civil liberties, stifle the right to organize and strike, lower the standard of living, increase the profit and defend the markets of a small minority, and preserve economic and political empires that impoverish and oppress millions of people.

To meet and help turn the tidal wave of war and dictatorship, to ally ourselves with the forces that really can build and defend democracy, the Youth Committee Against War calls upon all young people who are opposed to America's participation in the war and who are against totalitarianism all over the world to meet together during this Christmas season of 1940. No greater responsibility or higher duty can call us together. We dare spare no efforts to attend and to make this congress an unmistakable demonstration of our determination to extend our liberties, to repeal conscription, to improve our living, and to keep America out of war.

AFL, CIO Opens Conventions; Labor Faces Big Problems

War Economy Issues Throw Shadow Over Both Gatherings; Fight Against Lewis Regime and Stalinists Seen at CIO Meet

(Continued from page 1)

Even when these powers are claimed to be necessary to fight racketeering, as the Teamsters convention some months ago showed.

On the other hand, the state of public opinion, fear of government regulation and the dramatization of the issue at the I.L.G.W.U. convention last May on the occasion of that union's reaffiliating with the Federation, make it mandatory that something be done. Strongly worded resolutions will be adopted, with the first blast probably coming in the Metal Trades Department convention just before the convention proper.

The menace of the anti-trust campaign against labor organizations will figure large in the deliberations. To a certain extent, Arnold's attacks have been sidetracked recently, altho many indictments are still pending. However, this may be a mere temporary lull. The convention will almost certainly demand clarification of the application of the Sherman and Clayton Acts so that trade unions will be held free from prosecution under these laws.

Whether legislative action will be asked for to accomplish this is not clear.

The problem of jurisdictional disputes, a perennial headache in the A. F. of L., will hardly be forgotten, particularly in view of Thurman Arnold's attacks. Here, too, the attitude will most likely be "something must be done about it—but what?" The likelihood is for a tightening up of existing procedures of resolving disputes. Any further action will probably depend on what

takes place at the convention of the Building Trades Department, preceding the A. F. of L. gathering.

Bigger than any of these issues loom the big "political" problems of the A. F. of L.—the inner power line-up and relations with the C.I.O. Here, of course, everything flows from the elections. Roosevelt's reelection, following Lewis's sensational break with him, gives the A. F. of L. inside track with the Administration, and within the A. F. of L. leadership, it means a certain realignment to the advantage of the original pro-Roosevelt elements. Despite divisions in the Executive Council the A. F. of L., unlike the C.I.O., was not split with any bitterness by the campaign, so the healing should not be difficult. Nevertheless, some sort of realignment in power is indicated.

William Green is not excessively popular in certain quarters of the Federation leadership, and some anti-Green talk is being heard. But he undoubtedly will be reelected, as will also George Meany as secretary-treasurer.

Relations with the C.I.O. and the prospects for labor unity depend, of course, very largely on what happens at the C.I.O. convention at Atlantic City. With Roosevelt's reelection, Lewis is out of power and influence in Washington and the C.I.O. is split. The likelihood is for a quick resumption of the unity movement, with growing chances of substantial success. The official A. F. of L. attitude will very probably be reiterated by the convention: "The door is open. Come in!"

New York, November 12, 1940.

Dear Reader:
What are you doing this coming New Year's Eve? No, it's not too early to think about it.
How about joining us at our NEW YEAR'S EVE DANCE? You know, we do have a reputation for the swell times at our New Year's Eve dances. If you were with us at our last New Year's Eve dance, you'll admit that you couldn't have had a better time anywhere.

Therefore, you know that you'll have a grand time if you join us this coming New Year's Eve.
If you've not yet had the pleasure of spending that traditionally merry holiday with us, you're in for a real treat.
So how about it? We'd be pleased no end to have you with us.
The place? MANHATTAN CENTER, 34th Street and 8th Avenue.
The price? \$1.00 per person.
The music? ASTLEY STEPHENS and his HARLEM DANCE BAND will set your feet a-going and keep you dancing to your heart's delight.
The date (just to make sure, you know)? TUESDAY NIGHT, DECEMBER 31, 1940.
Please do let us hear from you soon. Use the convenient form below.

With fraternal greetings,
INDEPENDENT LABOR INSTITUTE

INDEPENDENT LABOR INSTITUTE
131 W. 33rd St., New York City

Please reserve _____ tickets for me and my party for New Year's Eve.

Name _____

Address _____

Stalin Welds Ties With Fascist Axis

Molotov Visit Points to Far-Reaching Deal; British Smash at Italian Fleet

(Continued from page 1)

reported that their warships had intercepted a convoy in the Strait of Otranto, within Italian waters, destroying the supply ships and damaging one of the two accompanying cruisers.

The British feat at Taranto was bound to change markedly the relation of forces in the Mediterranean, authoritative quarters pointed out. British control of the sea would be definitely established, and it might even be possible for London to transfer some of its ships to the Atlantic to hunt down German submarines and other raiders.

With full British assistance, the Greeks continued to drive the Italian invaders before them all along the line, reports from Athens said, and even the communiques issued at Rome admitted reverses. Perhaps it was this critical situation that formed the subject of discussion at the conference at Innsbruck last week between Marshal Pietro Badoglio of Italy and Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, chief of the German High Command. Altho Berlin was not very enthusiastic over Mussolini's adventure, it was recognized that an Italian defeat in Greece would have serious repercussions in virtually destroying Axis influence in the Near East and badly damaging its prestige everywhere. In some quarters, it was suggested that a counter-blow at Gibraltar was being plan-

ned; hence the sudden summoning of Spain's Foreign Minister Sener to Berlin.

The German air offensive against Britain scored an unusual success last week when 500 Nazi planes, raining incendiary and demolition bombs for over ten hours, devastated the important industrial city of Coventry. The extent of the damage was not disclosed.

Syllabus - Outline
of the course
now being given by
Will Herberg
★
I. REVALUATION OF MARXIST PHILOSOPHY
(in two parts)
EACH PART
10 CENTS
INDEPENDENT LABOR INSTITUTE
131 W. 33rd St., Room 707
New York City

REGISTER NOW!
for the new class

MARXISM: AN INVENTORY AND A BALANCE SHEET

with WILL HERBERG as instructor.

This course is a critical reexamination of traditional Marxist thought and doctrine in the light of recent events and discussions—and an attempt to determine realistically what is living and what is dead, what remains valid and what must be discarded, in Marxism. Among the fields touched upon are philosophy, history, economics, politics, social theory, ethics and the conception of socialism.

WEDNESDAY EVENINGS, 7:00 P. M. — 8:15 P. M.

7 sessions... \$1.50 for the course... 25 cents single admission.

Socialist Policy on the War

About 'Adequate Defense'

By BERTRAM D. WOLFE

IN the October 26, 1940 issue of the Workers Age Comrade Lovestone advances a "practical program for avoiding war... for meeting the critical world conditions."

SOCIALIST VIEW OF DEFENSE

Since the rise of imperialism, it has been accepted as a truism in revolutionary socialist circles that socialists could not support the "defense" budgets and "defense" projects of the great imperialist powers...

stances involve a complete abandonment of a position which we have held together for a quarter of a century and which the I.L.L.A. has held through its existence.

The first reality is that the United States at present has more than "adequate" armament for its defense, and is actually building, pell-mell and heter-skelter, an armament economy, a nation in arms, and forces which are so gigantic that they can have no real meaning except in terms of the policing of North and South America and the Far East...

Actually, the "defense" burden is staggering; it will militarize our civil life; it will convert our entire economy into an arms economy; it will swell our bureaucracy and the power of the state to monstrous proportions...

THE K.A.O.W.C. ON DEFENSE

There is only one sense in which a socialist organization that respects its socialism and the interests of the American masses, can use the words "adequate defense" today in the face of that overwhelming reality, namely as the Keep America Out of War Committee used it with the approval—I think on the motion—of Norman Thomas and myself: namely, as a negative slogan of something to move down towards, not a positive slogan of something to build up towards...

position's") war plans. Here is how we put it in our book ("Keep America Out of War"), written during the first month of the Second World War:

"In this field, there is much cowardice and loose thinking. It is high time Congress ceased the automatic approval of fantastic and excessive arms budgets just because the Administration calls them appropriations for 'defense of our shores'."

It may be argued that a great deal in the book which we wrote in 1939 is now out of date. That is true. But the passage just quoted above, with alterations that do not affect its essence, is fearfully more true today after the introduction of peace-time conscription and the 25 billion dollar budget than it was when written.

QUESTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Everybody is talking and wondering about national defense. Can one be for national defense and still be true to socialist principles? There has been a mistaken notion for years within socialist ranks that national defense and socialism are mutually exclusive.

"What shall be the practical attitude of the social-democracy in the present war? Shall it declare since this is an imperialist war, since we do not enjoy in our country any socialist self-determination, our country's existence or non-existence is of no consequence to us, and we will surrender to the enemy? Passive fatalism can never be the role of a revolutionary party like the social-democracy. It must neither place itself at the disposal of the existing class state, under the command of the ruling class, nor can it stand silently by to wait until the storm is past. It must adopt a policy of

What Is the Policy of The I.L.P. in the War?

Party Supports War Efforts but Not Regime

By J. CORK

THE position of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain has received a rather mixed reception in our organization. Everybody says lip-service to it. Some, I am afraid, do so out of actual lack of knowledge of the real position of the I.L.P. Others do so by giving a characteristic emphasis and weight to some part of the I.L.P.'s position different from what the latter itself would give.

The writer, on the contrary, thinks such a discussion is both necessary and valuable. The I.L.P., at present, is the only substantial independent revolutionary socialist organization functioning on a decisive sector which has some chance of impressing its views on subsequent developments. Such being the case, a knowledge of its attitudes and activities is highly pertinent for all of us.

ONLY SOCIALISM CAN DEFEAT FASCISM

Before the attempt at invasion of England, the I.L.P., indicating the imperialist roots of the war on both sides, and pointing to the suffering of the masses generally, said that the masses could trust the ruling class of neither side, that they had nothing to gain from the victory of either side as constituted, and called for the cessation of the war and for the peoples of both sides to rise jointly and force a socialist peace upon their respective ruling classes.

This over-simplified analysis is superficial. It merely leaves out the heart of the I.L.P. position, that's all. Does the I.L.P. support the military effort against the Nazis? Of course! Only an insane person, certainly not a realistic socialist, would adopt an abstentionist, do-nothing position, with the bombs bursting all around. The defeat of fascism is its first plank. But the struggle against imperialism and its representative, the government, is also central to the purpose of the I.L.P., for it regards fascism thru the support of a bourgeois capitalist government.

"What shall be the practical attitude of the social-democracy in the present war? Shall it declare since this is an imperialist war, since we do not enjoy in our country any socialist self-determination, our country's existence or non-existence is of no consequence to us, and we will surrender to the enemy? Passive fatalism can never be the role of a revolutionary party like the social-democracy. It must neither place itself at the disposal of the existing class state, under the command of the ruling class, nor can it stand silently by to wait until the storm is past. It must adopt a policy of

Further Remarks on Nature of Fascism

Validity of Wolfe's Criticism Challenged

By DONALD GRAHAM

IN the Workers Age of October 12, Bertram D. Wolfe polemizes against "some false theories of fascism" allegedly held by leading members of the I.L.L.A.

"To some, fascism is Hitler. It is an emanation from Germany. If Germany is licked, fascism is licked, and the world will go back to pre-fascist democratic capitalism."

"But," say certain comrades, "when the Nazi Blitzkrieg shifted to England, the I.L.P. came out for supporting the war effort of the British government. It has changed its position."

FASCISM AS A NEW SOCIAL ORDER

The second "false theory" is that fascism is a "new social order," and that socialism is "some remote music of the future." I know of no leading member of the I.L.L.A. who holds this theory. The only ones in general who have expressed this concept in any way are Dwight Macdonald and Lewis Corey, and I doubt whether they agree in the formulation of this theory, or even mean the same thing.

FASCISM AS COUNTER-REVOLUTION

I come now to the third "false theory"—that "fascism is counter-revolution on the march." This is a formulation of Lovestone's. It is a correct one. That fascism is reactionary and counter-revolutionary is indisputable. The ruthless destruction by fascism of socialist, labor and democratic movements is reactionary and counter-revolutionary.

the Quislings could not have overthrown the Labor regime in Norway, wiped out the socialist and labor movement of that country, merely by force of their own native strength and power in 1940, without the invasion and military victory of Hitler.

The denial of the theory that "fascism is on the march," the theory advocated by Wolfe that fascism grows as a universal tendency in all countries of the world, and the theory that the greatest immediate menace of fascism comes in your own country and not from a Hitler-Mussolini victory, means just this: that the menace of fascism in Norway was greater from the fascist movement within Norway than from Hitler. This is a palpable absurdity. It is possible to believe absurdities, and to feel strongly about them, just as it is possible for millions of people to believe in miracles and witchcraft. But such belief does not negate the fact that it is an absurdity.

MISINTERPRETATION OF A CORRECT THEORY

How Wolfe combats the concept that fascism is "counter-revolution on the march" is typical. He makes an "interpretation," which interpretation is then easy to knock down—because it has been set up so as to make it easy to knock down. Wolfe writes:

"For them, the duty of the revolution is simple: aid Great Britain to administer a military defeat to counter-revolution on the march, or there is no more hope of revolution or socialism in the world. A military victory of Hitler signifies the end of possibility of struggle, at least for our generation."

One should note that this is not a quotation, but a curious and imaginative interpretation of the thoughtful, complex and by no means "simple" articles of Lovestone. Actually, Lovestone never wrote that the military defeat of Great Britain would result in "no more hope of revolution or socialism in the world." Lovestone never wrote that "the duty of the revolutionist is simple: aid to Great Britain to administer a military defeat to fascism."

Education-for What?

(Continued from page 1) men and women of the colored race be able to find careers commensurate with their education? By educating them, you're only doing them a disservice, condemning them to hopeless discontent and misery. The best thing for them and for all concerned would be to educate them for the jobs they're going to hold, and no further."

It is particularly ironical that this program is being advanced in the name of democracy. For it is undemocratic a program of class discrimination as one could imagine. "Time and time again," Miss Rummel tells us, "I have observed that regardless of CIRCUMSTANCES or aptitude, Evelyn and Tom have their heads full of professional dreams... (emphasis mine—W. H.). If this means anything at all, it means that education for professional careers should be restricted with an eye to the "circumstances" of the students, that is, with an eye to the economic or social status of the families from which the students come. It's quite all right for those whose "circumstances" permit to try to realize their aspirations; it's only the boys and girls coming

from low-income homes that should be taught the folly of "day-dreaming." And this is education in a democracy!

STATIC SOCIETY IS DOOMED

Maybe Dr. Bell and Miss Rummel are right. Maybe the old days of the open frontier, the old days of boundless opportunity, are gone. Like practical people, our practical educators recognize the fact. But it seems to me that they're not quite practical enough that they're not quite recognize all the facts. For as sure as death, once the youth of America become convinced that our society no longer holds out any hope to them of new worlds to conquer, of great ambitions to achieve, they will turn against that society and will become the storm-troopers of some totalitarian demagogue who will know how to feed their aspirations and ideals. A democracy that is not dynamic, that is not capable of opening the way to new frontiers of action at all levels of human life, is doomed, and deserves its doom. This is a very practical fact; let our practical educators think that over once or twice.

The program that this type of educator advocates is in effect a program of training the great masses of the American people to be efficient hevers of wood and drawers of water in a stagnant society of fixed status, and to be satisfied with their lot; to function efficiently as cogs in the wheel of an industrial machine that grinds on and on without meaning and without hope. It is not a program of a democracy worthy of the name.

But there is still a more serious flaw in this program. For it conceives the young men and women of the country simply as wage-earners, as job-holders. But these young men and women are also human beings, human personalities, each of transcendent worth; they are too, or are soon going to be, free citizens of a free democracy. Is it not an outrage committed against them and against society to bar them from a share and participation in the heritage of human culture simply because they may not need it in earning a living? In addition to knowing how to make a living, isn't it important that they should know how to live, how to live

a good life, as befits civilized men and women in a free society? How can they possibly learn to live a good life without being put into organic communion with the great thinkers and the great thoughts of the tradition of our culture?

EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY

From a social standpoint, the need is even more imperative. How is it possible for men and women to rule themselves in a true democracy if their education is restricted to the bare necessity of earning a living, if they are shut out from the great cultural heritage that is rightfully theirs?

Yes, there is no doubt that the school should prepare youth for the "turbulent world that lies beyond the classroom window." And there is as little doubt that the school does not do today. But the trouble is not that our education is still too "classical." The trouble—or rather one of the troubles, for the troubles with our school system are many indeed—is that our education is not "classical" enough, using that term in the traditional sense of a liberal education designed to bring the young mind into genuine contact with the living stream of our culture.

The idea of liberal education was born as the education of an aristocracy, a social elite, to fit them to rule themselves and society. If democracy is to have any meaning at all, the entire mass of the people must raise themselves to the level of this social elite of the past and become genuinely capable of ruling themselves, of determining their own fate. They must become genuinely capable of rational choice and self-determination so that they will not be prone to fall victim to every loud-mouthed demagogue that comes along. On the educational side, this seems to me to require the democratization of the great but hitherto aristocratic ideal of a liberal education. Instead of trying to make our education more narrowly "practical"—and falsely practical—our goal should be to develop and realize the ideal of a liberal education for all. Each and every boy and girl is worthy of receiving such an education to the limit of his intellectual capacities, and, in a democracy, each and every boy and girl is entitled to it.

AMERICAN REALITIES Be this last matter as it may, the fact remains that the slogans offered by Comrade Lovestone for America under present circum-

WORKERS AGE 6 mos. 60¢ subscribe now! A YEAR SUB TO WORKERS AGE 6 mos. 60¢ subscribe now!

WHY IS THE DEFEAT OF HITLER PREFERABLE? The defeat of Hitlerism is desirable not because we can then "go back to pre-fascist, democratic capitalism," where workers can be "democratically" exploited, bigger and better profits can be "democratically" made, and the colonial countries can be "democratically" enslaved, but in order to give the possibility to the labor movement through the world to revive, grow, increase its (Continued on Page 4)

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.

Reentered as second class matter Oct. 14, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879. Phone: LACKAWANNA 4-5282.
WILL HERBERG, Editor

Vol. 9 SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1940 No. 39

THE CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST

ACCORDING to the press, the New York State Industrial Union Council, headed by Gustave A. Strebel and made up of the Hillman faction of the C.I.O., is going to the Atlantic City convention of the C.I.O. with a three-point program of action. The New York Times reports the attitude of the Council as follows:

"Curbs on the power of the president of the C.I.O. . . . will be demanded in a resolution to be introduced at the C.I.O. national convention in Atlantic City next week by Gustave A. Strebel, president of the State Industrial Union Council, the state organization announced yesterday.

"Mr. Strebel was instructed by the Council's Executive Board to urge adoption at Atlantic City of the proposition that the national management of the C.I.O. be carried on in a 'democratic manner consistent with the spirit and practices of the labor movement' . . .

"Another resolution to be offered by Mr. Strebel in behalf of the state body describes labor unity as 'most imperative' and demands that 'all red-tape and all petty considerations of personal prestige, ambition or face-saving' be cast aside in the effort to achieve peace between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O.

"A third resolution calls upon the national convention to set forth its condemnation of communism, Nazism and fascism . . ."

In other words, the three big planks in the program of the Hillman wing of the C.I.O. are: (1) democracy in the C.I.O., (2) unity in the labor movement, and (3) anti-Stalinism along with anti-fascism. In order to achieve these ends, they are apparently prepared to wage a fight against John L. Lewis' all along the line.

Almost exactly two years ago, in November 1938, the National Council of the Independent Labor League of America adopted a resolution on the situation in the labor movement, a resolution made public at the time in the columns of this paper. The second section of this resolution is headed: "Three Big Problems Facing the C.I.O." It reads:

"There are three aspects of the present situation in the C.I.O. which are at once sources and manifestations of the crisis in which it finds itself: (1) the unity question, (2) union democracy and autonomy, and (3) Stalinism.

"1. The Unity Question: The reunification of the trade-union movement is the biggest and most urgent task of organized labor at the present moment. . . .

"2. Democracy and Autonomy: A very grave defect in the C.I.O. from the very beginning has been the inability—and, to a large extent perhaps, even the lack of desire—to establish genuinely democratic foundations for the new movement. Real control has remained in the hands of one or two leaders at headquarters. . . . Of democratic collective leadership, there has been hardly a sign. . . . These tendencies are in direct conflict with the best traditions of the American labor movement. . . .

"3. The Menace of Stalinism: The most baneful influence in the C.I.O. today is Stalinism. The very fact that Stalinism has been permitted to gain a preponderant influence in many sections of the movement is in itself a striking indication of the unhealthy condition of the C.I.O. . . ."

This analysis, with a program of action based upon it, was made two years ago. How was it received by the leadership of the C.I.O. at that time? It was promptly denounced as "factional" and "disruptive," as a "vicious slander" against the C.I.O., as nothing but a "political maneuver" of the "Lovestoneites." In a number of unions, a veritable pogrom was launched against these "Lovestoneites" for daring to raise this program, and under the category of "Lovestoneites" every independent-minded, non-conformist worker was frequently included. Well, the counter-offensive succeeded; the "Lovestoneite" program of reform of the C.I.O. failed of realization; totalitarianism, Stalinism and dualism were strengthened and confirmed in the C.I.O. leadership until today the whole C.I.O. movement is in the throes of a desperate crisis.

We are not bringing all this forward at this time in the spirit of 'I told you so.' We have a moral to draw from this story. For the general-in-chief of the hosts of the C.I.O. against the "Lovestoneite factionalists and disrupters" who dared to raise the program of reform was none other than Sidney Hillman himself, who was then still doing John L. Lewis' dirty work. Today, it is Hillman and his lieutenants who are raising the same program and are being besmirched with the same foul epithets in the same Stalinist press.

We bear no grudges, and we do not seek any further vindication than the events themselves bring. We urge all sincere progressive unionists in the C.I.O. to give their full support to the present campaign to rid the labor movement of the baneful influence of Lewisism and Stalinism.

THE CASE OF MRS. BROWDER

WE regard Earl Browder as the paid agent of a murderous foreign dictator hostile to the interests and welfare of the American people. We consider him a baneful influence, whose viciousness is limited only by his impotence. Nevertheless, we deplore and protest against the action of the Department of Justice in suddenly ordering the deportation of his wife, who happens to be a Russian-born alien resident in this country.

We protest against the deportation because it is inhuman and because it is a cheap political trick. The only ground for Mrs. Browder's deportation, as given by federal authorities, is her irregular entry way back in 1933; no crime, offense or improper conduct is charged against her during her stay in this country. Now the federal government was fully aware of the circumstances of her entry when she arrived in 1933, and it continued to be fully aware of these circumstances during the past seven years. Yet the authorities did nothing all this time, for this was the time when the Administration was casting hopeful eyes on Russia as a partner in the "democratic front" and was silently accepting the backing of the communists here. Now that the wheel of circumstance has turned, and Russia is an ally of Hitler and the Stalinists here are hostile to the Administration, the authorities in Washington have suddenly discovered Mrs. Browder's seven-year-old "crime"! This is cheap, contemptible trickery, and no decent person should countenance it.

We protest also on the grounds of humanity. To break up a family by the deportation of the wife and mother is a ruthless, inhuman act, even when the husband is Earl Browder. Furthermore, we are convinced that sending Mrs. Browder back to Stalin's Russia is sending her to her death. For a while, she would probably be made much of as a martyr; before long, however, because of her foreign residence and connections, she would fall under suspicion, and that would be the end of her—especially should Earl Browder ever fall into disfavor with his master in the Kremlin, as is not altogether impossible. Let us not forget that Stalinist Russia is the country where more communists have been murdered by the government than in any other country of the world, perhaps more than in all other European countries combined.

Finally, Mrs. Browder's deportation, so far from weakening Stalinism in America, would strengthen it by fortifying it with repression and martyrdom. Even from this standpoint, it is folly.

The deportation order should be withdrawn.

Another British Socialist View:

U.S.A.—Brother or Bailiff?

By JON KIMCHE

(Jon Kimche is a leading member of the British Independent Labor Party. Our attitude on the question of an Anglo-American alliance was given in an editorial article in the Workers Age of October 12, 1940, and an editorial from the British New Leader on the same subject was reprinted in our issue of September 28, 1940.—Editor.)

London, England
It took three years last time. This time—just over a year. Elderly destroyers are sent across the Atlantic to aid Britain and the tell-tale Gallup poll shows a small majority—for the first time—in support for Britain even if it means the U.S. entry into the war. Yet this is not the 1914 business all over again only very much accelerated.

In responsible circles in Britain—the Left as well as of the Right—there is little of the hysterical hopefulness which marked "the Yanks are coming" period of the last war and which repeated itself when President Wilson came to Europe to install the new world order of the League of Nations. This faith in the American from over the seas was deep-rooted at the time and not simply a popular quickly-forgotten emanation: one has but to read the diary of Harold Nicolson or to follow the career of men like Brailsford during the last war, or of H. G. Wells during it, to note how much intelligent men set upon American influence. In place, however, of the idealistic clichés of the last war, we have now a cynical, slightly bitter and suspicious outlook on what America will do—and why!

Starting from this healthy basis, two schools of thought and influence have developed in Britain with the progress of the war.

The first, the "hopeful" school, is made up of the popular press, the intellectual weeklies, the bulk of organized labor, so far as one can judge, the great mass of middle-class England and—most important of all—the vigorous members of Britain's newer industries, who would prefer to become junior partners in an active Anglo-American imperialism to remaining senior partners in the more dubious venture of British imperialism unaided.

These last have few illusions: they are aware that the time of Anglo-American cooperation will be Yankee Doodle, and not Rule Britannia. They are willing to face the prospect and to stand the pace. This conclusion applies equally in varying degrees to the other components of this school. Vaguely perhaps, but quite definitely, they are prepared to bear American domination rather than Nazi rule if it is a choice between these two. John Strachey, in his new book, "Federalism or Socialism?", makes this statement with a full realization of its implication and many leaders of the Labor Party and trade unions will probably echo this sentiment.

The second school of thought, the "fearful" school, also sees the implications of an Anglo-American alliance, but it sees supreme danger in its possibilities. In the words of Fenner Brockway, who holds this view: "If this all-powerful capitalist country becomes united with Britain, one thing is certain. It will not allow a workers social revolution in Europe." In addition to the I.L.L.P., British heavy industry is fearful of too much American influence. The British Iron and Steel Federation and its subsidiaries could not maintain themselves for a minute in an equal struggle with their American counterpart. It would mean economic finis to the backbone of British Toryism. On the other hand, a Nazi victory might hardly affect the economics of the British Iron and Steel Federation.

This, then can be taken as a sketchy outline of the divergent approach in Britain to the problem of Anglo-American relations. But we must look at the picture as a whole. We now have to fit in the following groups and scenes.

WHAT IS GERMANY DOING?

Germany is organizing the European continent economically. We are here not speaking hypothetically of Nazi horrors, but of simple economic reality explained in an important speech by the Nazi Finance Minister, Funk. In effect, he said this: Europe's continent west of the Soviet border will be organized as a unit in the economic sense. The primary purpose of this unit will be, not the equal well-being of all members, but the satisfaction first of all of the needs of the German Reich by its vassals. To do this, the Nazis will decide what and how much each vassal shall produce and what he shall not produce and what and how much shall be delivered to the Nazis at Nazi prices. Put simply, Europe outside U.S.S.R. and Britain will be rationed to satisfy the German elite, and exist itself as best it can on the left-over. In doing this, the Nazis will, of course, also make certain that the economic basis of potential future resistance is destroyed, as it has been in France.

This Nazi program of "rationing" Europe is most important in estimating the role of Anglo-American cooperation. After America's victory in 1918, it was customary in the best and most intelligent Left circles to speak of "the coming conflict between British and American imperialism." Lenin said it, so did Trotsky—and all the little Lenins and Trotskys repeated it faithfully. By 1924, however, this anticipation proved to be erroneous, for there were plenty of conflicts, they had not led to the anticipated wars, and the revision of this theory was the occasion of one of Trotsky's periodic, scintillating, outstandingly brilliant reviews of the world situation. Writing in Pravda, he concluded that the American economic plan was "to place capitalist Europe on rational." This would include not only Germany, but also France and Britain. And in the attempt to impose the American "rationing" plan economically and politically on Britain, Trotsky saw the revised version of the world's great antagonism between these two rival imperialisms.

This slight excursion into the history of the "rationing" theory is necessary because the source of most of the Left publicists in Europe and the U.S.A.—such as F. A. Ridley, Fenner Brockway and Dwight Macdonald—who hold that there is mortal danger in Anglo-American collaboration under capitalist aegis is this theory of Leon Trotsky. For the sake of accuracy, then, it can be said that Trotsky's theory allotted to the United States the role now outlined for Nazi Germany by Funk, and that nowhere in the theoretical literature is there any analysis showing a coming harmonious relationship between the U.S.A. and Britain. On the contrary.

We have drawn attention to the Trotsky theory because it does indicate what will happen if the progressive forces in Britain and the U.S.A. are eliminated from the war: it would then probably become a struggle between American and German imperialism for the right to ration Europe.

others." Yet, today, ninety days after the collapse of France, London is a battle-scarred, but the cruisers are crossing the Atlantic. This is at once an admission of error by the American government and should be a hint to the American Left (and to the British.) However clear it is becoming that, in the long run, only socialism will defeat the Nazis, it is vitally necessary that Britain shall not be defeated now. For this purpose, destroyers were desperately needed; anti-aircraft guns are needed and needed soon. The fact that some of these have been made available by the Roosevelt government is an admission of Britain's increased chances. It is not the beginning of an Anglo-American alliance to crush the European social revolution.

FEAR OF BRITAIN'S EXAMPLE
What is feared at present by American industry and finance is the much more imminent danger that the example—with all its admitted limitations—of Beverinism might spread to the States. In a series of remarkable revelations, the New York Nation has produced much evidence of this.

The aviation industry—of crucial importance now—has been staging a sit-down strike of the employees. As a result, the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, stated before the Senate Finance Committee on August 9, 1940 that of the 4,000 planes voted by Congress in June, contracts had been let for only 33, and on August 24th the New York Herald Tribune revealed in a dispatch from Washington that on that day the United States had actually eighty fewer combat planes than it had on the first of the year.

A few samples from the American press indicate the reason for the sabotage by the powerful aviation industry of the U.S. For example, the financial editor of New York Sun was appalled by the British excess profits tax. It was "difficult for many Americans to understand how Britain can expect anyone to make the tremendous extra productive effort required by war without some stimulus other than the vague one that it is necessary to save the country." When Congress at the end of June imposed an 8% net profit limit on government business, the aviation industry struck. The United States News accused the Treasury of harboring "a belief that patriotism rather than a desire for profits should motivate industry."

The Battle for Britain did not concern the U.S. aviation industry; its primary concern was to prevent Bevin's "Bolshivism" from crossing the Atlantic.

(Continued in the next issue)

IS ENGLAND "IN THE BAG"?

At the moment, however, this is not a live issue and it need now never become one. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy in Roosevelt's Cabinet, expressed the opinion after Petain's surrender that at the outside Britain would last sixty days. In the July issue of Partisan Review, Dwight Macdonald, the editor, says that "even President Roosevelt seems to have given up the idea of coming to the rescue of England." As for Macdonald, he wastes no words: "England is in the bag with France, Holland and the

What Is the Policy Of the ILP in War?

Party Supports War Effort but Not Regime

(Continued from Page 3)
can move in either one of two directions: either seek to out-totalitarianize the totalitarians, or to be transformed into socialist democracy. The ruling classes, England's included, must in the long run seek the former solution. Socialists must press for the latter, and from the very beginning.

POWERFUL DYNAMIC OF SOCIALISM

"The ruling class wants to resist the fascist 'New Order,' . . . but they will be incapable of fighting the 'New Order' of fascism. The new state of efficient, totalitarian, regimented capitalism, which is fascism, cannot be matched by the capitalism of the past stage. Nor can the old order of capitalism provide the positive moral dynamic necessary to stand up against the fascist dynamic. Political democracy cannot arouse enthusiasm unless social and economic democracy is added to it. Freedom cannot be elozugized with sincerity so long as the repression and exploitation of political and economic empires continue.

"There is one power and one power alone which can challenge the 'New Order' of fascism and that is the 'New Order' of socialism, an order which is equally efficient because it will have the necessary centralization and coordination, and which will provide a dynamic far superior to that of fascism, the dynamic of social, economic and racial equality, liberty and fraternity." (New Leader, October 3, 1940).

(Another article by J. Cork on socialist policy in Britain will appear in the next issue of this paper.—Editor.)

Balabanoff to Be Given Dinner As Testimonial

New York City.
A TESTIMONIAL dinner to Angelica Balabanoff, world-famous socialist and author of "My Life As A Rebel," will be given by a group of her friends on December 6, 1940 at Hotel Diplomat, 108 West 43rd Street.

Among the sponsors of the dinner are such outstanding personalities as John Dewey, Babette Deutsch, Max Eastman, Mary Fox, Arturo Giovannitti, Suzanne LaFollette, Jay Lovestone, Giuseppe Lupis, Eugene Lyons, Louis Nelson, Rose Pesotta, Joseph Schlossberg, Mark Starr, Benjamin Stolberg, Norman Thomas, Carlo Tresca and Charles S. Zimmerman.

The sponsoring committee has expressed the hope that all those desiring to honor this great woman for her contribution to the cause of labor, peace and human liberties will attend the dinner. Tickets, at \$1.50, are on sale at the Workers Age, 131 West 33rd Street, LACKAWANNA 4-5282.

Fascist Barbarism in the Name of Anti-Fascism...

WE have had occasion more than once in these columns to comment on the sad havoc that Hitler and the war have wrought with the ideals and beliefs of our liberal intellectuals. These men, men of the type of Lewis Mumford, Waldo Frank and Archibald MacLeish, have literally lost their balance, have abandoned the convictions for which they once fought so valiantly, have turned themselves into ranting war-mongers, vulgar jingoes and wild-eyed advocates of intolerance and repression.

Undoubtedly, the very low point in this retrogressive development has been reached by Lewis Mumford in his new book, "Faith for Living". Here is Mr. Mumford's "anti-fascist" program, as summarized by Malcolm Cowley in his recent review in the New Republic:

"He [Mumford] compares our civilization to a foundering vessel that cannot be saved unless its whole cargo of inessential is thrown aboard. That may be true enough; but Mr. Mumford has a pretty far-reaching idea of what is essential to a ship of state.

"Let me mention just a few of the democratic rights that he wants to jettison. Free speech would go first of all. Mr. Mumford proposes a National Board of Censorship charged with the duty of keeping pro-fascist speakers off the air and fascist magazines out of the mails. From a reference on page 40, I assume that it would also be charged with suppressing plays like 'Tobacco Road' and 'Of Mice and Men,' which 'spread defilement.' Freedom of political organization would have to disappear, since all active leaders of fascist groups, including both Nazis and communists, would be immediately clapped into jail or sent into exile. 'Democracy must be prepared,' he says, 'to play the human game with the same ruthless consistency that fascism plays the anti-human game.' Behind this patriotic vista, one can see the barbed wire of concentration camps.

"But these are only the first of Mr. Mumford's measures. Every boy and girl in the county, on nearing military age, would spend at least a year in a labor army. Men of the middle classes would be exhorted to work with their hands for an hour or more each day. Women would devote more time to cooking and having babies, less time to stenography and 'frivolous occupations.' Factory owners 'must take over the classic tradition of the professional classes: public service and public responsibility', while surrendering part of their incomes. Labor unions will thereupon surrender the right to strike. The population as a whole must abandon the economy of comfort for a new economy of sacrifice. 'The only abundance that our skill with machines will create will be an abundance of weapons, munitions, tanks, airplanes, warships.' And these will not be intended solely for defense. 'We need an overwhelming force, ready to strike on behalf of liberty and democracy and justice with overwhelming audacity; ready, like the armies of Napoleon, to IMPOSE liberty and democracy if need be rather than to see them perish utterly from the earth!'"

Further Remarks on Nature of Fascism

Validity of Wolfe's Criticism Challenged

(Continued from Page 3)
power and strength and acquire the possibility to move forward to a democratic socialism. It is in this sense that Marx and Engels desired the defeat of Czarism and Bonapartism, and advocated aid to those countries at war with Napoleon and with the Russian Czar. Certainly, no one could ascribe to Marx and Engels a preference for the defeat of Bonapartism or Czarism because, forsooth, Marx and Engels were British or German patriots and admired the bourgeois-democratic system of exploitation as the highest possible stage of development of human society. Their preference for the defeat of Bonapartism and Czarism in war-time was based on the revolutionary possibilities and consequences of that defeat, and the counter-revolutionary consequences of a victory. To ascribe to Marx and Engels a chauvinistic, bourgeois approach would not only be false, but malicious as well. I can see no reason for attempting to ascribe to Lovestone's analysis of fascism any other approach than that of Marx

and Engels in somewhat similar situations, even if one regards Marx and Engels and Lovestone as in error. Marx and Engels were wrong on occasion. But they did not cease being genuine socialists every time they made a mistake. The theory that "real" socialists are infallible is a dangerous one, fraught with reactionary consequences. The worst of all possible errors that can be made in a socialist discussion is not a false theory of fascism, not even the theory of "objective progress" under Hitlerism held by some spokesmen of the minority, but the concept that a socialist who disagrees with you automatically becomes a "social-patriot," one who "sits on the horn of British imperialism," and one who "gilds the claws of the American eagle." That is the worst possible error.

We thus have seen that the "false theories of fascism" held by anonymous spokesmen of the majority of the I.L.L.A. are either not held by anyone or are not false. It is not the concept of "fascism as counter-revolution on the march" which is false, but the complete misinterpretation placed upon it by Wolfe. One can be opposed to a correct concept because one does not, or is unable to, understand it, but misinterpretation of a correct theory does not make it any the less correct.

In the next article, I will discuss the remarkable theory of some minority spokesmen about "objective progress under Hitlerism."

the core, to use the slogan as Lovestone has used it in the October 26 issue of the Workers Age, to set our group to fighting FOR an "adequate national defense" is as self-defeating and self-destructing as to put "aid to Great Britain" in the center of our positive slogans and goals of the present moment. Our activities in this field should be concentrated on a drive for the repeal of peace-time conscription, the exposure of the present arms budget and war preparations for what they are: a conspiracy to abuse the mass desire to see the country able to defend itself, in order to utilize that desire to put this country into war and permanently militarize its economy and domestic life.

Our longer-range aims are to drive home the socialist message that the only true defense of America from totalitarianism, domestic and foreign, lies in reorganizing our economy and institutions, extending not curbing our political democracy, establishing economic democracy (socialism) and making its example contagious, giving every man and woman in America a stake in this rich country which will be something for him or her to defend, eliminating the rot from the social fabric in which the seeds of totalitarianism have a chance to sprout, harnessing our magnificent machinery to the production of abundance for all. For there is no other "adequate defense."

WHY THE "DEFENSE" SLOGAN IS WRONG

If the United States were in actual danger of invasion by the Axis troops—which it is not—I should favor an attitude on defense similar to that being advanced in every issue of the New Leader of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain (to be analyzed in a future article). But, under the present realities of the present situation in America, with our Administration and Republican "opposition" united in putting over an army and navy for overseas war, peace-time conscription as a permanent feature of American life, an arms economy and budget, and life militarized to

On the Question Of "Defense"

(Continued from Page 3)
out of war. Our problem, a "pedagogical" or tactical problem, is how to link up the genuine mass desire to keep out of war with a realization by the masses of the necessity of fighting the present peace-time conscription and the present get-into-the-war budget. If we could have gotten a commission with a few honest experts, civilian and military, to examine the war budget, we would thus have helped to expose the Administration's policies and focus attention on the problems: For what are we arming? Why a military machine of this size?, etc. We do not expect that such a commission will be appointed at present, or if appointed that many of its members would speak their minds freely. But we could send our own witnesses to testify. And the mere fight for an examination of the President's true aims in putting across the present budget and arms measures will serve to make people conscious of the problem involved. The motion was adopted by absolute pacifists in favor of disarmament but believing that a proposal of their ultimate program at this time would cut the K.A.O.W. off from the genuine anti-war sentiment of the mass of our people instead of aiding in organizing and directing it. It was adopted by socialists with a socialist notion of defense, who also felt that to put their full program into the K.A.O.W., united front platform would have a similar effect.

WOODSTOCK TYPEWRITER
Read—Spread
WORKERS AGE

JUST ARRIVED FROM ENGLAND!
October 1940 issue of
LEFT
(Formerly Controversy)
Articles by Jon Kimche, Walter Padley, C. A. Smith, and others.
15c a copy
For sale at
WORKERS AGE
Room 707, 131 W. 33rd St.
New York City

SEE
ANNOUNCEMENT
On Page 2