

# Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol 5, No. 22.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1936.

5 Cents a Copy

## Guffey Decision Blocks All Labor Legislation

Supreme Court Rules Against Federal Regulation Of Wages and Hours As Invasion of the States' Rights; New Price-Fixing Act Prepared.

The Supreme Court continued its drive against New Deal legislation and declared the Guffey Act unconstitutional by a 6 to 3 decision. Three opinions were registered, the majority stating that the price fixing aspects of the bill were inextricably combined with the wages and hours clauses, and since the latter is an invasion of state's rights, the whole bill was thrown out. Chief Justice Hughes while concurring in the majority decision, entered a separate opinion in which he maintained that Congress had a right to regulate prices, thru the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, and that this section of the Act should have been upheld (as it was in lower court decisions), while the wages and hours regulations should have been thrown out. The minority opinion agreed with Hughes on this point, and asked that no decision be rendered on the question of wages and hours, as yet, "because they may never at all take effect", and because the suits seek "a judicial declaration of opinion", rather than present a specific grievance against the labor provisions.

Probably no decision of the Supreme Court, in the present situation, has been so brazenly anti-labor and openly pro-capital as this. While the majority made it clear that they were neither arguing for or against a Coal Act which would solely concern itself with price-fixing, it is fairly well accepted by the administration that the decision rendered is an invitation to rehabilitate the coal industry in such a fashion as will debilitate the miners. It is in direct line with the drive of the American employing class against any and all types of legislation for the real or supposed benefit of the workers and farmers.

The implications of this decision, politically and economically are of the greatest importance. The Act was supported by the United Mine Workers, not merely on the basis of the regulation of wages and hours, which in practise (if not in theory) was merely a supplement to union enforcement of union agreements, but also because, in creating a national basis for fixed prices, the conditions for national agreements were laid. The existence of lower priced production are always a threat to union conditions. Secondly, the chaotic conditions of the industry demanded stabilization, so that steps could be taken to solve the problem of unemployment in the mines.

Commenting on the decision, John L. Lewis, said: "It is a sad commentary on our form of government, when every decision of the Supreme Court seems destined to fatten capital and starve and destroy labor". The question of a coal strike looms large, if not for the immediate future, at any rate for the autumn. Wm. Green, indicated that the Executive Council, now in session had been discussing the question of a constitutional amendment but "had run into difficulties in phrasing such a proposal". A sudden wave of "extreme" class - consciousness seems to have engulfed Green for he feared such an amendment as would grant Congress the powers to fix hours and wages, because that would automatically "nullify and destroy the free exercise of the right of collective bargaining

and the right to strike. It seems now more than ever that labor must rely on its economic power to strike and fight. We want to have that power fixed by Congress as in the Wagner Act, but we do not want to have wages fixed by the government as in Fascist countries." This conservative anarchism, refusal to deal with the government at all, besides sounding strange when at one and the same time, Green defends the Wagner Act, while fearing fascism because the government is forced to concede social legislation to the masses, also serves as an argument against a Labor Party—hence the emphasis on "economic action".

Lewis has also announced that the UMWA would support a new bill which would only deal with price-fixing, if a separate clause on collective bargaining were included.

## SPAIN'S PREMIER DEMANDS ORDER

Quiroga Calls For Civil Peace From Workers To Uphold "Unity"

The formation of a new cabinet was announced by Quiroga, after Azana, People's Front President, had appointed him premier. The shakiness of the Left Republicans in the face of the country's crisis Quiroga indicated when he stated that "I am ready to grant the demands of the labor parties as quickly as possible, but I must ask the Socialists and Communists to instruct their followers not to resort to violence. I will be implacable with Fascists who attack me from above and I will not be coerced by Marxists from below." Strikes are constantly going on all over Spain, there is still a peasant movement, and it is these factors that he refers to when he asked the workers' parties "to instruct their followers to desist from violence." That there still are "fascists above" is a very interesting commentary on the efficacy of the People's Front against fascism.

According to Quiroga, none of the problems have been solved as yet. One million unemployed exists whom he hopes to cure by public works. On the program of the new government is the breaking up of the large estates, sometime in the future. The army is rumored to be in ferment, altho the strict press censorship maintained by the "democratic" popular front government allows no details to seep thru the cordon.

The Socialist Party will face a

JOHN L. LEWIS SAYS:



"... Every decision of the Supreme Court seems destined to fatten capital and starve and destroy labor."

## U. S. Army Forces Soldiers To Finance Nazi Olympics

The U.S. Army is soliciting 25 cents from each of its 12,000 officers and a dime from each of its 140,000 enlisted men to finance its Olympic team in the games in Germany.

convention next month where the issue of entering the government will be fought out between the Caballero wing and the followers of Prieto, a right-winger, who is preparing to bolt if he loses out. The right wing is practically in complete agreement with Azana, on the tasks of the government. The monarchist, clericals, and fascist forces, are agitating constantly about the weakness of the government, and their apparent sabotage of parliamentary activity leads some observers to believe that they are recruiting their forces anew.

## STRIKE IN STEEL PULLS OUT 5,550

A 50% increase in wages and recognition of the Amalgamated Association was demanded by 5,500 steel workers as they struck the Portsmouth Ohio plant of the Wheeling Steel Corporation. The strike is headed by a joint committee representing five lodges of the Amalgamated. The two demands had been presented to the management ten days ago but the union received no reply.

The strike was immediately effective, a mass picket line being thrown around the plant, estimated by the police at about 2,000. The company banked its furnaces and has prepared itself for a siege. Recently the National Labor Relations Board had issued an order to the firm to end its campaign against the Amalgamated. The action of the workers will undoubtedly be much more effective. The coming of the strike at this time, so soon after the union's convention had adopted the proposal of the CIO to organize on industrial lines, shows the great encouragement given to the workers

## Socialist Convention Backs Thomas Forces; Old Guard Talks Split

Seating of Militant Delegation from New York Is Last Straw for Old Guard; Plan to Organize a Social Democratic Party After Convention

### Workers Age Correspondent "Haunts" Confab for Social Democratic Party

By JAY LOVESTONE  
(Special Correspondent Workers Age)

Cleveland, Ohio—The group around Waldman have declared themselves in open rebellion against the Socialist Party by announcing plans to organize a new Social Democratic Party. However, the Old Guard is divided and no complete split is possible because the Pennsylvania, Connecticut and Massachusetts delegations have remained with the Thomas forces.

The conference to organize a Social Democratic Party just got under way with the press called in. Goebbel then arose to demand the expulsion of your correspondent because he is "ABLE TO UNDERSTAND OUR BEING IN GREAT DISTRESS." After discussion in which Waldman proposed my remaining Goebbel's motion was carried. Discussion was again reopened and to save their face and in the name of "tolerance" they decided to exclude the entire press.

By JAY LOVESTONE

By a vote of 9,449 4,809 the National Convention of the Socialist Party seated the Militant Delegation headed by Norman Thomas, as the delegation to represent New York State. This came after days and nights of caucuses, fruitless attempts at peace and compromise arrangements, and after hours of acrimonious debate which led to a marked sharpening of the situation in the Socialist Party ranks.

## COURT ATTACKS RELIEF LEGALITY

Resettlement Project Is Barred; Appeal Might Endanger F.E.R.A.

The Court of Appeals, D. C., ruled against the Resettlement Project at Boundbrook, N. J. The opinion of the majority held that the project was unconstitutional, while a concurring opinion agreed to the stopping of this project, but held that no ruling on constitutionality was necessary. The minority dissented entirely.

Since no lower court can throw out the entire Resettlement administration, the various other projects will probably continue. Actually, without the help of the courts, the Roosevelt Administration has been whittling down Tugwell's pet, by paring appropriations tremendously. Appropriations have not been made directly this year but thru the WPA, and now it is doubtful whether this money will be forthcoming.

For fear that the entire Federal Emergency Appropriations Act may be declared unconstitutional, there will be probably be no appeal by the government on this case. The particular project in question will be halted and the others will go on. While there is no doubt that such a danger of invalidation exists, the Roosevelt Administration is putting the whole affair to good political use by pretending terror at what the courts might do. It is thus enabled to cover up the fact that it has cut down an already meagre appropriation for the unemployed.

All efforts to arrive at harmony between the Waldman and Thomas factions on the basis of an equitable and mutually satisfactory division of the New York delegation of forty-four, failed. The leading advocate of a compromise arrangement between the Thomas and Waldman factions was Mayor Dan Hoan, boss of the Wisconsin delegation of thirty-one. The most vigorous champions of the intransigents of the Old Guard were Joseph Bearak, head of the Massachusetts delegation, and Mayor Jasper MacLevy of Bridgeport, leader of the Connecticut delegation. The important Pennsylvania delegation, tho somewhat divided, in the main supported the New York Old Guard.

Three Keynoters!

The Convention opened in a spirit of stormy revivalism. Indicative of the chaotic situation in the Socialist Party was the fact that there were three keynoters—Kryczki, Hoan and Thomas. Kryczki dispelled doubts as to his attitude to Roosevelt by declaring himself 100% for a Socialist Party candidate and campaign in the coming elections. Hoan talked about the farmer-labor party and lost no time denouncing Communism and the Communists. Thomas, who aroused the greatest enthusiasm, further stressed opposition to any and all flirtations with Roosevelt. By insinuation and innuendo he criticised some of the crassest expressions of opportunism by the official Communist Party and made it clear that he was opposed to a general united front with the Communists and particularly against a joint ticket with the Communist Party.

Lansbury conveyed to the delegates the fraternal greetings of the British Labor Party and struck  
(Continued on Page 8)



# What's Wrong With Our Trade Union Movement?

### A Discussion on Industrial Unionism

By GEORGE F. MILES

The recently concluded convention of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers indicated how deep is the schism that divides labor over the question of organization. The very bitterness aroused by this question of industrial unionism at the convention, the extreme tenseness which this proposal caused through the trade union movement shows that we are dealing here with an issue that touches the very nerve center of trade unionism.

What is the issue? It is usually formulated by stating that it is a fight over how to organize the workers. This is not strictly true. It is not as if there were any number of ways in which the mass of the American workers may be organized and all that remains is a determination of choice. Actually the problem is much more fundamental. The proponents of industrial unionism argue that the question to answer is not "how shall the workers be organized?" but "shall the workers be organized?"

A positive answer, they insist, presupposes the acceptance of industrial unionism because craft organization has hardly been able to hold its own in the face of modern, trustified industry. But is it true that craft unionism has barely held its own during these few decades? Even a cursory examination of the status of trade unionism will bring inevitable conviction to all but the most die-hard stand-patter that there is something radically wrong.

Organized in 1881 (or 1886, as you will. The A. F. of L. recognizes the former date) the A. F. of L. led a precarious existence for about a decade. It was not until after the crisis of 1893-96 that Sam Gompers swung the A. F. of L. into an extensive drive and emerged with an organization of a half million members. Between 1897 and 1913 there was a steady growth of trade union membership. The A. F. of L. having succeeded in establishing its hegemony, membership rose to 2,700,000. But between 1913 and 1933—a period of two decades most significant in the industrial life of the country, for

it was during this period that trustification in industry and the creation of giant combines was at its highest—the trade union movement had to record a mere 200,000 growth—2,900,000 in 1933 as compared with 2,700,000 in 1913.\* Hardly an impressive figure when we recall that there are approximately 30 million potential trade unionists in the United States. After more than half a century of tireless and self-sacrificing toil during which many a proletarian laid down his life in the struggle for unionism in the coal and iron fields, the steel mills and on the railroads, what have we to show?—a mere 10% of the workers organized. At no time did we succeed in topping the 20% mark.

These facts are enough to arouse every intelligent trade unionist to some deep thinking. Why is it so? Is trade unionism doomed to be a minority movement for ever? Is there something inherent in American economic life or development that makes the industrial worker suspicious of and unwilling to affiliate with the trade unions? What if anything is there to be done to overcome this sad state of affairs?

### Three Answers

These puzzling questions have been answered in three different ways. William Green and the supporters of things as they are, insist that there is no cause for panic; that all's well with our trade union movement; that no short cuts to success should be sought or can be found. Then there is the industrial unionist who attributes all evils in our trade union movement, perhaps too sweepingly, to the craft form of organization. Finally there are those who see ignominious death and extinction to what we had better get used to calling "free" trade unions. They visualize no future for trade unionism except as part of the government apparatus.

Let us go into these positions a little more thoroughly.

These gentlemen who already wear mourning bands on their sleeve, in anticipation of death, gloat over this weak and ineffectual status of America's trade unions, believing that such a condition will make it all the easier to convert the trade unions into adjuncts of the Department of Labor—into instruments for assuring economic peace and stability so that the golden stream of profits may flow without interruption into the bank vaults of the owners of industry.

Such, for instance, are the hopes of gentlemen like Leo Wolman, a spokesman for the Roosevelt administration, who already visualizes "compulsory trade unionism." He looks upon our trade union movement and insists that "trade unionism in the United States holds the proportions of a distinctly minority movement." He further insists that even what little there is of trade unionism might never have come to be, were it not for the patronizing attitude of the government. Witness, he says, the war and N.R.A. periods, both accounting for the greatest membership

\* Between 1916-20 the membership of the A. F. of L. rose precipitately to almost 5,000,000. This, however is of little significance since it was a growth stimulated by the government because of the need of uninterrupted production for war purposes. With the passing of the war expediency, the attitude of the government changed and trade union membership declined sharply. Between 1921 and 1923 one and a half million workers left the unions, leaving approximately as many as there were before the war.

## THE BIG FELLOW KNOWS HOW TO GET IN!



Courtesy Union News Service

## ST. LOUIS LABOR ACHIEVES UNITED FRONT ON MAY DAY

For the first time in years, a United May Day Parade and Demonstration was held in St. Louis. 18 labor organizations participated in this celebration: Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Society, International Workers' Order, American Workers' Union, Socialist Party, German-American Worker's Club, Greek Worker's Educational League, Croatian Fraternal Union, Lodge No. 50, Communist Party, Young Peoples Socialist League, Project Workers' Union, Macedonian Progressive League, Polish Workers' Club No. 7, Warehouse Workers No. 667, Youth Branch of American Workers' Union, Young Communist League, Communist Party (Opposition), American Friends of the Soviet Union, Tom Mooney Molders Defense Committee.

Also the greater number of Trade Unions in the City did not participate, the celebration was a genuine United May Day Parade and Demonstration.

The paraders flaunted many colorful banners and slogans, such as: "To make St. Louis a 100% Union City," "For the 30 Hour Week," "For Unemployment, Old Age and Social Insurance," "For Full Social, Political and Economic Equality for the Negro People," "For the Freedom of Tom Mooney, Warren K. Billings, and all Labor Prisoners," "Against War and Fas-

gains in the history of the A. F. of L.

If Mr. Wolman's conclusions were mere statistical abstractions about the status quo there would be little about which to quarrel with him, for, as an old Italian proverb has it, arithmetic is not a matter of opinion. But Mr. Wolman's remark strikes much deeper. His claim that there is something inherent in American social life that makes it impossible for trade unionism to live and thrive must be examined, even if briefly, in order to determine the future of trade unionism.

The second article in this series, by Comrade George F. Miles will appear in the next issue of Workers Age.

## On the LABOR FRONT

### Teachers Fight Loyalty Oath

The Teachers Union has begun a campaign for the repeal of the Ives Law which demands a declaration of "loyalty" from teachers and students. At a mass meeting held in New York under the auspices of the union, a resolution was adopted, stating that "such repressive measures revived the spirit of reaction." An appeal was made to labor and progressive organizations to join with the Teachers Union in the campaign.

### City-Wide Barbers' Strike

The Joint Board of the Journeymen Barbers International Union completed plans for a strike to affect New York. The strike is scheduled to hit various areas of the city in turn. The union demands a minimum salary of \$25 with 50% of all receipts over \$37 going to the barber; hours from 8 A.M. to 7 P.M., four full holidays and half-day for other holidays.

### Shipyard Workers to Strike

Workers in the plant of the United Shipyard Corporation, which is at present building four naval destroyers that cost four million apiece, have voted to strike if their demands for wage increases are not met. The Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, Local 12, is negotiating for an agreement based on a 36 hour week, \$1.20 per hour for skilled and \$3.80 per hour for unskilled labor, and recognition of the union. The officials of the company have as yet not indicated their willingness to accept these terms.

### Wagner Act Test Prepared

The International Harvester Company is preparing to bring its case against the National Labor Relations Board before the Supreme Court in order to test the constitutionality of the act. Hearings are now being held before the board, and will probably go on for another few weeks. Most firms have attempted to get an injunction to halt hearings, but the action of Harvester makes it clear that they are driving towards a test.

### Milk Drivers Present Demands

A mass meeting of all members of the Milk Drivers Union decided to present the following demands to 114 independent milk companies in the New York area: A flat wage of \$55 and the elimination of commissions as part of the drivers' pay. The latter point has been a thorn in the sides of the workers for a long time. For example, when the union attempted to launch a boycott against Borden, many housewives, attempting to support the union, were told by individual drivers that if they refused to place their order, the drivers themselves would be affected. The elimination of commissions would be a very efficient method of disarming the large milk companies in their drive against labor organization.

## MEXICAN STRIKE IS SMASHED

Mexico, D. F.—Intimidated by the government ban on their walk-out, 50,000 railway men called off their strike for higher wages.

The workers are particularly incensed because the strike was declared illegal before it started. Cardenas, until recently acclaimed the savior of all Mexican labor, had an editorial in the printing press of El Nacional, the government newspaper, before the union announced its strike decision. The government actually threatened to abolish the existing labor contract between the workers and the railway if the men did not return within twenty-four hours.

The strikers showed their disillusionment by condemning Cardenas as a Fascist. They invaded the Labor Department Building carrying a coffin covered with a red flag bearing the inscription, "This is the burial of the labor laws in Mexico by the so-called revolutionaries."

## Roosevelt and Labor

This is the fourth in a series of articles by Comrade Herberg. The first appeared in our issue of February 22 under the caption "Roosevelt and the Liberty League." "Roosevelt and Big Business" appeared as two articles in our issues of March 7 and March 14—Editor.

By WILL HERBERG

Not since 1924, when La Follette came forward on an independent ticket and flung a challenge in the face of the two old parties, has organized labor been so deeply and actively aroused in a presidential election as today. Nor, for that matter, since 1924 has organized labor as such, as an independent force, ever played so politically decisive a role as it is likely to do this year; never, in all this time, was it placed in so strategic a position, never was its every move followed so closely for its possible effect on the outcome of the campaign.

At the same time, the problem with which labor is confronted in the presidential elections today is far more difficult, far more complicated, than when La Follette headed a third party twelve years ago. To find a situation at all comparable in this respect, we must go back almost a quarter of a century to 1912, when a split in the Republican party placed three capitalist candidates before the country—Theodore Roosevelt, the "progressive"; Wilson, the liberal Democrat; and Taft, the Republican reactionary. It is surely no wonder then that, in the more advanced sections of the labor movement, among those to whom the masses generally look for guidance and leadership, significant shifts in traditional opinion are rapidly taking place, reflecting deeper processes under way in the ranks of the working class.

The Key Problem—Attitude to Roosevelt

The key problem for labor in the present political situation is, of course, its attitude towards Roosevelt and the New Deal. Huge sections of organized labor have al-

ready come out in official support of the President and others are sure to follow, whether thru the Labor Non-Partisan League or otherwise. It is easy to brush all this aside as "nothing new," for have not the vast majority of the workers always supported old-party candidates in the elections? But such an attitude would be a grave mistake, indicating failure to understand the essence of the situation. For the miners and the textile workers and the clothing workers who are going to vote for Roosevelt this year are not going to do so as just ordinary American citizens of the Democratic persuasion but as workers. This new aspect of the situation has received its organizational expression in the formation of the Labor Non-Partisan League, whose nature, potentialities, prospects and dangers are thoroughly analyzed in the editorial statement appearing in the May 2, 1936 issue of the Workers Age. It is sufficient for us here to emphasize that today, in 1936, the Roosevelt question has become a labor question in a way that no presidential candidacy has been since LaFollette or at any time before!

It is our task as Marxists to examine and evaluate this new development in the ranks of labor, not dogmatically in terms of set abstractions nor superficially on the basis of partial and inadequate judgments but critically in the light of the historical interests of the working class. General formulas will not do; we must face and answer the arguments raised by the labor partisans of Roosevelt, the very questions that arise spontaneously in the minds of the great masses of the workers.

The considerations that have such decisive weight with the various sections of the organized labor movement are not all of one kind, by any means. They differ greatly among themselves, reflecting a wide variety of stages of political sophistication and maturing class consciousness. At the very root of it all lies the great Roosevelt myth, the widespread and potent belief that the President is a genuinely progressive and far-seeing statesman, a real friend of labor, that the New Deal, under his sponsorship, has brought great benefit to the laboring masses of town and country. The power of the Roosevelt myth is altogether out of proportion to its truth. The New Deal record, as I have shown in my previous articles (Workers Age, Feb. 22, March 7 and March 14), is one of singled minded fidelity to the larger interests of capitalism. For labor there have been big and fine-sounding promises, turning to ashes at the first touch of reality. The fact of the matter seems to be that the Roosevelt of popular fable—Roosevelt the friend of labor, Roosevelt the progressive, the radical—is not a real person at all but rather a figment created by the bitterly hostile imagination of the old-line reactionaries. In this respect, the President's worst enemies have turned out to be his best friends politically, for they have built up for him his biggest political asset, the Roosevelt myth. In fact, it would not be too much to say that, among the great masses of the people, his prime attraction as a candidate is the enemies he has made.

## HARTFORD C.L.U. BACKS MOONEY

Hartford, Conn.—At its meeting on May 6, the Hartford Central Labor Union went on record endorsing National Mooney Day to be held on July 22 of this year. The resolution, introduced by Delegate Fishman of the Upholsterers Union, after detailing the essential facts in the Mooney-Billings case, concludes as follows:

"And whereas, the San Francisco Central Trades Council and the California State Federation of Labor have both come out for a National Tom Mooney Day to be held July 22, the 20th anniversary of Mooney's and Billings' imprisonment, on which day labor will again demand freedom for the two labor heroes;

"Therefore be it resolved, by the Hartford Central Labor Union, that it endorses this move, and is prepared to help morally, materially and financially in the fight for their release."

Copies of this resolution were ordered sent to Mooney and Billings to the Governor of California, to the Molders' Defense Committee and to the local press.

The attitude of the Daily Worker, has the local Communist Party members guessing. The Daily Worker printed a complete report of the meeting of the Central Labor Union but failed to mention the decision on Mooney by so much as one word.

## MOONEY RAN FOR SHERIFF ON S.P. TICKET

# Socialist Party

## Open Air Meetings

Sunday, Aug. 20 2 P. M. WATER FRONT  
Foot of Howard Street  
SPEAKER S

K. J. Doyle, for Supervisor | Thos. J. Mooney, for Sheriff

Tuesday, Aug. 22 8 P. M. Grant Avenue  
and Market Streets  
SPEAKERS

Wm. McDevitt, for Mayor | Selig Schulberg, for Supervisor

Saturday, Aug. 26 8 P. M. Post and Fillmore Sts.  
SPEAKERS

A. K. Gifford, for Auditor | David Milder, for Tax Collector  
C. W. HOGUE, for Supervisor

# Don't Forget! Monster RALLY at the Valencia Theatre THURSDAY, AUGUST 24, 8 P.M.

Eastman & Co. 220 Kenney St. Socialist Party Headquarters 1674 MISSION STREET

A leaflet of 1911, when Tom Mooney, then a young trade unionist, ran for Sheriff on the ticket of the Socialist Party. Mooney has always been in the fore of the labor movement's progressive wing.

derlying aim, the administration has attempted certain far-reaching changes in the relations between government, industry and labor, all in the direction of a more all-embracing system of state capitalism. That the measure of recovery and rehabilitation which has already occurred has taken place at the expense of the working masses can hardly be doubted by any one acquainted with the facts of the case. I have already called attention to the discrepancy between improvement in business and rapid rise in profits, on the one hand, and continued mass unemployment, stagnation in real wages and extension of the work-week, on the other—a characteristic of the recovery movement equally prevalent under the NRA and since its abolition.

We might also very well go into the matter of labor relations under the New Deal, the early outlawing of the closed shop, the stimulation of the closed shop, the stimulation of company unionism, the notorious runaround under Section 7a, the disastrous blows dealt to labor by New Deal agencies in the automobile, steel and textile industries—and, perhaps most important of all, the persistent efforts at government strangulation of the labor movement thru some sort of "overhead control" of the unions. We might emphasize the fact that, under the New Deal, Congress has just passed the biggest peace-time naval budget in history and one of the biggest army budgets. We could also note that, under the New Deal, and under such New Deal stalwarts as Senator Joseph T. Robinson of Arkansas and Governor McNutt of Indiana, sharecroppers and organized labor have been exposed to the worst excesses of governmental violence and official tyr-

anny. Under the New Deal, we could recall, a bloody dictatorship is being maintained in Cuba entirely by the weight of American influence. The conclusion would be everywhere the same: It is not what has actually been accomplished by the New Deal that gives body and strength to the Roosevelt myth but rather what has been attributed to it by the fanatically reactionary propaganda of the Liberty-League-Republican coalition.

It is true that, under the Roosevelt administration and thru it, the first beginnings of federal social and labor legislation have been made. However inadequate and delusive much of it is already turning out to be, the fact itself must be registered as of positive significance. But this development must be understood in its larger context. It is part of the broad Roosevelt program for the rehabilitation of capitalism. In such a policy of bourgeois social reform, the President was preceded many years ago, under different circumstances, of course, by Bismarck in Germany and Lloyd George in England. History has abundantly shown the thoroughly capitalistic and truly conservative character of such a course, in spite of its frequently unexpected and far-reaching consequences. Roosevelt and the Supreme Court President Roosevelt has been especially fortunate in his Supreme Court, which has done perhaps more to give plausibility and power to the Roosevelt myth than any other institution in this country. Precisely those New Deal measures which may conceivably be interpreted as promising most to the working people have either been completely voided by the courts or else are facing such a fate, and are meanwhile largely nullified by judicial interference. The Roosevelt program is thus enabled to retain the original glamor of its broad and sweeping promises while,

derlying aim, the administration has attempted certain far-reaching changes in the relations between government, industry and labor, all in the direction of a more all-embracing system of state capitalism. That the measure of recovery and rehabilitation which has already occurred has taken place at the expense of the working masses can hardly be doubted by any one acquainted with the facts of the case. I have already called attention to the discrepancy between improvement in business and rapid rise in profits, on the one hand, and continued mass unemployment, stagnation in real wages and extension of the work-week, on the other—a characteristic of the recovery movement equally prevalent under the NRA and since its abolition.

We might also very well go into the matter of labor relations under the New Deal, the early outlawing of the closed shop, the stimulation of the closed shop, the stimulation of company unionism, the notorious runaround under Section 7a, the disastrous blows dealt to labor by New Deal agencies in the automobile, steel and textile industries—and, perhaps most important of all, the persistent efforts at government strangulation of the labor movement thru some sort of "overhead control" of the unions. We might emphasize the fact that, under the New Deal, Congress has just passed the biggest peace-time naval budget in history and one of the biggest army budgets. We could also note that, under the New Deal, and under such New Deal stalwarts as Senator Joseph T. Robinson of Arkansas and Governor McNutt of Indiana, sharecroppers and organized labor have been exposed to the worst excesses of governmental violence and official tyr-

anny. Under the New Deal, we could recall, a bloody dictatorship is being maintained in Cuba entirely by the weight of American influence. The conclusion would be everywhere the same: It is not what has actually been accomplished by the New Deal that gives body and strength to the Roosevelt myth but rather what has been attributed to it by the fanatically reactionary propaganda of the Liberty-League-Republican coalition.

It is true that, under the Roosevelt administration and thru it, the first beginnings of federal social and labor legislation have been made. However inadequate and delusive much of it is already turning out to be, the fact itself must be registered as of positive significance. But this development must be understood in its larger context. It is part of the broad Roosevelt program for the rehabilitation of capitalism. In such a policy of bourgeois social reform, the President was preceded many years ago, under different circumstances, of course, by Bismarck in Germany and Lloyd George in England. History has abundantly shown the thoroughly capitalistic and truly conservative character of such a course, in spite of its frequently unexpected and far-reaching consequences. Roosevelt and the Supreme Court President Roosevelt has been especially fortunate in his Supreme Court, which has done perhaps more to give plausibility and power to the Roosevelt myth than any other institution in this country. Precisely those New Deal measures which may conceivably be interpreted as promising most to the working people have either been completely voided by the courts or else are facing such a fate, and are meanwhile largely nullified by judicial interference. The Roosevelt program is thus enabled to retain the original glamor of its broad and sweeping promises while,

\* Workers Age, March 7, 1936. For the continuity of this contradictory form of recovery during the NRA and after, compare the March 1936 issue of the A. F. of L. Monthly Survey of business with that of May 1934.

## MOONEY HEARING EXPOSES PROLL

### Detective Testifies He Identified on Basis Of "Prosecution's Profit"

The parade of prosecution witnesses on the hearing on Tom Mooney's petition to the State Supreme Court for a writ of habeas corpus resulted in further unmasking the details in the frameup. James F. Brennan, Finkert's assistant of the frame-up days, admitted spending many hours trying to induce Billings to turn State's evidence and help frame Mooney. He exposed his later "pro-Mooney" attitude as being motivated by political ambitions and hatred of his former boss for hogging the spotlight. "Mooney should be stuck on a central peg with Emma Goldman on one side and Alexander Berkman on the other, and you would have a trinity of anarchists the world could not equal," was his parting shot of hatred.

William Proll, who was attached to the bomb bureau in 1916, testified that it is his custom to "make identifications in the manner which he thinks would be most profitable to the prosecution."

Peter J. Hughes, another member of the police frame-up crew, who still actively figures from time to time in attempts to crush Union Labor, was placed on the stand. Hughes is now an Inspector of Police, and may be remembered from newspaper reports in connection with the shooting of two maritime workers in the 1934 San Francisco dock strike. It was Hughes who searched Nolan's basement and testified before the Grand Jury that the epsom salts found there was saltpetre. Shown the chemist's analysis, he still refused to say now that the statement was false, but announced that he took it for granted that the powder was saltpetre, presumably because that was a constituent of explosives and he had to prove the prosecution theory.

The State is continuing its parade of Pickert assistants with Attorney Ferrari, who is now replacing his reward as counsel for the Bank of America, for services rendered in those days in 1916 in the frame-up conspiracy against Tom Mooney.

## Chrysler Inoculates Against Union Virus

Detroit.—The Chrysler Corporation has just announced an increase of about 5% in the hourly wage

Perhaps not so surprising is the fact that this announcement comes soon after the convention of the auto workers union where all preparations for a real organization drive were laid.

at the same time, the President is spared the necessity of having to make good on his promises thru the kindly interposition of the courts. And against the courts Roosevelt has done absolutely nothing, altho the situation is certainly such as to challenge action on the part of anyone with the least claim to liberalism.

On the whole, therefore, it seems rather difficult to make out a case for Roosevelt as a "friend of labor" in any real sense of the term. Nor is there the least ground to exalt the New Deal for the benefits it has showered upon the working people of this country. Whatever advance labor has really made under the Roosevelt administration, it has made thru relying upon its own independent and organized power, thru hard fighting against

(Continued on Page 6)



WORKERS AGE

Organ of the National Committee, Communist Party U. S. A. (Opposition), 51 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. Phone: GRamercy 4-8903.

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

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

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

Vol. V. Saturday, May 30, 1936. No. 22.

An Announcement

FOR A NUMBER of weeks, we have been appealing to our friends to help us put over the Five Thousand Dollar Drive. We had hoped that long before this we would go over the top. It is with regrets that we must inform our friends that we have been unable to reach our goal.

Furthermore, the readers of the Workers Age are aware of the fact that one-third of the funds collected in the Drive was sequestered for our comrades in underground Germany and Austria and for revolutionary activities in Spain.

1. Everyone who has pledged makes good his promise in cash immediately.

2. Readers of the Workers Age and sympathizers of our movement who have so far not responded to our repeated and at times frantic appeals now break with their apathy and rush to us instantly immediate help to the very best of their ability.

If both of these proposals are greeted favorably by our readers and friends, then we will be able without question to continue the Age as an eight-page weekly, then we will be able to avoid any and all reductions in size and features.

This decision on our part is neither a threat nor a game. It is a frank recognition of things as they are. We hope that this announcement will arouse sufficient interest, concern and response to change things as they are into things as they should be.

The Guffey Decision

IN OUR issue of May 9th we wrote the following:

"The Supreme Court has been tarrying in its preparation of the decision on the Guffey Act. Perhaps by the time these lines appear in our columns the decision will be public. We have no pipelines to these robed gentlemen who are experts in flouting the will and riding rough shod over the most vital interests of the masses."

Nothing would surprise us more than the Supreme Court ruling favorably on the Guffey law. We have every reason to declare that the highest tribunal of the land will invalidate even so devalitized a measure. The latter will be branded as disturbing the contractual relationship between employer and worker.

We have not quoted the above in order to engage in the game of "I told you so" after the U. S. Supreme Court knocked the Guffey law into a cocked hat. We have repeated our comments of several weeks ago merely to prepare our readers for more decisions of this sort being handed down by the citadel of American capitalist reaction.

No doubt, our readers are fully acquainted with the essentials of the Guffey Act decision decreeing that its labor provisions are unconstitutional. The underlying philosophy of this decree is to be found in the Supreme Court decision on the Railroad Retirement Act. We need but remind the workers that the Supreme Court decided in that case that any move made by the Government in the direction of helping, in the least, to provide pensions for railroad employees is unconstitutional because it tends to diminish the loyalty of the employee to his employer by transferring some of this loyalty to the Government.

Hence, we dismiss as mere juridical claptrap the attempt of Justice George Sutherland to draw a rigid distinction between "production" and "commerce". By defining commerce as "intercourse for the purpose of trade", (prostitution would also qualify here, as the vener-

(Continued on Page 7)

The Workers Need a Labor Party

The article printed below is an excerpt from "The Workers and Their World," a book published in 1935. Joseph Schlossberg is the Secretary-Treasurer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and, on the Executive Board, alone raised his voice against the endorsement of Roosevelt.

By JOSEPH SCHLOSSBERG

The conditions which call for a trade union also call for a labor party. Those conditions arise from the industrial relations between the employers and the wage workers. For the purpose of the present discussion it is not necessary to examine those relations.

Our own daily experiences, and the industrial history of our country and others, prove conclusively that the relations are those of opposing parties. The ever-raging conflict between profits and wages dominates our social order. The need for both the trade union and the labor party flows from that conflict.

The reason is that the trade union is set up against a visible adversary, the immediate employer, who is present in the flesh, and because of labor conditions which prevail in his own plant and are subject to his own will. A labor party takes the field not against the individual employer, but against the class of employers; not against a particular case of exploitation, but against the system of human exploitation. That looks very much like an abstraction. The enemy seems complicated; the visibility is blurred.

The opposition to an independent political party of labor may be summed up under three heads: 1) the "labor politician", the trafficker in the "labor vote"; 2) "there are no classes in the United States" and, therefore, no room for a labor party; workers should vote as all other citizens do; 3) labor must be non-partisan: reward friends and punish enemies.

Opposition one may be dismissed without serious discussion. The "labor politician" will be for a labor party if and when such a party should become strong enough to distribute patronage and insure a career.

If Opposition two is right and "there are no classes", why does the phrase "capital and labor" occur so frequently in our economic discussion? Surely "capital" and "labor" cannot be synonymous.

While Opposition Two refuses to have any political attitude and tells the workers to be political nobodies, Opposition Three assumes a definite attitude, which is non-partisan, or bi-partisan—rewarding friends and punishing enemies. That is the official political po-

deceiving ourselves, where the purpose is not to deceive others, to say that there are no classes in the United States at this time, when more than twenty million Americans are on the public relief rolls because those who own the job would not employ the idle who are eager to work. What do such terms as "labor market" and "collective labor agreements" mean if not indicating the existence of a distinct economic class, a working class? "Labor" and "capital" are not names of callings or professions; they are designations of economic and social clarifications. Yes, there are economic and social classes in the United States.

And how do "all other citizens" vote? They are not all in one party. The electorate is sharply divided between the two large capitalist parties. The legislative and executive branches of the government take official cognizance of this party division by giving to both parties representation in committee—majority representation to the larger party and minority representation to the smaller one. Why are "all other citizens" divided politically? Political parties do not drop from the clouds. They are voluntary associations of citizens. There must be reasons for their existence. Those parties have histories which tell us that they arose out of conflicts of material interests among the citizens. That is why we have more than one party. How can a substantial group of citizens give political expression to their common material interests except through a political party? If the founders of the Democratic and Republican Parties had been guided by the philosophy of "voting as all others do", there would have been no political parties in this country. No, it is not contrary to good citizenship to say, "We will not vote as others do; we will vote as our interests require of us."

Practically all political activities deal with economic problems—the tariff, labor legislation, taxes, public works, recovery measures, etc. When such items are checked off, there is very little left of a legislative program that is purely political. The economic interests of the workers are not identical with those of the employers. The workers may and must have their own political party as the employers have theirs.

For the benefit of those who are too impatient to wait for a labor party to come into governmental power and get results, it may be confidently stated that a growing labor party will achieve results before it becomes a victorious party. We know that an employer grants concessions to his employees in order to keep them from joining a trade union which is showing signs of success. In the same manner the capitalist politicians will hasten to hand out sopas to the workers in the hope of keeping them away from the growing labor party. The capitalist politicians will grant much more to the workers out of fear and respect than they do now out of pity.

Under existing labor movement conditions one cannot expect an American labor party to be an out and out socialist party, though the socialist movement should be a part of it. But a labor party must not be a so-called third (capitalist) party; nor a "progressive" (capitalist) party, nor a party built around the name of a prominent politician. Neither a "third" party nor a "progressive" party nor a "dynastic" party will build up a political party of labor. And that is the all important thing—the power of organized labor. Political action by labor which is not calculated to achieve that aim is worthless—is the same as the present worthless political policy of labor, lack of policy.

position of the American Federation of Labor, and is essentially the same policy of secrecy in politics that the Knights of Labor followed in economics. The Knights of Labor thought that secrecy would make it impossible for the employers to know when the organization was weak. Similarly the non-partisan political policy is expected to conceal the political weakness of labor. At the beginning, the old party politicians had faith in the labor vote myth. They know better now. You cannot have a "labor vote" when workers are told that they must vote as "all other citizens" do, and you can have no labor vote without a labor party.

If it is possible to "reward friends" who are on the outside, why can't we have our own friends, in our own party, under our own control and command, instead of begging for friendship in the enemy's camp? If labor legislation is worth begging for, why is it not worth fighting for? And what is our standard of "friendship"? Suppose a Senator or a Congressman votes for Roosevelt's \$50 a month wage proposal and also for an anti-injunction law. Shall we punish him as an enemy or reward him as a friend? Suppose also that one is an open shop and company union employer but votes for the child labor amendment, which is not in conceivable; is he a friend or an enemy? And what are we to do with a state governor who sends troops against strikers and shouts "hurray" for the New Deal—should labor vote for him or against him? One who was elected on a labor party ticket is pledged to the entire labor program. There is an unmistakable standard by which to judge his conduct.

If we are to refuse to organize a labor party because some old party legislators or public officials are friendly to labor, and there are such, why should we not likewise refuse to organize workers in an industrial plant whose owner is friendly to labor? There are such, too. We seek to organize into unions all workers, because we realize the need of a strong labor movement. A labor party must be organized for the same reason. The vital matter is not to have individual friends in the enemy's camp but to have our own camp and our own power.

And when we pry into these statistics a bit more we note two significant trends. In comparison with 1934 the manufacture of so-called producers' goods rose by 26%. In the same period the production of "consumers' goods" registered a further decrease of more than 2%. Even if we were to discount the effect of the feverish production of armaments on the general economic situation in present day Germany, even if we were to compare the 1935 figures with those of the bottom of the crisis year 1932, we would still run into a scathing indictment of the Nazi crimes against the welfare of the masses in Germany. Comparing figures on this basis we find that the output of so-called producers goods has doubled, while the manufacture of consumers' goods has

AT FIRST GLANCE

By Jay Lovestone

WE ARE not hitting far from the mark when we say that it won't be long before a lot of Socialists and official Communists will hail as a most praiseworthy idea the proposition to "nationalize" the French armament industry. In fact, the People's Front in France has for months been making much hubalabaloo about the "nationalization" of the armaments industry as a real guarantee for peace and an effective preventive of war.

We are compelled to be impolite. We are compelled to say that all such talk is the bunk. There can be no genuine nationalization in a capitalist society. So long as the capitalist class continues to rule, government ownership and operation of any industry—whether it be the armament of cosmetic—will only mean shifting from a private capitalist to a state capitalist basis.

Moreover, it is asinine to speak of "nationalizing" the armament industry while leaving the iron, steel, copper, coal, oil, tin and nickel industries in private capitalist hands. To resort to "nationalization" of the armaments industry without "nationalizing" the kindred industries on which arms production rests is the sheepest of folly, even in a capitalist society. In reality, such nationalization only creates a bigger and better buyer of the materials going into arms production. It does not in the least undermine or override the profit motive as the mainspring of social and economic relations.

WE HAVE always emphasized that there's nothing more unreliable as an index of the real economic situation than mere production figures. Often, by themselves, mounting production figures may or may not provide us with proof that economic improvement has set in or prevails—that improvement in economic equilibrium is at hand.

We are led to reemphasize the above because of the latest report on the economic situation in Germany issued by Hitler's Institute for Trade Research. The latter body has just reported that industrial production in Germany last year practically reached the 1928 levels. This is to be taken, according to Nazi orders, as proof of things in Germany being just fine. A somewhat poetic dispatch—passing off as a scoop from the New York Times "Five Star" reporter Birchall—tends to lend still more color to this glowing picture.

We do not hesitate to say that Birchall's colors in his recent Nazi painted reports are synthetic from the point of view of truth and accurate portrayal. What is more, let us suppose that the Nazi researchers have for once not overworked their imagination when they told us that in 1935 German economy approached the 1928 peak. This in itself does not necessarily mean a thing, because no one can deny that the economic situation in Germany in 1928 was basically unsound, that it suffered from crushing dis-equilibrium and that its entire prosperity had a foundation of sand.

And when we pry into these statistics a bit more we note two significant trends. In comparison with 1934 the manufacture of so-called producers' goods rose by 26%. In the same period the production of "consumers' goods" registered a further decrease of more than 2%. Even if we were to discount the effect of the feverish production of armaments on the general economic situation in present day Germany, even if we were to compare the 1935 figures with those of the bottom of the crisis year 1932, we would still run into a scathing indictment of the Nazi crimes against the welfare of the masses in Germany. Comparing figures on this basis we find that the output of so-called producers goods has doubled, while the manufacture of consumers' goods has

Hardly worth the piece of paper on which it is written because it sets no limits on the building of cruisers under 35,000 tons, a very serviceable class indeed, the treaty is reduced to a virtual mockery by the inclusion of an escape clause. By the terms of this provision, a signatory may proceed full speed ahead with its construction program just as soon as it notifies the other two contracting parties of its intentions. The only excuse it needs is some fancied threat to its

United States have ever played any really decisive role in the strategy of the major parties, but rather because, in the coming months, the words in the platforms will be more deceiving than ever.

That is why we conclude that the Republican Party will have a much more liberal platform than most people expect it to have. The G.O.P. has been taking more baths in pitch black reactionary mud than is good for its health. A liberal whitewash or veneer is good strategy under these circumstances. And words are the cheapest bait for voters!

Insofar as the Democratic Party is concerned, we cannot escape the conclusion that its platform will be far less radical or even liberal than have been some of the first-side messages coming over the national hookups from the White House study rooms. The Party of the Donkey has been plastered with too much red mud. Therefore it must be covered with a rather relatively conservative garment, in the pattern of a platform which will please hundreds of thousands of have-been and would-be successful American entrepreneurs.

This is what has been called "the great game of politics" in our Wall Street democracy. It is a game as fraudulent and anti-social as is the entire economic system, the whole economic foundation, on which the political superstructure rests.

WITH THE LAWMAKERS

Its guts torn out in obedience to the dictates of the United States Supreme Court as expressed in the recent ruling on the measure, the Guffey Coal Stabilization Act was submitted to Congress for consideration at this session. The United Mine Workers and the National Conference of Bituminous Coal Producers, not to mention the Roosevelt administration, are behind the eviscerated bill.

In drafting the measure anew, Vinson retained a favorable statement of policy on collective bargaining, but they cut out the vitally necessary provisions which make interference with labor organization a matter punishable by the federal government. As the bill stands now, with its interstate price-fixing and fair practice regulations, it is the dream of all monopoly business. Even representation on the contemplated Bituminous Coal Commission, the administrative body, is cut to the pattern of the coal interests' wishes. The industry can match labor's two seats with its own two, and can fall back upon the government's three if it ever finds itself in a hole.

Even as originally framed, the Guffey Act was of more than questionable value to labor. For one thing, it tended to seduce the miners into believing in the good faith of the government, and for another, it gave the coal barons their hearts' desire, freedom from the restrictions of monopolistic restraints of trade. As rewritten in the shadow of the big stick wielded by the Supreme Court, it represents a positive menace.

THE TOOTHLESS London naval treaty providing "qualitative" instead of "quantitative" restrictions in battleship building until 1942 was passed unanimously by the United States Senate this week. The three nations affected by the "disarmament" program are Great Britain, France, and the United States.

ROOSEVELT has definitely ditched the Wagner Housing bill so far as this session of Congress is concerned. Whatever the merits of the measure, the action of the President was tantamount to a slap in the face for the workers, for Roosevelt knew that Green had it on his "must" list.

THE MUIR anti-injunction bill was buried in the New Jersey Judiciary Committee this week after a brief gambol on this earth.

—LEE MASON

JOIN COMMUNIST PARTY (OPPOSITION) 51 West 14th Street New York City

Send me more information about the C.P.O.

Name Address City State

TRADE UNION NOTES

By George F. Miles

ONE of the signs by which it was possible to tell that there was something new in the Socialist Party of America, was the consistent opposition which the Militants presented against the time-honored do-nothing policy in the trade unions pursued by the Old Guard. The Militants argued very correctly that it was both silly and contradictory for socialists to have a position whether on internal trade union matters or general policies, without taking the necessary measures to organize the socialists in the unions for the propagation of these ideas and opinions.

The Old Guard was never convinced—which is a nice way of saying that the Old Guard feared such group organization because it might lose them the patronage which comes their way from the trade union bureaucracy as the reward for their silent endorsement of things as they are. But the mass of the progressive workers in the Socialist Party thought what the Militants said sounded like common sense and ought to be given a trial. And so it came about that the hated "fractions" (the C.P. term for the Communist group in the unions) came to be, took up questions, and exercised party discipline to compel uniform action. Only they made them sound very respectable by calling them Socialist League.

There was a general opinion that this convention of the Socialist Party would mark the extension of this policy nationally and would make more than a mere title of the position held down by Paul Porter. But such it appears is not to occur, if Comrade Norman Thomas has his way.

Thomas never was much of an expert on trade union matters but he now suddenly flowers out with a position of his own (Socialist Call, May 23)—apparently to provide proof that he "will go a long way to get unity" with the Old Guard.

Beginning with the hope "that the Labor Committee will give us a genuine and vigorous leadership in regard to the relations of Socialists to labor unions," he soon makes clear what type of leadership would be acceptable to him. "We have got to have a Socialist policy," says Thomas, "BUT EXCEPT IN VERY UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES I DO NOT FAVOR SOCIALIST LEAGUES FAVOR SOCIALISTS IN THE UNIONS."

There are circumstances where Socialists ought to be active in progressive clubs in unions in order to bring about within the union changes consistent with labor democracy.

This formulation constitutes a big retreat from the practice of the Socialist Party of New York. In fact minus some of the verbiage it is essentially the position of the Old Guard which the Militants have resisted for many years. To say that only "in very unusual circumstances" should Socialist Leagues be resorted to is another way of establishing the rule against Socialist Leagues. The exceptions are not important. Even the Old Guard sanctioned some exceptions in New York—for instance when it attempted a crystallization of Socialist Party members against the progressive leadership of Local 22 of the I.L.G.W.U., some time ago.

It remains to be seen whether the convention will toe Thomas' chalk line.

The Supreme Court of the United States is due for a vote of thanks from the labor movement of this country. Its brazen decision in the case of the Guffey Coal Act should go a long way to convince a lot of doubting Thomases among the workers that the Supreme Court is not a rigidly impartial body standing above classes. This decision, perhaps more than many others, shows the Supreme Court as being ruled by class passions more so than the workers of this country who have still to find

themselves as a class. This law was declared unconstitutional not because it is in conflict with some mythical constitutional provision but because it is in conflict with the interests of the capitalist class from which the Justices spring and to which they belong.

When labor finally recognizes this truth it will organize politically to smash this organ of oppression.

Even so serious a matter as the voiding of the Guffey Coal Act is not without its humorous angle. When informed of this decision and asked for an opinion President Hutchenson of the Brotherhood of Carpenters (he who got slapped at the A. F. of L. convention) stated that he hoped this will be a lesson to John L. Lewis not to depend upon the government to organize the workers, but to depend upon the organized strength of labor.

We just listened to Leo Kryczki, Chairman of the Socialist Party, deliver his keynote address over the radio. We want to be the first to congratulate Comrade Kryczki for at last mustering sufficient courage to come out against Roosevelt. It would have been much more effective, however, if the Chairman of the Socialist Party had shown the same degree of courage in the General Executive Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, when Roosevelt was endorsed.

We don't know if you have noticed it but a local of the Teachers Union was forced to liquidate because the city fathers of some city in Tennessee threatened to fire everyone belonging to the union. Strange as it may seem we have heard no protests. But if this action is permitted to go unchallenged it may well be extended to other workers in the employ of the city and the state.

Brooklyn's District Attorney William F. X. Geoghan has been investigated by the Grand Jury and a letter was sent by the latter to Governor Lehman calling for his removal. The Grand Jury found him guilty on three charges: (1) Negligence and incompetence in prosecuting the Druckman murderers; (2) failure to investigate charges of bribery of public officials; and (3) associating with underworld figures. We're for Geoghan's removal. Besides being hand in glove with gangsters, gamblers and bookies, District Attorney Geoghan has proven to be viciously anti-labor, as is shown by his strike-breaking record for the Mays Department Store, various Knitgoods strikes and strikes conducted by the Painters Union. The Central Labor Union did nothing about it because, being Tammany ridden, it covered up for the party pal—Geoghan.

STRIKING SEAMEN ASK AID The striking seamen, members of the International Seamen's Union, are appealing to all trade unionists and friends of the labor movement for assistance. Outside of financial assistance the strikers are in bad need of shoes and clothing. All Brooklyn friends are urged to send or bring bundles or contributions to the strike headquarters at 13 Union Street, Brooklyn.



# ROOSEVELT AND LABOR

(Continued from Page 3)  
the employing class and, only too frequently, against the New Deal and its agencies as well.

**"Roosevelt or Reaction?"**  
But there is another type of appeal made by Roosevelt supporters based not so much on the President's alleged merits as on the dreadful alternative to his election. Stand by Roosevelt or else the Liberty League will get in and then the iron heel will descend upon labor! It is Roosevelt or reaction, Roosevelt or fascism! This is the essential argument of the Labor Non-Partisan League and, as such, it deserves to be given careful consideration.\*\*

In what sense is it a choice between Roosevelt and reaction? I have already attempted to show in a previous article (Workers Age, March 14, 1936) that, between Roosevelt and his enemies in the ranks of big capital, there are no differences of fundamental aim or purpose. Both stand on the basis of the capitalist system and both want to stabilize and perpetuate it. But they disagree sharply as to ways and means of accomplishing this, of bolstering up and reinforcing the present system of exploitation. The general outlines of the New Deal program are determined not by the academic vagaries of the Brain Trust but by the very necessities of capitalism itself. Consequently, no matter how violently they may rave and rant in their attacks on the President, the Republican reactionaries will hardly be in a position, should they emerge victorious, to change more than the secondary features of whatever New Deal legislation remains. It was no empty challenge that Roosevelt issued in his message on January 3, when he dared his opponents in Congress to propose the outright repeal of any of the chief New Deal measures!

Nor is there any better ground to place the issue as "Roosevelt or fascism." The Republicans hardly constitute a fascist movement today nor can the Roosevelt administration be regarded as by any means an effective safeguard against fascism.\*\*\* Experience at home and abroad has amply proven that the working class is able to win concessions for itself and to block the way to reaction and fascism only to the degree that it becomes a formidable political power in its own right. An impressive vote for an independent labor candidate in the coming elections, for example, would be a far more effective way of halting reaction and gaining a hearing for the demands of labor than any number of labor votes cast for Roosevelt in the form of a blank check for the New Deal. Europe has surely taught us that the menace of fascism is to

\*\* Declares an unusually thoughtful editorial in the *World-Telegram* of May 6, 1936:

"Has this amazing rank and file movement come about because the workers of the country are completely sold on Roosevelt and the New Deal, and are confident they will get what they want in the 1936 Democratic platform? We don't think so. There are many things about the New Deal which workers do not like—higher cost of living, failure to solve the unemployment problem, substitute work-relief wages, to mention a few.  
"No, the answer can be found in the sort of Republican leadership which has permitted such ax-grinding organizations as the American Liberty League and the National Association of Manufacturers to set the tenor of the C.O.P.'s New Deal opposition. . . . American workers are getting ready not to vote for somebody or something, but to vote against. They are going to vote against that kind of leadership (of the Republican party)."

\*\*\* See the article, "Who Are the Fascists in America?", *Workers Age*, Jan. 4, 1936.

be met and destroyed not by reliance upon some alleged "lesser evil" but by the united, militant and independent political action of labor.

**Two Decisive Questions**  
Two grave questions face those who advocate support of Roosevelt on the grounds of the "lesser evil." If it is necessary to back him today in order to prevent a Republican victory, how about the future? It is generally recognized that this year the President is fairly certain and that the Republicans are placing their real hopes in 1940 when conditions will be much more favorable for them. Will it, therefore, be incumbent upon labor to support Roosevelt in 1940 as well, so as to avoid a triumph for the Liberty League then also? Is not this a logic compelling labor to mortgage its entire future to the Democratic party at the sacrifice of all prospects of its own political independence?

By what token, furthermore, shall we draw the line between Roosevelt and his party, so that we can support the former without committing ourselves to the latter? Of what use would it be, for example, to reelect the President without simultaneously giving him a Democratic majority in both houses of Congress so as to enable him to carry his policies out into effect? The logic of labor support of Roosevelt is inescapably the logic of the support of the Democratic Party all along the line. And are any of the spokesmen of the Labor Non-Partisan League ready to insist that the Democratic party as such is devoted to the interests of the working people and deserving of their support?

All this may well be admitted, as it frequently is, and yet a pro-Roosevelt position may be taken on utterly different grounds. For better or for worse—we are told by many—the labor movement has already swung almost unanimously towards Roosevelt and we must go along—we must not allow ourselves to be divorced from the main body of organized labor. Literal acceptance of this type of argument would, of course, take us far beyond the support of the President; it would compel us to condone craft unionism and every other outworn and reactionary practice in the A. F. of L. Experience has taught us that it is quite possible for the advanced elements to avoid isolation and maintain organic contact with the movement as a whole, while standing in uncompromising opposition to policies that are false and dangerous to labor even though the great majority of the workers may still believe in them. In fact, the ability to do this is the secret of real progressive leadership—and such leadership is more vitally needed in the present situation than in any other in recent years.

### The Labor Non-Partisan League and the Labor Party

The final argument I have reserved for the last because it is easily the most important. Quite apart from any question of supporting Roosevelt—it is urged—the Labor Non-Partisan League represents the beginning of a labor party movement in the United States, a very paradoxical, even contradictory beginning but the kind that is demanded by American conditions, and it is the duty of the advanced elements to be in the inside in order to guide the development into proper channels. It is easy enough to laugh this type of argument out of court with ironical references to a "Roosevelt labor party"—altogether too easy, I am afraid. For it is a fact that, "historically and objectively, the Labor Non-Partisan League, or rather certain of its fundamental as-

# The People's Front Policy Versus The Teachings of Marx and Lenin

THE Communist International professes to follow the doctrines of Marx, Engels and Lenin. They, however, did not stop at the formulation of the principles of communism; they did not regard their theories as a dogma but as a guide to action. Their works and political activities are examples of the practical application of communist principles, of communist tactics. This phase of the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin has been completely ignored by the C.I. in its policy outside the Soviet Union. No one can claim that the tactics of the C.I. in capitalist countries bear the stamp of Marxism-Leninism. Undoubtedly it is much more difficult to apply the tactical teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin than it is to propagate the general principles of communism as formulated by them. They worked out the problems of the revolutionary proletariat in specific historical situations by taking into account the concrete conditions and peculiarities of the class struggle at the time. It is far from easy to apply their tactical teachings, that is, to draw the lessons from their positions in specific historical situations for the Communist Party today facing different situations in different countries.

The problem becomes all the more difficult today because the decline and decay of the capitalist system has infested the contradictions of bourgeois society, creating constantly new domestic and foreign crises and thereby placing new problems before the Communists. There is a tendency today to abandon the study of the tactics of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the grounds that the situation has changed completely and that it is far better to rely upon "common sense" for the solution of our present-day problems without consideration of what the great masters of communism thought about the problems of the class struggle in their own time. This tendency to ignore the lessons of history, this theory of "common sense" has always led into a blind alley because there can be no accurate prognosis without a thorough assimilation of the experiences of the past.

The C. I. charged the Communist Opposition with opportunism because the latter demanded that an analysis of fascism must take into account the Marxian analysis of French Bonapartism as expounded in the "Eighteenth Brumaire". The opposition formulated a correct communist policy for the struggle against fascism thanks to its thorough grasp of the Marxian analysis of Bonapartism. The leadership of the C.I., however, followed "common sense" and formulated the theory of "social fascism" on the basis of superficial factors. Now, that this theory, and the ultra-left course of which it was a part, has collapsed, the C.I. maintains that the working class faces the alternative of bourgeois democracy or fascism and has adopted the People's Front idea.

Had the Comintern leadership understood the lessons to be drawn from the position of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the class struggles of their time, it could have avoided the ultra-left theory of "social fascism" as well as the present ultra-right policy of the People's Front. In formulating the revolutionary tasks of the proletariat in a specific situation, Marx, Engels and Lenin always carefully analyzed the position of each class, judged the attitude of the non-proletarian classes on the basis of their class interests and not on the basis of the good or evil intentions of their political representatives nor on the basis of superficial events. They always insisted that the line of demarcation between the various classes be brought out clearly, that the

contradictory elements may well come to form a transition stage towards independent working class political action in the future. We must not overlook the great inherent potentialities in the mere organization of the workers for political action, even though its alleged independence is largely illusory" (editorial on "Labor in the Coming Elections," *Workers Age*, May 2, 1936). To recognize this, however, is by no means the same as to approve the formation of the League or to endorse its policies. On the contrary, it seems clear that the foundation of the League at this time has served to forestall and prevent, for the present at least, a direct and positive development towards a labor party, has helped to drive the movement on to a false and tortuous road along which the goal can be reached, if at all, only at the price of heavy sacrifice. American politics may be a dense forest

differences between the interests and the views of each class are to be determined in general and in relation to the specific historic situation at the moment and that the proletariat always put forward its own independent class viewpoint. The theory of "social fascism" as promulgated by the Communist International refused to recognize any difference between bourgeois democracy and fascism; all parties with the sole exception of the Communist party were labeled fascist; all conflicts and disputes among political parties were regarded as sham battles. The theory of "social fascism" did emphasize the independent class position of the proletariat but only in the form of a general acceptance of the ultimate aims of the proletarian class struggle. The ultra-left course could not lead to the independent, effective participation of the proletariat in the concrete struggles of the day. The Communist Party was groping in the dark because the theory of "social fascism" made impossible an accurate appraisal of the real situation.

The People's Front policy is based on the same methods of reasoning as was the theory of "social fascism" and is therefore far from being a Marxist-Leninist tactic. As a result of the People's Front policy the independent class viewpoint of the Communist Party has been lost in a maze of bourgeois-democratic phrases employed in its day-to-day work. According to the People's Front, fascism is not a form of the rule of the bourgeoisie as a class and in the interest of the bourgeoisie as a class, but rather the "dictatorship of the most imperialist, the most chauvinist elements of finance capital" (resolution of the seventh world congress); the work of the "two hundred families" of France's richest capitalists. Against this a united front of the "people" must be set up. The concept "people" includes the working class, the petty bourgeoisie, that section of the bourgeoisie which does not belong to "the most imperialist, the most chauvinist elements" of capital, radical bourgeois elements in France, liberals, catholic priests and capitalists, yes, even Reichswehr officers and monarchists in Germany.

The Communist Party does not regard bourgeois democracy in the light of the class conflicts of a decaying capitalist system, in which bourgeois democracy is being dissolved and at the same time giving rise to fascism. The Party heeds only the traditions of 1789 and 1848, the period of the birth of bourgeois democracy. The view that the proletariat at present is faced by the choice of either fascism or bourgeois democracy has led the Communist Party to fight for the maintenance of bourgeois democracy in countries of bourgeois democratic rule, such as France, and to come out for the restoration of bourgeois democracy in those countries in which fascism has already triumphed, as in Germany and Italy. This is particularly dangerous because the logic of this line of reasoning means the postponement of the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship to an indefinite period in the distant future. The danger of fascism will always arise from a decaying capitalist system. The only thing that would put off the danger of fascism for some time and bring about a consolidation of bourgeois democracy would be a new golden age of capitalist economy. To ask the proletariat to postpone the struggle for a proletarian dictatorship until the disappearance of the danger of fascism, would be asking the proletariat to wait forever. The only hope we have is that the C.I. leadership is constantly made aware of the necessity of the proletarian dictatorship by the existence of the Soviet Union. (To be continued)

and the road to a labor party may well come to an irreconcilable clash, releasing the more progressive sections of the movement for a direct advance towards independent class politics. But such a development can hardly be expected to come of itself; it will have to be brought into being under the impact of the class struggle, thru the active intervention of the class conscious elements in the labor movement. And these elements will be able to exercise their influence effectively only to the degree that they retain their political independence and freedom of action. Certainly, to allow themselves to be swallowed up by the Roosevelt torrent would mean virtual political annihilation and would thus greatly weaken the forces making for the eventual emergence of genuinely independent class politics out of the Labor Non-Partisan League movement!

# BOOKS of the AGE . . . . .

JOHN REED by Granville Hicks. (with assistance of John Stuart) New York. Macmillan. 445 pp. \$3.50.

This biography represents an enormous amount of work by both Hicks and his research assistant Stuart, who already engaged in writing his own story of Reed's life, and gave it up to assist Hicks. They were aided by Reed's articulateness and his habit of writing letters, articles and diary notes of his experiences and thoughts and the rich and full notes of Louise Bryant. The writing is vivid and the pictures of Reed at Harvard and as a free-lance writer and radical bohemian and war correspondent are highly effective and recreate his warm, boyish, adventurous, impetuous personality.

But the political chapters of the book dealing with the culmination of Reed's career and the things that make him worthy of a biography, are not so satisfactory.

Granville Hicks is so steeped in the present atmosphere of mechanical discipline and careful falsification of history to prune out all mention of the contributions of persons now persona non grata in official Comintern circles, that he has curiously attempted to simulate the Comintern of Lenin's day to that of today, has systematically falsified the record to avoid mentioning the role of such men as Lovestone in the building of the American Party and even attempted to make John Reed (of all people) into a puppet leader of today.

It is a shame that a man with the gift of scholarly and persistent research which is an obvious trait of Hicks, should be so far corrupted by the present use of falsification as a "revolutionary" weapon, that in a book which gives us the name of well-nigh every man Jack Reed ever met or argued or spent a pleasant evening with, there should be not one mention of the name of Jay Lovestone, no attempt to hint at the role of C.E. Ruthenberg, or, for that matter, no mention of the present reviewer who served with Reed on the National Council of the Left Wing and on a small editorial committee of three that put the Left Wing Manifesto, in one of its important stages, into final form. Hicks is

determined not to mention "forbidden" facts and names even if he has to sprinkle his pages with such sentences as: "The members of the Council who signed the joint call, Ruthenberg, Fraina, Cohen and the others"—and this in a book so detailed that it does not leave us in doubt as to what was the name of the fellow who failed to sail with Reed on a cattle boat! Does Hicks really believe that fact and history can be changed by such procedure?

But the far more democratic and less heresy-hunting character of the International of Reed's day (and Lenin's) shines through the pages despite the careful obscurations of Hicks. That is Reed's fault, not Hicks'. Thus he quotes John Reed as writing: "All these people (the Delegates to the Second Congress—B.D.W.) were not clear on Communism; they had violently divergent ideas about the dictatorship of the proletariat, parliamentarism, the need for a political party; but they were welcomed as brothers in revolution, as the best fighters of the working class, as comrades that were willing to die for the overthrow of capitalism."

It is noteworthy that none of these dissenters on tactical questions were expelled; they were patiently reasoned with and convinced, they were outvoted and asked to carry out decisions, although they might continue to oppose them, and in the appropriate times and places they might continue to argue against these decisions and seek to win a majority for their defeated views. Indeed, Jack Reed was one such dissenter.

On the trade union question he was an incurable dual unionist and although he did not accept the anti-dualist position of the Second Congress and in the words of Hicks "predicted that the next congress would adopt a different policy" (page 395), he was not expelled but elected a member of the E.C.C.I. Such was the inner democracy of the Comintern in Lenin's day.

How hard it is for Hicks to understand such a conception of the Comintern is shown by such sentences as this:

"Reed peremptorily offered his resignation from the E.C.C.I. in protest against Zinoviev's decision on an organizational question." It was not a decision of Zinoviev but of the E.C.C.I. There were no mechanical one-man decisions in those days, and no servile sycophancy to think that when "the

leader" had spoken, absolute truth had been revealed. There are certain errors of fact in the book, such as that the City Committee of the Left Wing met at Croton in John Reed's house (we had neither time nor carfare to go up to Croton in those days), or that the Socialist Propaganda League was purely a Chicago Organization (this reviewer belonged to its Kings County Section) but these are minor and not on the same plane with the deliberate falsifications for factional purposes which mar an otherwise splendid and unquestionably absorbing and well-written biography.

There is one serious defect of emphasis, perhaps the result of Granville Hicks' literary predilections and lack of political grasp. John Reed's "Ten Days that Shook the World" occupies an altogether too minor place in this biography. Yet it is John Reed's only really monumental service to the revolutionary movement, his one genuine claim to immortality, the one thing that really made him worthy of biographical recording. More than that, it is, in the judgment of the reviewer, the best book on the Russian Revolution (with the possible exception of Trotsky's monumental three volume work), and the greatest piece of historical eye-witness reporting in English, perhaps in any literature.

We could have spared a few lines from some of John Reed's less moving poems, or even from some of his love letters to Louise Bryant ("Don't forget the interest on Croton due August 1, and on Truro Sept. 26"), if necessary, to make room for a little more analysis, and some gems of citation from this masterpiece of literature, history and propaganda.

But with all these reservations, the present work is a good biography, a vivid picture of John Reed as we knew him, and an absorbing story worthy of making the best seller list of the year's biographies.

—Bertram D. Wolfe

11,000 Laid Off by WPA  
11,000 W.P.A. employees received dismissal notices as part of the program to bring work relief rolls down to 191,500 by June 15, Daniel S. Ring, Assistant Works Progress Administrator in charge of labor relations, disclosed this week.

# "BURY THE DEAD" (a review)

Perhaps because he is a very young man and relatively inexperienced in the ways of the theater, Irwin Shaw's *Bury the Dead* does not hit on all six cylinders. A philosophical pretentiousness, strongly reminiscent of O'Neil in its expression if not in its content, and some awkward stage business clog the feedline on occasion and make the play falter and lose speed. But so strong is the momentum of Shaw's original conception, that of dead men who refuse to be buried, that the play carries him home to a successful conclusion.

It must have been an uphill drive for Shaw. His loan of Shlumberger's idea put a terrific burden upon him. Not only did he have to add something to the Austrian's modernized version of the Lazarus miracle, but he had to repay the principal, the capital. This, from the start, was a job in itself. It is one thing to stand dead men on their feet and quite another to make the audience accept the accomplishment at its face value. A poetic intensity, an incandescent imagination, a surging, vaulting, irresistible ambition—these are the qualifications needed for the task of making the auditors forget the picture frame stage and time and place. It is precisely here that Shaw falls down; he is too prosaic, too lead-footed.

Not that *Bury the Dead* is a dismal failure. Whatever it lacks in point of fancy, of inspiration, it makes up for in a feet-on-the-ground approach. The play is interpenetrated with a bitter, dark humor, a sensual appreciation of life, and a realistic, if somewhat perfunctory, reading of character. When Martha, working herself up to a frenzy of reproach, exclaims to her dead husband:

"Just like you! Wait until it's too late! There's plenty for live men to stand up for! Eggs you can eat and butter and sunlight in your bedroom. . . . They're there, waiting. . . . All right, stand up! It's about time you talked back. It's about time you poor eighteen-fifty bastards stood up for themselves and their wives and their dirty-rickety children! Tell 'em! Tell 'em!"

one not only knows what she is talking about, one burns to upset the system which breeds such flaming resentment. The speech, incidentally, comes as the culmination of a workmanlike build-up as one can conceive. It is more than a professional incitement to rebellion.

A religious exaltation creeps into the play at the very end when, as the dead men leave their graves for a final missionary stay upon the earth, the Young Women, symbolic of the strong, new generation, says with ecstasy in her voice, "The dead have arisen, now let the living rise, singing!" It is on this revolutionary note that Shaw drops his curtain. There is no mistaking his intentions.

The production stands in need of more underscoring and better pacing at the end. As it is directed at present, the hopeful, aspiring notes are almost indistinguishable. Shaw is thus done a grave injustice, for the effect of the strong emotional wallop which he packs in the closing scenes is lost in the clamor of the crowd's voice.

Not much is required of the actors, but Neill O'Malley in the role of the philosophic captain, Aldrich Bowker in the part of the unimaginative, routine general, and John O'Shaughnessy as the outspoken first soldier do their stint with especial intelligence and care.

The *Prologue*, the collective composition of the Actors' Repertory Company, is a serviceable curtain raiser with a biting caricature of der Schoene Adolph. It re-creates the war hysteria from the gruesome vantage point of a veterans' hospital.

—Lee Mason

# THE GUFFEY DECISION

(Continued from Page 4)

able Judges know), the majority of the Court categorically excludes from the realm of Federal legislation "the employment of men, the fixing of their wages, hours of labor and working conditions, the bargaining in respect of all these things", in the manufacturing and mining industries. Let no one for even a moment fail to see the significance of this sweeping decision. Chief Justice Hughes lost no time concurring with it despite his hedging on other phases of the case in question.

On this basis practically all labor legislation of recent years with the possible exception of the Social Security Act will be declared invalid.

Why is the Supreme Court and particularly its majority acting in this fashion? We do not deal here with a matter of petty graft or even large scale corruption. There's every reason to conclude that the Supreme Court as such believes in every word of this type of decision that it has been rendering and will continue to render. The nine robed monarchs of American bourgeois justice sincerely adhere to certain social and economic philosophy. Therefore, THIS philosophy of law! These keepers of King Mammon's conscience in the United States appear to be fanatic in their belief that only through such commercial and industrial procedure can what they call American civilization be saved. Obviously, to the highest judiciary of the land, the highest expression of civilization is the lowest wages, longest hours, and most unbearable conditions that can be imposed on labor.

One phase of this decision deserves emphatic comment in that it helps rip off the veil of dignity covering the ugly class character of the Court as an institution. The Supreme Court fogies roll up their sleeves, pull up their pants and with sprightly gait and youthful vigor jump into the cesspool of the election campaign. It is an open secret that the strategy of the Democratic Party is to pussyfoot, to straddle, to dodge, to evade, to shy clear away from the question of a constitutional amendment as an issue in the election. For this strategy, Roosevelt, his brain trust, his entire Administration inclusive of Mrs.

President, deserve only the sharpest condemnation and repudiation at the hands of labor. Without a constitutional amendment it will be impossible to prevent the Federal judiciary from disrupting and paralyzing even the most anemic efforts at national social legislation.

However, regardless of what we may think of this cowardice on the part of Roosevelt, it is imperative that we don't overlook the cheap, pro-Republican Party game played by the Chief Justice Hughes and the rest of the majority of the Supreme Court when they declared the following in the Guffey decision: "If the people desire to give Congress the power to regulate industries within the State, and the relations of employers and employees in those industries, they are at liberty to declare their will in the appropriate manner, but it is not for the Court to amend the Constitution by judicial decision." How upright these doddering watchdogs of Wall Street law are—when it suits certain class interests!

We thank you gentlemen of the Supreme Court for your high-handed, unabashed, shameful trampling on even the simplest rights of labor! We give you "thanks" not because you have acted in any manner surprising to us, but because we feel that your continued service to Wall Street along these lines will sooner rather than later tend to arouse labor to take these matters into its own hands. You gentlemen have surely not forgotten how labor managed to get the Adamson eight hour law. President Wilson and his Congress were rather anxious to pass this law not because they had any anxiety for labor's welfare, but because the threat of the Railway Unions to declare a General Strike gave them many an anxious moment.

We never placed too great value on the Guffey Act. Whatever the coal diggers of this country won they have gotten and they will preserve only thru their militant struggles, only thru their powerful organization, the United Mine Workers of America. But the repeated onslaughts on all labor's rights by the Federal judiciary will undoubtedly accelerate the development of class consciousness in the ranks of American labor. This trend will manifest itself in a strengthened desire to improve the economic organizations of the workers (industrial unions) and in the beginnings of independent mass political action of the workers as a class (labor party).

For this we thank you and with this we hope and plan to take the first steps which will make us strong enough to bury your entire social system and all its watchdogs—robed, uniformed and camouflaged.



# SP Backs N.Y. Militants; Old Guard Prepares Split

(Continued from Page 1)

a note of harmony and pure Christian Socialism.

A warm reception greeted a telegram from Comrade Thomas Mooney. The latter struck a note of militant class-consciousness and dealt with the mistakes and experiences of the international class struggle, particularly in Germany and Italy.

Soon bitter factional strife gripped the convention. The moment the gathering got down to the business of organizing itself, it was evident that there would be a number of important contests over the seating of delegates and even convention procedure as such. The Right Wing which had been caucusing as the Interstate Socialist Conference forthwith challenged the New Jersey Delegation. Their spokesman Oneal proposed to split the New Jersey delegation fifty-fifty. Despite confusion in the ranks of the Militants over action on the report of the Credentials Committee, the Old Guard lost in its effort to grab off a slice of the New Jersey delegation. A similar fate befell the efforts of the Right Wing in the contest over Rhode Island and Texas. But the real question was over the question of the New York Delegation. This involved the entire action of the NEC in lifting the Old Guard's charter in New York and reorganizing the State and finally recognizing the Militants as the New York State organization of the Socialist Party.

## Hoan Cracks Whip

At first the Militants sought to dispose of the whole matter quickly and perfunctorily by treating it as a formal, simple, credential committee report on a contested

## DRESS PRESSERS STATEMENT

In a statement issued by the Dress Pressers' Progressive Group of Local 60, I.L.G.W.U., a number of irresponsible individuals, formerly connected with the Progressive Group are censured for deliberate misrepresentation in a statement which they had published in the "Morning Freiheit".

The difficulties began some time ago when upon the change of line by the Communist Party and the Rank and File Groups, they began a campaign for merger with the Progressive Group. The latter took the attitude of welcoming the change of attitude by the rank and filers but rejecting immediate merger until after a period of joint work proved to all members of the Progressive Group that the Rank and File had really overcome its past habits and was working in the union in a constructive manner. Stimulated and assisted by the Rank and File Group, a number of individuals seeped into the Progressive Group and together with a few disgruntled ones began a campaign of disturbing and disrupting the work of the group—and acting as the direct agents of the Rank and File Group.

Apparently tiring of this disruption-from-within policy this little group staged a fight at the last membership meeting of the Progressive Group and, being defeated overwhelmingly, left the meeting. These few individuals, strengthened by a number of recruits loaned by the Rank and File Group, issued a statement declaring that they are the Progressive Group and informing that the old officers of the group had been expelled.

delegation which happened to be in this case New York. But Mayor Dan Hoan of Milwaukee who, as soon as the convention opened, began to act as the receiver of the S.P. put his foot down quickly on this effort of the Militants. He proposed to consider the N.Y. situation in its entirety as a separate matter. This was precisely what the Old Guard wanted. Before the maneuvers of Hoan the Militants were helpless and did not even resist audibly. How pivotal a role the Wisconsin delegation was to play in the convention was quickly evidenced in the vote on the New Jersey contest. Oneal's proposal was defeated by a vote of 115 to 55. If the thirty Wisconsin delegates pocketed by Hoan had voted with the Old Guard, the tally would have been 85-85.

However, none of these skirmishes were really of importance. They were all third rate preliminaries in preparation for the big fight—over the New York delegation. James Oneal fired the opening gun for the Old Guard here thru his amendment in behalf of the Waldman combination. The Right Wing began to raise a storm of protest over the fact that while both the Thomas and Waldman delegations were being contested, the Thomas group was allowed seats in the convention among the delegates but the Waldman flock was not treated accordingly. This led Thomas to propose that the Waldman followers be invited to take seats on the platform.

## Oneal's Minority Report

Immediately Oneal went to bat for the Old Guard. He read a not very carefully prepared statement which went at great length into the controversy and scurrilously denounced the Communists as blood-thirsty insurrectionists and terrorist anarchists. The Revolutionary Policy Committee was singled out for denunciation by this old master at the game of pouring hell and damnation on revolutionary socialists.

Replying for the NEC, Devere Allen reported on the investigation of the RPC conducted by the NEC. He stressed that the RPC as well as the Old Guard of New York was dissatisfied with the findings of this committee. Allen closed with a confession that in the great desire on the part of the NEC for unity it had erred and was too weak and dilatory and vacillating in its attitude towards the continued violation of discipline and flaunting of party authority by the New York Old Guard. This was in refutation of Oneal's charge that

This comedy will not last very long. Pretty soon this new "group," being no more than a tool of the Rank and File, will declare its union with the Rank and File. However, in the meantime, it is trying to cause as much confusion as possible in the hope of breaking some workers away from the Progressive Group.

The Progressive Group statement is signed by Rosen, Forman, and Jaffee, the officers of the group.

## BRADLEY'S CAFETERIA

SEASONABLE  
FOOD  
AT  
REASONABLE  
PRICES

6th Ave. at 14th Street

## Mooney Greets S.P. Convention

"Please accept my firm fraternal Socialist greetings from tomb of living dead for a successful convention. May your deliberations prove of great benefit in furtherance of the aims and object of the Socialist Party. Don't forget those working-class soldiers who have fallen on the industrial battlefield or been taken prisoners in the class war. We have spent a score of years in California dungeons because of our loyalty and devotion to the working class. I urge the Socialist Party to participate together with the trade union movement in demonstrating on July 27, commemorating the 20th year of our imprisonment. We are desperately in need of immediate funds to complete present hearings on habeas corpus. Won't you help us? My warmest proletarian regards to all the delegates attending this momentous Socialist convention."

the NEC was arbitrary and high-handed.

The real fireworks came at a late hour Saturday night, after a mass meeting. By agreement between both sides an hour was allowed to one speaker for the Waldman group and to one for the Thomas group. Then, there were to be ten minute rebuttals to spokesmen for both sides. After considerable wrangling and uncomplimentary exchanges it was further agreed that two hours would be allotted for winding up the discussion of this question from the floor, with the time to be divided equally. Faction feeling was at white heat at this point.

## No Compromise—Says Waldman

Louis Waldman was the heavy artillery for the Right Wing and fired first. As against the accusation of the Thomas faction that he was with LaGuardia, he cited Dan Hoan's united front with LaFollette in Wisconsin. He continued his offensive by emphasizing that he was against any and all compromise with the Militants. Pleading for a Social Democratic Party pure and simple, unvarnished by any left phrases, Waldman at the same time jumped on Thomas for the latter's first favorable attitude to the New Deal. This was the answer of the Old Guard to the accusation of the Militants that the Right Wing is tacitly or openly preparing to play ball with Roosevelt. Waldman time and again stressed that the basic issue was: what kind of a Socialist Party is to be had? Thruout his attempts to answer this question, Waldman laid most stress on a denunciation of the united front with all communists and revolutionary socialist ideas as such.

Thomas replied for the Militants. He deplored the bellicose attitude of Waldman and emphasized that he and his Militants had hoped for a different kind of a speech, that he and his comrades had hoped for a peace and harmony speech from Waldman. The leader of the NEC went out of his way to show how patiently the Committee had acted with the Old Guard, despite wanton provocations. He frankly admitted that he erred in being too patient and lenient with the Waldman's State Executive Committee of N. Y. Thomas spared no words in denouncing the Old Guard for going into the primaries in New York State to challenge the recognized organization. With particular sharpness did Thomas attack

Waldman's all-or-nothing attitude. Thomas openly admitted that he was wrong in being for Panken's acceptance of the judgeship at the hands of LaGuardia. He did not go into a lengthy discussion to answer Waldman's charge about his being too favorable to the New Deal was calculated to break thru the overwhelming favor with which the New Deal was hailed at the outset.

As a final plea for unity Thomas implored Claessens, Waldman and their comrades to stay in the S.P. which wants them and needs them, but that they are to stay as Socialists.

When the sessions were resumed next morning a telegram from the Second International urging harmony was read.

The debate from the floor added nothing new. Whereas Thomas has taunted Waldman for appearing on the same platform with Lovestone at the May Day Meeting in New York for the last few years, Bearak charged, for the Right Wing, that the Militants were subject to the control of the CPO and the Communists in general.

## Militants Carry Vote

Oneal's substitute motion that the entire 44 delegates be given to the Old Guard in New York was defeated on a weighted roll call vote by 9,322 to 4,397.

Hoope's proposal to split the New York Delegation fifty-fifty was rejected next by a vote of 11,097 to 3,537.

Then came a proposal by Mayor Hoan to grant the Old Guard of N. Y. twelve of the delegates on the basis that this represents their strength in the primaries vote in New York—provided they agreed to abide by the decisions of the NEC relative to joining a reorganized party organization in New York and agreed in advance to abide by the decisions of the Convention. Dr. Laidler of the Militants inquired from Chairman Kryczki for a reply from the Old Guard. However, the Old Guard maintained a stony silence, in so far as its New York adherents were concerned. Delegate Bearak leaped to his feet to denounce this offer by Hoan as a horsedeal with which his friends would have nothing to do. Bearak went out of his way to denounce the CPO for its influence on Socialist Party members and offered this as evidence that no compromise was to be considered possible. Because of the hostility of the Old Guard to the Hoan proposal the Militants in the main voted against the Hoan peace offer. It was defeated by 10,201 to 4,393.

The session closed with a vote on the report of the NEC (serving as the credential committee) recom-

## U. S. ACQUIRES GRIP ON CHINA

A sharpening of the struggle between U. S. and Japanese imperialism became evident this week, when the U. S. announced that an agreement had been reached with the Bank of China to stabilize her silver dollars in terms of the U.S. dollar. Britain had also been negotiating to achieve this control for herself, but was beaten out by the U. S. The Bank of China will establish a New York Branch and work in close co-operation with the Federal Reserve System, thus assuring the commanding position of the U. S. in respect to the financial policies of China, and the ensuing trade advantages.

Japan, however, has continued her plans for the consolidation of North China, by enlarging at a rapid rate the garrisons in the Hopei-Chahar areas. The army there is supposed to total 10,000 and is growing daily. This enables her to enforce her "smuggling", duty free, of Japanese goods into North China—a fact which is causing great alarm among the Chinese merchants and bankers and even greater panic in the British foreign office because in this area Great Britain had an almost complete monopoly.

## MILITARY COUP IN BOLIVIA

Following in the footsteps of its erstwhile foe Paraguay, Bolivia set up a new regime which for three days consisted of an army-"socialist" junta, and at last report, consists of a purely military dictatorship. Bolivia is governed by English interests, as Paraguay is by American. The move was necessary due to the discontent which followed the two years war between both countries in the famous Chaco dispute, a struggle for oil between U. S. and British imperialism.

The "socialists" who participated in the government were obviously as "socialistic" as Franco in Paraguay was "communitic." The rule of the military in Bolivia will follow the same path as Paraguay, being based on the war veterans and led by the "extreme revolutionary" party, the National Socialists, representing the native bourgeoisie.

While the original manifesto of the government said the coalition would "organize a new fatherland upon bases of social justice, equity and equality more in accord with the times in which we are living", and took a few potshots at the "great fortunes formed by exploiting the natural riches of our territory", it is not expected that Britain will delay in recognizing the new government, for such declarations are necessary in any of the Latin American countries, ground under the heel of foreign imperialism and betrayed by their governments.

mending that the Militants be seated as a body—44 in all. This motion was carried by a vote of 9,449 to 4,809.

## SUBSCRIBE NOW!

WORKERS AGE  
Box 68, Station "O"  
New York City.

Enclosed find \$.....

for a ..... months sub.

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

Name .....

Address .....

City .....

State .....

Special Decoration Day Weekend Rate at  
**BOWERY CREEK FARM**  
Most picturesque section of the Catskill Mountains  
ACRA, GREENE COUNTY, NEW YORK  
Five dollars for two days — Friday eve to Sunday eve.  
Directions: By Auto, Route 9 or 9-W to Catskill. From there  
Route 23 two miles out of Acra.  
By Hudson River Day or Night Line or West Shore Rail  
road to Catskill. Our buses will bring you to the farm if notified  
in advance. Telephone Cairo 3-F - 14.  
New York City Telephone TRafalgar 7-2085.  
M. Matz M. Wachovsky