

# Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. 5, No. 24.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1936.

5 Cents a Copy

## SPLIT IN A. F. OF L. INEVITABLE, SAYS GREEN

### OLSON FLP MEET GETS SETBACK

Chicago Confab Against 1936 Party; Balks At State Tickets

By PAUL KIMBERLEY

The Farmer-Labor Party conference called by the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Association met in Chicago on May 30th and 31st. Although heralded by the Communist Party as a major historical event, the conference accomplished very little. The most that can be said for its accomplishment is that it did not succeed in putting any further important barriers in the way of a genuine Labor Party.

The first day of the conference was taken up with the formalities of news reel publicity and speeches by various liberal celebrities who were present. Earl Browder spoke for the Communist Party. Comrade Browder pleaded that the Communists be permitted to assist in building the party, saying: "It is true that we Communists are revolutionists. That is our right, guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence. In this we follow the hallowed American tradition associated with such names as Washington, Jefferson, Tom Paine, and Lincoln. We differ from our forefathers in this respect, only in this—that we come 160 years later, and face a deeper crisis".

At the morning session of the second day of the conference the Organization Committee, to which was entrusted the task of formulating strategy, recommended, by a vote of 14 to 1, the organization of a national Farmer-Labor Party. The function of this party was to be the encouragement of local and state parties and election campaigns. The one opposing vote was that of David Lasser, of the Workers Alliance, who submitted a minority recommendation that no action be taken to organize a national party at this time. J. B. S. Hardman, editor of Advance, the official organ of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, objected so effectively to the majority report that action on it was deferred to the afternoon session.

In the afternoon session Brother Hardman offered a substitute proposal which limited action to a continuation committee and excluded building of a national party until the support of significant labor forces can be gained. Brother Hardman cited the support of the Labor Non-Partisan League by such powerful unions as the United Mine Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers as evidence that even the industrial union forces in the American Federation of Labor are not yet ready for independent political action in the 1936 presidential campaign. Between the morning and afternoon sessions the Minnesota delegation shifted its support to the substitute proposal. The Communist Party could only meekly accede to the decision of the Minnesota Farmer-Laborites. A last minute attempt to instruct the continuation committee to call a national Farmer-Labor Party convention within three months was easily defeated.

One of the last actions of the

### French Workers Force Granting of Demands

Blum Presents Program To Chamber, Including Arms Nationalization

As the first Socialist coalition cabinet (in which the Labor Ministry is called the Department of National Solidarity!) prepared to take over the business of capitalist government, strikes broke out in the basic armament industries of France. For the week that the Sarraut government yet had legal existence, they worked frantically, in conjunction with Leon Blum, to achieve "order" in this keystone of production.

On Saturday, June 6th, Leon Blum became first Socialist premier of France, and while presenting his program to the chamber, was greeted by the Right Wing as "the first Jew to rule this Gallo-Roman country". A near riot ensued, Communist and Socialist deputies advancing on the Right, while the whole Chamber was in an uproar. The attack on Blum was made by Vallat, a leader of the Croix de Feu, an organization supposedly banned a few months ago! After this display of the wonders of freedom of speech for all, Blum was able to present his program: Nationalization of Munitions; greater government control of the Bank of France; revision (not repeal) of the Laval Emergency Decrees; in the face of the mounting masses of strikers, Blum also proposed a 40-hour week bill; public works for unemployment relief; and paid vacations—some major demands of the present strikers.

The strikes which were settled in a hurry last week broke out again, many workers claiming that the agreements were never lived up to. At the bottom of this tremendous movement, which embraced the major industries of France, lies the will of the workers to make of the Popular Front electoral victory an economic reality.

After hours of hectic activity Blum and Salengro, the Minister of the Interior, achieved a conference between the workers' representatives and the employers which at last reports, has reached an agreement. The major demands of the workers have been granted but not all industries have been settled. In the major industrial center of the North, the miners have called a general strike, 250,000 textile workers are still on strike. The agreement reached included wage rises of from 7 to 15%, recognition of the unions, and a promise to install the forty-hour week even before the law is passed. It is expected that some time will elapse before these agreements become effective.

conference was to send, on motion of Earl Browder, a telegram of encouragement to Dr. Townsend in his fight in common with the conference against the reactionary Liberty League-Hearst-Republican bloc.



LEON BLUM

### CHARGE LEGION SLEW UNIONIST

The Black Legion, an organization patterned after the KKK with Hearst's Americanization policy of wiping out all isms but pure Americanism, claiming 6,000,000 membership thruout the U. S. and 120,000 in Michigan was "just" discovered in the State of Michigan with the killing of Charles Poole who knew too much about the Black Legion. Some members of the Legion state that he was a member of the Legion but was killed when it was found that he was a Catholic.

These terror bands of night riders, which have been in existence for a number of years, were responsible for floggings of many of their former members for wanting to leave the organization, bombings of radical headquarters, the burning of Jewish radical camps, and at least twenty-five deaths, including Marchok, an auto union organizer who was killed in Lincoln Park, December, 1933 and Jack Bielak, a member of the auto union in the Hudson plant, killed March 1934. Homer Martin, president of the Auto Workers Union, has announced that he has proof of the use of the Black Legion as the terrorist arm of the employers in the Motor Products strike, where strike headquarters, and workers' homes were bombed. Its discovered membership consists mostly of city and state job-holders, such as police and prison guards. There isn't a department of government in the different Michigan cities in this section which has not a member of this gang on its payrolls.

Meanwhile the leadership of the Black Legion is trying to whitewash their activities by claiming that the organization is anti-Communist. When asked why they did not take in Catholics, Jews, and Negroes, they refused to answer.

The Police Department of Detroit, under the command of Police Commissioner "Heinie" Pickett, has been too busy shooting down pickets and mere suspects to have the time to discover sooner

### SUPREME COURT BANS WAGE LAW

Decision Says State Law Infringed "Right Of Free Contract"

Once again the Supreme Court, royal defender of capitalism, struck a heavy blow at labor legislation, when it invalidated the New York Minimum Wage Law, by a 5 to 4 decision. So brazen was the anti-working class character of this decision that even Hughes could not align himself with the majority. Behind New York State, the defendant, had banded seven other states with minimum wage laws, only to discover that states' rights do not make it right for a state to pass social legislation.

Whereas the most recent decision on the Guffey Coal Act, had stated that the Federal Government had no right to pass wages and hours laws, because that invaded states' rights, the Court now discovered that for a state to pass such a law, means that the freedom of contract (read exploitation) is curtailed. Thus, under the democratic system of checks and balance, social legislation is impossible. However, the National Woman's Party hailed the decision as guaranteeing "freedom and equality to women", since now both sexes of the working class are unprotected by law.

Wm. Green, speaking for the American Federation of Labor, announced that the drafting of a constitutional amendment will be immediately taken up by the Executive Council, that "labor cannot and will not assume a defeatist attitude in its fight for the enactment of social justice legislation."

The political implications of this decision (not unknown to the justices) will shake up the Democratic Party, and certainly must force the Labor Non-Partisan League into action. While Democratic strategy was to avoid the issue of the Supreme Court, it will certainly be difficult to hold in line the members of the unions in the League, unless Roosevelt comes out for a constitutional amendment. For the first time since the "horse and buggy" comment on the voiding of the NRA, Roosevelt spoke up, weakly wondering if there weren't a "no man's land" where social legislation is supposed to be valid.

members in their own department who are participating in these night riders' murders of the Black Legion. The shooting of Poole was so flagrant that the Police Department was forced to act.

Connections of the organization with the Wolverine Republican Club have been uncovered, and it is this aspect that will be pushed by the Democratic Party. Democratic Congressmen who yawned when informed of lynchings in the South, suddenly have discovered that the various threats which they have received in the past few years are undoubtedly traceable to this organization, which they, in conjunction with the entire apparatus of Roosevelt, will trace to the Liberty League eventually.

Steel Union Joins C. I. O. As A. F. of L. Refuses To Aid Organization

The Committee for Industrial Organization has scored a sweeping victory in the affiliation of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers. But this very victory, coming as it does on the very heels of the ultimatum of the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. ordering the dissolution of the C.I.O., practically makes it certain that the Council will resort to disciplinary actions at its next session in July.

The ultimatum of the Council, intended, as many contend, to bring pressure to bear upon Dubinsky of the garment workers and Howard of the Typos, failed (dismally since both declined to withdraw from the C.I.O., the former even contributing another \$5,000 towards its work. The Amalgamated Association which had been vacillating despite the vote of its convention finally made up its mind after John L. Lewis advised them against any further delays. In reply to a cautious letter asking Lewis for further conferences, Lewis replied in no uncertain terms: "Your executive board must decide whether it will cooperate or obstruct. If you do not yet know your own mind, please stay at home."

Pressed on the one hand by William Green and on the other by the conviction that Lewis represents the forces most anxious and capable of organizing the steel workers, remembering also the vote of its convention, the Amalgamated finally took its stand.

In an agreement made public on June 4, the Amalgamated took a firm stand on the side of the C.I.O. Not only does this historic document affiliate the Amalgamated to the C.I.O. but it also gives to the C.I.O. sweeping powers in setting up the necessary organization machinery for the drive in the industry; for financing the drive which the C.I.O. underwrites to the extent of \$500,000 and in determining the policies to be pursued.

Arising out of this decision and the persistent rumors that the charters of the 10 C.I.O. unions would be lifted, the relations between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. unions have become very strained. In a letter to William Green, himself a member of the United Mine Workers, Lewis appeals to join in the good fight expressing the hope that Green will not continue "to sit with the women, under the awning on the hilltop, while the steel workers in the valley struggle in the dust and agony of industrial warfare." Lewis further appeals to Green on the strength of the facts that even now Green's colleagues on the Council are planning to "slit his political throat and scuttle his official ship."

In reply to Lewis, Green maintains that there is only one important question before the workers today: "Shall the Federation be maintained and preserved?" And, he continues, "if you persist in your determination to divide the forces of labor I will still continue to protect and preserve our common heritage, the American Federation of Labor."

Thus, at this writing, there appears to be no possibility of composing the differences between the craft and industrial unionists.



# COMMUNISTS AND PALESTINE

By I. BRILL

The Arabs in Palestine have openly revolted against British imperialism and its agency—Zionism. To achieve their aim—national emancipation—the Arabs have declared a general strike which is so forceful and effective that the High Commissioner is contemplating introducing martial law instead of the present curfew and has already established in the desert a concentration camp for the strike leaders. In this general strike, which is six weeks old, everybody is participating: young and old, male and female, worker and student, peasant and intellectual. All of them have deserted factories, workshops, fields, harbors, offices, stores and schools. They are on the streets; they demonstrate. And despite the sabotage, strike breaking and scabbery of the Zionists, the general strike is gaining momentum, sympathy and support not only among the Arab population but also among the Arab nationals in most Arabian countries. In Egypt, in Syria, in Transjordan and even in India, the Arabs and Moslems demonstrate and collect money for the Palestine Arab movement.

The nationalist movement in Palestine is so strong that even Zionist leaders must recognize it. "The situation is grave, indeed," says Dr. S. Margoshe, prominent American Zionist and editor of The Day, "for no longer can it be said that only a handful of Arab agitators is pitted against the Jewish settlement in Palestine. Today a great part of the Arab population, but particularly the Arab youth, is implacably opposed to Jewish immigration and Jewish achievement in Palestine. The Arab nationalist movement has become a factor to be reckoned with." (The Day, May 9th).

And another Labor Zionist leader, H. Greenberg, openly admits that "the situation is now such, whether we like it or not, that we have no other way out but to appeal to England as the only political factor that can save off the dangers that threaten us," because there is not a single group among the Arabian population with whom the Zionists are able to negotiate for peace. "In Palestine," says Greenberg, "we are completely isolated."

### As The C.I. Saw It

In the highly complicated political situation in Palestine, what should be and what is the position, the attitude of the Communists to the national liberation movement in that country?

It goes without saying that the Communists are to be found in the very forefront of the struggles against imperialist oppression and exploitation. In all the colonial countries, Palestine included the Communists wholeheartedly support and fight for national independence and liberation of the colonial peoples. As Lenin pointed out correctly: "The Communists cannot reach their great aim without fighting against every form of national oppression."

And while fighting against the imperialist invader, who is the main enemy, the Communists at the same time do not forget for a moment the struggle against the native exploiter, the rich landowner, the cleric and the capitalist.

Now, let us be more specific. The Communist Party position on Palestine, as outlined by the Palestine delegate Hadyar, to the Seventh World Congress of the C.I. is as follows: "The Arab masses are filled with a burning hatred towards the Arab capitalists, feudals, towards the Zionist bourgeoisie, who has taken upon itself the gendarme role of imperialist oppression. The struggle

against the Zionist bourgeoisie is something which can be directly understood by almost all the oppressed social strata of the Arab people. This struggle is taking place daily, and is basically an anti-imperialist struggle. By supporting this struggle, we must lead, extend and direct it along the proper channels, towards the struggle against the main enemy, against imperialism.

"We hate the Jewish Zionist bourgeoisie, but we extend a fraternal hand to the Jewish toilers for a joint struggle against imperialism, against Zionism—against the bitterest enemies of the Arab and Jewish peoples in Palestine. The Communist Party is BUILDING THE ARAB NATIONAL PEOPLES' FRONT against imperialism and against Zionism. It actively works among the Jewish toiling masses in order to liberate them from the influence of the counter-revolutionary party of the Jewish Zionist capitalists, in order to draw the toiling Jews into the national emancipation struggle of the Arab masses. The Jewish national minority in Palestine is faced with great perspectives when the national emancipation movement under the hegemony of the proletariat will be victorious. Our task is to show and convince the Jewish toilers that their class and national interests are linked up with the victory of national liberation movement of the Arab masses and the Democratic transformation of the social system in Palestine. We must work particularly to form the united front between the Arab and Jewish workers." (Emphasis mine—L.B.).

This is a clear and, I believe, correct statement on the line of struggle to be pursued by the C.P.P. There is in the statement one phrase, however, that is not only vague, but has led the C.P. to commit a number of costly mistakes, mistakes for which the American C.P., too, is paying dearly. We have in mind the reference to the "Arab national people's front" tactic, which is now the pet slogan of the C.I. in all countries.

### Comes The People's Front

The small, weak and underground Communist Party of Palestine, in carrying out the policy of building the "national people's front" and having in view "the possibility of collaboration and agreement with EVEN THE MOST VARIOUS PARTIES OF THE NATIONAL REFORMIST BOURGEOISIE" (Ramsi at Seventh Congress), apparently forgot the words of Lenin that the Communists must in their relations to the democratic bourgeoisie of colonial countries and during their temporary alliances with it "absolutely maintain the independent character of the proletarian movement—even in its embryonic stages." Hence the blurring of class issues with race issues. Hence the taking over without reservations or modifications slogans of the national bourgeoisie and landlords. Hence the failure gradually to raise demands that would meet the needs of the tenant farmers and the workers. And last but not least, the C.P. failed to come out and condemn individual terror and arson on the part of some vandalist and terrorist groups among the Arab nationalist movement, supported by the Effendi and the Mufti.

To prove our point, we bring now two documents issued by the C.P. of Palestine. To be more correct, the first document was published by the C.P. of P. in the Arabian language, and the second by the Young Communist League of Tel-Aviv in Hebrew.

### An Unfortunate Leaflet

The occasion for the first proclamation was a general strike called by the Arabs in October, 1935, in protest against the Zionist smuggling of ammunition into Palestine in order to protect themselves against a possible Arab revolt. During the general strike, the C.P. issued the following leaflet:

"You have seen the shamefulness of Zionist occupation. They, the Zionists, have succeeded in seizing the largest part of our community land. They were not satisfied with the establishment of their national home with the support of British imperialism and a large number of illegal Zionist immigrants. They began to strengthen it with ammunition, with large quantities of weapons aimed solely at ARAB HEARTS. They exterminate them completely. There are but two ways for the ARAB PEOPLE: one is the way of ignominious extinction, the other is the way of a LIFE OF HONOR. Whoever wishes to choose the second way, MUST CHOOSE WAR. Now is the opportunity and this is the day of the strike! The Communist Party joins this strike. It demands that the strike assume a mass form through revolutionary demonstrations and not by sleeping at home or in the cafes. THE STRIKE MUST NOT BE DISCONTINUED UNTIL JEWISH IMMIGRATION AND THE SALE OF LAND TO JEWS ARE STOPPED AND UNTIL THE STOPPING OF JEWS AND THE ARMING OF THE ARABS IS CARRIED OUT." (My emphasis—L. B.).

This was indeed a bad and unfortunate leaflet. Even the Morning Freiheit, official Jewish organ of the American C.P., was forced to come out—after the cunning Jewish nationalist press opened up a barrage against the Palestine and American Jewish Communists, accusing them of "inciting to pogroms"—and state in so many words that this proclamation could not possibly have been written by Communists, because in it the class line, which distinguished Communist language from any other language, is completely absent. But, after considerable delay, the C.P. admitted, in a radiogram to the Morning Freiheit, the authorship of the leaflet, but stated that the "document included an error of principle" and that the "error was acknowledged and rectified by another document." The mentioned "rectified document" never reached this country.

The second document, issued a few days after the present outbreak, is infinitely better than the first one, both in approach to the complicated problem and in class content. Nevertheless, it, too, has a number of shortcomings. First there is no clear-cut condemnation of individual terror and arson. To murder innocent Jews or Arabs and destroy property of innocent people is a "policy" with which Communists have nothing to do. Secondly, it calls for a struggle "to stop the rabid race propaganda on the part of the Zionist organization." That's fine! But what about also stopping the rabid race propaganda on the part of the Mufti and Effendi. Is the rabid race propaganda of the Mufti and Effendi the same propaganda of the Zionists? An explanation here is badly needed.

And finally, this document, instead of raising—in addition to anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist demands—some elementary demands for the workers and poor peasants, endorses without reservation "the demands for which the Arab youth is fighting."

### Which Is The Policy?

There is in general a marked

# AT FIRST GLANCE

By Jay Lovestone

IN preparation for the presidential elections the Democratic National Committee is now preparing a sort of "encyclopedia of recovery". Statistics and charts, colorful and colored, will be produced aplenty to show the vast recovery that has taken place in American life as a result of the policies of the Roosevelt Administration. Considerable emphasis is to be placed by these Roosevelt super-salesmen on "the much improved condition" of the capital market as an index of the free flow of investment and, therefore, of economic life as such.

Nothing can be further from the truth than this synthetic conclusion. We stress this particularly because the coming weeks will witness a terrific over-accumulation of the government loans which are to be floated to the tune of a couple of billions. At the outset, we hasten to grant that the last three successive quarters have registered capital flotations of over a billion dollars each. Boom times, eh? Yes—in the eyes of the superficial observer. Let's go beneath the surface a bit.

Only five percent represented registrations for newly organized corporations; 77% went into refunding operations. Of the total capital, only three percent went into "the purchase of physical property or other equipment." So much for corporate issues in this period. In a significant sense of volume only the government operations require new capital. All else is steeped in stagnation. And this government expansion is merely a synonym for constantly ascending government deficits! Here lies the weakness of the very character and extent of recovery in the last three years.

Further analysis of this situation reveals some facts which reveal a more sombre picture of the actual condition of the American body

discrepancy between the C.P. of Palestine and the C.P.U.S.A. Take the question of immigration. Says the Palestine Party: "Stop Jewish immigration!" Says the Jewish Bureau of the C.P. in New York: "Jewish immigration into Palestine shall be freed from Zionist domination." On the question of selling land to Jews the Palestinians say: "Stop the sale of land to Jews!" Say the Americans: "No land shall be bought without the previous consent of the peasant working on the land." The disagreement in both examples is obvious and no comment is necessary. Is it so difficult for the Communist International to work out a program for our Palestine comrades that would be acceptable to Communists in all countries without having to explain away certain documents of the C.P.P. as being the work of "agents provocateurs"?

By and large, however, the C.P.O. agrees with the minimum program formulated by the C.P. U.S.A. in December 1935, months before the present revolt, to stop Arab-Jewish clashes in Palestine. This minimum program, somewhat modified, was published in leaflet form by the Jewish Bureau of the C.P. in New York and contains the following points:

"1. The responsible Jewish leaders of mass organizations in Palestine shall declare that the Jews are not out to capture or dominate Palestine, that theirs is to live in peace and neighborly friendship with the Arabs.

"2. The same responsible leaders shall declare they are in favor of a free Palestine, not dominated by British imperialism, but ruled by a democratically elected parliament, with the fullest freedom for the entire

(Continued on Page 4)

economic stagnation, the amount of bank credit extended to private industry during this period has actually been shrinking; secured loans show a fall of 25%; commercial loans indicate a loss of 10%. Simultaneously the amount of bank credit extended to the government has more than doubled. Today, almost 50% of the assets of the Reporting Member Banks consist of government securities.

Certainly this is no picture of health. Yet, had the government not stepped in to become the principal investor, American economy would have been infinitely worse off and rugged individualism would have become even more ragged. More than that: no change in the Administration at Washington can seriously alter this significant trend. On the eve of election, the Republicans can shriek against this governmental policy. Should the G.O.P. win control of the Federal trough, its cabinet swine would behave in no different fashion. The powers that be would not and could not have it otherwise so long as this stagnation continues to prevail in the economic life of the country.

BY the time our readers will get a chance to glance at this column, France will very likely have, functioning in full regalia, its hundredth cabinet, headed by Leon Blum. Many of our comrades, feverish liberal onlookers, and sympathetically excited fellow-travellers are expecting wonders from Monsieur Blum. Well, it is not our desire to pour buckets of ice cold water on these warm-wishers who are simply living in a fool's paradise. But we must be cruel in our realism. Why? Blame the facts of life.

In a recent issue of L'Oeuvre (May 16th) leading organ of the Radical Party, the pivotal organization of the People's Front, Dandier, the head of this party frankly declared: "There is nothing in the Front Populaire Program which could injure the economic interests of anyone or frighten the investors. There is no question of a capital levy or of a vast system of nationalization." Evidently, the Communist Party's talk about a capital levy will remain a mere disturbance of the air currents, at best. And judging by the fact that the C.P. states that the reason it does not want to enter the Blum cabinet is that by doing so it would give the reactionaries and the biggest business interests a chance to create a panic atmosphere, one may reasonably conclude that the official Communists will not continue to make much noise about the capital levy plank of their platform. (L'Humanite, May 15th).

However, some bogus nationalization may soon be realized in France—at the hands of the People's Front. In what field? In none other than the war industries. The matter of "nationalizing" the manufacture of munitions has been given considerable and thorough attention by the General Staff of the Army. The latter is in favor of this "nationalization" in the interests of military efficiency and national security. All of which means that even the Fascist Marshall Petain now wants nationalization! A veritable broadening of the People's Front—in anticipation of and preparation for a suicidal victory.

Fortunately, we are glad to be able to report that the masses in the trade unions are beginning to stir and to make some real demands. Here is a possibility of militant class conflict in France which may upset the class collaboration policies of the S.P. and the C.P. now parading as the People's Front.

# The Socialist Platform—Compounded Confusion

This is the third article on the Socialist Party convention by Jay Lovestone who covered the convention as special correspondent for the Workers Age—Editor.

By JAY LOVESTONE

With the intentions and spirit of the platform's criticism of the New Deal one can find little fault. Here is a sharp change and welcome relief from the first favorable estimate of the New Deal made by the S.P. three years ago. On the plus side we must also register the fact that for the first time in years a Socialist Party platform speaks of social order instead of public ownership. To some this may appear to be a little thing. However, we have learned to be thankful even for the smallest moves—in the direction of progress towards Marxism, towards revolutionary socialism.

But from here we travel to the kingdom of thoroughgoing unsoundness and confusion worse confounded. The platform angrily proclaims: "Our capitalist system is also sowing the seeds of dictatorship." Only now sowing the seeds, eh? What does this mean but continued, blind faith in capitalist democracy as an instrument by which socialism can be achieved.

If anyone has any doubt as to the validity of our criticism, then, let him read on to find the platform elaborate: "The Socialist Party calls upon the workers, farmers and all advocates of social justice to join with it in its struggle to widen the channels through which may be made peaceful, orderly and democratic progress." Well, well, what is this but the People's Front strategy, the adherence to which, on the part of the Communist Party, is now being given as a reason by the Socialist Party for not joining in a united front with it in the elections? Here we must emphatically indicate one important difference: The Communist Party, the wrong in the notion that thru bourgeois democracy fascism can be beaten, does not believe that socialism can be achieved thru bourgeois democracy. This platform formulation leads one to the conclusion that the Socialist Party is doubly wrong—in principle as well as tactics—in regard to the historical role of capitalist democracy.

What does this mean but adherence to the Right Wing position that bourgeois democracy is not a capitalist dictatorship? Capitalism in democratic America and republican France is maintained by a dictatorship, tho the form of the latter state is different from the Fascist state prevailing in Germany, Italy and Austria. Likewise, there is no good, even plenty of harm in the platform's talk of "ending the usurped power of the Supreme Court" without frankly attacking also the power vested in the Supreme Court by our forefathers. Why doesn't the Socialist Party demand outright the abolition of this institution—the Supreme Court—dedicated to the monarchical principle in American government? Surely the Socialist Party is not animated by Roosevelt's vote-getting considerations in side-stepping the basic constitutional issue! Or, is it a matter of being more practical? Certainly, the Socialist Party leadership has no illusions about the American ruling class attitude to the Workers' Rights amendment. Then, why?

And why does the S.P. devote itself to the fantastic proposal "that farm prices be stabilized at the cost of production to the working farmer"? Why doesn't the platform demand that the govern-

ment guarantee a minimum annual income to the working farmers? Very few today deny that all price-fixing schemes are artificial and impossible—under capitalism—especially of agricultural commodities. To dabble in such preposterous panaceas gives an impression of vote-catching.

### "Real" Neutrality

Thus, too much is pledged and too many promises are made by the platform. For instance, isn't the demand for "the strengthening of the neutrality laws, to the end that we may ward off immediate wars while fighting for the attainment of a social order which will eliminate the chief causes of war," a meaningless proposition at best and in a most charitable sense? Does the Socialist Party have the slightest faith in the present U.S. neutrality laws as an instrument of peace? Then why does it ask merely for "the strengthening" of them? Has the Socialist Party forgotten how under the present Hull neutrality laws Uncle Sam supplied Mussolini's army with oil and barred arms shipments to Abyssinia? Really, Comrade Dr. Laidler, author of the platform, does know that the failure of the U. S. to declare an oil embargo, made it practically impossible for the European countries to declare an effective oil embargo against Mussolini's Italy. And all of this on the basis of the neutrality laws!

Again, there is no such thing as "neutrality" in a vacuum. Suppose Japan or Germany or both of them should declare war on the Soviet Union. Would Comrade Thomas, if he were president, invoke absolute neutrality towards all participants in the war? Would he propose that no food should be shipped, no ammunition should be sold, no credit should be extended the Soviet Union as well as to Germany and Japan? Is war an abstraction? Would Pres. Thomas propose to treat all three belligerents alike? Would Chief Executive Thomas have us believe that the aims and aspirations of the Soviet Union waging a revolutionary defensive war are identical with the aims and aspirations of Nazi Germany or Imperialist Japan? Of course, Comrade Thomas would never say such a thing. If not, why does he have in his platform such planks as are nailed to such untenable and impermissible conclusions, from the point of view of international working class solidarity?

### "Technocracy In Our Times"

The convention, dazed with the prospect of advancing the prospect of "socialism in our times" by means of a feverish election campaign based on an all-inclusive, if not all-attractive, election platform, even went so far as to adopt in substance the hitherto frowned-upon Commonwealth Plan and to make a bow to the corpse of technocracy. It is in this spirit that the convention adopted the following from the Commonwealth Plan:

"1. An approximate doubling of the present annual production of wealth in the United States, and its distribution broadly enough to permit the American people to buy what they would produce. Assuming

no important change in the present price level, the proper use of the natural, mechanical and human resources of the United States, with the products fairly distributed, would allow each family a minimum income of \$2,500 a year, rising to more than \$4,000 a year as the plan would be put into full operation."

The above is in line with Hoan's cry at Cleveland to "try socialism on the depression." It seeks and promises "an abundance of goods and services for THE WHOLE AMERICAN PEOPLE, by means of a reorganization of the producing and distributive system along such lines as will permit their capacity operation." (Our emphasis). Here we have a specie of a regenerated, more efficient, more productive capitalism offered as a solution by a party which proudly proclaims itself as being to the left of the Communist Party! Since when are defects in productive capacity responsible for hunger and misery in present-day capitalism? Why refuse to recognize the fatal contradiction inherent in capitalism—the growing gap between productive capacity and the present possibility for consumption in our present class (not people as a whole) society? Only the most vulgar of bourgeois economists are that blind today.

And, if it is necessary to secure "an approximate doubling of the present annual production of wealth in the U. S." before we would be able to "allow each family a minimum income of \$2,500 a year," etc., then why kick so much against capitalist inequities today? With production not yet doubled, the average annual working family income is today approximately half the \$2500. Better still, if capitalism can be so improved and reorganized on a Commonwealth Plan as to "allow each family a minimum income of \$2,500 a year, rising to more than \$4,000 a year," etc. (assuming prices don't advance at all), then, why work so hard hoping and praying for its replacement by a socialist society? Or, are we to be told that the Commonwealth Plan is synonymous with and a shortcut to socialism because, for one thing, it seeks Stuart Chase's "economy of abundance" "by means of reorganization of the producing and distributive system (our emphasis on the separation and the plural—J.L.) along such lines as will permit their capacity operations"? If the comrades of the Socialist Party will permit us, we will spare no frankness and tell them straight from the shoulder in true comradely fashion: This is shallow and shoddy reformism. It is unworthy of comrades of whom honestly believe themselves to be militants. Such a platform is neither an inspiration nor a guide to militant working class action. It does not merit the confidence or support of class-conscious workers who want to work and fight for socialism today or even the day after tomorrow.

In this light it is entirely clear why the Convention keynotes, makers of acceptance speeches, nominators of candidates, did not say a word about Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. when they talked to the convention—with incessant repetition—about "socialism in our day." "Socialism in our times." Obviously, even in presidential campaign speeches there are no accidents of commission or omission.

What Is The "Worst Evil?" The fact of the matter is that Browder is utterly wrong in declaring that "a Republican victory is the worst thing that could possibly happen to the nation." The worst thing that could possibly happen to the "nation" (the proletarian part of it, anyway) would be to have the working class swallowed up completely and entirely in the Roosevelt whirlpool, to have the first few sparks of political class independence completely extinguished, to have the two-party system, the essential mechanism of capitalist rule in this country, reinforced and consolidated, as a result of the political demoralization of the more advanced sections of the working class. This is the way revolutionary Marxism would place the question—unfortunately not the way it is placed by Browder.

"A Republican victory," we are told furthermore, "... would

# The Communist Party and The 'Roosevelt Question'

By WILL HERBERG

(Continued from last week)  
The attitude of the Communist Party is now very much like unofficial support of Roosevelt. Such an attitude was already implicit, as I have attempted to show in a previous article (Workers Age, January 4, 1936) in the analysis of the New Deal, the Liberty League and American fascism made by Dimitroff and Browder at the seventh world congress of the Communist International. For a time, while the party was absorbed in its hectic drive for a "national farmer-labor party", the Roosevelt question was allowed to recede somewhat to the background. But even then the C.P. spokesmen found it necessary to apologize for the labor party by assuring all concerned that a labor party ticket would not hurt Roosevelt's chances of reelection, since it would mainly draw votes that would otherwise have gone Republican!

Today, with hopes of a 1936 national farmer-labor ticket admittedly gone, the Roosevelt orientation seems to be returning. At the recent New York Youth Congress, Browder took occasion to outline the official party position on the elections (Daily Worker, May 11, 1936):

"The main slogan of the Communist Party in the election campaign will be: Keep the Hoovers, Landons and Hearsts out of power.

"A Republican victory is the worst thing that could happen for this nation. It would mean starvation for the unemployed, union smashing and further deflation for the farmers. It would throw the United States in the international field with those forces making for war."

If this is true, and we need not here go into the quality of the analysis, on what conceivable ground can you refuse to vote for Roosevelt or to urge the masses of the workers to do the same? How can you possibly assume the responsibility of running an independent ticket in the elections—because surely you do not expect anyone to take seriously the naive idea that such a ticket will draw votes away not from Roosevelt but from the reactionary Republican candidate? From a standpoint such as that outlined by Browder, support of Roosevelt follows immediately, as a matter of political responsibility and logic. To refuse to draw this conclusion, even the refusal is based on the very good grounds of revolutionary conscience—does not change the fact that it is the only possible conclusion to be drawn under the circumstances.

What Is The "Worst Evil?" The fact of the matter is that Browder is utterly wrong in declaring that "a Republican victory is the worst thing that could possibly happen to the nation." The worst thing that could possibly happen to the "nation" (the proletarian part of it, anyway) would be to have the working class swallowed up completely and entirely in the Roosevelt whirlpool, to have the first few sparks of political class independence completely extinguished, to have the two-party system, the essential mechanism of capitalist rule in this country, reinforced and consolidated, as a result of the political demoralization of the more advanced sections of the working class. This is the way revolutionary Marxism would place the question—unfortunately not the way it is placed by Browder.

"A Republican victory," we are told furthermore, "... would

throw the United States in the international field with those forces making for war." Presumably, therefore, the present administration is following a policy making for peace. That must be the reason why, under the New Deal, the biggest peace-time naval budget and one of the biggest army budgets have just been passed! Like Wilson, Roosevelt must be supported to "keep us out of war!"

The estimate of Roosevelt and the New Deal given by Browder is in conformity with his general position:

"President Roosevelt's chief characteristic is that he fights the Republicans, the Hearst-Liberty League helpers, mainly with words, while in deeds he is yielding step by step to their reactionary program" (Daily Worker, May 11, 1936).

"The relation of Roosevelt towards the Republican party and its allies is one of attempting to maintain a center position between them and the masses of the people. This is the explanation of Roosevelt's vacillating course and of his attempt to maintain contact with the masses while he yields to the policies of the Liberty League-Hearst combination and moves in their direction" (Daily Worker, May 20, 1936).

This is truly worthy of the New York Post or the Nation in one of its critical moods! Apparently there is no independent Roosevelt policy for the rehabilitation of American capitalism with all its implications and consequences. The President is just a well-meaning, confused sort of person, vacillating between the "people" (whatever that may mean) and the reactionaries. He is to be criticized not for what the New Deal represents in itself in the way of state capitalism, government control of labor, armaments, foreign policy and the rest, but only insofar as he "yields" to the pressure of the Liberty League! In essence, the C.P. is adopting towards Roosevelt an attitude that might be appropriate for Communists to adopt towards a social-democratic government; in other words, it is losing sight of all class lines in the elections.

How far the Communist Party has gone in its new Roosevelt orientation can be seen from the startling similarity between its views on the question and those of the Old Guard Socialists. Thus we read in a report of the Madison Square Garden meeting (Freiheit, May 21, 1936):

"To those who say that we should vote for Roosevelt, Comrade Browder turned with the question: 'Don't you think that it is necessary to mobilize our forces to drive Roosevelt to the left just as the reactionaries are driving him to the right?'"

Is this not altogether identical with the statement of Harry Rogoff in the New Leader of February 15, 1936—for which, by the way, Rogoff was bitterly taken to task by the Daily Worker? Here is what Rogoff said:

"By their criticism of Roosevelt, Socialists seek to push him further to the left, in the direction of organized labor, progressive farmers and the needy elements of the middle class." The same in content—and almost the same even in phraseology!

(In a forthcoming article, Will Herberg will review the policy of the C.P.O. in the coming elections.—Editor.)

# WORKERS AGE

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

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

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

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

Vol. V. Saturday, June 13, 1936. No. 24.



## MD. FEDERATION IN CONVENTION

The thirty-first annual convention of the Maryland State and D. C. Federation of Labor was held in Hagerstown, Md., on May 18th, 19th, and 20th. The largest representation in the history of this body was present. This fact, plus the sharp division among the delegates, were indications of the new currents that have entered the main stream of the American labor movement since the N.R.A.

The main controversy of the convention took place around the C. I.O. resolution favoring the organization of the mass production industries along industrial lines. The craft group, led by President McCurdy, got 212½ votes. The Industrial group got 152½.

The debate on this resolution indicated an astounding ignorance of the issue on the part of the craft unionists. Without exception the speakers for this side confused industrial unionism with the One Big Union of the Knights of Labor (textile workers belonging to the same union as the clothing workers), or took the resolution to mean the re-organization of the existing craft unions. If, by the next Convention the craft locals are informed as to the issue at stake, the C.I.O. resolution should pass overwhelmingly.

The Convention passed unanimously a resolution introduced by the delegates of the ILGWU and the Teachers' Union, supporting July 22nd, as NATIONAL TOM

## Communist Party And Palestine

(Continued from Page 2)  
population and with guaranteed national rights for the Jews.

"3. The leaders of the Jewish organizations in Palestine shall at once demonstrate their friendship toward the Arabs by admitting Arab workers into the trade unions and Arab farm laborers into the tenant organizations, renouncing the criminal scabbing policy of 'capturing the jobs.'

"4. . . . That from now on Jews will buy land in Palestine only with the consent of those living upon that land and cultivating it.

"5. Jewish immigration into Palestine shall be freed from Zionist domination. At present it is not immigration but colonization for the purpose of capturing the country. The Zionists select as immigrants either rich Jews or toilers who are misled and ready to put themselves at the disposal of the Zionists and their policy."

The question of immigration, we maintain, should be clarified. Communists, as a matter of principle, are for free immigration for the toiling masses. This goes for Palestine too. The Zionist immigration is not only selective, but is a political immigration, aimed to establish a Jewish State in Palestine. The Arabs are aware of this and are strongly objecting to

MOONEY DAY. The resolution for a state labor party was defeated. President Roosevelt was endorsed for re-election (but not the Labor Non-Partisan League), with about 15 out of 375 votes being opposed.

The administration slate carried the elections. For president, McCurdy received 231½ votes; while J. Fred Rausch, candidate of the progressive slate, received 143½. The opposition slate received more votes than there were delegates to the previous convention; the C.I.O. unions, (ILGWU, ACWA, UMWA) being the backbone of this slate. The Convention was packed with twenty A.F.G.E. lodges (American Federation of Government Employees).

## JOBLESS UNITE IN MARYLAND

On May 17, a preliminary convention of several Maryland unemployed groups was held in Hagerstown. Over 30 delegates were present. The newly created state-wide organization will be affiliated to the Workers' Alliance of America.

Temporary officers were elected. Among them are: James Blackwell, Chairman of the Peoples' Unemployment League in Baltimore, president; Luther Owens of Cumberland, secretary; Dorothy Dare, Baltimore, assistant secretary.

The convention called for the transfer of Maryland from Region 2 to Region 1 of the W.P.A., a change which would increase the "security" wages by \$10 to \$15 per month. Resolutions were passed advocating the formation of a state and national farmer-labor party; and supporting July 22, as NATIONAL TOM MOONEY DAY.

Dorothy Dare introduced a resolution for a united labor ticket with Tom Mooney for president. The resolutions committee discussed this matter, and recommended it unanimously to the Convention. On the floor of the Convention a motion was passed to refer this resolution to the National Executive Committee of the Workers' Alliance.

it. Free immigration into Palestine —yes! But not a political or selective one.

The suggested minimum program should be acceptable to all who don't want any more Jewish-Arab blood being shed in Palestine. For the sake of clarity, it would be very interesting to know whether or not the C.P. of Palestine has already endorsed this program.

### Revolution—The Way Out

In conclusion, let me once more quote Karl Kautsky: "It is not in Palestine, but in Eastern Europe that the destinies of the suffering and oppressed portion of Jewry are being fought out. . . . Emigration abroad cannot help them no matter whither it may be turned. Their destiny is intimately connected with that of the REVOLUTION IN THEIR OWN COUNTRY." (Kautsky's emphasis).

Well said. Only the social revolution will free the toiling masses, will solve the Jewish question, as was done in the Soviet Union. But without the liberation of the colonial peoples—the social revolution is impossible.

### BEGIN TO READ

In the Next Issue  
**JAY LOVESTONE'S**  
articles on the  
**Republican Party**  
**Convention**

which he is now covering for the  
**WORKERS AGE**

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

(Continued from May 30th issue)

Let us examine the position of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the problems which have been raised by the People's Front policy.

Marx wrote the following to Kugelmann on April 17, 1871:

"Your comparison of the petty bourgeois demonstrations a la June 13, 1849 with the present struggle in Paris is quite inconceivable to me."

The events of June 13th of which Marx speaks so scornfully were based, so to speak, on a kind of People's Front policy. On June 13th the so-called Social Democratic Party, which in certain respects can be regarded as the predecessor of the present French Radical Socialists, attempted an insurrection against Louis Bonaparte, the President of the French Republic, and against the Party of Order—a coalition of monarchist groups which controlled a majority in parliament. In "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte" Marx has the following to say on the French Social Democratic Party of the time:

"To make a united front against the bourgeois forces, the petty bourgeoisie and the workers had formed a coalition on their side, the so-called Social Democratic Party. . . . In February 1849, there were banquets to celebrate the reconciliation. A joint program was drafted, joint electoral committees were founded, and joint candidatures were arranged for. The revolutionary point of the socialist demands of the proletariat was blunted, and these demands were given a democratic gloss. Conversely, in the case of the democratic demands of the petty bourgeoisie, the purely political form was effaced, and they were made to seem as socialistic as possible."

As compared with the present Social Democratic Party, which pursues petty bourgeois aims and has a proletarian membership, the French Social Democracy of 1848-49 was predominantly petty bourgeois in composition.

The "Eighteenth Brumaire" says the following about the political views of these Social Democrats, or the Mountain as they called themselves.

"Those who look at the matter from the democratic viewpoint declare that throughout the period of the Legislative National Assembly the same forces were at work as during the period of the Constituent National Assembly. They see nothing but a straightforward contest between republicans and royalists. The general sense of the movement is summed up by them in the catchword 'reaction'—a night in which all cats are gray, and in which they can drone out their commonplaces. At the first glance, it is true, the Party of Order has the aspect of a tangle of royalist factions, which are not merely intriguing one against the other because each wishes to set its own pretender on the throne and to defeat the rival claimants, but are likewise united in a common hatred of the 'republic' and a common determination to attack it. In contrast with this royalist conspiracy, the Mountain looms before us as representative of the 'republic.' The Party of Order appears to be continually at work promoting a 'reaction,' directed, just as in Prussia, against the freedom of the press, the right of association, etc.; and, once more as in Prussia, enforcing its will by the brutal intervention of the bureaucracy, the police, and the public prosecutor. The 'Mountain,' on the other hand, appears to be busily occupied in repelling these onslaughts, and thus in defending the 'eternal rights of man,' just like every other so-called People's Party, for the last hundred and fifty years. But, this semblance, which veils the class war and the peculiar physiognomy of the period under consideration, vanishes on close scrutiny."

We read further, that:

"The democrats admit that they are faced by a privileged class, but they think that they themselves, in conjunction with all the rest of the nation, constitute the 'people.' What they represent, is the right of the people; what interests them, is the popular interest. Consequently, when a struggle is impending, they see no reason for studying the interests and attitudes of the various classes, or for carefully reckoning up the forces at their own disposal. They need merely give the signal, and the people (whose resources are inexhaustible) will fall upon the oppressors. If it should turn out that their interests are inadequate and that their supposed power is impotent, they ascribe their defeat to the activities of pernicious sophists who have spread disunion and have split up the indivisible people into a number of mutually hostile factions; or the army, they say, was so brutalized and misguided that it could not perceive the pure aims of democracy to be its own true advantage; or

the whole plan was wrecked by some error of detail; or, on this occasion, an unforeseen accident ruined the scheme."

The rising of the Mountain having collapsed miserably, Marx had the following to say, in his "Class Struggles in France," on the attitude of the Parisian proletariat to this struggle.

"After the vote of the National Assembly on June 11, a conference took place between some members of the Mountain and delegates of the workers' secret societies. The latter pressed for striking the first blow the same evening. The Mountain decisively rejected this plan. On no account did it want to let the leadership slip out of its hands; its allies were as suspect to it as its antagonists, and rightly so. The memory of June 1848 surged through the ranks of the Paris proletariat more vigorously than ever. Nevertheless it was chained to the alliance with the Mountain. The latter represented the largest part of the departments; it exaggerated its influence in the army; it had at its disposal the democratic section of the National Guard; it had the moral power of the shop behind it. To begin the revolution at this moment against the will of the Mountain, meant for the proletariat, decimated moreover by cholera and driven out of Paris in considerable numbers by unemployment, to repeat the June days of 1848 uselessly, without the situation which had forced this desperate struggle. The proletarian delegates did the only rational thing. They bound the Mountain to compromise itself, i.e., to come out beyond the confines of the parliamentary struggle in the event of its bill of impeachment being rejected. During the whole of June 13, the proletariat maintained this same sceptically watchful attitude, and awaited a seriously engaged irrevocable melee between the democratic National Guard and the army, in order then to plunge into the fight and push the revolution forward beyond the petty-bourgeois aim set for it. In the event of victory the proletarian commune was already formed which would take its place beside the official government. The Parisian workers had learned in the bloody school of June, 1848."

There is, of course, a tremendous difference between the present People's Front and that of June 13, 1849. The Mountain was a petty bourgeois party which nevertheless attempted an armed uprising against the big bourgeoisie (the Party of Order) which was depriving the masses of their democratic rights, and against Bonaparte who was aiming at dictatorship. The present Radical Socialist Party with which the C.P. has formed a People's Front is a party with a petty bourgeois mass following but completely dominated by a bourgeois, definitely capitalist, leadership. It is not an opposition party as the Mountain was. It is a government party which supported and continues to support the undermining of democratic rights and the capitalist offensive. Marx would criticize the present People's Front even more sharply than the policy of the Mountain in 1849.

Even so the words of Marx written about the Mountain are a devastating criticism of the People's Front policy as pursued by the C.P., particularly in France.

What was Marx's criticism of the policy of the Mountain? Tho the Mountain admitted the existence of a privileged class ("the most imperialist and most chauvinist elements" of capital, the 200 families), Marx charged them with the failure to examine the interests and attitudes of the various classes. They had been satisfied with issuing general statements on the "general" interests of the people. As a result, they had failed to see that the "reaction," the anti-democratic efforts of the big bourgeoisie, the plans for a dictatorship by Bonaparte concealed specific, material interests of big capital. Furthermore, they had been unable to defend the social interests of the working masses which were following its political guidance; they had divested the social demands of the proletariat of their revolutionary content and had confined themselves to defending the so-called "eternal rights of humanity."

On the other hand, Marx praised the attitude of the Parisian revolutionary workers, of the delegates of the secret workers' organizations, for refusing to subject themselves to the political leadership of the Mountain and for preparing itself in case of a struggle to go beyond the petty bourgeois aims of the Mountain, for refusing to wage a struggle under the banner of bourgeois democracy, for insisting on the slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for refusing to orientate themselves towards a "People's Front government" with the Mountain, for preparing to set up a proletarian commune, a soviet, as we would call it today, which would be a dual government to the Mountain should the latter come into power.

(To be continued)

## BRADLEY'S CAFETERIA

SEASONABLE  
FOOD  
AT  
REASONABLE  
PRICES

6th Ave. at 14th Street