

Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. 5, No. 35.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, AUGUST 29, 1936.

5 Cents a Copy

WORKERS PREPARE TO DEFEND MADRID



This scene shows the armed workers defending the mountain passes of Guaderama, key to the defense of Madrid. It is here that the fascists have made heavy attacks but no appreciable gains.

THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR

—The Fascist forces are rumored to be preparing for a despairing assault on Madrid, all troops being brought into play. Meanwhile the workers and peasants are continuing their drive to split the northern and southern wings of the fascist troops. The use of Moroccan troops by Franco's southern wing indicates the result of international aid to the fascists in transporting these mercenaries.

—Leon Jouhaux, leader of the French trade unions, reported the results of his trip to Spain to more than 100,000 workers in Paris. While the masses roared "Arms and planes for Spain," Jouhaux attempted to defend the non-intervention policies of the Blum government, policies which he himself has scored.

—Britain demanded that Spain "apologize" to Nazi Germany for searching a ship which was carrying munitions to the fascist rebels. She also announced that the blockade of Gibraltar declared by the Madrid government would not be recognized—thus giving open aid to the rebels. In addition, Britain forced Spain to apologize for searching one of her own ships.

By WILL HERBERG

The Spain itself is by no means a European power of the first rank, the Spanish civil war has already become a major issue in European, even world politics, in a way in which no "domestic" occurrence has been since the great Russian revolution. It is a striking indication of the degree to which the fate of mankind today is being determined by the great world forces of imperialism and socialism and of the tensivity of international relations in general, that a "civil disturbance" in one corner of Europe should suddenly emerge as an acute and menacing problem of European diplomacy.

The Spanish crisis has shown once again how hollow are the conventional lies of official diplomacy, how empty are its conventional forms and phrases. To understand the situation as it actually confronts us, it is necessary to brush aside this web of futilities and to examine the forces at work in terms of the real interests involved.

Europe Dividing Into Two Camps!

"Since the Middle Ages, when religious strife divided every country of Europe within itself and split the Continent into rival Catholic and Protestant camps, there has not been such a turmoil of spirit as has been climaxed with the outbreak of the civil war between Right and Left in Spain. For the moment those natural divisions and rivalries which have been so dangerous to peace have become secondary in evil to the division between rival political conceptions that, for lack of better terms, are defined as communist and fascist. That division is not only tearing countries apart but is dividing every country within itself." Aside from their bias, these words of P. J. Philip in the New York Times (August 7, 1936) are profoundly true. With the Spanish situation as a touchstone, Europe is indeed dividing into two great camps—with a deep and treacherous swamp in-between!

At the head of the one, the camp of fascism, stand Italy and Germany. The Spanish government holds irrefutable evidence proving the complicity of Italy, and of Germany too, in preparing the fascist uprising in Spain. The aid that they have given to the fascist rebels in terms of aircraft, munitions, officers and instructors is notorious and now the report comes that a "certain Central European power" is about to supply General Franco with poison gas for the siege of Madrid! Diplomatic and naval officials of the two powers have openly and provocatively flaunted their solidarity with the cause of the military insurgents. In fact, Mussolini has gone so far as to conclude a formal "mutual assistance pact" with the fascist "government"; he and Hitler are undoubtedly only waiting for an opportune moment to extend it official recognition. And all this, of course, while formally maintaining "friendly" relations with the legitimate government at Madrid!

It is not difficult to understand the motives that have inspired Germany and Italy to rush thus recklessly to the aid of the fascist clique. The cause of fascism everywhere is, of course, the cause of Hitler and Mussolini and a smashing defeat administered to the working class on any front is a very real triumph for them. But there are also more immediate and perhaps even more compelling factors at work in the situation. In his "pact" with Italy, General Franco is understood to have promised Ceuta and Malorca to Mussolini in case of victory. Such gains, together with the undoubted influence that Rome would have over a fascist regime in Madrid, would bring Mussolini so much nearer to his imperialistic dream of undisputed hegemony over the Mediterranean, then truly a Roman sea. For his part, Hitler has been promised an African colony and something in the Balearic Islands; to Germany this would indeed mean a big step forward on the way towards that new colonial empire of which German imperialism has been dreaming for the last decade. Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany know their interests and are acting upon them with vigor and determination.

On the other side, heading the other camp, the camp of communism (socialism), stands the Soviet Union. Altho naturally in a difficult position and greatly embarrassed by the criminal imbecilities of French foreign policy, the U.S.S.R. has given every possible assistance to Spain, thru powerful expressions of moral support and solidarity, thru huge money collections by the trade unions, thru attempts to in-

(Continued on Page 3)

ADDITIONAL MILLS SIGN WITH KNITGOODS WORKERS UNION

The Settlement Committee of the Joint Council Knitgoods Workers Union reports that since Thursday, August 13th to date, which includes five working days, 83 mills involved in the General Strike of the Knitgoods Workers Union have been settled and the workers have returned to work.

Many more manufacturers have applied for settlements but due to the overwhelming amount of work the Settlement Committee has been unable to reach them to date, but further announcements of settlements will be forthcoming.

The wild statements and charges made by Mr. Sylbert and Mr. Lhowe, Executive Directors of the Metropolitan Knitted Textile Association and the Knitted Outerwear Association respectively, were not based on facts but were merely made for the purpose of demoralizing the workers on strike and to hold on to manufacturers who are members of their association but who are rapidly deserting them.

None of the statements with regard to settlements on the part of these gentlemen have been based on facts but have been purely figures of their imagination. The manufacturers listed above as having settled with the Union prove conclusively that the Metropolitan Knitted Textile Association is now defunct and is no longer a factor in the knitgoods industry today. Mr. Jed Sylbert speaks only for himself and not for any legitimate knitgoods manufacturers.

Mr. Louis Nelson, Manager of the Joint Council Knitgoods Workers Union, in a statement today said "that these settlements proved beyond a doubt that the General Strike of the knitgoods workers has been effective and that victory is already in the hands of the knitgoods workers."

The Joint Council Knitgoods Workers Union will continue its picketing and mass demonstrations until all manufacturers who are today attempting to beat back the unionization of the industry are included among the list of Union manufacturers. Especially will the fight be continued against the backbone of company-unionism in the industry, the Reitzas Mill which has used armed thugs to break the strike.

SOVIETS DOOM PLOTTERS

The trial of sixteen former members of the Russian Communist Party, accused of terrorist activity against the leaders of the Soviet state, resulted in a death sentence for the whole group. The prisoners, including Zinovieff and Kamenev, were given seventy hours to appeal to the Central Executive Committee for mercy. At the time of writing it is not known whether the appeal will be made.

The chief defendants presented all the necessary evidence for conviction in their own testimony, wherein they vied in accusations of one another, and attempted to paint themselves as more involved, more guilty than their fellow-accused Zinovieff, former head of the C.I., and, since 1926, a leader of the United Opposition (with Trotsky), despite his many recantations, announced that he had taken the complete road from "party opposition to complete counter-revolution, actually Fascism."

Kamenev ended the trial with a speech in which he hailed Soviet Russia and Stalin's leadership, de-

ROOSEVELT TAKES "OLD GUARD" AID

THE Old Guard Socialists found solace in nestling snugly in the broad bourgeois arms of President Roosevelt, receiving from the great charmdispenser a personal letter of thanks for the support they have thrown to him in the coming elections thru their People's Party. Governor Lehman also sent a letter of appreciation to Louis Waldman, the state chairman.

Roosevelt found particularly pleasing the use of the phrase "forwarding the forces of social progress as against the forces of reaction," as the basis of their entrance into the campaign. The Communist Party should really insist on a special letter—as the originator of this phrase for the support of Roosevelt. Or perhaps such correspondence might be embarrassing—to one of the correspondents.

nouncing his own activities. It was Kamenev who made his own analysis of the basis of the terrorist groupings. The socialist successes of the Soviets, he said, were such as made them despair (Zinovieff, Kamenev in Russia and Trotsky outside) of ever re-gaining power. Faced with the impossibility of achieving a mass basis, they resorted to terror, the assassination of leaders, especially Stalin, to recapture the reins of leadership.

The trial also brought out the connection of the terrorists with the Nazi Gestapo, who, according to the testimony, furnished false passports for the Trotskyists to enter Russia.

REMEMBER MOONEY ON LABOR DAY

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

(This is the third article in a series dealing with the People's Front and the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin concerning the attitude of the proletariat towards bourgeois democracy in various stages of capitalist development. The first appeared in the Workers Age of May 30th, the second in the issue of June 13th, and dealt with Marx's analysis of the 1848 events in France and his insistence on carrying the struggle beyond the establishment of bourgeois democracy—his work for the independent position of the proletariat, even at that early date. The article below takes up the question of the alliance of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie in the bourgeois-democratic revolution and its relationship to the struggle against fascism.—Editor.)

The attitude of Marx to the class struggles of France in 1848 is of particular significance to us since the February revolution and the June events of 1848 had brought the bourgeois revolution to a close, and had placed the proletarian revolution on the order of the day. The main problem in Germany, however prior to 1870, that is, up until the unification of Germany and the elimination of the chief remnants of feudalism by the Junker revolution "from above," was that of initiating a bourgeois revolution. To the extent to which the bourgeoisie opposed and fought feudalism, it played a progressive role. Hence, Marx and Engels approved of collaboration with the liberal bourgeoisie under certain conditions as long as the central issue was that of a bourgeois revolution in Germany. Their attitude, however, cannot be cited today as a defense of the present People's Front policy of the Communist International. In capitalist countries today, including those which are either menaced by a fascist coup d'etat or ruled by a fascist regime, the next historical step is a proletarian revolution and not a bourgeois revolution. It is wrong to conclude that the bourgeoisie, having played a progressive role in the struggle against feudalism will do likewise in the fight against fascism. The medieval barbarism of fascism does not signify a restoration of feudal classes nor a denial of the capitalist base of society. It is rather the outward expression of the complete decadence of the capitalist class and proves that only a proletarian revolution can promote the progress of mankind. In the struggle against fascism, therefore, the working class cannot ally itself with bourgeois groups or organizations. Furthermore, even in the epoch of bourgeois revolutions when the bourgeoisie played a progressive role, Marx and Engels had quite a different attitude towards the bourgeoisie than have the present leaders of the C.I. toward their bourgeois allies in the People's Front.

The Struggle Against Democratic Illusions

In their polemics with the so-called "true Socialists," Marx and Engels, prior to 1848, urged the proletariat to participate in the bourgeois revolution and to support the liberal bourgeoisie in its struggle against absolutism. At the same time, however, Marx and Engels waged a sharp struggle against all bourgeois-democratic illusions.

CAMP ARTEMUS
BREWSTER, NEW YORK
Fare from Grand Central \$1.05
Rate: \$16 weekly
Improved sport facilities

"The working class is aware of the fact that the elimination of bourgeois property relations will not proceed if feudalism is preserved. The workers realize that the revolutionary movement of the bourgeoisie against the feudal lords and the absolute monarchy will accelerate their own revolutionary movement. They know that their struggle against the bourgeoisie will commence on the day of the victory of the bourgeoisie. Yet, the workers do not share the bourgeois illusions of Herr Heinen. The working class can and must accept the bourgeois revolution as a prerequisite for the workers' revolution, but it must never look upon the bourgeois revolution as its final goal."

Thus wrote Marx in the "Deutsche Bruesseler Zeitung" in a polemic against the bourgeois republican, Heinen.

The Communist Manifesto states that "the German bourgeois revolution . . . must needs be the direct prelude to the proletarian revolution." Engels elaborated on this idea in his "Fundamentals of Communism":

"In Germany, finally, the decisive struggle between the bourgeoisie and the absolute monarchy is yet to come. Since, however, the final and decisive struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie cannot take place until such time as the latter attains power, it is to the interest of the Communists to help the bourgeoisie achieve power as soon as possible only to overthrow it as soon as possible. Communists therefore must support the liberal bourgeoisie, but they must guard against the self-deceptions of the bourgeoisie nor must they be deluded by the treacherous election promises of the bourgeoisie."

On the basis of the above, the "Communist Manifesto" outlined the central task of the C.P.G. as follows: "The C.P.G. must infuse the workers with a clear consciousness of the deep antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat so that the German workers will turn the social and political conditions, which will inevitably be brought about by the rule of the bourgeoisie into weapons against the bourgeoisie, so that immediately after the overthrow of the reactionary classes, the struggle against the bourgeoisie itself will commence."

The above quotations prove that on the eve of the revolution of 1848, Marx and Engels urged the German proletariat to participate in the bourgeois revolution, to fight for its final success so as to precipitate a proletarian revolution. The C.P.G. today agrees to support a People's Front government which would aim at the restoration of bourgeois democracy in Germany after the overthrow of fascism while Marx and Engels, prior to the 1848 revolution, were of the opinion that it was the task of the German proletariat to fight against the bourgeoisie in the event the latter seized power in order to transform the bourgeois revolution into the immediate prelude of the proletarian revolution.

No Progressive Bourgeoisie Today

In the epoch of bourgeois revolutions, Marx and Engels stood for the support of the bourgeoisie only to the extent to which it really fought feudalism. Their motive was to advance the struggle of the working class for its own class demands. The People's Front, however, in the period of proletarian revolution, obscures the class demands of the proletariat and sup-

presses the struggle for them in the interest of an alliance with the reactionary bourgeoisie of today—the bourgeoisie of the present is a reactionary throughout—even those sections of it that affect to be liberal.)

During the revolution of 1848-49, Marx and Engels exposed and combated vigorously the betrayal by the liberal bourgeoisie of the bourgeois revolution and the vacillations of the petty bourgeois democrats.

The liberal bourgeoisie allied itself with the feudal reaction immediately after the March days of 1848 in order to check the advance of the revolution and the revolutionary actions of the toiling masses, the workers, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the peasants. In their struggle against the liberal bourgeoisie, Marx and Engels pursued a policy which aimed at the completion of the bourgeois revolution through the struggle of the masses against the treacherous bourgeoisie and the preparation for the transformation of the bourgeois revolution into the proletarian revolution. While they were yet emigrants in Paris, Marx and Engels worked out a program for the CPC which called for the general arming of the people, the transformation of the feudal estates into state property, and the nationalization of all means of transportation. It was the task of the "German proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie and the farmers," that is, the toiling masses, to struggle for these demands. Their orientation towards independent action of the working class was consistently adhered to by Marx and Engels in the course of the revolution. Marx wrote on December 29, 1848 in the "Neue Rheinische Zeitung":

"The History of the Prussian bourgeoisie from March to December proves that in Germany a purely bourgeois revolution and the foundation of bourgeois rule in the form of a constitutional monarchy is impossible. The only possibility is either a feudal counter-revolution or a social republican revolution."

The Workers Make the Bourgeois Revolution

This Marxian dictum already contained the germ of the Leninist slogan issued in Russia in 1905 for a democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants, thus carrying the bourgeois revolution to its ultimate success in the face of the betrayal of the liberal bourgeoisie, and laying the base for the proletarian revolution. Because of its organizational weakness, the Communist League worked within the organizations of the petty bourgeois democrats in the beginning of the revolution of 1848. The organizational break did not occur until 1849. From the very start, however, Marx and Engels pursued an independent policy in opposition to the petty bourgeoisie and criticized the latter sharply.

On the basis of the experiences of the revolution of 1848-49, Marx and Engels outlined their position on the tasks of the German Communists in a statement of the Central Committee of the Communist League in 1850. In it they vigorously rejected all bourgeois democratic illusions and called for laying the basis for the proletarian revolution—for the seizure of power by the working class. The statement accuses the liberal bourgeoisie of betraying the revolution.

REMEMBER MOONEY ON LABOR DAY

We admire your hardy strength and courage fully as much as your clear political insight which enabled you to be willing to assume the role of Presidential candidate at one stroke. The attempt failed. We can very well imagine the terrible sufferings of one who spends 20 years in prison innocently. We are filled with admiration and respect for one who for 20 years has defied his jailers and has kept the banner of revolutionary internationalism aloft.

tion of 1848 and prophesies that "this treacherous role . . . will be taken over by the democratic petty bourgeoisie in the coming revolution," that the democratic party is far more dangerous to the workers than was the liberal party; that the relation of the revolutionary workers party to the petty bourgeois democrats ought to be as follows:

"The workers party will collaborate with the petty bourgeoisie against the reactionaries which both aim to overthrow, but it will oppose the petty bourgeoisie on all issues pertaining to the working class."

Opposition to Petty Bourgeoisie

On the question of the program of the petty bourgeois democracy which called for a republican constitution and social reforms, the statement reads: "These demands are by no means adequate for the proletariat. While the petty bourgeoisie wants to terminate the reaction as quickly as possible satisfied with the realization of the above mentioned demands, it is our duty, and to our interest, to insure the permanency of the revolution until the ruling class is overthrown and state power has been seized by the proletariat."

Marx and Engels, furthermore, opposed the formation of a "large opposition party which would embrace all shades of democrats . . . and in which certain demands of the proletariat would not be voiced for fear of breaking the peace." The democratic petty bourgeoisie was clamoring for just such a party. Marx and Engels called for "an independent, secret or public workers party." "In case of a struggle against a common opponent," we read on, "there will be no need of a special alliance. As soon as such a situation develops, the interests of both parties will require and achieve a spontaneous alliance as has always occurred in the past."

Soviets—Not Cabinet Offices

In case of a revolution, Marx and Engels advised that "they (the workers) must set up their own revolutionary workers government in opposition to the new official government either in the form of

municipal councils or workers committees. Thus the bourgeois democratic government would not only lose the support of the workers immediately, but would be menaced by and watched over by authorities that are backed by the great mass of workers. . . . The chief points that the proletariat and the League must bear in mind during and after the coming revolution are: the destruction of the influence of the bourgeois democrats over the workers; immediate, independent, armed organization of the workers, setting up of difficult and compromising conditions for the momentarily inevitable rule of bourgeois democrats."

It is quite evident from the above that the views of Marx and Engels were very different from those underlying the People's Front policy today. In 1850—in a period of black reaction following the defeat of the revolution—Marx and Engels demanded that the Communists criticize the program of the petty bourgeois democracy most sharply. They were opposed to the exclusion of the class demands of the proletariat in the name of a broad opposition movement against the reaction to pledge their support to a bourgeois republic as demanded by the petty bourgeoisie. On the contrary, they called for the formation of local workers governments—soviets as we would call them today—in order to carry the bourgeois revolution to its logical conclusion and thus to initiate a transition to the proletarian revolution.

We have amply illustrated that the People's Front policy is a cross transgression on the tactical teachings of Marx and Engels. We shall endeavor to prove in a future article that Lenin, too, was always a decided opponent of the tactics now employed in the name of the People's Front.

(Continued in future issue)

Send me more information about the C.P.O.
Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____

CZECH OPPOSITION GREET TOM MOONEY AND BILLINGS

Aseh, July 16, 1936
Dear Comrade Mooney:

On this day, the anniversary of the twentieth year of your imprisonment, we send you and Comrade Billings our warmest, fraternal greetings.

You became a victim of class justice which tried to silence one of the most courageous of revolutionaries. The American capitalist class tried to destroy you and Billings and the struggle for emancipation of the American working class at one stroke. The attempt failed. We can very well imagine the terrible sufferings of one who spends 20 years in prison innocently. We are filled with admiration and respect for one who for 20 years has defied his jailers and has kept the banner of revolutionary internationalism aloft.

We admire your hardy strength and courage fully as much as your clear political insight which enabled you to be willing to assume the role of Presidential candidate at one stroke. The attempt failed. We can very well imagine the terrible sufferings of one who spends 20 years in prison innocently. We are filled with admiration and respect for one who for 20 years has defied his jailers and has kept the banner of revolutionary internationalism aloft.

With fraternal greetings,
COMMUNIST PARTY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA (OPPOSITION)

We here in Czechoslovakia, a country surrounded by Fascist states, so near the Third Reich, are painfully aware of the sufferings of the German proletariat. We are daily witnesses of the horrible sufferings of those confined in Hitler's concentration camps and prisons; we witness daily the tremendous arming of Germany for an attack on the Soviet Union—for another world war. But we also witness the heroic struggle of the underground movement in Germany.

In Czechoslovakia reaction and fascism are growing. We are waging a valiant struggle against the fascist menace—fully conscious that victory is dependent upon the application of Marxian principles and correct Leninist tactics. You, Comrade Mooney, are a symbol of the struggle of the revolutionary working class against its oppressors. We know that the struggle we wage against reaction, against fascism, against imperialist war mongers, will at the same time free you and Billings and those tens of thousands of workers suffering in the dungeons of the bourgeoisie of all countries. Comrade Mooney, courage to you! The international proletariat will break your chains and free you!

This decision greatly upset the Poale Zion as they were placed in a predicament. In St. Louis division, a strongly Jewish section, two candidates are in the field:

FRENCH POLICY ENDANGERS THE SPANISH WORKERS

(Continued from Page 1)

fluence the French course and thru other means which it is impossible to discuss in detail. Here, as everywhere else, the Soviet Union finds its best and most reliable ally in the international labor movement. The response of the organized workers of the various countries, including England and the United States, to the great emergency has been heartening, in many cases really splendid, as a demonstration of true proletarian solidarity. and the practical assistance hitherto extended has been by no means inconsiderable.

How far these two camps, locked in a bitter struggle to the death, reach in their international allegiances, can be seen from characteristic incidents on every side. America's would-be Hitlers, Father Coughlin and Gerald Smith, froth at the mouth in filthy abuse of "Red Spain," while German refugees are fighting heroically in the Spanish republican militia not so much against General Mola—the report runs—as against General Goering. Socialism against fascism—on the Spanish front—is now being fought a great and bloody battle in this mighty war upon which so much of the fate of mankind depends!

What About "Democratic" Powers?

But what about the so-called "democratic" powers, Great Britain and France above all? Surely something might have been expected from them, for considerations of international law and national interest alike would seem to urge action on behalf of the Spanish government, especially in the face of such provocative interference by the fascist powers. In international law and justice, respect

for legitimate authority and democratic processes, about which the great democrats at London and Paris are so fond of prating—all of these high-sounding phrases have been thrown on the dust-heap in the moment of crisis. "The existing regime in Madrid," Charles A. Seiden points out in a London dispatch published in the New York Times of August 9, "is recognized by all the other powers as the legitimate government and is, of course, entitled under international law to purchase in other countries all the munitions it needs for its own defense against a military rebellion. But that government is being left in the lurch by non-intervention, just as Ethiopia was because of fear of Italy."

Where, furthermore, is this united front of democratic powers against fascism, which the sentimental socialists and their echoes in the official communist movement have been hailing as the very salvation of mankind? It is shown to be nothing but a miserable pacifist delusion, blown to bits by the first touch of hard reality.

What is the aspect of this hard reality? England, the very savior of the "democratic front"—England, the proud mother of parliamentary democracy—is openly hostile to the republican, the democratic, the legitimate government of Spain and is openly sympathetic with the fascist insurgents and military mutineers! "It is impossible to discover in political and business circles here," writes the authoritative English correspondent, Augur, in the New York Times of August 17, "any sign of sympathy with Madrid." And it isn't merely a matter of sympathy. England is second only to Italy and Germany in the help it has extended to the fascists. It was

the British cruiser, Queen Elizabeth, that stepped in to prevent the bombardment of the rebel stronghold, Algeciras, thus securing the fascist lines of communications between Spanish Morocco and the mainland, and it is widely known that bombers and combat planes, in considerable quantities, have reached Franco and Mola from British sources.

Grounds Of British Policy

The grounds of English policy are a bit more complicated than in the case of Italy and Germany. "A republican regime in Spain would receive strong backing here," Augur continues in the article above mentioned, "but reports obtained from reliable sources show that in reality the situation is dominated not even by the communists but by frankly anarchist elements." The spectre of a socialist Spain—for hatred of socialism is deep in the conservative heart of British "democracy"—is a great factor in determining the British attitude. In particular, there is Portugal. For ten years that country, virtually a British colony, has been groaning under the iron heel of a "military-civilian" dictatorship. "On no account," proclaims Augur, "can Britain tolerate a Red menace to the Portuguese dictator. . . . Portugal must be protected against the possibility of a socialist Spain! But, underlying everything, is the prevailing British attitude towards the fascist powers; an Anglo-German 'understanding' has for some time now been a guiding line of Tory policy—for the present," we are told, nothing must be permitted to cause serious irritation to either Germany or Italy—everything must be done to "conciliate" them and "reasonable

concessions" may be necessary to foreign offices at Berlin and Rome welcome opportunity for endless diplomatic trickery to cover up their nefarious activities. Its most sinister aspect is that it virtually slams the door in the face of the sorely pressed Spanish government, while the fascist rebels are being aided, openly and with impunity, by Germany and Italy. Is it any wonder that the People's Front government of Madrid has been compelled to protest publicly against the action of the People's Front (socialist) government of Paris as "discriminating against an established government in favor of the rebels" (New York Herald-Tribune, August 12)?

The Blum cabinet finds all sorts of scruples in the way of allowing the Spanish government its full rights under international law and custom. It does not, however, seem to be able to do anything in the case of M. Peyroutan, governor-general of French Morocco, who recently went out of his way to help the fascist insurgents by borrowing half a million francs from the State Bank and placing this sum at the disposal of General Franco! Nor do the conscientious politicians in Paris seem very much concerned that thruout the country there are right now at least half a dozen centers from which Spanish monarchist and fascist leaders are working virtually in the open in contact with their fellow insurgents in Spain. The French government is apparently too deeply absorbed in its diplomatic "non-intervention" farce to pay attention to such trifles!

Price Of People's Front

But how could this regime, contemptible as it is, have gotten into a blind-alley so disastrous from every standpoint? There is but one answer: Just as the fascist revolt in Spain is the legitimate the monstrous offspring of the People's Front policy there, so is the criminal fiasco of French foreign policy the logical consequence of the People's Front on that soil! The socialists and communists and virtually all other sections of the French proletariat are bitterly hostile to the whole "non-intervention" swindle. At the recent "peace picnic" in Paris, the eloquent, if somewhat vague, sermon delivered by Leon Blum was continually interrupted by cries of: "Airplanes for Spain!" Blum's own paper, Le Populaire, carries daily reports of workers meetings demanding an end to the discriminatory embargo. At the teachers union congress on August 4, Leon Jouhaux, secretary of the C.G.T., expressed himself vehemently to the effect that "the doctrine of non-intervention has cost us dear. The defeat of the workers in Spain might well be our own defeat, not only in the social struggle but in the defeat of our country as well. . . ."

And yet the Blum government persists in spinning the treacherous diplomatic web in which it is itself becoming ever more hopelessly entangled. Why? Because, altho the cabinet is headed by a socialist and supported by the communists, it is dominated in its essential policy by the Radicals. Such is the fatal mechanism of the People's Front; the workers parties become the political prisoners of their worthy allies, the bour-

(Continued on Page 4)

Provincial Elections In Canada

(This article was written before the elections, which took place a few days ago—Editor.)

By LENA ZUKER

Montreal, Canada. After an investigation which exposed the corrupt practices of members and proteges of the Liberal Government of the Province of Quebec, the Liberal Taschereau clique was forced to resign, ending a sixteen year regime. Elections will be held on August 17th. The Liberal Party will be strongly opposed by the Conservative Party, calling itself the Union Nationale.

As soon as the announcement of elections was made, K. Kaplansky, delegate of the Workers League of Canada, urged the Quebec Labor Party to begin active preparations for an intensive campaign. At a following Executive meeting of the Labor Party a representative of the Communist Party proposed a United Front between the Labor Party, Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and the C.P. in the elections. Anticipating the inevitable defeat of this suggestion, Kaplansky made a proposal for minimum co-operation between the three parties. He proposed that each party run candidates under its own banner; that there should be only one labor candidate in each division and that there be close co-operation between all working class candidates. This proposal was unanimously adopted and was supported by Wolfe and Welicovitch of the Amalgamated.

This decision greatly upset the Poale Zion as they were placed in a predicament. In St. Louis division, a strongly Jewish section, two candidates are in the field: Peter Bercovitch, a prominent Liberal and lawyer for local unions, and Fred Rose, C.P. candidate. The Poale Zion would like to make a Jewish issue of the campaign and support Bercovitch. But according to the decision of the Labor Party, to which they are affiliated, they would be forced to support Fred Rose. Furthermore, the Poale Zion thinks it its duty to break up every united front in which the C.P. plays any part and has played a disruptive role in every united working class effort that has been attempted in the city.

The delegates favoring united action succeeded in calling a second meeting to reconsider the question, but were again defeated by a vote of 13 to 12. An Electoral

Committee was elected and at the meeting of this Committee the Poale Zion proposed that the Labor Party run a candidate in St. Louis division. Obviously the Poale Zion aimed at weakening the C.P. candidate and contemplated a manoeuvre at the last moment in favor of Bercovitch. The delegate of the Workers League put up a strong fight against this and at the Council meeting attacked and exposed the Poale Zion's hypocritical stand and petty manoeuvring. Wolfe, at this meeting, proposed that a committee of the Labor Party approach the C.P. and ask them to withdraw their candidate from the St. Louis division. This was opposed by Kaplansky of the Workers League but Wolfe's proposal was accepted. The Party was approached but, of course, refused to withdraw.

The Committee then proposed to the Council meeting that the Labor Party pass a resolution not to endorse any candidate in St. Louis division and that no delegate to or Executive member of the Labor Party be allowed to take the floor for any of the candidates in that division. This compromise resolution was passed unanimously, but Kaplansky made it clear that if any of the delegates did not adhere to the resolution and worked for Bercovitch, he would consider himself free to take the platform for Fred Rose.

The stand of the Workers League has been made very clear by Kaplansky's active support for united effort in the Provincial elections. Of course, the Workers League will adhere to the decision of the Labor Party and, for the sake of unity, will refrain from participating in the election campaign.

foreign offices at Berlin and Rome welcome opportunity for endless diplomatic trickery to cover up their nefarious activities. Its most sinister aspect is that it virtually slams the door in the face of the sorely pressed Spanish government, while the fascist rebels are being aided, openly and with impunity, by Germany and Italy. Is it any wonder that the People's Front government of Madrid has been compelled to protest publicly against the action of the People's Front (socialist) government of Paris as "discriminating against an established government in favor of the rebels" (New York Herald-Tribune, August 12)?

The Blum cabinet finds all sorts of scruples in the way of allowing the Spanish government its full rights under international law and custom. It does not, however, seem to be able to do anything in the case of M. Peyroutan, governor-general of French Morocco, who recently went out of his way to help the fascist insurgents by borrowing half a million francs from the State Bank and placing this sum at the disposal of General Franco! Nor do the conscientious politicians in Paris seem very much concerned that thruout the country there are right now at least half a dozen centers from which Spanish monarchist and fascist leaders are working virtually in the open in contact with their fellow insurgents in Spain. The French government is apparently too deeply absorbed in its diplomatic "non-intervention" farce to pay attention to such trifles!

Futility Of French Policy

But the most miserable example of criminal, suicidal futility parading as foreign policy is exhibited by France, by that renowned People's Front government whose praises are sung so vociferously in the socialist and official communist press. In France we have a socialist-liberal coalition supported by the communists. It is a government that is all for democracy and against fascism and never fails to make its intentions known in the best phraseology of 1793. It is the government of a country for which a fascist triumph in Spain would have well-nigh fatal consequences, virtually completing the iron vise of fascism around it—fascist Germany, fascist Austria, fascist Italy, fascist Spain! But what has this government done? Has it given the Spanish republic that aid to which the latter is entitled under every concept of international law—at least permission to purchase aircraft and munitions in France? Oh, no! Just the contrary; it has taken the initiative in setting in motion interminable and highly complicated negotiations among the powers for a so-called "non-intervention" pact banning the sale of any sort of implements of war to "either side" in the Spanish conflict—meanwhile anticipating matters by itself prohibiting the export of war materials to Spain.

In net effect, and admitting the best of intentions, such a line amounts to objective aid to the Fascist rebels. For not only does it put the murderous fascist clique on the same level with the "legal and democratic" government of Spain; not only does it force the Soviet Union into a difficult and embarrassing position; not only does it give the

And yet the Blum government persists in spinning the treacherous diplomatic web in which it is itself becoming ever more hopelessly entangled. Why? Because, altho the cabinet is headed by a socialist and supported by the communists, it is dominated in its essential policy by the Radicals. Such is the fatal mechanism of the People's Front; the workers parties become the political prisoners of their worthy allies, the bour-

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. 5, No. 35. Saturday, August 29, 1936.

The Spanish Civil War

(Continued from Page 3)

geois liberals. The socialists and communists may propose—but the Radicals dispose!

The whole wretched idea of "non-intervention" was conceived and sponsored by the Radicals in the cabinet, in particular by the Daladier wing. Indeed, on July 31, according to an Associated Press dispatch in the New York Post, Radical-Socialist spokesmen went so far as to urge "a three-power attempt to settle the civil war . . . France, Great Britain and Italy were proposed by the Radical-Socialists for membership in an international commission to arbitrate the struggle between the Spanish fascists and the loyalists. A precedent for their suggestion, they said, was set in China, where neutral powers arbitrated an internal dispute." For cold-blooded villainy this "proposal" certainly has no equal! To throw the fate of Spain into the hands of the predatory imperialists of Italy, Britain and France is brazen enough but to recall the imperialistic partition of China as a worthy model to be followed in the Spanish situation is cynicism beyond description. These are the people who really hold the reins of the Blum cabinet!

It is pretty well established by this time that, in the first cabinet sessions on the Spanish question, the socialists and a few Radicals passionately urged that the republican regime at Madrid be given every possible assistance within the limits of international law. But Daladier, minister of war, was of a different mind. He, the head of the Radical party and the leader of its "left wing," insisted on "non-intervention." Leon Blum pleaded, stormed, threatened to resign . . . Daladier was adamant and confronted Blum with an ultimatum: either the Radical policy is accepted, or else. . . . The Radical policy was accepted!

Pro-German Orientation Of Radicals

It is impossible to miss the connection between the Radical attitude on the Spanish question and Daladier's notoriously pro-German orientation as well as his scandalous subservience to the fascist officers infesting the French general staff. The general policy of the French People's Front government towards the Italian and German fascist regimes is, except for a shift in emphasis from Germany to Italy and a few saving phrases, very much like the English Tory policy: a Franco-Italian "understanding" is the great objective—the fascist powers must not be "antagonized"—to assure peace, it is necessary to make all sorts of "reasonable concessions" so as to achieve a "friendly modus vivendi" with them. This was the course followed by Laval towards the end of his regime when he tried to sabotage the Franco-Soviet pact and this is the course taken over by the Radicals and made the official policy of the Blum cabinet. It implies, of course, constant yielding to the pressure of the fascist elements at home, actual cringing before their political bullying. Out of such an attitude, the "non-intervention" swindle was but a natural development!

It is really startling to note how closely the Radical policy fits in with Nazi views. During the third week of civil war in Spain, on August 7, the official organ of the German foreign office, *Diplomatische Korrespondenz*, carried an article deprecating "European alignments along ideological lines" rather than along the "natural divisions of national interest." Almost simultaneously, a "prominent Radical-Socialist spokesman" warned against the "tendency towards the formation of mutually

hostile fascist and democratic fronts" in international politics as a "threat to peace." In perpetual fear and trembling at the very possibility of a diplomatic front against fascism, of what are the Radicals capable except systematic capitulation?

Nor should it be overlooked that the Radicals themselves are very much disturbed at the prospect of a socialist Spain. Their participation in the People's Front government, side by side with the socialists and supported by the communists, has not changed the fact that they are sworn champions of the bourgeois order of things and sworn enemies of the socialist aspirations of the proletariat. A socialist Spain, which would very likely follow in the wake of a smashing defeat of the fascist rebels, would result in an immense radicalization of the French masses and a powerful advance of the working class movement towards socialism. For the Radicals such a turn of events would be disastrous; the People's Front, upon which they depend so much for political security, would inevitably be wrecked in the storm and the Radical party would lose virtually all its proletarian and petty bourgeois following. It is plain that the joy of these liberal gentlemen at a republican (really, socialist) victory in Spain would not be altogether unmingled!

Reactionary Politics In Pacifist Garb

The criminal policy now being pursued by the French cabinet on the Spanish question is the policy of the Radicals forced upon Blum and the workers parties thru the mechanism of the People's Front. We have emphasized that the socialists inside the cabinet and the communists outside are bitterly opposed to it. We know, too, that the Soviet Union has done everything in its power, within the limits of the situation, to exert pressure in the right direction, striving, as Augur authoritatively informs us, "to make support of the Spanish republic the touchstone of the Franco-Russian alliance" (New York Times, August 17). But all to no avail! The Radical leaders are determined not to "precipitate a crisis" by "provoking" the fascist powers, and so they seek refuge in the interminable futilities of diplomacy.

Of course, all this they trick out in the cant phrases of pacifist idealism, in which they are aided by the vague and flowery peace sermons to which Leon Blum and his friends are so addicted. But, at bottom, it is a matter of class politics in the raw, stripped of all fancy ideology. In Britain, sentiment in official quarters is hostile to the republican regime in Spain;

in France, such sentiment is "sympathetic." In Britain, the Tories hold power; in France, the socialists and Radicals, supported by the communists. But, in both Britain and France, the actual policy, as it emerges from the welter of diplomatic phrases, is one dictated by fear of socialism, by deference to the fascist powers at home and abroad. It is a reactionary bourgeois policy, committing its atrocities, as usual, in the name of peace!

Crime Of Blum Cabinet

As I write these lines, word comes that Mussolini is mobilizing his entire air-force for direct intervention in Spain on the ground that France is "aiding the socialist government in Madrid"! To the abject creatures in the French foreign office even this holds out signs of hope. "Despite the Rome dispatches about rebel aid," runs the Associated Press report in the New York World-Telegram of August 19, "a French foreign office spokesman insisted negotiations for the neutrality accord were advancing with Italy and Germany. Premier Mussolini's return to Rome from a vacation, the spokesman said, was a 'step forward,' toward agreement and Italy's final reply to the neutrality invitation was being awaited. Germany's acceptance of the pact, with reservations, indicated a 'distinct effort' to achieve a common stand, the spokesman avowed."

This is not merely an illustration of the shameless effrontery so characteristic of fascist diplomacy nor even of the despicable servility of pro-fascist pacifism; it is, above all, proof, if proof were still needed, that to throw concessions to the fascist dogs is no way of "conciliating" them and thereby securing peace; that, on the contrary, such tactics only whet their predatory appetites and inflate their self-assurance, actually accentuating the danger of war. If anything is responsible for the brazenly overbearing and really menacing attitude on the part of Italy, it is the yielding and capitulatory course of the French cabinet!

The French People's Front government, nominally headed by Leon Blum but politically dominated by the Radicals, has committed an unpardonable crime against the Spanish people, against the French masses and against the international labor movement. It has covered itself with eternal shame which will not be washed away by any amount of weeping and wailing and beating of the breast when it is too late. It stands forth as an object of contempt and execration; but more—it stands forth as an object lesson of the depths of infamy to which the liberal bourgeoisie can sink and drag the proletariat along with it thru the dead-weight of the People's Front!

"We Alone Fight for Democracy"

Phila., Pa.—In an attempt to justify the ways of the American Youth Congress on whose third convention he reported for the edification of the local Y.C.L., Comrade Glick, late of the model Bronx district, advanced the argument that only the Communist Party fights for bourgeois democracy. In pre-Hitler Germany, he declared, the Social Democrats merely talked about defending the status quo. The C.P.G. had no argument with this, but it did insist that the line be applied. Not a single Y.C.L.'er complained!

In the main body of his report, Comrade Glick tilted with the "sincere but muddled" Y.P.S.L. and the "sectarian" Lovestoneites. The Y.P.S.L. drew his fire for permitting themselves to be "influenced by the Trotskyites" and the Lovestoneites were scored for insisting upon a labor orientation in

the American Youth Congress. The Y.P.S.L. were given a counter-revolutionary coloring only because they too fought the People's Front ideology of the Congress. Quoth Comrade Glick: The C.P.O. Youth and the Y.P.S.L. are suffering from infantile sickness!

So untenable was Glick's position that it was easy for the four questioners to drive him from pillar to post. First Glick declared for unity in the abstract. In a minute he was defending this conception of class unity or peace with the statement that even for Lenin there were "compromises and compromises." Soon thereafter he made the astounding reference to bourgeois democracy and the new C.P. attitude to it.

REMEMBER MOONEY ON LABOR DAY

BOOKS of the AGE

What Employers Are Doing For Employees—A Survey of Voluntary Activities for Improvement of Working Conditions in American Business Concerns. Issued by National Industrial Conference Board, Inc. New York City. \$2.00.

This study of what is euphemistically called "Industrial Relations Policy in the United States" refers only obliquely to government "interference" in the affairs of big business, but it is this of which the author is most afraid. Ruled by this fear, he amasses a pile of statistics to "prove" that employers are the good angels of their employees.

Whatever else may be said about the survey, it must be granted that the subject is handled with kid gloves. The suave paternalism of the bosses, which trade unions find so noxious, is praised not only because it will take the ground from under the feet of over-solicitous legislators, but also because it represents a good, long-time investment. Thus medical services, athletic facilities, apprentice training and quality bonus plans are recommended for universal adoption. Stock-purchase arrangements, long the old reliable of class-conscious employers, is tried and found wanting, chiefly because the depression has played havoc with the scheme.

2,452 establishments with an employing capacity of 4,502,608 people served as the source of the author's material. Every conceivable industry is represented. However, companies with a personnel of 10,000 or over provide the lion's share, 53.9 per cent, of the workers.

Although the author is fearful of government legislation, he indicates that the Wagner Labor Relations Act has so far not resulted "in any material diminution of these (company union) plans." He provides food for thought in the news that employee representation jumped from 5 per cent of all reporting companies in 1927 to 30.6 per cent in 1935. It might be said that this bit of evidence is introduced with the unexpressed admonition that company unionism should be picked up by businessmen.

The booklet has its value not so much because it contains many tables, but rather because it affords an insight into the mentality of certain sections of the ruling class.

—Lee Mason

YOUTH'S WORK IN THE NEW WORLD, by T. Otto Hall, Association Press, \$1.75.

To aid youth in getting its bearings in this new world of profound social crisis, Mr. T. Otto Hall interviews in their behalf, prominent leaders in industry, art and science. Such worthies as Frances Perkins, Kirby Page, Dr. William Mayo, Conrad Nagel, Senator Arthur Capper are represented. They all assert most vigorously that youth can do great things, that their spheres of activity are boundless; they speak of the worthwhile things that should be done, and insist on the boundlessness of opportunities. Hardly news. They all shy away from specific information on the difficulties in their vocations, the narrowing of work possibilities in contradistinction to the expansion in social need for the services of science, industry and art. Of what avail to discuss what could be done purely on the basis of social need and the technical means at hand for the job, when the private ownership of our economic order obliterates the possibility of young men and women even grasping the technical instruments to satisfy the social needs. There is no inspiration, no real insight furnished by these leaders of present-day

SOCIAL INSURANCE UP IN RUSSIA

THE number of insured persons covered by the Soviet Union's social insurance scheme was 17.6 million in 1931, 22.1 million in 1933, and 23.5 million in 1934. The increase in expenditure, all of which is borne by industry, was even more marked: 2,700 million roubles in 1931, 4,800 million in 1933, 5,400 million in 1934, and 6,500 million in 1935.

SEATTLE LABOR BACKS GUILD

Strike Against Hearst Paper Puts Halt To Publishing

The American Newspaper Guild, now affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, has received the full and ardent support of the Seattle labor movement, in its strike against the Hearst-owned Post-Intelligencer of that city. The strike began when two of the oldest correspondents of the paper were fired for union activity. The pressmen, truckdrivers, and other trades connected with the work of the paper joined with the Newspaper Guild when it called the strike. The entire plant has been shut down, and Hearst has fumed about "mob-rule," etc.

The Central Trades and Labor Council of Seattle supported the strike fully as soon as it began. Three of the unions concerned, under contract but on strike, asked the A. F. of L. to nullify the action of the Central Trades. The City Council however, however, indicated that such pressure was of no avail when it reaffirmed its position in support of the strike and praised several of the leaders. The three objecting union presidents, who demanded that the paper be removed from the unfair list are Howard of the Typos, Major Berry of Printing Pressmen, and Roberts of the Mailers.

The Hearst management has consistently refused to negotiate, contenting itself with demands for "law and order." The Mayor of Seattle, offering to arbitrate, received what he termed "a gross insult" from the paper. Hearst issued a personal statement covering the fight for collective bargaining by an attack on Communism.

society, who are as lost as the "lost generation" they would advise. This volume will fulfill a mission that eludes the author: it will reveal to the youthful readers the complete bankruptcy of the leaders of today and thus dissipate the fogs blinding them to the real social realities that imprison them. Perhaps the Association Press, Y.M.C.A. publishing concern, has done much better service for youth in its other messages—*Youth Without Jobs* and *We Are The Builders Of A New World*.

—S. H.

BRADLEY'S .:. CAFETERIA

SEASONABLE FOOD AT REASONABLE PRICES

6th Ave. at 14th Street