

Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. 5, No. 48.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1936.

5 Cents a Copy

2 UNIONS JOIN SHIP STRIKE

Federal Intervention Is Asked by Mayors; AFL Spikes Strike

Two more marine unions, covering the Mates and Pilots, and the Engineers, have joined the strike of the sailors on the East Coast and Gulf ports. This adds some 4,000 men to the strikers on the waterfront, and is even of more importance because here the unions have joined with the Strike Strategy Committee which is battling not merely to wrest decent conditions from the shipping employers, but also to end the hold of the losses over them thru the top bureaucrats of the ISU, who have branded the strike as "outlaw."

The strike of the seamen on the East and Gulf Ports continued this week, despite the stab in the back given by the Tampa Convention of the A. F. of L. There, support was given to the strike-breaking bureaucrats of the Inter-

(Continued on Page 6)

FASCIST BOMBERS OVER MADRID



Madrid Holds Fascists at Bay; Germany, Italy Recognize Franco

Aim To Cut Off All Aid In Preparation for New Attacks

In a manifesto issued at Valencia on November 21 and signed by the entire Spanish Cabinet, the republican government charged that Italian recognition of the Burgos rebel junta had been paid for by Franco with the virtual "cession" of the Spanish Balearic Islands and that Germany had collaborated with Italy in order to obtain raw materials "for carrying out her aggressive intentions." The cabinet statement greeted warmly the support the Soviet Union and Mexico are giving to the republican cause.

Sensational developments in Europe and the Far East during the course of last week, involving the official recognition of the fascist clique in Spain by Germany and Italy and the completion of an Italian-German-Japanese coalition against the U.S.S.R., greatly accentuated the tension of international relations and raised a series of new, extremely complicated problems for Soviet diplomacy.

At the end of another week of incessant fighting on the outskirts of Madrid, the republican forces not only retained control of the city but had maneuvered the rebels into a most dangerous position in University City. Wave after wave of Moors and Foreign Legion infantry were sent into battle by General Franco only to be hurled back with terrific losses by the heroic workers militia, supported by Catalonian veterans and the intrepid International Volunteers. The attempt of the fascist leader to terrorize Madrid into submission by the slaughter of hundreds of women and children thru a ruthless bombardment also fail-

IMPORTANT NOTICE!

The news story on Spain in the issue of November 14 was factually inaccurate and, in spirit, out of line with the policy of the WORKERS AGE and the attitude of the C.P.O. on the Spanish situation. This must have been clear to any thoughtful reader as any other issue of the paper would show. The WORKERS AGE expresses its regret and has taken steps to prevent the recurrence of such unfortunate mishaps.

—The Editor.

ed, for the net effect of the bombardment seems to have been to arouse in the people of the capital a burning sense of indignation and hatred, as well as an unconquerable determination to destroy the enemy or die in the attempt. With the evacuation of Madrid of non-combatants well under way, General Miaja, head of the Supreme Defense Council, is now planning an encircling counter-offensive to envelop the fascist forces in University City, thus ending the threat to the capital.

On the Northern front the republican forces also made considerable headway in a very successful offensive around Bilbao, in the course of which a number of strategically important villages were taken and the way opened for the recapture of San Sebastian.

In consternation at the unexpected setbacks suffered by the rebels in Spain, the fascist dictators of Germany and Italy hastened last week to extend diplomatic recognition to the Burgos clique, altho originally this step had been scheduled to follow the fall of the capital. Thereupon Franco immediately proclaimed a "blockade" of the whole eastern coast of Spain, especially of the Catalonian ports, and announced his intention of

Chinese Beat Back Jap Invaders In Outer Mongolia

bombarding Barcelona. For these activities, Italy has already "loaned" him some submarines and other war vessels, since his own sea-power is virtually non-existent.

In the face of this brazen challenge, neither England nor France has as yet ventured to take any decisive action. The British Foreign Office, exceedingly unwilling to "provoke" Hitler or Mussolini and quite eager to welcome a fascist regime in Spain if only it will look to London rather than to Rome for guidance, has contented itself with addressing some polite inquiries to the Burgos junta regarding neutral zones, thereby virtually recognizing Franco's paper "blockade." The People's Front government of France, dominated politically by the treacherous Radicals, has become no more than a diplomatic auxiliary of Downing Street. "The unity of views between France and Great Britain is so complete," reports a New York Sun (Nov. 21) despatch, "that the French are leaving all diplomatic activity in this field to the British"—that is, to the Tory Foreign Office which is avowedly favorable to Franco and Hitler! Ever greater concessions to the rebel clique can be expected as the natural consequence of the whole Anglo-French orientation.

The diplomatic manouvers climaxed in the recognition of Franco are plainly aimed at the Soviet Union almost as much as at Madrid. They are the first fruits of the recent Italo-German agreement and are directed at isolating and encircling the U.S.S.R. in the West. To accomplish the same thing in the Far East is the chief purpose of the German-Japanese pact concluded some time ago and now at

(Continued on Page 6)

A. F. L. Rift Deepens As Convention Backs Suspension of C.I.O.

Convention Attacks ACW for Failure to Provide Tribute to Rickert; Turn Down Request for Spanish Ambassador to Address Meet

TAMPA, FLA.—After a bitter battle during which Matthew Woll injected the question of racialism, the AFL convention adopted the report of the Resolutions Committee endorsing the suspension of the 10 CIO unions.

The resolution adopted calls for (1) approval of the suspension by the council; (2) continuation of peace negotiations if the CIO should show a desire to commit suicide; and (3) to authorize the council to call an emergency convention for the purpose of expelling the CIO unions should they stick to their desire to organize the mass production industries along industrial lines.

Max Zaritsky of the Hatters led the fight for the CIO. Observers close to the council admit that the difference between continued suspension and outright expulsion is "purely technical".

By Jay Lovestone

TAMPA, FLA.—If the Fifty-Sixth Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor will settle anything, it will be above all the following: The Executive Council of the A.F.L. is bankrupt; it is dead from the top down. Frey-Wharton-Green and their entire coterie are finished, in so far as their being able to respond in the least to the new moods and demands of the great mass of the American workers.

I have seen dull conventions. Sterility is nothing new to such symbols of frustration as Second Vice-President T. A. Rickert. But I do not hesitate to say that this convention marks the lowest ebb in the life of the Federation. The very atmosphere of the convention is drab. The gatherings are spiritless; its hours are instalments of routine passed thru with lifeless mechanical precision. One gets the impression that the whole show is run by a steamroller recklessly driving backward. The occasional worthwhile remarks from a guest speaker, the very infrequent attempt of some rank and file delegate from the floor to breathe some life into the congregation, the very absence of such powerful and dramatic figures as John L. Lewis and his colleagues Howard, Dubinsky and Hillman only lends more shadow to the picture of hopelessness. In the convention hall there is not a delegate representing the automobile, steel, radio workers or metal miners.

CIO ISSUE DOMINATES CONVENTION

The pall of the CIO controversy hangs over the convention. That is why there is more life in the hotel lobbies than in the meeting hall. Here there is discussion, argument, and reasoning. At the restaurant tables and in the hotel rooms rumor is dished out and intrigue abounds. Without fear of challenge, we assert that Wharton and Frey have even been raising (in private conversations) a smoke screen of anti-Semitism.

Yet, I am convinced that the CIO leaders should have come here. They should have come not because there was a chance of their getting a majority of the votes. Here the decks are stacked. But they should have come for the purpose of dramatizing their struggle for industrial unionism more effectively, for the purpose of giving some generalship and lending some organization to the many worthwhile forces in the ranks of the delegates representing state federations, city central bodies, and federal locals. They should have come in order to take away from the Wolls and Greens an argument which they have been using with some effect among many delegates. It is the argument that they are reasonable men who want to talk it over and who want peace and unity but that Lewis won't even accord them an interview.

Of course, this whole plea of Green and his aides that they want to talk it over and that they want unity is just that much sheer hypocrisy. When Woll and Wharton and Frey seek to parade as innocent lambs without evil intentions and with nobility of purpose dripping from every pore, they play the role of unvarnished prevaricators. Whatever criticism one may attach to some of the tactical moves made by Lewis in particular and the CIO in general, it must be said that: (1) these errors in strategy, pale into insignificance when placed beside the importance of the fundamental nature of the issue involved and (2) the Executive Council in all its actions has not shown the least desire for a constructive settlement of the issue at stake.

To a large number of delegates it is clear that the Executive Council, in suspending the CIO unions, acted in a high-handed, disruptive manner, in utter violation of the letter and spirit of the AFL constitution, organization practices and precedents. Many delegates here have not forgotten that the CIO and Lewis himself have unhesitatingly agreed to confer and to seek a settlement provided that the illegal suspension is first of all lifted. But the Council majority is

(Continued on Page 2)

EUROPE TODAY

By LAMBDA

AS IS usual at Radical Party Congresses, the Biarritz Convention ended with the "unanimous" adoption of a resolution. The contents of the latter were what the dominant leadership of the Party had previously decided in its inner circle as an accomplished result.

At Angers, Chautemps had already indicated the proposal to eject the Communist Party of France from the Government majority. However, at Orleans, Leon Blum turned down this idea. Consequently, the definite result of Biarritz was as follows:

For the present the Radicals will continue in the People's Front and the Blum government; at the same time they will sharpen their conditions for collaborating with the workers' parties; they are determined to force the workers' parties, thru every artifice, still further into the service of capital.

The Radicals' decision at Biarritz not to break the People's Front and replace it with one form or another of a "National Union" was occasioned not so much by the "mild manners" or the moderate course of the French Socialist and Communist Parties—of which these leaders are so proud—as by the pressure of the working masses and its own following among the toiling population.

The burden of Guernut's argument against a coalition with the parties of the Right was that the working masses will not accept such an arrangement quietly. Other speakers gave the Congress to understand that the Radicals' breaking with the People's Front would inevitably lead to a split of their own party.

Daladier laid special emphasis on the fact that the People's Front is necessary today in order to hold the mass of Radical voters in check and that a break-up of the People's Front in the present situation would cause a great number of them to go to the Left. This open confession by Daladier and others to the effect that the People's Front policy of the workers' parties blocks the winning over of sections of the followers of the Radical Party and serves as a means of tying the working population to the apron strings of their capitalist leaders, is in itself sufficient evidence of the fact that the SP and the CP have no reason to be proud of the results of the Biarritz Congress and that precisely at that account they should steer clear of the People's Front policy.

The Radicals—A Capitalist Party But Biarritz has shown still more: It has shown that it is a monstrous deception of the workers to deny or to soft-pedal the fact that the Radical Party is determined to defend the capitalist system and capitalist exploitation by all means, that the Radical party is an embittered opponent of the proletarian class struggle and all independent action of the workers. At Biarritz all speakers, regardless of whether they were for or against the People's Front, stormed against strikes and occupation of the factories because the latter acts are in violation of certain bourgeois legal statutes and, according to the Radical politicians, disturb the "order" of the capitalist profit-makers.

Furthermore, Biarritz proved that the Radical Party is everything else but a force to be relied on in the struggle against Fascism. It is bent upon securing increasing armaments. As to its foreign policy, Herriot declared that France must stick with British imperialism thru thick and thin. And Herriot, who, among Radicals, is friendliest to the USSR could make only a lukewarm defense of the pact with the Soviet Union. The kind of guarantee for peace—such as unconditional collaboration between French and British imperialism provides, was evidenced in the so-called Non-intervention Pact on Spain—a pact which is the fruit of this collaboration. At the Biarritz Congress this shameful "non-intervention" policy was a great trump. One delegate who was trying to speak against this policy was not even allowed to get the floor.

In his latest speeches Blum has again come out for "law and order" and for Auriol's financial program which has been heartily hailed by the Paris Stock Exchange. This shows, that the Socialist Party ministers are loyally adhering to the directives for the People's Front and its government, laid down in behalf of the French bourgeoisie, by the Radicals at Biarritz. In short, the People's Front is a new confirmation of an old truth that in coalition policy (class collaboration) the bourgeoisie command and the workers follow.

Still more, Biarritz confirms the fact that, being a party of French imperialism, the Radical Party cannot be relied upon in the struggle for the preservation of peace.

London, Nov. 4th.

AFL PLANS WIDENED SPLIT BY APPROVING CIO SUSPENSIONS

(Continued from Page 1)

adamant in one thing and one purpose: in its refusal to lift the suspensions as a prerequisite for negotiations. In this refusal Green and Co. are revealing their despair of today and their doom of tomorrow. They are symbols of an epoch in the labor movement which is about to end; they are obstacles to an epoch in the labor movement that is being ushered in. In the latter capacity they can and will do much damage to the best interests of the trade union and general labor movements. In this respect only, would it be folly to write them off.

GREEN'S POLICY—ONE OF DESPAIR

Let's look into this matter a bit further. I put to Green point blank the following leading question: "What likelihood is there that the Convention will invite Lewis to address the delegates so that they may be better informed and better able to make an intelligent decision on the CIO controversy?" President Green replied: "Lewis will never accept. That's out of the question." And when a newspaper man followed with another query: "What about the move that is being made by important delegates here to have Lewis invited?", Green could think of no better reply than: "I have not heard of any such move." It was evident to all of us at this interview that Green was hedging and dodging the question of Lewis being invited to address the convention as a speaker and not as a defendant or delegate sentenced to expulsion or its equivalent—permanent suspension. This incident reveals beyond a shadow of a doubt the transparency of the tissue of claims for unity and "talking-it-over" made by the Executive Council in its own behalf. It was clear to all of us that Green did not want Lewis to address the convention in this role.

But despite all the noise and bombast, despite all the pinpricking proposals, despite all the threats of Wharton and Frey, in spite of the latter's resolution for the expulsion of the CIO unions, there is extremely little likelihood that the resolutions committee will dare propose outright expulsion. When I say dare, I do not desire to give anyone the impression that the reason for this probable failure to recommend expulsion is the danger of its being rejected. With the biggest and liveliest unions not represented here, Green and his partners-in-destruction could get anything passed here. In reality, the Executive Council does not dare have the resolutions committee propose open, outright frank expulsion. It is planning to resort to a subterfuge but nevertheless

equivalent recommendation because it, better than anyone else, knows its own weak foundation, its own bankruptcy.

Alongside of the Republican National Committee, there is no more paralyzed and backward-looking outfit than the A. F. of L. Council. Its liveliest members are alive precisely to the extent that they are aware of the fact that the best men, the best brains and the most cash are in the unions today lined up with the CIO. Even Wharton is aware of the fact that not even the decision of the convention to the decision of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers label and to give the United Garment Workers a monopoly of the label could bring Rickert back from dissipation and futility to inspiration and utility.

Suspension To Be Approved

At this writing it appears certain that the resolutions committee will recommend and that the convention will adopt the following "solution" for the CIO question: (1) To endorse the action of the Council in suspending the CIO unions; (2) to empower the incoming Council to continue to handle this question in an effort, of course, to re-establish harmony (Continued on Page 5)

Cabinet Socialism Lives Again In People's Front

(Below we reprint an article from the WINTER ISSUE of the INTERNATIONAL CLASS STRUGGLE.)

"It is indeed a momentous occasion when the bourgeois republic proclaims its need of socialist forces in its struggle against a military coup d'etat. Whatever the immediate cause may be, it is an event of great historical importance; an aggressive, militant Party cannot, in my opinion, ignore this kind of offer of fate, this challenge of history."

In which organ sympathetic to the People's Front did the above paragraph appear? Does not the above citation sound familiar? As a matter of fact, we did not quote from any Socialist or Communist paper of 1936. The above statement is taken from an article by Jean Jaures written on June 24, 1899 hailing the entrance of Millerand into the Waldeck-Rousseau cabinet.

Millerand—who was at the time a socialist deputy and not yet a pro-fascist senator—entered the ministry of Waldeck-Rousseau, the so-called ministry of "republican defense" during the Dreyfuss Affair. This set the first precedent for a reformist coalition policy in the Second International and led to a lengthy discussion thruout the entire international labor movement.

In view of the fact that the Socialist Party of France is today forming a coalition government in the name of the People's Front, and the Communist Party of France is preparing to support this coalition and to agitate for its "final" success—also in the name of the People's Front—it is well to recall this discussion. Those who defended Jaures and Millerand and came out for the support of a left bourgeois government used the identical arguments that the exponents of the People's Front policy advance today.

Revolutionary Marxists such as Lenin, Plekhanov, Luxemburg, and even Kautsky and Guesde, still backed these arguments mercilessly. In the name of the People's Front, the C.P.F. cites any and all "traditions" of bourgeois France, Jeanne d'Arc and the Tricolor included. In doing so it discards the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the traditions of the revolutionary French working class which under the leadership of Guesde, Lafargue and Vaillant fought against Millerand and his ilk.

Kautsky who at that time had not yet broken with Marxism wrote the following in an article entitled "The Republic and the Social Democracy in France" in the "Neue Zeit" of 1904-05: "Why is the Republic in danger? . . . Because the working class which once hailed the republic as its liberator has become disillusioned with it. We cannot restore the confidence of the masses thru the preservation of the capitalist republic and parliamentary corruption. We must transform the government into a truly social republic and guard it against coup d'etats by means of self-government and the arming of the people.

"The bourgeois republicans are attempting to persuade the masses that their immediate aim must be to save the republic in alliance with the bourgeoisie and thru the support of the bourgeois regime. It is therefore all the more necessary for Socialists to criticize the aims and methods of struggle of the bourgeoisie and to point out that the proletariat has very little to gain from such an alliance, that, moreover, the proletarian republic is quite different from the bour-

geois republic, that the proletarian methods of saving the republic . . . are fundamentally different from the ways of the bourgeoisie, and that the Social Democracy is absolutely opposed to an alliance which would make it responsible for the deeds and misdeeds of the latter."

Thus wrote Kautsky on the policy which finds its expression today in the People's Front. His analysis of the advances made by the nationalists allied with the military against the republicans at the time of the Dreyfuss Affair, is particularly applicable to the present situation in which fascism has declared war on bourgeois democracy.

The followers of the People's Front maintain that tho a coalition government cannot introduce socialism, it can at least realize certain urgent partial demands of the working class. Rosa Luxemburg replied to this argument which was advanced in defense of Millerand in the following manner: We quote from the article "A tactical problem" (July 6, 1899):

"It is true that the program of the Social Democracy contains many demands which could be accepted—in theory, at least—by a bourgeois government as well as by a bourgeois parliament. It would, therefore, appear at first glance that a socialist can serve the cause of the proletariat even in the government and in parliament and that he can strive to attain . . .

"But it must be kept in mind that in the struggle of the Social Democracy it is not primarily a question of WHAT but of HOW—a fact which the opportunists as always have again entirely disregarded. Because of their simultaneous opposition to bourgeois legislation and to the bourgeois government as a whole, as illustrated in their rejection of the budget among other things, the representatives of the Social Democracy in the legislative bodies, in seeking to carry out social reforms, are free to conduct their fight for bourgeois reforms on a principled socialist base, on the base of the proletarian class struggle. A Social Democrat, on the other hand, who attempts to carry out the same social reforms as a member of the government—that is, at the same time supporting the bourgeois state as such—thereby transforms his socialism to bourgeois democracy or to bourgeois labor politics at best. Hence, while the participation of the Social Democracy in the representative bodies strengthens the class struggle, its participation in the government can result only in introducing corruption and confusion into the ranks of the Social Democracy."

This criticism applies not only to the present policy of the S. P. of France but also to the C.P. whose spokesmen, Ducloux and Thorez, have stated that under certain conditions they would approve the budget and vote military credits in the Blum cabinet.

Rosa Luxemburg wrote the following on the practical results of Jaures' policy ("The Socialist Crisis in France, 1900-01): "As soon as there is a danger that the cabinet might be overthrown, principles are thrown to the winds; it is sufficient for the government at any moment to ask for a vote of confidence in order to beat Jaures and his friends into submission. In the past it was a question of saving the republic thru the defense of the government, today, it is a question of saving the government thru the abandonment of the defense of the

(Continued on Page 4)

STUDENT LABOR PARTY CLUBS ARE NEEDED

A pre-election poll conducted, in October, by the Campus, undergraduate publication of the College of the City of New York, shows that 1,585 students voted for a labor party and only 401 against it. It must be noted that this vote exceeds by 371 the combined vote (1214) of Earl Browder (504), Norman Thomas (261) and the American Labor Party—Roosevelt vote (449).

This remarkable vote raises an interesting question. Are labor party clubs the most suitable form of organization for the progressive students in America? In our opinion, the answer is in the affirmative.

When the writer last discussed the problem in an article called, "The People's Front Goes Collegiate," he posed the question in this manner: "At last the radical student movement of America has been united into the American Student Union. Its very existence raises the question, 'What type of an organization is the American Students Union?' It is certainly not a students' trade union. Nor is it a political body. It cannot be merely a discussion group, for the A.S.U. must engage in a struggle for immediate demands on the campus. In short, the A.S.U. is a new type of organization, having features peculiar to itself. And since there is no model to follow, it must fashion a program for itself and submit such a plan to the criticism of time and man."

"Time and man" now offer the answer to the problem. Labor Party clubs on the campus will fulfill the requirements of an effective student organization sympathetic to labor. The labor party clubs offer the broadest possible base, compatible with a working class orientation. The labor party is not a political party in the ordinary sense. In addition, members of the labor party clubs will naturally graduate to the regular Labor Party once they have left college. At present, the student has no off-campus organization that is the equivalent of the A.S.U.

The A.S.U. seems to be vaguely aware of the significance of the Labor Party developments to the A.S.U. At the time when the labor party is the most pressing issue for the working class and its allies, the A.S.U. blabbers in this fashion (October-November issue of the Student Advocate): "If a Farmer-Labor Party—independent, powerful, outspoken,—steps forth into the political scene, what will be the verdict of the American Students Union? Will we contemplate the surrender of our non-partisan role? Or would that step disturb the unity now achieved in our ranks, perhaps blocking our path to further accomplishments? . . . The inquiry is obviously a momentous one for the future of the Student Union. The fact of discussion should not in any sense be interpreted as foreshadowing a favorable decision." (My emphasis)

Several months before there was any serious labor party movement, the writer said in criticism of the A.S.U. program ("The People's Front Goes Collegiate"): "The community of interest between the student and working class should also express itself in the political field—in a Labor Party. The failure to endorse the idea of a Labor Party is inexcusable."

What sense is there in talking of educating "students to the cause of their plight and to the need of aligning with labor and other progressive forces" if you fail to recognize these forces when they confront you, as the Labor Party. There are not two ways

about it—the future of the progressive student movement is with the labor party. There must be no delay in joining with the labor party wherever it exists (New York, Minnesota). The Students will derive immeasurable power from such a movement. —AL EPSTEIN

The 1936 Elections

Roosevelt Sweep Opens New Period of Struggle

This is the second in a series of articles by Jay Lovestone dealing with the results of the Presidential election campaign.

By JAY LOVESTONE THE LAST Presidential elections were held at a sort of intersection point of trends, historically speaking—trends which had been developing and maturing for some time, trends aggravated and accentuated by the economic crisis itself or reaching maturing points. These trends sort of cut across each other to a focal point, marking a movement of deep-going change.

Briefly evaluated, the situation in which the American election campaign was waged was the following: Basically the economic crisis continued; its depth is revealed by the stagnation in the capital market, by the increasingly effective challenge to its privileged position in the world market, particularly in the Far East, by the huge organic, chronic unemployment, by the failure even to approach fundamentally the source of disparity between agriculture and industry, by the growing acuteness of social dimensions, as a problem which could no longer be avoided or even reduced by illusions. It is in this atmosphere that the middle class found itself facing ever more anxious moments; it is in such an atmosphere that labor was on the threshold of something new, something definite—thanks to the unquestioned and unquestionable dominance of the mass production industries of American economic life, and thanks to the new wave of members pouring into the unions in the last years.

Politically, the role of the government had become one in which it was the biggest investor, the biggest customer on the market, and in which state capitalism was being extended constantly on a gigantic scale. Though the Supreme Court threw out the N.R.A., yet there were certain ineradicable consequences which flow from it as specific American expressions of state capitalism. Furthermore, never before had old political labels lost so much meaning and assumed so much new content in relation to important issues as at this time. One need but look at the growth in population of the bourgeois innocents clubs, to wit the Coughlin movement, the Townsend movement, the Epic movement, the Lenke outfit, etc. These clubs were political organizations representing various shades of big bourgeois and petty bourgeois opinion, from pale progressivism to the crudest reactionary notions of outright fascism. Under these circumstances, naturally the question of reconstructing the government, of modernizing its structure to meet the new, became all the more acute in the light of the heavy blows dealt the New Deal by a whole series of Supreme Court decisions. In such a situation, American foreign policy was beginning to assume new forms and in a measure new content. It is no accident that the blackest jingoes of the American ruling class could find only words of highest praise

for Roosevelt's magnanimity in the war budget. Naturally, the problem of government budgetary deficits assumes, at such a moment, an importance of greater proportions than is usually expected. It is not the object of the writer as to figures and facts of the Roosevelt sweep. There would be no point of repeating that what happened here was something that had not happened since the days of Monroe. No one could emphasize sufficiently the tremendous import of Pennsylvania going so solidly Democratic for the first time in nine decades. Likewise, very much could be said but need not be said here about the loss of Du Pont's satrapy, Delaware, by the Republicans. The same applies in general to the terrific shellacking handed the Kansas Coolidge (London). From one point of view, let no one forget that not only the Presidency was involved in the last elections but also the Senate and the House, and the results here, results of almost equal importance, were about as one-sided.

In a moment of jest, Farley spoke of asking for a recount in Maine and Vermont, but all jest aside, it is the conviction of the writer that, if Roosevelt had spoken in these states, and had thrown overboard Brann in Maine instead of allowing the latter to throw overboard the New Deal, the Democratic Party could probably have carried Maine also. This would have meant, in the words of Farley, that as Maine went, Vermont would go. We hope we are wrong in our suspicion that the C.P. probably regrets exceedingly the loss of Maine and Vermont to the Democrats because they continue to remain in the Republican column, thus tending to disturb "the unity of the American people."

All sorts of silly explanations have been offered for this Roosevelt victory. Some say that the administration simply bought the votes. This is too shallow an approach, though one need not hesitate to recognize the very vital role played by the PWA and its brother organizations in American democracy in 1936. Some of the most reactionary spokesmen of big capital have begun to yell that Roosevelt terrorized the people. Of course this is too hypocritical even to deserve comment. At any rate, those who have denounced Roosevelt as a red, as a communist, feel rather uncomfortable nowadays, if they have really begun to believe what they have tried to talk others and perhaps themselves into believing. Nor should one seek to evaluate the results of the election campaign merely as a personal triumph. Very little stock is to be put in the personal triumph, though of course no one can deny that Roosevelt was a particularly capable champion of so-called enlightened American capitalism. Time and again we have emphasized this in the columns of the Workers Age in an effort to con-

front the future of the progressive student movement is with the labor party. There must be no delay in joining with the labor party wherever it exists (New York, Minnesota). The Students will derive immeasurable power from such a movement. —AL EPSTEIN

vince labor that Roosevelt was dangerous to the labor movement, not only as an enemy, but also as a friend.

In order to show that we are not at all minimizing the role played by Roosevelt, we cite an estimate made as far back as 1923, after the Hoover sweep. I then said the following: "The Democratic Party is not in very good shape today. But the Democratic Party has a future in capitalist society. It will be reorganized completely. It may not win the next elections, but it has vitality. It polled about 40% of the total popular vote. It obtained a great proportion of this popular vote—especially in the industrial centers. Seventy-five per cent of its strength is today outside of the hitherto solid South. And Smith is not thru. Of course, it is possible that the newly elected Governor of New York, Franklin D. Roosevelt, may come forward as the leader of the Democratic Party." (Communist, December 1923, Page 749).

We cite the above because it also has some valuable lessons for those who would rush to write off the Republican Party because of its latest defeat. But there are diverse factors and stronger social and economic forces at work, responsible for the avalanche. It is our conviction that these forces have reached a cumulative point in the Roosevelt landslide, ushering in a new period in the life of American capitalism. What are the specific and decisive causes of the 1936 election results which proved so overwhelming a surprise to practically all political observers, which proved so painful and rude a shock to so many important figures in the ranks of the American ruling class? Why do we say that the Roosevelt avalanche ushers in a new period in the life of American capitalism, is the beginning of a new epoch in the struggle of the American working class?

The third article in this series will appear in the next issue.

But there are diverse factors and stronger social and economic forces at work, responsible for the avalanche. It is our conviction that these forces have reached a cumulative point in the Roosevelt landslide, ushering in a new period in the life of American capitalism. What are the specific and decisive causes of the 1936 election results which proved so overwhelming a surprise to practically all political observers, which proved so painful and rude a shock to so many important figures in the ranks of the American ruling class? Why do we say that the Roosevelt avalanche ushers in a new period in the life of American capitalism, is the beginning of a new epoch in the struggle of the American working class?

But there are diverse factors and stronger social and economic forces at work, responsible for the avalanche. It is our conviction that these forces have reached a cumulative point in the Roosevelt landslide, ushering in a new period in the life of American capitalism. What are the specific and decisive causes of the 1936 election results which proved so overwhelming a surprise to practically all political observers, which proved so painful and rude a shock to so many important figures in the ranks of the American ruling class? Why do we say that the Roosevelt avalanche ushers in a new period in the life of American capitalism, is the beginning of a new epoch in the struggle of the American working class?

But there are diverse factors and stronger social and economic forces at work, responsible for the avalanche. It is our conviction that these forces have reached a cumulative point in the Roosevelt landslide, ushering in a new period in the life of American capitalism. What are the specific and decisive causes of the 1936 election results which proved so overwhelming a surprise to practically all political observers, which proved so painful and rude a shock to so many important figures in the ranks of the American ruling class? Why do we say that the Roosevelt avalanche ushers in a new period in the life of American capitalism, is the beginning of a new epoch in the struggle of the American working class?

But there are diverse factors and stronger social and economic forces at work, responsible for the avalanche. It is our conviction that these forces have reached a cumulative point in the Roosevelt landslide, ushering in a new period in the life of American capitalism. What are the specific and decisive causes of the 1936 election results which proved so overwhelming a surprise to practically all political observers, which proved so painful and rude a shock to so many important figures in the ranks of the American ruling class? Why do we say that the Roosevelt avalanche ushers in a new period in the life of American capitalism, is the beginning of a new epoch in the struggle of the American working class?

But there are diverse factors and stronger social and economic forces at work, responsible for the avalanche. It is our conviction that these forces have reached a cumulative point in the Roosevelt landslide, ushering in a new period in the life of American capitalism. What are the specific and decisive causes of the 1936 election results which proved so overwhelming a surprise to practically all political observers, which proved so painful and rude a shock to so many important figures in the ranks of the American ruling class? Why do we say that the Roosevelt avalanche ushers in a new period in the life of American capitalism, is the beginning of a new epoch in the struggle of the American working class?

BROWDER VOTE IN BALTIMORE HALF OF 1932

The voters of Baltimore carried out Browder's line of defeating Landon-at-all-costs, by giving Pres. Roosevelt a record vote.

The Socialist Party, controlled by the right-wing, which had an important base among needle trades workers in previous elections, and which conducted virtually no campaign in the city this year, showed an even more tremendous loss than was expected. In Baltimore Thomas got 950 votes—a record breaking low vote for the S.P.

The Communist Party reached the largest audience in its election history. Browder personally addressed 1600 at a mass-meeting on Oct. 25. Many more heard him over the radio. A total of 474 of his audience failed to vote for Roosevelt!

In 1932 Foster received 658 votes in Baltimore. In this same election, Bradley, Communist candidate for Senator received 838 votes. In short: four years ago, during the days of the ultra-left, sectarian line, the C.P. received almost twice as many votes as in 1936.

To date, the highest number of votes received by a Communist in Md. was in Nov. 1934, when Parker got 1,792 votes, 774 of which were received in Baltimore City.

Judging from the larger audiences an increase in the C.P. vote could reasonably have been expected. Evidently, Browder's audience understood his line and wanted to make sure that "reaction was defeated", that the representative of "the main army of Fascism in America," Landon, was kept out of the White House "at all costs." Anyway, only 474 took a chance. — J. ARTHUR.

Business Views the Elections

BUSINESS WEEK, NOV. 7.

"Washington still sees Roosevelt as a sailor, bending his course to the wind, tacking to the Left, tacking to the Right, but intending to keep closer to the middle than most of his friends or enemies on the Left and Right like to believe. Beyond the intention rises a question mark: How far over can he be pushed by opposition or pulled by allies that he, Washington believes, the landowner of Hyde Park doesn't envision the United States as a country in which he, a private citizen of considerable wealth, cannot live comfortably and happily.

"President Roosevelt gave away briefly to passion and emotion in some of his later speeches. He seemed to dissipate any lingering hope that he might turn to the right. It was made clear that we may be confronted in the future with class issues rather than national issues and that class interest may be paramount to national interest. The end of the campaign will stimulate rather than terminate the interest of the national government in labor as a class and as a political issue.

" . . . As business men, election results are in part our own responsibility. Every effort should be made to clarify the thinking and mold the policies of government and to cooperate with its agencies to the public good. Complete honesty and forthrightness and an active sense of social righteousness should distinguish the acts and attitudes of American business from now on. If this be generally true we need have no lasting fear of the impact the government or public opinion on American business."

UNITED STATES NEWS, Nov. 9.

"The low-income groups in America not only went to the polls but elected a President . . . The theory . . . that intervention by the State must be enlarged upon in the future will lead inevitably to fascism. . . Fascism had its innocent beginnings in the NRA—the notion that all industry and business must be regimented. Labor supported the idea because it seemed the expedient way to get special privileges. Certain elements of big business supported the plan because there are always groups in big business who because of fear or inefficiency are ready to embrace the prop and profit of fascism just as business groups did in Germany and Italy. . . Here (the elections) we have the workings of what has sometimes been called 'pure democracy'. . . few of us believed this mass vote would be brought to the polls. The election of 1936, therefore, marks a milestone on the political evolution of America. The low income groups have become conscious of their power—they have been aroused to action by the New Deal. Can the New Deal control the political force it has itself set in motion?"

UNITED STATES NEWS, Nov. 9.

REVOLUTIONARY GREETINGS to the WORKERS AGE from the BUFFALO UNIT C.P.O.

WORKERS AGE

Organ of the National Committee, Communist Party U. S. A. (Opposition), 51 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. Phone: GRamercy 5-9903.

Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Publishing Association. Subscription Rates: \$1.00 per year; \$6.00 for six months; 5c a copy. Foreign Rates: \$1.50 per year.

Entered as second class matter Nov. 3, 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. 48. Saturday, November 28, 1936.

Random Comments

General Malin Craig, chief of staff has recently come out for a paid, enlisted reserve army of 150,000. It is intended that these reserves form the "cadres for the rapid expansion of the Regular Army and organized reserves." The General also stated that the current appropriation for the War Department provides the most liberal training program for the organized reserves since the passage of the national defense act.

Two things that labor should remember: First, this is the peacetime appropriation made by President Roosevelt. When a chief of staff expresses satisfaction with the war department appropriation then it must indeed have been plenty big. Those who think of Roosevelt as a pacifist will please take note. Second, the army has been used against workers in the past and can be used in the same way now. Hugh Johnson suggested to Roosevelt that the army be called in to break the seamen's strike.

In case you should think that Father Coughlin's temporary fade-out from the political scene went unmentioned we quote from a Herald Tribune editorial of Nov. 9: "Every sound American who believes that the survival of democracy depends upon the freest possible discussion of all political issues will be much more inclined to regret than to rejoice in Father Coughlin's retirement from the air."

A certain Dr. Hans Mueller, writing in the monthly magazine "Das Jung Deutschland," reports that fully 25% of Germany's youth has been found unfit for military service due to physical deficiencies. That this figure must be an understatement becomes clear when we note that the magazine is published in Berlin.

A week after Dr. Mueller's report was published came a Berlin dispatch captioned "Reich Pegs Wages At Slump Levels." Apparently Germany's youth does not grow fat from heiling

Hitler, casting cannon and skipping butter at meals. But then one must consider the glory of the swastika. One cannot have everything.

The British Labor Party describes its recent losses in the municipal elections as "no smashing defeat, but only a temporary set-back."

"There is little doubt," says the Labor Party, "that the temporary prosperity now existing in a number of industrial centres owing to the Government's rearmament programme has worked to the disadvantage of Labour."

Perhaps, but we can't help feeling that the weak, vacillating and ineane policy of the Labor Party in the Spanish situation, helped to disgust many workers. The reason given by the Labor Party would be plausible if there were any great swings in votes towards the conservatives in the constituencies in question. The truth is that the conservatives did not make any material gains in popular votes. Laborites lost because very many workers stayed home and did not vote.

The "New Leader" tolls the death-knell for the Socialist Party because of its heavy election losses but we failed to find a single explanation for the crushing defeats suffered by the Old Guard in Bridgeport and Reading.

The Challenge of Youth (Nov. issue) shouts about the recent elections where wiser comrades talk in whispers. "That a campaign purely for socialism was able to muster such a large vote this year is a real indication of the rapid radicalization of the American working-class."

What large vote? Will the comrades consult the book for 1912 when 'Gene Debs rolled up almost a million votes and in a similar set-up too. Remember, Teddy Roosevelt was no piker in his pose as a "trust-busting" progressive. And no so loud, please, about the purely socialist campaign.

But why argue? The Challenge of Youth itself spills the beans in the form of a typographical error. "Our vote," says this paper, "exceeded all our explanations."

French Anarchism Gains As Workers Grope for a Militant Policy

By EDWARD CHAMBERS and JOHN WILLIAMS

ON FRIDAY, October twenty third, a meeting attended by ten to fifteen thousand persons was held at the Vel d'Hiv—the Madison Square Garden of Paris—under the auspices of "Le Comité pour l'Espagne Libre," an anarchist-dominated organization. Beside representatives of anti-fascist Spain—from the CNT, the FAI, the POUM, and the Catalan Eguera—there were French speakers, among whom were not only anarchists but representatives of many other organizations. Notable among the latter were Leon Jouhaux, general secretary of the Confederation Générale du Travail, official French trade union body; Jean Zyromski, well-known left wing SFIO (Socialist Party) leader; and Marceau Pivert, head of the "gauche révolutionnaire" group of the SFIO and M. Blum's Secretary for Radio Communication. M. Pivert, long an important figure in the left wing of the Socialists, has recently been collaborating with the anarchists and adheres to their, "Comité pour l'Espagne Libre." Significantly, the Communist Party of France had no speaker at the meeting.

Growth of Anarchism

The fact that this meeting was held in the largest auditorium in Paris, and was addressed by the official head of the CGT, containing in its ranks over five million French workers, testifies to the recent growth in influence of the anarchist organization in the French labor movement. The leading big business newspaper, Le Temps, on the ninth of October published the following item, evidently emanating from police sources. "The Surete Nationale and secret service state that recently there has been a regrowth of the anarchist movement especially in Paris. Formerly, anarchist meetings in the capital

gathered but two or three hundred auditors. Now these same meetings are held in the presence of several thousands. This movement is not unnoticed by the government which follows this growth with attention. Extremists who expected to see in the success of the Communists the triumph in France of revolution, insurrection, and anti-militarism are abandoning the Communist Party to swell the ranks of the anarchists."

Although it is true that anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism have a considerable tradition in France, in recent years the influence of the anarchist movement itself has been insignificant. The World War and the Russian Revolution gave a decisive blow to anarcho-syndicalism. At the beginning of the War, the majority of the leaders of the anarchist movement became patriots, and the leadership of the CGT—which until 1914 was dominated by anarcho-syndicalist ideology—forgot their declarations and resolutions against the bourgeois state and became fighters for French democracy. Also, the Russian revolution brought most of the revolutionary-feeling workers to the communist position of their brothers in Russia, destroying most of the remnants of anarcho-syndicalist thinking in the French working class movement.

Before the Russian events, workers had espoused anarchist ideology, uncompromisingly against the bourgeoisie, as a protest against the opportunist blunders of the Socialists who had lost themselves and their principles in a maze of parliamentary maneuvering. The triumph of the Russian workers over their bourgeois state, however, demonstrated to the erstwhile anarchists that the communist position was one not only uncompromisingly against the bourgeois state, but that it brought results.

But even after the war and the Bolshevik Revolution, although reduced to a small sect, the anarchists in France conserved a few old cadres with connections inside the trade unions. The present regrowth of the movement is largely possible because of the existence of these cadres.

Effect of Spain

The first cause of the present growth of the anarchist movement in France is undoubtedly the role being currently played by the anarchist organizations in Spain, especially in Catalonia. But the authority of the Spanish anarchists is not sufficient to recreate the French anarchist movement were there not other important factors. One of the chief sources of anarchist influence before the war, as already indicated, was the opportunism of the Socialists. The Socialist Party, after the war, continued in its opportunism and became a definitely reformist party. The Communist Party was then for years the natural gathering place for revolutionary-feeling workers and continued to be such a gathering place until recently

Rosa Luxemburg also pointed out the decisive significance of the extra-parliamentary struggle.

"In direct opposition to the erroneous opinion of Jaures, I believe that the basis of parliamentarism is more fully assured (against attacks of reactionary forces, today meaning fascism—Editor) if our tactics take into account not only parliamentary acts but also the direct action of the proletarian masses."

Thirty years have passed since these discussion on ministerialism. The exponents of the People's Front policy in offering the old tactics of Jaures which have been refuted by history point to recent changes in the political situation. What are the new events that lead the C.P. to believe that the teachings of Marxism-Leninism are no longer valid? These factors are no longer valid? These factors are the decline of capitalism and the appearance of fascism which in itself is but a product of capitalist decline. Precisely under these conditions of capitalist decay, it is doubly false to sacrifice the interests of the proletarian class struggle to an alliance with the democratic bourgeoisie which, as part of the capitalist class, participates in its development as a class and becomes evermore reactionary as the decline of capitalist economy progresses.

Greetings to the
WORKERS AGE
ON ITS SEVENTH
ANNIVERSARY
from
DAVE GASSNER

"OUR AMERICAN PROLETARIAT"
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 27, at 8 P. M.
NEW WORKERS SCHOOL, 51 West 14th Street

LEWIS COREY

CABINET SOCIALISM AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

(Continued from Page 2)

republic. 'Republican Union' today stands as the rallying center for all republican forces for the preservation of the Waldeck-Millereand cabinet.

To pledge the working class parties to coalition government with the bourgeoisie can only result in a situation where these parties, including the Communist Party, if it continues to pursue a 'lofty perspectives' of socialism without exerting any influence on the practical policy of the government. . . .

"Instead of increasing the influence of the Socialists in the government and in parliament, the tactics of Jaures have made the Socialist Party a helpless tool in the hands of the government and a passive appendage of the radical petty bourgeoisie. Instead of stimulating progressivism in the Chamber, Jaures' policy has eliminated the only driving force—the opposition of the Socialists—which might have prevailed upon parliament and the government to pursue a more aggressive, a more militant policy. . . .

"The tactics of Jaures are . . . built on a foundation of sand. The resurrection of petty bourgeois democracy, which end Millereand's participation in the government was to serve and for the sake of which the socialist opposition in the Chamber was sacrificed, has turned out to be a phantom. On the contrary, Jaures, in chaining the socialist proletariat to the

corpse of petty bourgeois radicalism, has paralyzed the only living force which was capable of defending the republic and democracy in France."

In the place of Jaures' tactics, Rosa Luxemburg proposed revolutionary tactics. To quote from "The Socialist Crisis":

"The difference between socialist policy and bourgeois policy consists in the fact that the Socialists as opponents of the existing order remain an opposition in the bourgeois parliament. . . . Fundamental opposition is generally speaking the only effective weapon for a minority party, and particularly for the Socialist Party, to gain practical results. It is by no means an obstacle to practical, concrete victories in the field of progressive, immediate reforms."

"RANK AND FILE" IN TEACHERS OPENS ARMS TO RED-BAITERS

By D. BENJAMIN

Despite an agreement to the contrary with the United Progressive Group of the Teachers Union, the Rank and File Group forced thru a motion at the last meeting of the Delegate Assembly to cooperate with the dualist Teachers Guild. The latter is a red-baiting organization set up by Drs. Lindville and Lefkowitz after they failed to have the charter of Local 5 revoked. The basis of "co-operation" was on the struggle against the McNaboe Legislative Investigation into so-called subversive activities in the schools of New York State.

The Rank and File Group, which controls the administration, had pledged itself at a general membership meeting of the Union, as well in a joint election statement issued with the Progressives, to a policy of non-cooperation with the Teachers Guild. It had stated in May and June of this year, that it wanted co-operation with the Progressives on a mutually satisfactory program. In spite of this, they organized a joint meeting with the Teachers Guild at Thomas Jefferson High School, thus breaking a well-established policy of the Teachers Union (and of the whole trade union movement) not to co-operate with an organization whose sole purpose is the destruction of the existing bona fide trade union, and division of the forces of the organized teachers. This meeting, incidentally, was organized without even consulting the Union Executive Board, a most irresponsible procedure.

The people's front policy of the Rank and File Group requires "unity" with anybody and everybody—so invitations were extended for a conference to the "company unions" in the field (the borough organizations dominated by the school supervisors), and the dual union. While the Teachers Guild was in process of formation, Mr. Befun, one of the leaders of the Rank and File Group, called the former leaders of the Teachers Union "social-fascists" and Dr. Lefkowitz a "Hitler". Now the same Mr. Befun justifies cooperating with company unions.

Under the guise of "unity" and "people's front", the Rank and File Group, now the Administration Group of the New York Teachers Union, would give standing, prestige, and life to the Teachers Guild which even today does all in its power to undermine the work and influence of the New York Teachers Union. Its red-baiting attacks on the Teachers Union will undoubtedly be used by the McNaboe investigating committee. Yet it would have a united front with the Guild on the campaign against this inquisition! One of the Guild's leading members, Mrs. Lindolf, now a member of the Board of Education, uses her official position to keep the Union out of committees and movements set ostensibly to protect teachers' conditions. On the committee of nine set up to study the whole question of rating and supervision, the Guild was given three members, the Union none. A conference has been called by the Guild on the question of liability of teachers for accidents, etc., to which all teacher organizations were invited, except the Teachers Union. Last year, after the Union had introduced a bill in the State Legislature extending, for a period of three years, eligible lists that were due to expire, the Guild sabotaged and interfered with the Union campaign and endangered the interests of the unappointed teachers by a change limiting the period of extension to one year. And so one could go on ad infinitum. The Guild not only has been carrying on a conscious, organized

campaign against the Teachers Union and its activities, but has recently rejected a proposal from Professor Jerome Davis, President of the American Federation of Teachers, to consider unification with Local 5 of the A. F. of T. (the N. Y. local), even to the point of refusing the setting up of a joint committee on some particular campaign to serve as a transition toward and to lay the basis for complete unification.

Why there should be a change in this union policy of not cooperating with such red-baiters and splitters is inexplicable when one considers that the Teachers Union grew in the period from October 1935 to October 1936 from 1300 to 4400, while the Guild at the same time grew only from 600 to 800 or so. The Teachers Union has grown by concentrating on its own independent activities.

Is it too much to expect that the

Rank and File Group, in earnest that it meant collaboration with the Progressive Group, in earnest and not as an election and pre-A. F. of T. Convention maneuver? Is it too much to expect that the administration will live up to its pledge to the membership made in the June joint election statement? Violations have occurred on the following four basic points: (a) adequate representation for all tendencies in Union bodies, (b) affiliation with conferences and movements having substantial labor backing, (c) against cooperation with the dual union, the Teachers Guild, and (d) presentation in bulletin to Union members and delegates of various points of view when there are differences on basic questions.

The May-June united front election program furnishes a sound basis for the unification of the activities of all Union forces, for the building up of the Teachers Union movement among the teachers. It is the duty of the Rank and File Group, the present administration group, to live up to that program that was adopted by the membership in the elections.

AFL PLANS WIDENED SPLIT BY APPROVING CIO SUSPENSIONS

(Continued from Page 2)

and unity; (3) to give the Council full power to act in any way it sees fit (expulsions not excluded, theoretically) to bring the controversy to a speedy conclusion.

This strategy is animated by the following objectives: First of all, the previous conduct of the Council in suspending is thus legalized; secondly, it will enable the incoming Council, which will be at least as reactionary as its predecessor, to continue maneuvering with a view of dividing the ranks of the CIO by taking away the ILGWU which is a special target of the Woll-Green leadership; thirdly, it will help hold in line and solidify its own forces in the ranks of which there is strong opposition to expulsions; fourthly, it will aid them in their game of shifting the onus of responsibility, the burden of the blame for the break on to the backs of the leaders of the CIO, thus shrouding themselves in a cloak of the angel of unity.

But everything that has happened so far at this convention as well as all that has not happened but should have happened condemns the dominant leadership here as unworthy of having the confidence of the trade unions' membership. In fact, the only progressive ideas that came off the platform, so far, have come from a representative of a government department. Fraternal delegate Gibson from Great Britain again established the British Trade Unions as the respected though respectable left wing of the convention.

"Democracy" Issue—Again

Thus, on behalf of the Central Trades and Labor Assembly of Tampa, its president W. E. Sullivan assured the delegates that they "will discover that the majority of the business men of Tampa are friendly to organized labor. . . ." and that "the majority of those who employ labor extend to you a friendly, sincere welcome." And this in a haven of kidnappers and floggers of labor organizers, in a town that has not yet thought it necessary even to bring to trial the murderers of Shoemaker, in a nest of reaction that would not allow Browder to make a fervent plea even for present-day American (capitalist) democracy! Small wonder that the Mayor had the insolence to send as his representative to the convention none other than the City Attorney. Yet, this

TRADE UNION NOTES

By George F. Miles

SOME well meaning and other not so well intentioned people have recently given voice to their horror at the position of the CPO on the titanic battle now being fought in the trade union movement between the forces of progress and growth—the CIO—and those of reaction and "special (craft) privileges" as personified by the Hutchesons, Whartons and Freys.

The outcry from one direction we can understand. It comes from people whose fingers are still seared from the roasting they got in the fire of dual unionism. Aware of their own past, they now walk on tiptoe and are overcautious where frank discussion and a clear guide is what the workers in the trade unions are looking for. To cry unity! UNITY! and consider that the issue has been solved is to cause confusion. There is not a single intelligent worker in the labor movement who does not recognize the full implications of a divided labor movement with all its accompanying bitter fratricidal conflicts. But having recognized this state of affairs one must not tear one's hair, wring one's hands in anguish and cry—woe is me! What purposes will it serve, except those of demoralization and disgust?

We must ask the question—is it possible, is it probable that the present struggle over industrial unionism as the form for the organization of the mass production industries, can be solved peacefully by means of some extremely clever and hitherto overlooked compromise proposal. The answer to that is—no a chance! Even so well informed a person as Chester Wright now admits that there is not the slightest basis for any such illusion. He goes further. He insists, and properly so, that even if the "moderates" (paradoxical term) should win out and the 10 CIO unions be "suspended only", the difference between that and outright expulsion would be "purely technical." In other words the split is an accomplished fact even if the so-called moderates in the A. F. of L. win out.

Now the extremely clever critic will say—Sure, I understand all that, that's perfectly correct, but we must not come out weeks before and say what you say. We must be diplomatic, we must talk

made her usual speech but for the sacrifice of some of her very stale and all too oft-repeated "jokes." By the time the fourth day got around, Third Vice-president Matthew Woll, chairman of the Resolutions committee, presented a resolution denouncing the strike of the seamen. This strikebreaking proposal was stricken by the policy-decision number one of the convention over the poorly organized left forces occupying delegates' seats. Flushed with victory, Woll retired to further labors of a similar sort in the resolutions committee plagued with the CIO problem.

Spencer Miller, head of the Workers Education Bureau, brought the first sign of life to the convention by his eloquent and effective plea in behalf of solidarity with the fighters against fascism in Spain. When he was thru, Green did not even render him the thanks customarily given to guest speakers. This conduct on the part of Green was fully in line with his adamant refusal to allow Isabel Palencia, member of the Spanish parliament, to address delegates in behalf of the heroic battlers against Fascist reaction in Spain. The heavy and brutal hand of the Catholic oligarchy, of the Vatican card, rests firmly on the dominant officialdom at the top of the AFL.

The fifth day opened with greetings from the British fraternal delegates. Delegate Gibson brought greetings from across the sea, pleaded for international solidarity in the struggle against Fascism, (Continued on Page 6)

unity and peace. Our answer is that that's tommyrot. At some point in the developing situation, the workers, it seems to us, should be let in on the secret. They should be told how the situation is likely to develop and must be mobilized to meet these developments if that is not done—if workers are fed on rosy fairy tales about the possibility and probability of unity then you cannot expect to receive maximum support when a show-down comes. A position such as ours represents a profound faith in the masses of workers in the A. F. of L., a firm conviction that they will understand and will rally to this history-making battle now going on.

A little while back Heywood Broun, arose at a membership meeting of the American Newspaper Guild, to receive from William Green, a charter of membership in the A. F. of L. On that occasion Broun said that everybody wants peace, but when it came to a matter of choice between peace and progress, he would take progress. We agree with that but must add that the time has already come to make that choice. He who today keeps on talking "peace" is blocking progress.

Tomorrow will be another day. A successful drive in steel, auto, and other mass production industries will go a long way, with the help of the progressives in the craft unions, to bring about a unification of the trade union movement on a plane much higher than the present craft-divided "unity."

OUR ATTITUDE to the CIO seems to be finding many friends lately. Even the Socialist Party which was equivocal in its position (witness the convention of the United Textile Workers) has finally climbed on the bandwagon.

An excellent article, to which we subscribe wholeheartedly, appeared in the October issue of "Gerechtigkeit" (official Jewish organ of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union). Zivion, the editor of the paper, has the following to say in this article:

" . . . a split will ultimately result in the absorption of the old organization by the newly created one, as was the case in the split of the Knights of Labor. The then newly created organization—the American Federation of Labor, absorbed the old Knights of Labor This was due to the fact that the new organization was better equipped to organize the workers in America on the basis of the then existing conditions and status of industry. And if a split should now occur in the American trade union movement, the new organization, based on the principle of industrial unionism, will be better fitted to organize the vast numbers of workers employed in the mass production industries and will thereby become the expression of the organized American labor movement."

In passing we might also say that it speaks well for the I.L.G. W.U. which makes possible such expression of opinion which do not entirely represent the official position of the I.L.G.W.U. Other unions, even some in the needle trades, could well profit from such procedure.

KNITGOODS CASE SHIFTS TO COURT

Charge of "Conspiracy" Denounced by Nelson As Frame-Up

After two weeks of investigation, the Additional Grand Jury of New York County referred charges against Louis Nelson, Manager of the Joint Council Knitgoods Workers Union to the Court of Special Sessions.

On November 16th, Manager Nelson was indicted by the Court for "conspiracy and coercion" and freed on \$1,000 bail. Four other members of the Union, Rosen, Tuman, Zinberg, and Joe Rapoport, Union organizer, were held on the same charges. The trial of all five was set for Special Sessions for December 10, 1936.

These indictments flow from charges made by the Hornick Knitting Mills and the American Brand Trimming Company. These firms are attempting to frame-up the Union leadership and members on trumped-up charges in a desperate effort to force the Union to give up the strikes now being waged by the employees of these mills.

Louis Nelson, Manager of the Joint Council Knitgoods Workers Union, stated yesterday that "regardless of the attempted frame-up and the endeavors of the employers to break these strikes, the strikes will continue until the just demands of the workers are met and Union conditions are established in these shops."

2 UNIONS JOIN SHIP STRIKE

(Continued from Page 1)

national Seamen's Union, Grange et al., and the struggle of the rank and file for decent working conditions branded as "outlaw". Wm. Green shoved this resolution across, calling for the discussion and the vote almost simultaneously, and ignoring the demand for the floor made by George Woolf, president of the Alaskan Cannery Workers Union. Joseph Curran telegraphed a demand that the other side of the story be heard before action was taken, but this was ignored.

The question of federal intervention in the strike was pushed by the conference of mayors. LaGuardia, president of the conference, also doubted the hold of the ISU leadership on the union membership, stating they were "either repudiated or powerless". While the Roosevelt Administration is hesitating to intervene, because it could only do so with loss of prestige, nevertheless it is very probable that the question was raised with the administration's knowledge.

Federal intervention is also the cry of the West Coast employers, where the strike is 100% effective under the leadership of the Pacific Maritime Federation.

The Eastern seamen have instituted proceedings to declare the contract signed by ISU illegal, because it was never ratified by the membership.

Proletarian Greetings

to the

WORKERS AGE

from the

Montreal Unit - C.P.O.

INTO THE ASH CAN



Courtesy Union News Service

MADRID STOPS FASCISTS; ITALY AND REICH RECOGNIZE FRANCO

(Continued from Page 1)

last openly avowed. On the other hand, there seem to be well-substantiated indications of a Chinese-Soviet understanding; at any rate, Chinese resistance to Japanese aggression has stiffened remarkably in recent days. Last week Chinese armies beat back 40,000 Manchukuoan and Mongolian troops invading Suiyan under orders from Japan. Relations in the Far East have become extremely tense.

The whole situation as it is developing today shows what suicidal folly it is to count on a "democratic" front arrayed against the fascist powers in the field of international politics. Some sort of common front of the fascist states—Italy, Germany and Japan—has indeed come into existence, altho their mutual antagonisms have by no means been eliminated. But where are the "democratic" powers? Under Tory domination, Great Britain is following a devious course which, in the end, amounts to playing Hitler's game and, to a degree, even Mussolini's. Under the People's Front regime of Leon Blum, which is supported by socialists and communists alike, France is continuing along the main lines of the notorious Laval foreign policy and is thus hardly more than a willing pawn in the reactionary manoeuvres of the Tory diplomats. Only the Soviet Union has taken a determined stand against fascism on the international arena—the Soviet Union supported in this struggle by the working class movements of the capitalist countries. One thing the Spanish crisis has certainly done: it has ripped away the veil of fine-sounding conventional lies with which capitalist democracy is wont to trick itself out and has exposed it in all its reactionary rottenness!

It is perhaps not without interest that fascist Italy and Germany were anticipated in their recognition of the Franco clique by a number of petty Latin American states and that Argentina, Brazil and Chile are said to be contemplating similar action. President Roosevelt is now on his way to Buenos Aires to attend the Pan-

B. DURRUTI

500,000 proletarians marched in Barcelona in the funeral of Buenaventura Durruti, anarcho-syndicalist leader and one of the most popular military leaders that the Spanish working class produced.

He headed the first contingents of Catalan troops who arrived to help save Madrid from the fascists and fell at the front while leading the militia in battle.

Regardless of political differences the international proletarian grieves over the loss of this valiant proletarian fighter.

American Peace Conference. In the course of the last year, Mr. Roosevelt more than once assailed fascism as the very embodiment of despotism and the prime breeder of war. Will he now find it possible to say a word in order to prevent the Latin American states, with whose peace he is so deeply concerned, from casting their lot with a band of murderous fascist adventurers in Spain, aided and abetted by the fascist dictators of Germany and Italy?

224 CONGRESSMAN FOR ANTI-LYNCH ACT

A check up by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People revealed that of the new congressmen elected, 59 have not committed themselves to a stand on anti-lynching legislation.

A pre-election pledge for an anti-lynching law was signed by 147 congressman, while 77 others have indicated in one way or another that they favor some federal action on the question.

It is interesting to note that of the 224 congressman promising to support or initiate such a bill, only 6, all from West Virginia, represent a southern state. Whether the others will remember their pre-election pledges without stiff prodding from organized labor and liberal groups, remains to be seen.

S.P. OF BELGIUM "FIGHTS" FASCISM

LEON DEGRELLE, Belgian Fascist leader, stalked triumphant out of court where he was supposedly tried for organizing the Brussels riot of October 25th. The socialist coalition government defended democracy by fining him thirty cents—and on the charge of "paralyzing traffic"!

The mockery of the "punishment" is only exceeded by the spinelessness of the charge against this enemy of the working-class. Thus does Vandervelde's socialist party, holding important cabinet posts, struggle against fascism.

MOONEY FUNDS ARE NEEDED

Tom Mooney, whose twentieth year of imprisonment on framed-up charges was recently protested by nation-wide mass meetings, has appealed to all his friends for desperately needed financial aid in what is hoped will be the last push in the drive to free him. The hearings on his application for a writ of habeas corpus, lasting for more than a year, were completed on August 31st, and drained the funds of the Defense Committee. To prepare the necessary documents for his appeal to the California Supreme Court, it is estimated that ten thousand dollars will be needed.

In a personal letter, Mooney states: "Now, as never before, I need your generous, continued financial support. Without it we are lost. With it there is hope of real ultimate victory. I cannot urge upon you too strongly the immediate need for quick generous response to this appeal. We are actually financially embarrassed."

All funds should be addressed to Tom Mooney Molders' Defense Committee, Box 1475, San Francisco, California.

AFL Plans Approval Of CIO Suspension

(Continued from Page 5)

and even mentioned Karl Marx by name! Canadian fraternal delegate Brunet followed. Green replied with an oratorical outburst against fascism and "all forms of dictatorship." It was a plea replete with vague generalizations, glittering generalities, and confusion—including some tears shed for "that great race, the Jews." Here was a sop, an antidote, and an investment—all rolled into one.

In the address of Edwin S. Smith, member of the National Labor Relations Board, there was some sound advice coupled with timely warnings to labor to be on guard against the open-shoppers seeking, by sundry means, to rob labor of the right to organize.

The resolution of the Committee on the Executive Council report was then adopted—except for the section dealing with the CIO—item by item with great dispatch under the tutelage of president Green and reporter Wharton. In the course of this session there came up the twenty-one year old Lithographer's controversy and the petty move against the amalgamated Clothing Workers. Max Zaritsky could not embarrass Rickert with the unpleasant query whether the United was "well enough organized to enable AFL members to use clothes with their label." Nor could even Martel with his warning that such a decision might mean that "AFL delegates would have to come to conventions in overalls instead of custom-made clothes. . ."

AUTO SIT DOWN 100% SOLID

4,000 Workers Remain In Bendix Plant; CIO Aids Auto Drive

About a thousand workers refused to accept the lockout imposed by the Bendix Products, an auto parts plant, and conducted a sit-down strike to force 100% unionization in the plant. Despite the freezing conditions in the factory after the management shut off the heat, the workers held firm to their posts. Food has been sent in by their families and sympathetic workers. Negotiations are going on between the management and the United Automobile Workers.

Detroit, Mich.—At least 3,200 automobile workers in Detroit alone joined the United Automobile Workers of America during last week.

"This is the workers' answer to fake wage increases and left-handed bonuses," President Martin said. "They are expressing their fundamental desire for their own independent organizations and their resentment at alleged raises and bonuses that were more than made up for by re-classification of jobs, speed up, and cuts in piece rates."

Philip Murray, chairman of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, and John Brophy, director of the Committee for Industrial Organization, spoke at three Union membership meetings in Detroit.

All organizers of the union were called in from the field for the session with Murray and Brophy who participated in the drafting of an immediate organizational program as follows:

An annual wage assuring security during periods of idleness, and providing a standard of health, decency, and comfort; elimination of speed-up; Straight seniority rights; Immediate establishment of 40-hour week, 8-hour day; Time and one-half for all time over basic work week and work day; Permanent program of progressive reduction of hours until all workers displaced by machinery are re-employed; Improved safety measures for protection on the job; Establishment of true collective bargaining.

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

WORKERS AGE
PO BOX 68-STA. O
NYC
Enclosed find.....
for a.....Sub.

NAME _____
NO. _____
CITY _____