

Lessons of Flint

by Observer

THE smashing victory of the progressive forces in the recent elections of Flint Local 156 of the United Automobile Workers, is one of the most significant events to occur in the trade-union movement for some time. Its significance goes far beyond Flint, far beyond the U.A.W., far beyond even the specific issues themselves.

Flint—key city in the General Motors empire—had always been regarded as perhaps the chief stronghold of the Stalinist-controlled “unity” group in the U.A.W. For months, the loud-mouthed ranters of this caucus kept on boasting of their vast support among the rank-and-file and raving against the Martin “bureaucracy.” All efforts on the part of the progressives to establish some minimum of peace and harmony in the interest of the union as a whole were contemptuously spurned by the “unity” leaders, who were apparently too sure that the elections would give them a stranglehold on the Flint organization to listen to reason. They were riding high or at least so they thought or pretended to think!

The eyes of the whole industry, corporation and workers alike, were turned upon Flint. Here was the first large-scale test of strength since the Milwaukee convention last Summer, between the progressive Martin forces and the “unity”-caucus opposition, with all odds apparently in favor of the latter. The election campaign of the “unity” group was quite in line with its general character—slandering, demagogic, reckless, irresponsible. At one point, they actually tried to create a panic by the sudden “disclosure” that there were “thousands of stool-pigeons” in Flint—somehow this fantastic concoction was supposed to be an election issue! It would be impossible to describe in cold print the kind of campaign these people carried on; suffice it to say that their “big point” was that “Martin was in favor of wage-cuts for the auto workers”!!!

The progressives, on the other hand, concentrated their agitation on appealing for support of the International administration and its policy of responsibility, discipline and militancy. Homer Martin and other International leaders aided in the whirlwind campaign that culminated in a series of gigantic meetings and carried everything before it. It was an annihilating answer to the anti-union slanders not only of the “unity”-caucus factionalists in the U.A.W. but also of their political and literary allies of the type of Browder, Hathaway and Heywood Brown. It was in truth the “battle of the century”!

Then came the elections. In the primaries, one progressive got a flat majority and was immediately returned to office; the other progressives all ran ahead but final elections proved necessary to decide the contest. And decide it they did! Despite wide unemployment and mass lay-offs, nearly 40% of the union members in Flint voted—a phenomenal record. Of the 11,620 votes cast, Jack Little, progressive candidate for president, received 7,540 to Roy Reuther's 4,080, a lead of 65% to 35%. For the five remaining offices, the progressive candidates did equally well; the entire progressive slate was swept in by staggering majorities. The broad rank-and-file spoke and spoke in no uncertain terms!

The victory is indeed tremendous in scope and significance. The demagogic pretension of the “unity-ites” to be the chosen representa-

(Continued on Page 6)

Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol 7, No. 12.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, MARCH 19, 1938

5c a Copy

G.M. Pact on Grievances

UAW Executive Ratifies Agreement; General Contract Remains

Detroit, Mich.

A new agreement on grievance procedure effective March 12, has been signed by the United Automobile Workers and General Motors Corporation, Elmer Dowell, union director for G. M. locals, announced last week.

The agreement, which has been ratified by the U.A.W. general executive board, supersedes the supplementary agreement reached April 12, 1937, which the corporation gave notice of cancelling January 12, 1938. The general contract continues unchanged and with no termination date. It may, however, be the subject of negotiations later, Dowell said.

The negotiators for the union were Homer Martin, president, R. J. F. Thomas, vice-president, William Munger, research director, Larry S. Davidow, attorney, and Elmer Dowell.

“Our negotiations with General Motors were another example of the effectiveness of genuine collective bargaining,” Dowell said. “I would like to point out that no pay cuts for men covered by the U.A.W.

“Good Neighbors” With Whom?

A RECENT tour of James Roosevelt, playing the role of an American Prince of Wales, included a friendly visit to the home of none other than Dictator Trujillo, bloody master of San Domingo, who recently was responsible for the slaughter of several thousand Haitian workers.

The visit, far from unofficial, was arranged thru the offices of Ambassador Joseph Davies, plenipotentiary of these democratic United States, and served the purpose of convincing the masses of San Domingo that Washington backed Trujillo's dictatorship.

contract have taken place in G.M., altho salaried men have been cut.”

Provisions of the new agreement: Shop committeemen will be paid by the corporation for two hours a day when engaged in grievance work. In the March 12, 1937 agreement, the corporation undertook to pay committeemen for four hours a day.

There shall be one shop committeeman to every 400 workers. In

(Continued on Page 6)

Monopoly and Crisis

by Lyman Fraser

IN the discussion of social and economic questions, it is often necessary to recall the most elementary theory and the most simple facts, because of the efforts made to bedevil understanding and action.

That is especially true now of the argument that monopoly is the cause of the present economic recession and hard times—and in general, of the permanent capitalist crisis.

The argument is not new. Monopoly was blamed for the crisis of 1907, for the crisis of 1893, for the crisis of 1873 and for all the minor crises and depressions in between those years. All the arguments of today were made by the Wilsonian “progressives,” by the Populists, by the Greenbackers.

And what is the essential point of all the monopoly arguments, old and new? All the arguments separate monopoly from capitalism. Monopoly, they insist, is not necessarily a part of capitalism; it is a “perversion” of capitalism. Hence, all the evils of capitalism, including economic crises and hard times, are not the result of capitalism but of its monopolist perversions. Destroy monopoly and “purify” capitalism and everything will be lovely.

Let us note, in passing, that all the struggles against monopoly have always ended in failure; that, while anti-trust laws were being passed, the monopoly or trust combinations of capital became bigger and bigger and more powerful.

All the old monopoly arguments were made by petty-bourgeois lib-

erals who accepted capitalism. And they are still being made by petty-bourgeois liberals today. From that angle, there is nothing new. What is new is that today alleged Marxists are making the same arguments that the petty-bourgeois liberals have been making for over sixty years.

Can Crises Be Ended Under Capitalism?

But whether the monopoly arguments are made by liberals or “Marxists” makes no difference. The conclusion is the same. If monopoly is the cause of crises, recessions and depressions, and monopoly can be separated from capitalism, then crises can be ended within the relations of capitalist production. That is a monstrous distortion of Marxist theory and of economic fact.

The arguments of some “Marxists” today are the opposite of an older reformist socialist theory. In the 1900's, Eduard Bernstein argued that monopoly was “organizing” capitalism, modifying crises, alleviating international antagonisms and the class struggle. The World War was the answer to Bernstein. In the 1920's, Rudolf Hilferding again argued that monopoly was “organizing” capitalism and making crises “milder” and unemployment “less threatening.” The answer to Hilferding was the increase of permanent unemployment in the midst of prosperity, the crisis of the 1930's, the worst in history, and the coming of fascism in Germany.

Never has monopoly been as

Hitler Annexes Austria by Arms

Campaign Of Terror Against Workers Launched; Czechoslovakia Feared To Be Next Nazi Goal; Powers Stand By Passively

As we go to press, a cable reaches us from Jay Lovestone informing us that he has just left Vienna after witnessing the German invasion and the launching of a bloody campaign of Nazi terror. More in the next issue.

* * *

In a series of lightning moves, Hitler last week completed the easy conquest of Austria and decreed its transformation into a German province, while the other European powers stood by, perturbed but unwilling to take action.

The first blow was struck by Hitler on Friday, March 11, in a double ultimatum to Chancellor

Schuschnigg, demanding the “postponement” of the proposed referendum on Austria's independence and the establishment of an Austrian government more satisfactory to Germany. German troops immediately crossed the border from Bavaria. Unable to get any promise of support from either England or Italy, to whom he appealed, Schuschnigg obeyed. Seyss-Inquart, Austrian Nazi, became Chancellor and head of a strictly pro-Nazi cabinet. His first act was to “request” Hitler for some German troops to “help maintain order,” thus “legalizing” the German invasion. Backed by these troops, the armed detachments of the Austrian Nazis immediately set about suppressing all protest or opposition, especially among the Viennese workers, and arranging pro-Hitler demonstrations. Wild confusion and terror reigned throughout the country.

The very next day Hitler himself came to Austria. As soon as he arrived he announced the removal of President Miklas and the conversion of the country into a part of the Reich, defying all Europe to interfere. German troops had meanwhile occupied all strategic points, especially those facing Czechoslovakia. Heinrich Himmler, head of the German secret police, promptly took over the Austrian police force and began mass arrests of socialists, communists and labor leaders. Other German Nazi agencies set to work immediately “coordinating” Austrian economic, political, social and cultural life on the German model.

Hitler's startling coup, the next step in the Nazi plans of aggression in Central and Eastern Europe, was made possible only by the certain knowledge that the other European powers, especially England and France, would stand by passively offering no hindrance of any sort. Both of the “great democracies” limited themselves to formal protests, which were contemptuously disregarded. Italy took no action whatever, officially maintaining good relations with Germany altho it was understood that the Rome-Berlin axis had been strained to the breaking point.

The next objective in Nazi Germany's expansion is apparently Czechoslovakia. English compliance or passivity seems already indicated. Meeting over the week-end, the British Cabinet failed to give a definite answer to the French inquiry as to whether any aid could be expected from London should Germany invade Czechoslovakia.

pressions; they all broke forth in the days of non-monopoly, competitive capitalism. And monopoly arises out of capitalist production—out of competition, the growth of large-scale production, the increasing accumulation of capital, the expansion of markets. Hence, monopoly is not something alien to capitalism, and it cannot be curbed or destroyed by capitalist

(Continued on Page 2)

Lewis COREY

“FASCISM OR SOCIALISM?”

FRIDAY, MARCH 18
NEW WORKERS SCHOOL
131 W. 33rd St.

WORKERS AGE

Organ of the National Council, Independent Communist Labor League, 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Publishers. Subscription Rates: \$1.00 per year; \$6.00 for six months; 5c a copy. Foreign Rates: \$2.00; Canada \$1.50 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. No. 12

NEW ROADS TO SAME WAR

THE SUDDEN shift of British diplomacy signalized in the resignation of Anthony Eden, a shift in form and tempo rather than in substance, has had a curious effect on the direction of the Administration's war propaganda.

As a matter of fact, the whole line of Administration propaganda is a fraud from first to last, a part of the vast conspiracy centered in the White House to commit this country to a war policy from which there can be no return and to work up among the people a wild jingo fever for that purpose.

Robespierre was hated and feared by the bourgeois upper class as well as by the aristocratic feudal forces. He was overthrown and his dictatorship ended on the 9th of Thermidor (July 27, 1794).

In a word, the Anglo-American alliance and the imperialist policy of which it is the consequence, are still going strong—but under a new guise, the guise of an "isolationist" national "defense."

The anti-war movement must take cognizance of this shift in approach on the part of the warmongers and must adjust itself accordingly.

The bourgeoisie is always afraid of a working class armed and under a class-conscious leadership. A working class of this character would use its arms not only against

War and Revolution

Some Lessons from History

By J. BRAUN (Concluded from last week)

DURING the rule of the Jacobins, the military situation improved. The first great victories were won against the foreign invaders. At the war-fronts unrelenting generals were removed and court-martialed, while political commissioners sent from revolutionary Paris controlled the army leaders and helped to create a strong revolutionary war morale.

The military technique of feudal armies was wiped out by the new manner of fighting developed by the French revolutionary volunteers. Workers, peasants and handicraftsmen, fighting for their own interests, did not have to be driven into the struggle by force like the mercenaries.

Great absence of the soldiers, who no longer attacked in close formation and who could individually use all natural advantages of their surroundings, did not endanger unity of action. The mercenary troops, however, had to be kept permanently under the direct control of their officers.

Under the regime that followed, the military situation became precarious again. Removed were the Jacobin representatives in the army, longer stand in the way.

1. Zur Deutschen Geschichte. Quoted from G. Reimann: Germany World Empire or World Revolution, London 1938, p. 4.

The crisis of February 4 gives renewed hope that the Nazi regime can be overthrown by the working class before the outbreak of a war. The realization of this possibility depends first on the ability of the German working class to consolidate its strength as an independent class force rather than relying on the possibility of cooperation with the bourgeoisie.

The official communist and socialist press (see Humanite and Populaire in France) interpret the crisis as a victory of the Nazis over the army and abound in chauvinist phrases either out of sheer

who had developed great initiative in arousing a revolutionary fighting spirit among the soldiers and who had stirred up the masses in the neighboring countries and helped them to shake off the yoke of feudalism. The French armies no longer appeared as emancipators to the people of the Netherlands and the Rhineland but rather as foreign invaders and plunderers.

The Thermidorians turned out to be quite incapable of ruling the country. The big bourgeoisie was not yet strong enough to rule against the opposition of the masses of the poor in town and country and against the feudal reaction as well. This situation enabled Napoleon to establish his dictatorship on the 18th Brumaire (November 9, 1799).

Napoleon's rise and final defeat illustrate the close relationship between military strategy and revolution. His military genius would not have been sufficient to defeat armies so superior in numbers or to conquer the greatest part of Europe, had not another factor helped him: he represented a progressive bourgeois power fighting the armies of feudal reaction.

In the early period of his dictatorship, Napoleon championed and introduced many bourgeois, anti-feudalist reforms in Western Germany. But the greater the conquests of Napoleon became, the more he felt compelled to make the feudal lords and monarchs of other countries his allies and supporters, protecting them against imperialist revolution.

The crisis of February 4 gives renewed hope that the Nazi regime can be overthrown by the working class before the outbreak of a war. The realization of this possibility depends first on the ability of the German working class to consolidate its strength as an independent class force rather than relying on the possibility of cooperation with the bourgeoisie.

My system of defense was worthless, because the means employed were not at all commensurate with the danger. I should have had to stir up the revolution again in order to receive from revolution all the means which it was capable of creating. It would have been necessary to revive all the passions, in order to utilize their blindness. Without this, I was no longer able to save France."

The bourgeoisie is always afraid of a working class armed and under a class-conscious leadership. A working class of this character would use its arms not only against

The bourgeoisie is always afraid of a working class armed and under a class-conscious leadership. A working class of this character would use its arms not only against

By Lambda

WORLD TODAY

The Inside Story Of Feb. 4 Bares Victory Of The Reichswehr

London, Feb. 9, 1938 (Concluded from last issue)

THE fundamental cause of the Nazi regime is to be found in the growing contradictions, in the economic difficulties resulting from the preparations for a totalitarian war. These contradictions cannot be solved under capitalism but there is still the possibility of slowing down the tempo of arming, of creating a breathing spell, in which case foreign credits would be decisive in facilitating the supply of raw materials and foodstuffs.

From our analysis, we conclude that the compromise agreed upon this time cannot last long and that there has been no real solution of the problem. The struggle continues.

This conflict amongst the top leaders could be confined to the flanks of the Nazi regime. The regime itself will not be directly menaced until the working class takes an independent hand in the matter and, takes over the leadership of the toiling classes, in particular, of the mass of small peasants. The reason why the working class has not stirred is to be sought in the People's Front policy which has prevented the formation of militant underground cadres.

In 1930, in England, five trade groups made up 76.6% of total membership. The basis has been the general and industrial unions, organized since 1910: transport and communications, 24.8%; public service, 14.4%; metals, machinery and vehicles, 12.9%; mining, quarrying and oil, 12.8% and textiles, 8.1%.

In 1930, in England, five trade groups made up 76.6% of total membership. The basis has been the general and industrial unions, organized since 1910: transport and communications, 24.8%; public service, 14.4%; metals, machinery and vehicles, 12.9%; mining, quarrying and oil, 12.8% and textiles, 8.1%.

In 1930, in England, five trade groups made up 76.6% of total membership. The basis has been the general and industrial unions, organized since 1910: transport and communications, 24.8%; public service, 14.4%; metals, machinery and vehicles, 12.9%; mining, quarrying and oil, 12.8% and textiles, 8.1%.

The crisis of February 4 gives renewed hope that the Nazi regime can be overthrown by the working class before the outbreak of a war. The realization of this possibility depends first on the ability of the German working class to consolidate its strength as an independent class force rather than relying on the possibility of cooperation with the bourgeoisie.

The official communist and socialist press (see Humanite and Populaire in France) interpret the crisis as a victory of the Nazis over the army and abound in chauvinist phrases either out of sheer

Labor Notes and Facts

Unions in England and the U.S.A.

(Concluded from last issue)

IN BOTH movements, membership is concentrated and a few industrial groups form the large majority of the organized workers.

In 1936, in England, five trade groups made up 76.6% of total membership. The basis has been the general and industrial unions, organized since 1910: transport and communications, 24.8%; public service, 14.4%; metals, machinery and vehicles, 12.9%; mining, quarrying and oil, 12.8% and textiles, 8.1%.

In the United States, the changing composition of the dominant groups reflects the swing from craft to industrial unionism. In 1935, the five major groups equalled 69.3% of total trade-union membership. The three largest have been leading since 1910: transport, 18.7%; building trades, (which do not even appear among the dominant English groups), 16.1%; mining, 15.6%; clothing and public-service unions, the last two of which have only risen to prominence since the 1920's, have respectively, 11% and 8% of total membership.

In spite of the new strength and basis of the American labor movement, the British is even today much more powerful. In 1930, in England, 10.5% of the total population were union members, in America only 2.6%.

Table with 3 columns: Year, Great Britain, United States. Rows for 1910, 1920, 1930, 1937.

In 1930, the percentage of non-agricultural workers belonging to unions was 30% in England and 10.6% in America.

This situation is duplicated in practically all trades, which are two to three times better organized in Great Britain than over here. Of these, mining and steam railroads have the highest degree of organization.

Mining: In Great Britain, fell from peak of 98.2% organized in 1920 to 64.3% in 1928 but rose again to 82% in 1935. The U.M.W. in America has generally been weaker than the M.F.G.B. in Great Britain; it controlled 58% in 1924 and went to a low of 31% in 1930 but, by 1935, it rose to surpass the British union with 93.9% organization.

Steam railroads: In Great Britain, fell from 75% in 1925 to 60.5% in 1927 and rose again to 71% in 1935. In the United States, from 45% average in 1923-30, rose to 53.2% in 1935, having reached a high of 56% in 1932.

Manufacturing: a lower degree of organization than the two previous occupations but the difference remains. In 1924, Great Britain had

Similar experiences are to be found in the Russian revolution. The expropriated capitalists and landowners supported the open intervention of foreign imperialism against Soviet Russia in order to save their property and profits.

A social revolution also revolutionizes military strategy and tactics. It makes it possible to defeat foreign armies which may be

TWO LETTERS

(We publish below a letter from a subscriber in Montreal which throws a lurid light on the state of civil liberties in another of our "great democracies," the Dominion of Canada.—The Editor.)

Montreal, Quebec, Feb. 25, 1938

Please discontinue mailing the Age to my home immediately. Things are going from bad to worse here. Places are being padlocked and whole libraries, regardless of the fact that they do not contain communist literature, are seized and not returned if there is as much as one prohibited pamphlet.

All else being well, I shall get my Age from Y. every week. Devotedly yours, Z.

Cincinnati, Ohio March 5, 1938

I have received your notice of expiration of my subscription to your publication Workers Age. I regret to say I cannot afford to renew my subscription at present due to unemployment. I am employed at General Motors Corporation but, since December 1937, I have been temporarily laid off. However, I am confident of being reemployed within several weeks and, if possible, I would very much desire to remain a subscriber and sincerely promise to remit at my earliest convenience.

I regard your publication as a vital factor in analyzing present-day problems and have used it as a guide to my participation in alleviating economic and social conditions of the masses of underprivileged working men and women in these United States. Trusting you will accept my explanation of financial circumstances and continue me as a subscriber until I can make payment, I remain Fraternally yours, C. L.

BOOKS

JUDGE LYNCH, by Frank Shay. Ives, Washburn, Inc., New York, 1938.

I hope that Frank Shay's "Judge Lynch" will be a very popular book. If graphic descriptions of the horrifying details and statistical analysis of the broad spread of lynch-law can add to the determination of decent people to do something about this ghastly practise, then the book will have well served its essential purpose. No theoretical discussion, no amount of rhetoric, can ever prove more so convincing, an argument against lynching as a bald description of the death of Claude Neal or the hanging of Wesley Everest.

Every polemicist on lynching—and practically all the commentators have written polemics—has noted its peculiarly American character but few have sought causes. Frank Shay shares in this lack of analysis, primarily because he has chosen a rigid pattern for his book and has to make the facts fit into his picture of "Judge Lynch" as a sort of malignant God stalking these United States even tho it involves a good deal of distortion. There have really been several different varieties of lynching and, unpleasant tho it may be to admit it, mob-law seems to owe its origin to the backward democratic rebirth of the Jacksonian era.

Armaments Are Politics

(Continued from Page 2)

can people into President Roosevelt's quarantine camp. All that Congress needs to do to satisfy itself on this point is to call naval officers into a secret session, vote them a retiring allowance so that the executive axe may not fall upon them, and ask them just how Hitler or Mussolini or the Mikado can perform this water-crossing miracle now, with our present defenses. It is high time that members of Congress may enlighten themselves on this point by reading the testimony of naval officers on previous bills and especially on the London naval treaty.

When minutely analyzed, when placed squarely in the history of sea power, when studied in relation to the present posture of the sea powers in their separate strategic areas, the President's program has no meaning save as one step in the direction of applying his quarantine doctrine to Europe and Asia. Next year, Congress will be called upon to take the next step. So the whole business boils down to a single issue: Do the American people, and the Congress that is supposed to represent them, want to commit themselves to the entangling obligations which the quarantine doctrine involves? The hour of a fateful decision has arrived. . . .

World Today

(Continued from Page 4)

stupidity or unscrupulousness. The main danger of the crisis of February 4 is that Germany will proceed with a more thorough and solid program of war preparations and that the so-called "democratic" nations will make an "arrangement" with Hitler in order to carry on their own war preparations undisturbed.

The French and British working classes must strive to counteract the attempts of their respective ruling class to create a hysterical cry for "national unity" on the basis of the February 4 events in Germany.

declared in 1935, the army and navy of the United States must not be employed to protect the profits of traders in war-infested regions abroad. Their duty is fulfilled in assisting in the evacuation of American citizens and their movable property from the war zones. This is not to "scuttle international practise and the dictates of prudence. No such naval program as the President demands is required by such practise or prudence. And, according to realistic knowledge that can be gained from a study of sea warfare, the navy for which he asks could not assure the protection of these fictitious rights against the naval force of Japan. Either way, his program is clouded with doubts.

When minutely analyzed, when placed squarely in the history of sea power, when studied in relation to the present posture of the sea powers in their separate strategic areas, the President's program has no meaning save as one step in the direction of applying his quarantine doctrine to Europe and Asia. Next year, Congress will be called upon to take the next step. So the whole business boils down to a single issue: Do the American people, and the Congress that is supposed to represent them, want to commit themselves to the entangling obligations which the quarantine doctrine involves? The hour of a fateful decision has arrived. . . .

Can we look on Shay's and similar books as the obituaries of Judge Lynch? The fact that there were only eight victims in 1937 and the general decline for the past twenty years would point to this. Yet, there is a dangerous new trend best exemplified in the Shoemaker murder in Florida: a kind of lynching that does not kill its victim to terrify a racial group but specifically as a class foe. As labor organization spreads thru the South, may we expect a great new wave of class lynchings like those that decimated the I.W.W. in 1919 and 1920? One cannot believe that employers fighting to preserve their sweatshop paradise will fail to ally themselves with so tested and American a personage as old Judge Lynch. D. S.

Advertisement for Workers Age magazine: \$1 A YEAR SUB TO WORKERS AGE 6mos. 60¢ subscribe now!

Labor's Road to Peace

from Advance

(We publish below sections of an editorial on "Labor's Task in Preserving Peace" that appeared in the March 1938 issue of the ADVANCE, official paper of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.)

—THE EDITOR.)

* * *

AS the issue is raised in public discussions, in congressional debates and in private conversations, two methods of dealing with the war danger are proposed in the effort to define a right American attitude. There are the "isolationists" on the one side, and the proponents of "collective security" on the other.

The "isolationists," as the term suggests, say that Americans should not have any concern with what is happening abroad. We are not to take part or in any other way get involved in what is happening in that madhouse, called the Old World, but we should arm ourselves so effectively that no Old World aggressor would dare come to our shores to attack us.

The "collective securitists" say that, no matter what we think of Europe, Asia or Africa, the fact remains that economic life today, the world over, is intimately interrelated and no nation can avoid getting involved, one way or another, in the major issues that agitate other nations. And, since it is so and, since sooner or later we are bound to get involved in international trouble, why not take care now, before it is too late, to line up the forces which stand for democracy and peace against all the other forces which want war and thus check in time the danger of a conflagration.

This argument, like the other argument, assumes strong arming of the American nation but it proposes that we get closer to the irritated spots of the Old World, while the "isolationists" say that any cooperation with the Europeans is another reckless step sure to bring us nearer war. . . .

We will readily agree with the "collective securitists" that calling the Old World a lunatic asylum does not help matters. The economic rivalries back of the present crisis won't be put to rest by words. But, while by itself, isolation seems to be a lesser evil and understandings between democratic powers a most natural course to pursue, there is no assurance of safety in either course. The "democratic powers" are mostly poker players in the game of empire even as are the Hitlers and the Mussolinis and he who banks on them, seeks to find support, in the words of the prophet, in leaning against a broken stick.

While isolation seems to be an unreal policy in a world as integrated as is ours, "collective security" is anything but secure with the Chamberlains of England

and their counterparts in France, as security's safeguards. The issue thus isn't which policy is better but which is worse. And either policy spells gigantic ruinous armaments, costly, burdensome, and above all war-provoking. What, then, is to be done? . . .

A democracy which permits its military men to meddle with its laws to suit their own concepts and conveniences is bordering on disaster with its hands tied back. Already we have a foretaste in the Sheppard-Hill Bill introduced into the Congress by the War and Navy Departments representatives, of what the military mind will do to America when given a chance. There is consequently the urgent need to watch out, in view of the situation, that our democracy should remain intact and that the economic content of our liberties should be extended. A happy people will resist war. The program of labor, in these circumstances, includes insistence on the complete realization of the New Deal program and greater emphasis than ever on the strict observance of our civil liberties.

Neither isolation nor collective security holds out the promise of peace in the world. But whatever may happen to Asia or Europe, we, in the United States can, if we try hard, make a go of our economic and political possibilities. Collective prosperity rather than collective security is our safest bet for the preservation of peace.

Bukharin and The Left S.R.s

(Continued from Page 3)

thing that Bukharin planned and did they naturally planned and did along with him. Are all of them, therefore, to be regarded as having conspired to overthrow the soviet government and assassinate Lenin, Stalin* and Sverdlov? Uritsky was shot by a Right S.R. terrorist in 1918. Menshinsky and Kuibyshev are now sanctified martyrs, two of the four alleged victims of the Bukharin "murder ring." Yaroslavsky is still at large—writing vile, filthy articles in the Stalinist press. May we assume that, on the grounds of mere consistency, Yaroslavsky will himself stand in the dock in one of the coming trials?

The G.P.U. just doesn't seem to have any luck—the grain of truth is precisely what it is now choking on. We would advise Yezhov and his collaborators to stick to the more familiar ground of pure fiction next time, to fancy stories about espionage, wrecking and connivance with the fascist powers. They are out of their depth in party history; it just isn't their province!

* But why Stalin? Lenin and Sverdlov were the heads of the new state but Stalin was only a second-line party leader. Why should anyone have bothered about assassinating him?

Cal. Assembly Backs Mooney

By a final vote of 41 to 29, the California State Assembly declared itself last week in favor of a legislative pardon for Tom Mooney. The action has no legal standing, according to the official rulings of the Attorney General, but it was hoped that it might influence Governor Merriam. The Assembly vote came after two days of heated debate and after Tom Mooney had himself appeared before the body to make a plea for vindication and freedom.

The following day, the California Senate, stronghold of reaction, killed the Assembly resolution, after an unfavorable report by the Rules Committee, on the pretext that it was beyond the powers of the body. A resolution appealing to Governor Merriam for a pardon, remains still to be acted on, however.

Labor Scores Big In Pontiac Vote

Pontiac, Mich.

The United Automobile Workers scored a signal victory here last week in the primaries for the three vacancies on the City Commission by placing its three candidates on the ballot for the April 4 election.

Inexperienced in the art of electioneering, the union did not really get under way until a few days before the primaries when it placed in nomination the names of Charles W. Barker, Arthur J. Law and Walter Hardin. The latter, head of the Negro department of the U.A.W. and one of the founders of the Pontiac local of the U.A.W., thus becomes the first Negro ever to be nominated on a municipal ballot in the state of Michigan. But, despite the late start and meager finances, the returns were amazingly favorable. Running in a field of 12, the three labor candidates finished among the first six. The candidates, in the order of their finish, are as follows: Nelse S. Knudson 2,375; Roy A. Strausser 2,128; Arthur J. Law (labor) 1,868; Charles W. Barker (labor) 1,824; Maurice E. Baldwin 1,796; and Walter Hardin (labor) 1,609.

Active preparations for the April 4 elections are now under way with the entire labor movement aroused over the possibility of placing labor candidates on the City Commission. Especially gratifying were the returns from the Negro districts, which cast approximately 85% of its ballots for Walter Hardin and the rest of the labor ticket, and from certain districts inhabited mainly by Southern workers in spite of the fact that the race question was raised in order to weaken the labor slate.

G.M. Signs New Grievance Pact

(Continued from Page 1)

plants of 500 or less, however, there may be three committeemen. Plants of 500 to 1,000 may have five committeemen. Plants of 1,000 to 2,800 may have seven committeemen. Each committeeman is to have a definitely defined district.

Adjustment of the number of committeemen is to be effected by March 15. Thereafter, adjustments can be made once every six months according to the number of workers. (In the April 12, 1937 agreement, the size of the shop committee was from five to nine, with additional members in plans of more than 3,600 workers in the ratio one to 400.)

Either the U.A.W. or G.M. can request changes or modifications in the supplementary agreement by giving 30 days notice. Previously

Labor's Decreasing Share

(From the United States Census of Manufacturers)

| Year | Product Value | Wages | Labor's Share |
|------|------------------|----------------|---------------|
| 1849 | \$ 1,019,106,616 | \$ 236,755,464 | 23.2% |
| 1859 | 1,885,861,676 | 378,878,966 | 20.1% |
| 1869 | 4,232,325,442 | 775,584,343 | 18.3% |
| 1879 | 5,369,579,191 | 947,953,795 | 17.6% |
| 1889 | 9,372,378,843 | 1,891,219,696 | 20.1% |
| 1899 | 13,000,149,159 | 2,320,938,168 | 17.8% |
| 1909 | 20,672,051,870 | 3,427,037,884 | 16.5% |
| 1919 | 62,418,078,773 | 10,533,400,340 | 16.8% |
| 1929 | 69,960,909,712 | 11,607,287,154 | 16.6% |
| 1933 | 31,358,840,338 | 5,261,576,029 | 16.7% |
| 1935 | 45,759,763,062 | 7,544,338,434 | 16.5% |

Thus, in a period of 86 years, labor's share of the value of manufactured goods in the United States has fallen from 23.2% to 16.7%.

ANTI-WAR APPEAL AT HIPPODROME MEET

Vigorous opposition to the war-making plans of the Administration was voiced by every speaker at the big New York anti-war rally on March 6 at the Hippodrome. The meeting was under the auspices of the "Keep America Out of War" committee, a group of several hundred prominent figures in the labor, political and cultural fields.

Great emphasis on labor's leadership in the anti-war movement was laid by Bert Wolfe, spokesman for the Independent Communist Labor League. He traced the roots of war to capitalist imperialism and stressed the necessity of extending the anti-war struggle into a struggle against the capitalist system. The fight against war—Wolfe concluded—does not end with the declaration of war; it enters upon a more difficult and intensive stage of revolutionary struggle against the war-making regime.

Norman Thomas urged that the high sentiment at the meeting find expression in continued activity and pressure upon Congress in favor of the LaFollette-Ludlow war-referendum amendment and against all of the so-called "industrial-mobilization" bills. Homer Martin gave voice to the strong opposition to war prevalent among the masses of the workers, declaring that "labor will refuse to die in Wall Street's wars." "Collective security," he insisted, was really a sort of "international company unionism."

The chief speaker of the afternoon was Senator Robert M. LaFollette, who concluded with the following eight-point program:

"Resist the present effort to build up our navy beyond the needs of adequate defense.

"Adopt the amendment recently introduced by twelve Senators, which will give the American people the right to vote on the question of our becoming involved in a war outside this hemisphere.

"Oppose our participation in punitive collective action, whether

it be in the form of economic sanctions or war.

"End the fiction that war does not exist in the Far East and invoke the Neutrality Act, which will put an end to the allowed irresponsibility of our citizens remaining in war zones, travelling on belligerent ships, loaning money to belligerents and shipping their munitions to war zones.

"Oppose the war-mobilization bill which would confer broad dictatorial powers on the Executive in time of war.

"Advocate a genuine war-time taxation measure which will take the profits out of war.

"Adhere to the principle that our wealth and productive capacity shall not be diverted to the building of armaments from the purpose of expanding our domestic economy.

"Preserve democracy at home by the inauguration of a broad program to restore and conserve our resource base; provide adequate rural and urban housing; give educational opportunity for youth; obtain more generous standards for social security; and a more equitable distribution of our annual income."

Lessons of the Flint Elections

(Continued from Page 1)

tives of the rank-and-file "oppressed" by Martin's "bureaucracy," has been smashed to smithereens, so that even such a profound student of the labor movement as Heywood Broun can hardly miss it. The shady intriguers of the Stalinist stripe, together with their sanctimonious stooges, have received the kind of rebuke they can understand—a warning to keep their dirty paws out of the U.A.W. and its affairs. One thing the auto worker will not stand for and that is to permit the Stalinites to wreck his organization in order to satisfy their lust for political domination.

Most important of all, the whole country now knows that responsibility, discipline and constructive militancy, as represented by the Martin progressive leadership, have triumphed beyond challenge in the United Automobile Workers. This consideration is bound to carry great weight in the relation between the union and the big auto corporations; no longer, for example, will the latter be able to count on unauthorized outbreaks and sit-downs to play into their hands.

On February 5, the Daily Worker carried a big front-page diatribe against Homer Martin, an editorial of the vilest sort, just dripping over with filth and venom. It was headed: "Homer Martin — For Whom Does He Speak?" Let the Flint elections supply the answer!

RETURNING FROM EUROPE!

Jay Lovestone
on
Europe Near
The Abyss

a mass meeting to be held
Thursday, April 7

HOTEL CENTER
108 W. 43rd St.

GEORGE HALPERN
on
"C.I.O. and A.F.L."

Sunday, March 20
11 A.M.

1729 Pitkin Ave., Brooklyn

Auspices: Local 117,
I.L.G.W.U.