

Next Week:
Some Socialist Problems
By Norman Thomas

Workers Age

Weekly Paper of the Independent Labor League of America

"WHY I LEFT THE COMMUNIST PARTY" . . . page 3.
SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY . . . by
Abram L. Harris . . . page 4.

VOL. 8, NO. 44.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1939.

5 CENTS

AT FIRST GLANCE

by Jay Lovestone

KEEP OFF THE ROAD TO HELL!

WITH the Senate's adoption of Roosevelt's "neutrality" measure, the curtain has fallen on Act I of the tragedy that the dominant forces in our ruling class are seeking to force upon the country. Soon the battle in the House will begin. The Representatives—all, and not only one-third of whom, face the electorate next year—will probably enact amendments interfering more effectively with the President's studied efforts to lead us into the war. Congress, always closer and more responsive to the will of the masses, must be given redoubled support, to halt or at least gravely hinder, the war-makers.

In this connection, we must stress that the heaviest artillery of the pro-war forces will undoubtedly be turned on the House. America's Number 1 Merchant of Death, Eugene G. Grace of Bethlehem Steel infamy, has just declared that his corporation has "earned" \$5,377,470 profits in the last three months, "a 100% increase in the second-quarter common-stock dividend," and was "in full 100% general all-round production at this time." Simultaneously, the King of America's munition makers declared himself vigorously in favor of the Roosevelt "neutrality" bill. No ill-conceived gold-dust twins for Old Man Grace! Obviously not, when one learns that Bethlehem's unfilled order book at the end of September was \$263,357,017—a peace-time record and exceeded only in 1918 after America's entry into the previous war to "make the world safe for democracy."

But the campaign to lift the embargo is not the only means employed by our more virulent war-mongers. Lobbying, propaganda and graft mills will soon be operating in full swing. Shortly, the country will be treated to some shocking details of a drastic Industrial Mobilization Plan. "Imponderable prejudice" is being feverishly generated to drive us into the conflagration. And all this despite the fact that well over 90% of our people are known to be against American participation. The tragic irony of it is that it is in no small measure being done in the name of "democracy" and "world peace."

No less sinister are the efforts of the preparedness drummers. Here we must take with a great deal of salt Roosevelt's statement that there will be no A.E.F. this time. The highest army officers are working overtime to show how "inadequate" are the American military and naval forces. Business Week reports that "a million men (under arms) and a billion dollars" is the battle-cry of an active preparedness group. Pleased as big-navy proponents are with Roosevelt's 1941 budget, they are planning to ask for still more. The airplane boosters are as noisy in their clamor for more fortresses of the air.

However, a most menacing phase of the militarization of the land is the President's repeated appointment of high army officers to posts of administration of social services. Page Colonels Harrington, Somervell, and most recently, Fleming. These military geniuses of the swivel chair brigade can thus do the meanest jobs against the working people via faithful administration of bad laws or maladministration of good laws. Then, they can and will go back to their army posts—free from all consequences of popular resentment and electoral disapproval. One could hardly devise a more decisive move towards annihilation of democratic rights and towards the fascization of the prevailing government machinery. Roosevelt takes prime dishonor for this ingenious and crushing contribution.

The slightest infirmity of purpose—particularly on the part of labor—in resisting all of these moves, the covert as well as the overt, would prove fatal to America and the world. Here there cannot be excessive vigilance. The hardest unceasing, coordinated work by the war-hating and the peace-loving forces of the country—especially by the millions of organized trade unionists—alone can save us here and elsewhere from the hell thus painfully portrayed by Walter Hines Page, Wilson's ambassador to the Court of St. James:

"You will recall more clearly than I certain horrible, catastrophic, universal-ruin passages in Revelation—monsters swallowing the universe, blood and fire and clouds and an eternal crash, rolling ruin
(Continued on page 2)

FDR Wins Embargo Repeal In Senate

Pittman Bill Carries by 63 to 30; Stiff Opposition is Expected in the House

Washington, D. C. After several days of high-pressure parliamentary driving by Vice-President Garner and his aides, the Senate last week cleared the Pittman neutrality bill with a victory for the Administration program of repealing the embargo on the export of arms to belligerents abroad. The repealer carried in the Senate by a vote of 63 to 30. On a resolution to include the arms embargo, the vote stood 33 to 6.

Before action on repeal itself, the Senate passed on a long series of amendments, introduced largely by representatives of the peace block in order to strengthen the keep-out-of-war features of the Pittman measure and to cushion as far as possible the effects of the scrapping of the arms ban. A number of amendments were also brought in by Administration spokesmen as concessions to the strong neutrality sentiment as well as to certain special interests clamoring for "recognition." Particularly important was the proposal by Senator Pittman to strike out the ninety-day credit clause and to confine all transactions with belligerents strictly to cash. This was carried, as was also another amendment by the same Senator to allow American ships to carry passengers and goods, except arms and munitions, to belligerent ports in the Pacific Ocean and tributary waters and in the Atlantic from Bermuda south in the western hemisphere. The effect of this modification of the bill to the advantage of the shipping interests was to restrict the ban on the transportation of goods and passengers on American ships merely to the home ports of belligerents in Europe, with the rest of the world, including dominions and colonies of warring powers, left wide open. Spokesmen of the peace block warned that this relaxation of the original "carry" provisions of the Pittman bill would greatly increase the danger of American involvement in war.

The Administration forces also sponsored an amendment prohibiting the extension of American credits to private citizens of belligerent states for the purchase of arms and munitions. The original bill banned credits to warring governments or their agents but had nothing to say about loans or credits to private citizens of belligerent countries. The amended bill still permits such loans and credits to citizens of countries at war for the purchase of everything except arms and munitions.

Spokesmen of the peace block again warned that the freedom given to private loans would facilitate circumvention of the ban on loans and credits since private citizens could very well act unofficially for their governments if the necessity arose.

A still further relaxation of strict "cash-and-carry" was voted by the Administration majority in the Senate in passing Senators Brown's and Connally's amendments that title to goods shipped to Canada and to other "permissible" outlying belligerent ports would not have to be transferred to the purchaser before the goods left the country.

All amendments offered by pro-neutrality Senators or even by arms-repeal supporters without the sanction of the Administration leaders were defeated. Among the most important of these were the following:

By Senator LaFollette—to place peace-time quota restrictions on all exports from this country to warring nations. LaFollette made a strong plea for his proposal by pointing out that the United States could best secure itself against being entangled economically in the European war and against building up an economic stake in the conduct and outcome of the war by limiting its exports in every category to peace-time levels and thus preventing the appearance of war boom. He was supported by Senators Nye, Downey, Vandenberg, Lodge, Bennett Clark and others. The Administration forces did not make any serious attempt to argue the issue. They defeated the LaFollette proposal by 66 votes to 21, for the steam-roller was at work.

By Senator Taft—to declare all waters within 300 miles of the continent of Europe, Great Britain and Ireland as combat areas where American ships may not travel. Defeated.

By Senator Bennett Clark—to include a member each from the Senate and House on the Munitions Control Board so as to provide Congressional supervision over its very important activities. Defeated 45 to 41.

By Senator Johnson of Colorado—to limit the discretion of the President to find a state of war. Defeated.

By Senator Downey and others—a number of amendments to keep the arms embargo in various forms. All defeated.

Even legislative experts could not tell last week what the neutrality
(Continued on page 2)

Roosevelt vs. Roosevelt

(From President Roosevelt's Chautauqua Address, 1936.)

"IF war should break out again on another continent, let us not blink the fact that we should find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or to evade our neutrality . . . To resist the clamor of that breed . . . would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace."

(From President Roosevelt's message to Congress urging the repeal of the arms embargo, Sept. 22, 1939.)

"WHAT is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there, when we could provide employment to thousands by doing it here?"

London Offers to OK Stalin Grab

Chamberlain States Russian Invasion, Seizure of Poland Were "Defensive"

Another strong effort to "woo" Stalin in order to drive a wedge into the Russo-German alliance and thus isolate Hitler was made last week by Prime Minister Chamberlain and Foreign Secretary Halifax in declarations in Parliament virtually justifying Russia's invasion of Poland and seizure of a large part of that country. Mr. Chamberlain's statement was made in the House of Commons in answer to a question. He said that the government believed it had been "necessary" for the Russian army to occupy part of Poland as a measure of "defense." In the House of Lords the same day, Foreign Secretary Halifax made a more elaborate declaration to the

same effect. He even mentioned that the Russian annexation of sections of Poland had had the effect of advancing "the Russian boundary substantially to that recommended at the time of the Versailles conference by Lord Curzon," then British Foreign Secretary, thereby implying that if Stalin behaved properly, a victorious Britain might let him retain his share of the Polish spoils.

The Chamberlain-Halifax statement produced somewhat of a sensation in British political circles. It was pointed out that it completely stultified the Anglo-French contention that the war was being fought to maintain the sanctity of treaties, to protect small nations and to bring about the restoration of Czechoslovakia and Poland. In government quarters, it was hinted that remarks of the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary committed Britain to nothing definite and were only intended to provide "an approach to Stalin."

However that may be, the attempt was far from successful. Russia continued cooperating very closely with Germany, not only providing it with economic assistance, but also serving it as a sort of diplomatic agent. Thus Moscow last week challenged the British blockade, saying it violated international law, harmed neutrals, destroyed trade and menaced peaceful populations. London did not answer the Soviet note.

Russia's curious position as a "neutral" was called into question in another quarter last week when the American freighter, City of Flint, captured by a German prize crew presumably as a carrier of contraband, was brought to the Russian port of Murmansk. Washington immediately demanded that the Russian authorities release the freighter with her crew and cargo but little headway could be made even in getting the necessary information. At first, it was reported that the City of Flint with her German prize crew in command had been released and was proceeding to Hamburg, hoping to evade the British blockade. Then it appeared that it was still at Murmansk. The Russian authorities insisted that everything was in full accord with international law, but at Washington the State Department let it be known that it "questioned" Moscow's neutrality. Considerable comment was aroused by the curious cloak of mystery thrown about the whole affair by official circles in Russia and Germany.

Russian "aggrandizement" took on extended form last week when it met with new difficulties. The Russo-Finnish negotiations were still at a deadlock, the indications being that Moscow demanded a measure of control over the Aland Islands which Finland, ready to make other concessions in line with the recommendations of the Scandinavian conference the week before, seemed determined not to grant. There were also rumors that a Russian drive on Norway and Sweden would not be long in appearing, beginning with the demand that the two Swedish ports of Goteborg and Karlskrona as well as some Norwegian ports be placed at the disposal of the Russian navy. Other reports indicated that in the division of spheres of influence between Russian and Germany the latter had obtained a "controlling in-
(Continued on Page 2)

Ten Years After the Great Crash—What Now?

THIS month marks an important anniversary. But it is an anniversary that is not likely to be widely or loudly celebrated. For it is the tenth anniversary of the descent of the Great Depression upon this land of ours and the world in 1929.

Ten years after, in October 1939, business indices are shooting up, prices are rising, industrial production is expanding; indeed, steel has reached 90% capacity. But it is a "prosperity" about which there is little boasting, for it is almost entirely a war boom, an inflationary "prosperity" based on European war buying and the eager hope of more to come. It is a "prosperity" that merely accentuates the Great Depression in its tenth year.

For that depression is still with us. It is still with us in the fundamentally unsound condition of industry and trade that virtually all serious students of the problem recognize as characteristic of our present-day economic life. It is with us above all in the more than ten million unemployed that have remained, now somewhat more, now a little less, for the entire decade. In this vast army of the disemployed, of outcasts from our economic society, we have the full measure of the profound crisis that has gripped the country without essential abatement for the entire decade.

Now, at the end of the decade, we can see clearly that there has been no real abatement of the economic crisis. Neither Herbert Hoover's magic spells ("Prosperity is around the corner!") nor Franklin Delano Roosevelt's bewildering succession of remedies, panaceas and expedients—from the N.R.A. to "public investment"—have helped. Indeed, what better sign that the crisis is still with us do we need than the President's own insistence that "emergency" measures are still necessary to keep things going on the tenth anniversary of the onset of the Great Depression?

For what is wrong with our economy is not a surface ailment that can be remedied with some salve, change of regime or even a blood transfusion; it is a deep-seated disease that can really be cured only by a fundamental reconstitution of the bases of our economic existence. It is a disease rooted in the constantly growing disproportion, inherent in the system of modern capitalism, between capacity to produce and "effective" capacity to consume, between productive power and purchasing power. And as long as the system of private property in the means of production and production for profit that is capitalism persists, this chasm too will persist and grow ever wider, this chasm that threatens to swallow up all of us in ruin and destruction.

Whatever the immediate future may hold, whatever heights the war boom may reach, whatever "revivals" and "recoveries" there may be in store, followed all too soon by ever deeper "recessions," the Great Depression will continue to weigh down on us like a nightmare, and, like a nightmare dreadful in its waking reality, it will continue to teem with horrible, all-devouring monsters—the monsters of fascism, totalitarianism and war.

Only along the road to socialism lies salvation!

Real Danger Is Seen in Dies Anti-Red Drive

Frank Howard's Weekly Washington Letter

By FRANK HOWARD

Washington, D. C. WASHINGTON Communist Party members and fellow-travelers are frantic because of the activities of the Dies Committee and increasing evidence that the F.B.I. is also going to crack down. Although I have no interest in keeping the truth about the C.P. from coming to light, I have grave doubts about the methods of the reactionary Martin Dies and his committee. There is too much of the odor of the old-time "Red"-hunt of the Palmer days about this present campaign. All the loose talk about outlawing the C.P. and the Bund is not being denied by the Dies Committee. Although the C.P. and Bund have both invited this persecution by their outrageous tactics, their double-crossing methods and their Moscow and Berlin connections, outlawing them would most emphatically not solve the problem.

It is urgently important that the

New Dealers on the Dies Committee define the aims of the committee more precisely and make clear what they don't intend to propose as well as what they do favor.

The Stalinists could not ask for anything more to their benefit than action which smacks of abridgement of civil rights and freedom of speech. This is the opinion of many about the C.P. from coming to light, I have grave doubts about the methods of the reactionary Martin Dies and his committee. There is too much of the odor of the old-time "Red"-hunt of the Palmer days about this present campaign. All the loose talk about outlawing the C.P. and the Bund is not being denied by the Dies Committee. Although the C.P. and Bund have both invited this persecution by their outrageous tactics, their double-crossing methods and their Moscow and Berlin connections, outlawing them would most emphatically not solve the problem.

THE EMBARGO ISSUE IN THE HOUSE

It is going to be a very close victory in the House for the anti-embargo crowd if they do not lose by a few votes. Again, I repeat, send letters and telegrams to your Congressmen and visit them if possible.

The present Gallup poll results show the effectiveness of the campaign hitherto waged to keep America out of war. The current Business Week speaks fearfully of the pos-
(Continued on page 2)

There Is Still Time to Act!

ADMINISTRATION leaders are far from confident that they have a majority of votes in the House to repeal the arms embargo. Survey showed a close division and is leading to renewed pressure to assure repeal.—"Washington Whispers," United States News, Oct. 23, 1939. Now more than ever is it necessary for the great masses of the American people who are determined to keep America out of war to make their voice heard in Washington. Write or wire your Congressman immediately urging him to vote to save the arms embargo and to strengthen the present neutrality legislation. Don't delay!

The ALP and the War Issue

By WILL HERBERG

SOME weeks ago in these columns, in the October 21 issue of this paper, we explained editorially why, despite our disagreement with much of the "Resolution on the Present European Conflict" that is now being used by the A.L.P. to purge its ranks of Stalinism, we urged members of the A.L.P. to vote for it if they could not obtain a separate vote on the two unrelated parts. It is logically combined in a single document. In this article, we want to examine those features of the resolution with which we disagree and to indicate briefly why we think that they represent an unsound viewpoint for a progressive labor organization to adopt.

WHAT KIND OF WAR IS IT?

What, exactly, is it to which we object? The essential point is the way the resolution analyzes the conflict now under way in Europe. "The present war in Europe," it declares, "has finally brought to a decisive struggle the conflict between the European democracies and the Hitler regime. . . . The western democracies . . . are fighting for the preservation of those democratic values and liberties which we in this country treasure so dearly."

Is this analysis sound? I maintain that it is so transparently unsound, so contrary to the obvious facts of the situation, that only uncritical emotionalism can possibly justify it.

England and France are fighting for democracy, to preserve "democratic values and liberties"? But who nourished, fostered and bol-

stered up fascist dictatorships in Italy and Germany thru all these years if not England, assisted by France? Is it necessary to rehearse the long story, beginning with England's direct economic and financial assistance to Mussolini in the early days of his regime and ending with Munich? We can hardly avoid a feeling of scepticism as to the genuineness of the sudden antipathy of official England and France for fascist dictatorship and their sudden devotion to the cause of democracy abroad.

Besides, if they want us to believe that they are so deeply attached to the cause of democracy, why don't they practise some of it at home? The British and French empires include scores of millions of colored peoples—quite as human as the whites and quite as much entitled to freedom—who are as thoroughly enslaved and as subject to ruthless, arbitrary dictatorship as are the masses in Germany or Italy. What faith can we place in a crusade for democracy waged by those who themselves exercise brutal authoritarian rule over their own subjects? What would you think of a Simon Legree suddenly posing as a champion of freedom for someone else's slaves while he himself continues cracking the whip over his own? And if you don't believe England and France are Simon Legrees on a world scale, just look at central and South Africa, just look at India and Indo-China!

"SAVING" DEMOCRACY BY DESTROYING IT

England and France are out to save democracy, we are told, but

how do they begin? In England, there are still some constitutional liberties left, but France is as thoroughly authoritarian as any regime in Europe. Declares Time, the well-known news-magazine, in its September 25 issue: "Paradox of democratic countries is that as soon as one of them begins defending democracy, it ceases to be a democracy. Last week, France became a full-fledged totalitarian state." A fine way of making the world safe for democracy, by destroying it at home to start with!

There is still another angle from which the self-imputed devotion to the cause of democracy on the part of the Allies seems mighty queer. With all the sympathy in the world for the unfortunate Polish people, no one can deny that the so-called Polish Republic was one of the most undemocratic, one of the most despotic regimes on earth, reactionary and anti-Semitic to the very core. England and France were both close allies of Poland; indeed, they say they went to war for its sake. Why didn't they, in their extraordinary love for democracy and hatred of fascism, exert a little pressure on Colonel Beck or General Smigly-Rydz to give the Polish masses a chance to breathe freely, to let up on the Jews and the national minorities? Not only might that have been a very tangible evidence of their devotion to democracy where it really counts, but it might also conceivably have increased Poland's capacities of self-defense. But, of course, nothing of the sort was forthcoming. Somehow, Chamberlain and Daladier are so concerned about emancipating the Germans that they

have no thought to give to their own empires or to their own allies. It seems mighty queer.

I think we may be permitted to feel a little sceptical about the new "war to make the world safe for democracy," especially in the light of our experiences with the last war in which the same glittering catchwords were used to lead the world to—Versailles!

I think that a realistic view of the situation is bound to convince any serious observer, who does not allow uncritical emotionalism to becloud his vision, that this present war is in all essentials but the continuation of the World War of 1914-1918, a resumption of the same war after a brief breathing-spell in which the combatants—especially Germany, the loser—could recuperate their powers. It is an imperialistic war in the crudest sense, a war for power, profit and domination. Germany wants to force a redivision of the imperialist plunder; England and France are determined to protect their huge share of the loot, the fruit of past aggressions. Everything else, all the talk about "self-determination" and "democracy" and "freedom," is mostly just so much eye-wash, just fancy ideology designed to cover up the naked imperialistic aims of the war and to rally the masses at home and abroad to the war.

WHAT WILL THE OUTCOME BE?

"In this struggle," declares the A.L.P. resolution, "the fate of Europe hangs in the balance. A victory for Hitlerism will inevitably mean
(Continued on page 3)



VOTE FOR THE A.L.P. CANDIDATES FOR CITY COUNCIL



Labor Ranks Unite For Miners Defense

AFL, CIO Join Hands to Free DuQuoin Boys

Chicago, Ill. A very encouraging example of close cooperation between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. in a cause that should be close to the heart of labor everywhere is to be found in the movement to obtain the freedom of the five DuQuoin boys sentenced in 1933 to life terms in prison as a result of violence growing out of the bitter jurisdictional conflict between the United Mine Workers and the Progressive Miners of America in the Southern Illinois coal fields.

REAL UNITED COOPERATION

On the Du Quoin Miners Defense Committee, of which Gerry Allard is head, are to be found side by side such men as Reuben Soderstrom, president of the Illinois Federation of Labor; John Battuelo, Board member of the A.F.L.'s Progressive Miners of America; and Ray Edmondson, president of District 12 of the C.I.O.'s United Mine Workers. Among the organizations supporting the movement are scores of affiliates of both the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. It is a case of real united cooperation of all sections of the labor movement.

FACTS BEHIND THE CASE

The story of the Du Quoin boys, as told in the material issued by the defense committee, is one of intense interest. On the night of April 6, 1933, it appears, a stray bullet fired by an unidentified person killed young Laverne Miller at Du Quoin, Perry County, Illinois. The shooting followed a pitched battle between strikers and non-strikers at the United Electric Coal Co. strip mine near Du Quoin. The United Mine Workers of America and the then recently-formed Progressive Miners union were engaged in a bitter struggle for jurisdictional control in the Illinois coal fields.

Feelings rose to white heat between followers of the two unions. On the following day, two local leaders of the Progressives, James Attes and Henry Arnold, were murdered in cold blood by Perry County deputy sheriffs. Violence was rampant throughout the Southern Illinois coal fields. Scores were injured in numerous clashes. Many were arrested. Hundreds lost their jobs.

In this setting, five young men—Olis Battaglia, Sam Ferro, Barney Bossetto, Emery Albers and Robert Shingleton—were arrested, held incommunicado, grilled, cruelly beaten, arraigned for trial and summarily sentenced to prison, four of them to life terms, Albers to forty years.

They were tried at Jonesboro, Union County, Illinois, instead of in Perry County, ostensibly because of the bitterness existing in the latter county at that time. Prior to the convening of the trial, the boys were transferred to at least three different county jails. They were shuffled from jail to jail, a defense attorney stated, to prevent immediate legal assistance.

At Jonesboro, a jury of farmers, most of them fruit growers and annually beset with labor problems of their own, rendered a verdict of guilty.

Four of the boys had signed "confessions" under duress. When brought to trial, they repudiated their signed statements, claiming that the physical and moral punishment inflicted by local and state authorities was more than they could endure. They professed their innocence through.

Economic conditions had driven the miners to a fierce combat and in many counties "law and order" did not exist. It can be stated without fear of contradiction that many law-enforcement officers were in league with coal companies.

Three special representatives of the Attorney General's office were dispatched to the trial to augment the prosecution's forces. A ballistics expert from Northwestern University was employed to aid the prosecution. The power of the state was thrown into motion for a conviction. Against all these forces stood a lone attorney. Evidence presented by the state to this date remains circumstantial. But a conviction had to be obtained. And the boys were railroaded to prison. They were given the maximum penalty short of the death sentence.

London Offers to OK Stalin Grab

(Continued from Page 1)

terest" in Denmark, Sweden and Norway.

Russian expansion took a southern direction last week with Rumania and Persia immediately involved. In his address from the throne, the Shah of Iran (Persia) announced that negotiations between his government and Moscow were under way. Russia's interest was directed largely towards Iran's rich oil lands and control of the Persian Gulf. These moves evidently carried considerable menace to Turkey and to the British protectorate of Iraq.

Diplomats in the Balkans declared last week that any Russian attempt to take Bessarabia from Rumania, and such an attempt was under contemplation in Moscow, would find no assistance for Rumania forthcoming.

It was the first labor experience for any of them. None had "radical" philosophies. Battaglia, a youth of 18, had just graduated from high school. Ferro was an unemployed garage worker. Robert Shingleton, altho a striker, was still a member of the United Mine Workers. Bossetto and Albers were members of the Progressive union.

CONDITIONS MADE THE CRIME

The boys have already spent six long years in prison. If forgotten and left to the whims of the authorities, they are doomed to die in the penitentiary. But informed public opinion that understands the true situation in Illinois, that realizes the boys are paying the penalty for an industrial grievance over which they had no control, can exert the necessary pressure for their immediate release.

To make these five boys pay the price for a breakdown in law enforcement is a cruel injustice. If the violence that marked the Illinois coal fields during 1932-33-34 had to be accounted for, then it is necessary to understand the economic and social conditions arising out of the coal industry which bred poverty, unemployment, part-time work and no relief. It is necessary to understand the role of law-enforcement officers, who were for the most part brutal lawbreakers themselves. It is necessary to understand that tens of thousands of people were parties to the violence, either offensively or defensively. Forty men, one woman and one girl died violent deaths in the Illinois mine war.

Bitterness between the warring groups has diminished. The United Mine Workers of America, which naturally had an interest in the case in 1933, and the Progressive Miners union, recently signed a joint petition to the governor asking him to pardon the five boys and assuring him their release would do much to promote industrial peace in Illinois.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

The Du Quoin Miners Defense Committee urges all those who want to help free the five boys to do the following:

1. Write to Governor Henry Horner and the State Board of Pardons and Paroles, Springfield, Ill., asking that the boys be pardoned.
2. Get your organization to write a letter or adopt a resolution on behalf of the whole membership telling Governor Horner and the Board that you support the appeal of the United Mine Workers and the Progressive Miners for the release of the five boys.

Harlem A.L.P. Campaign Fights Inner Sabotage

Welsh Blasts Tammany and Stalinists

By JESSIE ARVEATUS

New York City. An estimated 69,000 registrations in Harlem for the coming elections indicates the intense interest of Harlem voters in electing a Negro to the New York City Council. This is a relatively high figure for an off-year, when it is considered that only 75,000 votes are needed to elect one councilman, declared Edward K. Welsh in a talk delivered at the West 135th Street Y.M.C.A. last Friday, as the Harlem Branch of the Independent Labor League of America held its first educational forum of the Fall season.

Analyzing the issues of the present election campaign, Welsh pointed out that both Tammany Hall and the Communist Party elements in the American Labor Party were responsible for the difficulties with which the Crosswaith campaign was confronted. When the A.L.P. selected Frank Crosswaith as its candidate, Welsh charged, the Stalinists in the A.L.P. started a whispering campaign against him, refused to cir-

culate petitions for his nomination on the ballot, and in some cases even destroyed signed petitions in the A.L.P. clubs. In spite of this opposition and sabotage, more than sufficient signatures were filed for Crosswaith by midnight October 10. Patrick Curran, Tammany man, filed an objection to the Crosswaith petitions and was supported by J. T. Dooling, head of the legal staff of Tammany Hall.

On October 24, the Board of Elections ruled Frank Crosswaith off the ballot, charging that he lacked 250 valid signatures. The technicality on which the signatures were held invalid was that assembly and election districts were not listed or did not correspond to last year's enrollment records. The case was brought before Judge Aaron Levy. The A.L.P. counsel defended the validity of the signatures on the ground that many Harlem voters had moved since last year and had therefore automatically changed their voting districts; furthermore, that many voters were not aware of the fact that a change in address would also effect a change in their voting district. The judge withheld a decision until both sides had an opportunity to present briefs.

"AIN'TCHA HEARD?"



—from Justice

Tips Are Not Wages, Rules Andrews

Washington, D. C.

ELMER F. Andrews, until recent-ly Wages and Hours Administrator, issued the ruling that he did not regard tips as wages. The government, he said, would seek an early federal court test on the legality of "an accounting and guarantee arrangement" made by the majority of American railroads with their 7,000 red-caps after the Wages and Hours Act became effective. The matter had been brought before Mr. Andrews by the Brotherhood of Red Caps, which contended that tips should not be counted as wages within the meaning of the law and that the railroad companies were obligated to pay the prescribed minimum wages to red-caps.

Releasing new regulations regarding records which railroads must keep concerning their red-caps and station porters, Mr. Andrews said that the railroads requirement of the red-caps to deduct tips from the 25-cent hourly minimum wage which the law requires "clearly violate the spirit of the Fair Labor Standards Act."

"Whether they violate the letter of the law is up to the courts to determine," he added. "Such a determination will be sought at an early date."

Certain railroads, Mr. Andrews added, were already paying their red-caps and porters a regular wage without reference to tips.

Food Union Progressives Unite Ranks

New York City.

ON Monday, September 18, several scores of delegates representing progressive groups in nine Greater New York locals of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers International met in conference and resolved to organize the progressive struggle on an inter-local, city-wide basis for the purpose of ridding the union of the "cancer of Communist Party policy and Communist Party domination." Meeting in all-day sessions which seriously and soberly discussed the problems facing the locals, the delegates subjected the past history and the present reactionary role of the clique dominating their organizations to a searching analysis.

The conference was opened by the temporary chairman, Louis Rifkin, of Local 1, who addressed the gathering on every aspect of union problems and was warmly received by those present. Then committees were elected which went over draft resolutions, a program, and an organizational set-up. The reports of the committees and discussion of them took up most of the time of the conference.

The conference called on all honest members of the locals to unite in the struggle for strong, democratic, militant unions in the industry, and pledged its firm support to any member victimized because of his activities in the interests of the membership.

Officers were elected who are, together with the Joint Executive Committee consisting of three delegates from each local group, to conduct the business of the Inter-Local Progressive Culinary Workers.

The conference also decided to issue a paper, Inter-Local Progressive, the first number of which has already appeared, dated October 1939.

Canadian Police Seize Militants

Toronto, Canada.

ON October 4, 1939, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Toronto police raided the homes of four men, Arthur Bortolotti, Ruggero Benvenuti, Ernest Gava and Marco Joachim, and arrested them on the charge of possessing "subversive literature." They were held without bail, pending trial, which was postponed from October 12. If found guilty under the new Canadian war measures, they will be given heavy prison sentences.

Leading the fight for the release of these innocent men is the seventy-year-old Emma Goldman, well-known radical leader. Besides making legal defense of the imprisoned men difficult by denying bail, the Canadian government has refused to make public any significant information concerning the case. In reporting the arrests, the Toronto Daily Star pointed out that it was unable to learn from the authorities what the nature of these "subversive" documents was.

U.S. Contracts Bolster Anti-Union Firms

Washington, D. C.

AS things are beginning to shape up, it would be no exaggeration to say that the mounting wave of rearmament orders constitutes a bigger threat to the Wagner Act than even the attacks of reactionaries.

Under the Walsh-Healey Act, the government sets up standards of labor on government contracts and punishes violation of these standards by making the responsible corporations ineligible to receive such contracts for three years. There is nothing in the law, however, which forbids granting of contracts to firms that violate the Wagner Act.

For several years, there have been attempts to plug this gap in the labor set-up. Twice amendments were passed by the Senate—first as a rider to a "national-defense" bill and later as an authorization to the Secretary of Labor to add to the ineligible list all firms found guilty in the courts of violating the National Labor Relations Act. Each time, the amendment was killed by the House Rules Committee.

So it is no legal barrier to a government contract if the firm resists the law which puts teeth in collective bargaining for labor. For example, during the six-week period from August 14 to September 30, the following firms got these contracts:

- Bethlehem Steel—contracts for eight orders totaling \$785,665.68, including one navy contract for \$609,000.
- Inland Steel—contracts for four orders totaling \$1,229,687.15, includ-

Labor and the Law

by Joseph Elwood

AFL, CIO REVERSE ATTITUDES ON WAGNER ACT

THE balance in attitude of the two labor federations towards the Wagner Act has now shifted officially. These shifts in policies were made at the annual conventions of the two organizations.

While the A. F. of L. decided to subordinate its more drastic proposals for amending the act to the single proposal that a five-man Labor Board be established, the C.I.O. decided to launch an attack on the act as administered by the present Board. According to John L. Lewis's report to the convention, "it becomes necessary to consider and weigh carefully

ing a T.V.A. order for \$1,035,806.60. During the same period, the following firms, which had been found guilty of violating the Wagner Act in Labor Board decisions, got substantial government contracts: Crucible Steel Co.; Lukens Steel Co.; Douglas Aircraft (one navy order of \$716,900); Electric Boat Co. (during the six-week period it received \$11,608,000 in orders from the navy for the construction of submarines); United Aircraft Corp. (\$973,505.27 in airplane orders). C.I.O. lawyers have presented to the President a carefully reasoned memorandum which argues that he has complete legal authority to issue an executive order putting a stop to this practise. But the White House refuses to act. It refuses to "hamper" the "national-defense" program by denying orders to heavy industries, regardless of whether they have violated the Wagner Act or not. And, if these industries can successfully flout the law, what chance has it of effective enforcement elsewhere?

War Breeds Dictatorship

"WAR, and particularly modern war, invests a government engaged in it with unlimited dictatorial power. We saw it come very near doing that for the democracies between 1914 and 1918; if war comes again, we shall see it doing so to the limit of absolutism. . . ."

—Wall Street Journal

whether the benefits of the act outweigh the dangers which its administration inflicts upon organized labor. At this time, it is worth recording that in contrast to last year's convention of the A. F. of L., when the resolution for amending the Wagner Act was carried unanimously, big opposition arose this year. It was led by a delegate from the Sulphite, Paper and Mill Workers, who very appropriately declared:

"How about labor indulging in a little self-criticism? . . . The split in the ranks of organized labor has made it most difficult for the National Labor Relations Board to administer the Act in a fair manner, and you know it." These are the right words at the right moment! We only wish that somebody had uttered the same words at the C.I.O. convention.

Problem of Bargaining Unit

The question: "What is an appropriate bargaining unit, and how is it determined?" divides the three members of the National Labor Relations Board as they have never been divided before. In six representation cases, all three members of the Board have written separate opinions illustrating three principal theories, the outcome in each case being dependent on which two of the three theories happen to coincide in application to a particular set of facts.

Many blame the law's complete silence on this point for the whole confusion. But the real and only solution to the problem is a united labor movement. That and that alone can eliminate this difficult problem now facing the Labor Board.

In a recent decision, that involving the Iowa Southern Utilities Company (15 N.L.R.B., No. 62, Sept. 22, 1939), the National Labor Relations Board stated that it might reconsider its findings as to an appropriate bargaining unit if an election revealed that organization has not advanced sufficiently. In such a situation, said the Board, Leiserson dissenting, new proceedings may be brought for consideration with the object of establishing only one district as a unit instead of a company-wide unit.

Last week, after winning elections in ten out of the Chrysler Corporation's thirteen plants, the United Automobile Workers, C.I.O., requested the Labor Board to certify it as the representative of all the corporation's production workers, altho the Board in its recent decision and direction of elections had found individual plant units to be appropriate.

If the Iowa Southern Utilities Company decision foreshadows a general practise of the Board to redetermine units on the basis of exceptional circumstances, a possibility exists that the U.A.W.-C.I.O.'s petition may be granted.

FDR Wins Arms Repeal Vote

(Continued from Page 1)

bill as passed by the Senate looked like amidst the welter of scores of amendments. About the only thing certain was that the arms embargo was repealed and that the original Pittman bill had been tightened up in one or two spots but greatly relaxed in others.

The whole neutrality issue now comes before the House of Representatives as an amendment to the Bloom bill introduced during the last session. There is a widespread belief that the neutrality block will muster considerable strength in the lower chamber.

Spokesmen for peace organizations stressed that the outcome in the House would depend to a large extent on the expressions of public sentiment that would reach the Congressmen. They therefore called upon all citizens interested in keeping America out of war to communicate with their Congressmen urging them to save the arms embargo and otherwise strengthen the neutrality law.

power or any pack of capitalist warmakers and plunderers. We in this country can still do it—and thus help return the world to peace, sanity and a resumption of social progress. October 27, 1939.

The "City of Flint" Case: As It Might Have Been

Daily Worker Changes Its Tune Fast

By JACK SODERBERG

October 23, 1939.

THE headline in the Daily Worker referring to the capture of the City of Flint reads:

"U.S.S.R. INTERNES GERMAN CREW WHICH SEIZED U. S. VESSEL."

Just a short month ago, a story in the Daily Worker, reporting this incident would have read something like this:

"NAZI PIRATES ROAMING THE HIGH SEAS CAPTURE NEUTRAL SHIP."

A sub line would have told us that:

"American ship on a voyage of mercy carrying food and clothing for war orphans is seized by lawless Nazi pirates."

This would have been followed by a story of how these pirates boarded an American ship and simply shanghaied the crew, and how the Daily Worker and the Communist Party demanded an "immediate inquiry."

The C.P. would further have demanded that all American ships in their lawful and peaceful trade with the "great democracies" be allowed to sail unmolested on the high seas, or failing such assurance from the powers concerned, a further demand would have been made that all American ships forthwith be supplied a convoy by "our navy" to protect "our" ships against these roaming pirates. The League for Peace and Democracy and various front organizations would have passed resolutions accordingly. But that, my friends, would have been a month ago. Things have changed since then. In fact, not only has the

Frank Howard's Weekly Letter

(Continued from page 1)

sibility of the embargo not being repealed.

A NEW LINE-UP IN THE FAR EAST?

New Dealers say you can expect some spectacular developments in the Far East in a few weeks or within two months. Ambassador Grew's strong speech was made with approval of the ruling faction in Japan. This message had to be given to the Japanese people and no Japanese wanted to break the news. It is in preparation for a new Franco-British-American-Japanese agreement of some sort. Russian aid to Chiang Kai-shek is playing into the hands of the present pro-British Japanese government. If this new agreement works out, it will probably be a victory for Japanese and American imperialism. The British Empire will have to make many concessions.

At First Glance

(Continued from Page 1)

enveloping all things—well, all that's come. There are, perhaps, one hundred million persons to whom death would be a blessing. The hills about Verdun are not blown to pieces worse than the whole social structure and intellectual and spiritual life of Europe. I wonder that anybody is sane. Let's keep off the road to hell. Let's not make death a blessing for many many millions—no matter what hypocritical calls be made to us in behalf of any imperialist

MARXIST QUARTERLY
originally 50c per copy
10c per Copy
Spring and Summer Issues
Postage Free
WORKERS AGE BOOKSHOP
131 W. 33 St., New York City

"STALIN"
By Boris Souvarine
(A Critical Survey of Bolshevism)
\$3.75
WORKERS AGE BOOKSHOP
131 W. 33 St., New York City

Insurance Companies Build Up Huge Money Trust

Billions Controlled by Few Financial Magnates

By JOHN CARSON

A MONEY trust which as a mere infant alarmed President Woodrow Wilson in 1912 and brought on investigations by the famous Pujio committee has grown into a giant and settled down in the clubby atmosphere of the life-insurance companies.

In 1912, the investigators and financial experts could talk in millions of dollars, but now before the O'Mahoney Monopoly Committee, the term "millions" becomes part of a lost language. Billions upon billions of dollars roll off the tongues of statisticians and experts.

Dimes and quarters and dollars from the poor frantically seeking thru industrial insurance for protection from a pauper's grave pour into the insurance-company counting houses to supplement other billions of dollars paid in checks by the wealthier buyers of "ordinary insurance."

FEW PLAY WITH BILLIONS

Boards of trustees, self-elected and self-perpetuated, gather from week to week to decide where the billions of dollars are to be invested. Inevitably, they have in their control the fate of business because they hold the credit life-line.

In 1937, 10 of the large insurance companies purchased 62.1% of all the bonds and notes offered to the public by corporations in the United States. Only seven years ago, these companies took but 10.9% of this demand for credit.

"What we are dealing with," observed Chairman O'Mahoney, "is a constantly concentrating capital market."

Before the last World War, "industries usually got their credit from local institutions," said the financial expert. "Now only the small industry deals with the local bank or in the local investment market."

Income of insurance companies in 1937 was more than \$5,257,000,000. In 1910, it was only \$781,000,000. Earnings from investments by insurance companies in 1937 exceeded \$1,245,000,000.

In 1937, the face value of insurance policies amounted to \$109,600,000,000. In 1910, the face value was only \$16,000,000,000.

Increased industrial activities in the United States and a consequent increase in the number of persons dependent on a wage and a weekly pay envelope—and the resultant increased sense of insecurity and fear of death and burdens on dependents—these constitute the increasing opportunity for the life insurance salesman.

Salesmen, working under pressure, knowing that they can exist or prosper only as they sell more insurance, seize on this dread of death and dependency.

In 1935, the income of insurance companies was only slightly less than the total ordinary receipts of the United States government.

The Metropolitan had assets of \$4,700,000,000; Prudential, \$3,500,000,000; New York Life, \$2,500,000,000; Equitable of New York, \$2,100,000,000; and Mutual of New York, \$1,300,000,000.

Last year the insurance companies owned \$4,500,000,000 of government bonds, \$1,475,000,000 of city and state securities, \$3,000,000,000 of railroad bonds, \$3,254,000,000 of public-utility bonds, \$1,453,000,000 of securities of other corporations.

Premiums paid to Metropolitan by stockholders in 1935 amounted to \$939,000,000 and the total revenue of New York State—the state which must "regulate" this company—was only \$315,590,000.

In Wisconsin, the total premiums of the Wisconsin Northwestern Mutual Company were \$130,000,000 in 1936 and the total taxes of the state were only \$96,000,000.

Control of this gigantic money trust is in the hands of boards of trustees. Also most of the compa-

nies are "mutuals" and thus, presumably, the policy-holders own the companies and have the power to elect the boards of directors, there is no possibility they will have any voice.

There are some 27,000,000 policy holders. Making a list would take months and involve a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Then a policy-holder would have to get 27,000 other policy-holders to join with him in nominating his "opposition slate."

Faced by these facts, Metropolitan officials frankly admitted to the O'Mahoney committee that the directors were usually chosen by the executive officers and that one vote would be sufficient to have the official "slate" declared elected.

The Metropolitan operates hotels, farms, housing developments. Its board of directors, like the boards of directors of practically all other insurance companies, interlocks with banks and railroads and utilities and every kind of big business.

And there is business also for the directors from their companies. Mitchell Follansbee, director of Metropolitan, has a law firm in Chicago. Since 1932, his law firm has taken fees of \$359,080 from Metropolitan business.

Alfred E. Smith, former governor of New York, was president of an oil company and an insurance company director. His company got the oil business even when a lower bidder sought it. These were only typical examples of the inside game of interlocking directorates.

HUGE SALARIES VOTED

In this clubby atmosphere of billions and good fellowship and letters from "Dear John" to "Dear Fred," it is not a shock to have the directors vote the president an annual salary of \$200,000.

And it hardly was a shock when directors were found on J. P. Morgan's "preferred list" from which other millions of dollars grew.

And in this clubby atmosphere, it is rather amusing to think of the little policy-holder who pinches his dollar a week from his pay envelope and contributes to Ecker's salary. Witness Ecker's testimony:

"It is amusing," he said, "the little correspondence we have from the policy-holder," and he added, "how rare it is for him to write."

Then, when he explained that those who buy industrial-insurance policies have a short time to reclaim their premium payments if they decide not to continue, he said:

"In the industrial field, it (the

Out of Their Own Mouths!

"THE bourgeois circles of Europe and the United States close their eyes to the fact, clear to the toilers of the entire world, that seizure of foreign territory and pogroms are only different expressions of the same thing."—Editorial in the Moscow Pravda, November 18, 1938.

first week's premium) is so small an amount that the average industrial applicant doesn't bother to ask for the return of his money."

But these "small amounts" add up to the staggering sums which enable those who control the big life insurance companies to come mighty near dominating the financial and industrial life of America.

(These paragraphs are from the September 12 issue of Labor, official publication of the standard railroad unions.—Editor.)

The American Labor Party And the Issue of War

Resolution Takes Unsound View of Europe's Clash

(Continued from Page 1)

Further territorial aggression, the spread of intolerance, the ruthless suppression of civil liberties and perhaps the final destruction of civilized life on the European continent." A little overdrawn, perhaps, but true enough in the main. But what would a victory for the Allies mean? The enthronement of freedom and democracy? Remember Versailles! In 1914, the Allies went out to war against Germany under the same slogan of "democracy against despotism"; in 1917, we joined in under the slogan of making the world "safe for democracy." The Allies won; "we" won. What came out of it? Versailles—the most rapacious, vindictive, brutal "treaty of peace" ever forced on a conquered people in modern times—with the exception of the Brest-Litovsk "peace" clamped down on Soviet Russia by victorious Germany! In the jubilation of triumph, the Allied chiefs at Paris thought they would settle with their German imperialist rival once and

for all by crushing Germany as a nation. They did everything they could—and they failed. Should the Allies win the present war, the most probable outcome would be a super-Versailles, an even more rapacious, more vindictive, more brutal "peace." And then another breathing spell, and then another war. Where would tolerance, civil liberties and civilized life on the European continent be then?

No, whichever side wins in this imperialist war, it will be an imperialist victory with all its consequences. Democracy, civilization and freedom have nothing whatever to expect from a victory by either side!

And what would be the condition of the "victorious" lands after the great "victory"? An authoritarian regime is firmly in the saddle in France today; if the war continues much longer, it will almost inevitably emerge in England as well. Does anyone believe that these dictatorial set-ups will be really dismantled

once the war is over, particularly in the condition of social instability which is bound to result from the war? Whichever side wins, authoritarianism will be triumphant and democracy doomed.

The plain truth is that emancipation cannot be brought to the German or any other people at the point of foreign bayonets. Their emancipation from the yoke of Hitlerism will come, when it does come, as the result of their own efforts, as the result of a revolution from within, as the result of a rising of the German people against their oppressors. That is the road to freedom and emancipation in Germany as it is wherever political oppression or dictatorship prevails.

I will not discuss at any length the attitude of the A.L.P. resolution on the arms embargo because the matter has been so thoroughly treated in these columns in the last few months. The resolution states that we are all "of one mind on the proposition that all efforts must be directed towards keeping America out of war. Differences arise only on the methods by which this can be achieved." Let us grant that this is so, also we suspect that many, very many, who urge the repeal of the arms embargo do so because they are inwardly committed to American involvement in this new "war to save democracy." But the main point is: Which methods will really help to keep America out of war? Here I believe the evidence is overwhelming that repeal of the arms embargo, by opening the way to a war boom on arms, munitions and implements of war, would serve to entangle us in the war situation abroad, while the program of the so-called "isolationists," with its embargo on arms, "cash-and-carry" for everything else, and restriction of trade with belligerents to peace-time quotas, would really operate to insulate this country from the forces already tending to drag it into the

Indian Nationalists Face War Crisis

Gandhi Vacillates, Unwilling to Fight Empire

By J. CORK

ONE of the central issues between left and right in the Indian National Congress has always been: "What attitude shall Congress take in the event of a European war involving England?" The consistent revolutionaries inside Congress have always maintained that such a war would be a naked imperialist struggle, that India should give no support to England, and that the Congress should utilize the exceptionally favorable situation created by England's participation in a war to intensify its drive for complete independence.

ATTITUDE OF GANDHI AND RIGHT WING

The attitude of the right-wing leadership of Congress, following Gandhi, has been completely different. This leadership has consistently fought against the idea of utilizing England's "troubles" for the purpose of initiating a decisive struggle for independence against British imperialism. Gandhism has, rather, tended to utilize the situation created by war to bargain with the British ruling class for a few added sops of rights and privileges, holding out on its part the promise of support to England in its imperialist war designs. Rank-and-file pressure in Congress has always forced the right-wing leadership to give lip service to the slogan of complete independence, but its activities and negotiations have always pointed the other way. The record of Gandhi and his satellites on this question goes back many years, but a few recent instances will quite suffice to define their attitude. A few months ago, in May, the Hindustan Times, the organ of the native financial magnates behind Gandhi, talked about war as "furnishing a new opportunity for industrialization," and confidently proclaimed its expectation that this opportunity would be exploited. Rajaji, Satyamurti and other Gandhian leaders, in the first six months of 1939, before the outbreak of war, talked about the bargaining opportunities that a war would present, and advocated "conditional support" of England's war against Germany. The crassest, yet clearest expression of Gandhi's real line was given by the Sunday Times of Madras in its issue of May 7, 1939. Among other interesting things, it had the following to say:

"India cannot avoid being in the thick of war. From the Gandhian point of view, any exploitation of the distress of the opponents is immoral. . . . As long as the politics of India are dominated by Gandhian principles, it must be considered as an offense against our moral and ethical code to take advantage of the trouble of others."

In his recent statement at Wardha on September 16, Gandhi begged England to liberate India and promised it support in its imperialist war if it would do so.

"The question is, will Great Britain have an unwilling India dragged into war, or a willing ally cooperating with her in the prosecution of the defense of true democracy."

ing with her in the prosecution of the defense of true democracy."

OFFICIAL RESOLUTIONS OF CONGRESS

The official resolution adopted by the Congress Working Committee, meeting at Wardha in August, 1939, reflects the pressure of the rank and file and the left wing in Congress to quote a degree, exhibiting the usual loopholes for defense of "democracy." Its most important sections follow:

"The sympathies of the Working Committee are entirely with the peoples who stand for democracy and freedom, and the Congress has repeatedly condemned fascist aggression in Europe, Africa and the Far East of Asia, as well as the betrayal of democracy by British imperialism in Czechoslovakia and Spain. The Committee further . . . declares its determination to oppose all attempts to impose a war on India. It . . . will try to prevent the exploitation of Indian resources for imperialist ends. The past policy of the British government, as well as recent developments, demonstrate abundantly that this government does not stand for freedom and democracy and may, at any time, betray those ideals. India cannot associate herself with a movement for democratic freedom which is denied to her and which is likely to be betrayed."

This lukewarm, indecisive resolution, hinting as it does at the war "as a movement for democratic freedom," offered a bargaining basis to the British ruling class, and in truth, it seemed to be so intended. The Viceroy of India is working overtime in his attempt to line up the Indian National Congress behind England's imperialist war aims. That a probable agreement will be arrived at is indicated by Gandhi's statement of September 16, already quoted above. It is indicated further by the report in the New York Times of October 11, 1939, of the recently concluded sessions of the All-India Congress Committee (the executive committee of the Indian National Congress) at Wardha. Its resolution endorses the resolution of the Working Committee, requests a declaration of policy towards India by the British government, and authorizes the Working Committee to suspend action pending negotiations with the Viceroy. The New York Times dispatch carries the following ominous news:

"Disinclination on the part of the All-India Congress Committee to take hasty action suggests willingness among the more moderate leaders to reach an agreement."

At the moment there is wide resentment in top Congress circles at the obdurate attitude of the British government which has refused even to promise Dominion status at the end of the war. The Working Committee, it is reported, has called upon the eight provincial ministries where it controls the government to resign in protest. But fundamentally, Gandhi's attitude is not (Continued on page 4)

The Polish Tragedy: Reality and Legend

Reactionaries Refuse to Face Real Tasks

By KALMAN

(Concluded from last week)

THE position of the workers was somewhat better than that of the peasantry. This could be explained by the strong revolutionary traditions of the Polish working class and the relatively high degree of organization. Social legislation was on a comparatively high level, although continuously undermined by the government. Wages in organized industries were comparatively good. The trade union movement had some freedom of organization, even under the "government of the Colonels". Even sit-down strikes were tolerated in certain instances. But the social standing of the workers was lower than in western Europe or in America.

CHARACTER OF POLISH STATE

With all these grave problems besetting Poland, the political system in existence was hardly capable of solving them, of unifying and solidifying the Polish state. The state itself could hardly be classified. It was a military-bureaucratic regime with very little social base and with no mass party to support it. Formed by Pilsudski after his successful "putsch" of 1926, when he drove the coalition of the peasant leader Witos and the Rightists out of power, it was composed of the Polish Legionnaires, the comrades of Pilsudski, who together with him formed the Polish Legion in 1914 to fight on the side of Germany against Russia. It had hardly any constructive program except to "cleanse" political life and reward those who fought in the Legion. The constitution was "reformed", parliament was turned into a mockery, and the "leadership principle" established. But not a single political party, not a single social layer, except the bureaucracy and the purged army officers ranks, supported the government. On the right, the powerful National Democratic Party, anti-Semitic to the core, the party of the Polish middle class and close to the large landowners, was bitterly opposed to the Pilsudski camp. The Polish peasants—both the party of Witos, "Piast", and the party of the village poverty, "Wyzwolenie" (both later united under Witos)—fought the government. The Polish Social-

ist Party (P.P.S.) carried on a continuous struggle against the ruling clique.

As long as Pilsudski lived, the ruling clique was more or less united. The myth and authority of the "Dziadek" (grandfather, as Pilsudski was known) kept their ranks together. But after his death, the unity was broken. A struggle for leadership began, with the diverging groups finally agreeing on the colorless Rydz-Smigly. A number of important military people took a back seat, like General Sosnowski and Zhelisowski, and the former leader of the Pilsudski camp and for many years premier, Colonel Slawek, committed suicide.

Was Poland a fascist state? It could hardly be described as fascist, when it had a free trade-union movement, some social legislation, political parties, including the socialists, carrying on legally, and a socialist and opposition press, criticizing the government.

But neither was it a democratic country—with a parliament boycotted by practically every party in existence, with the "leadership principle" established, with a government party, working under the "leadership principle" from the top downwards, with concentration camps where political opponents and tax-drogers were sent by the administrative authorities without any trial or hearing, with even a "Winter relief" scheme and some racialistic trimmings. Every municipal election during the last year ended with a defeat for the government party, which rarely came out under its own name. There was no doubt whatsoever that the government enjoyed hardly any popularity either in town or village. Its foreign policy years of cooperation with Nazi Germany, its hunting parties for Goering and Goebbels, its attitude towards the village and town poor, were not acceptable to the Polish masses and had there been an opportunity in the form of free parliamentary elections, the government would have been defeated in an overwhelming manner.

GOVERNMENT BACKED IN WAR

But in spite of these prevailing conditions, there wasn't any political group in Poland opposed to the carrying on of a defensive war against

Germany. From the rightist National Democratic Party to the Jewish Socialist Bund—all were ready to support the government. Even the Ukrainians, disappointed in Germany's double-crossing policy in regard to Ruthenia, were beginning to change their attitude towards Poland, and the P.P.S. (Socialist Party) took an even more aggressive stand than the government circles. On August 20, Niedzialkowski, the editor of the P.P.S. paper, Rubotnik, in an answer to Goebbels' statement that the question of Poland would again have to be placed on the European agenda, demanded that the question of Germany be placed on the international agenda—in other words, suggested a partition of Germany.

Even the remnants of the Communist Party of Poland offered their help to the government. The party dissolved by the government and international, with most of the leaders arrested or shot in Moscow, allegedly for being in the service of "international fascism", was shattered. But the political prisoners in the Polish jails, members of C.P., sent a letter to President Moscicki, pledging their fullest support in defense of Poland's integrity. And the members of the Dombrowski Legion, the Stalinist-organized International Brigade in Spain, sent a similar offer from France.

Hardly anybody in Poland expected Stalin to join Hitler in the invasion of Poland. During the month of August, there were news items in the Polish press to the effect that Russia was withdrawing her troops from the Polish border and articles showing in what way Russia could help Poland at war with Germany. Consequently, the whole Polish defense plan was based on the supposition that Russia would remain neutral or even side with Poland. The announcement, therefore, of the Russian-German "non-aggression" pact was the beginning of the war panic. The outbreak of the war was not September 1 but Wednesday August 23, when the Polish radio carried the news of the pact. The resultant panic amongst the population was the most reliable commentary on the significance of the Nazi-Soviet alliance. They understood that it meant the invasion and destruction of their land and homes, the beginning of a world slaughter.

CHARACTER OF NEW GOVERNMENT

A few words on the division of Poland and the reorganized Polish government in France. In spite of all statements to the contrary, Hitler got the best of Poland. He took the rich coal mines, iron ore and

salt deposits of Silesia and western Galicia, the new industrial triangle of Poland, the textile industry of Lodz, the industries of Warsaw and vicinity, the rich agricultural land of Posen and the black, fertile land of Lublin. Stalin got the pine forests and swamps of the East and part of the oil wells in eastern Galicia. What is more important, the hotbed of Ukrainian nationalism, the potential "trouble-maker" for Soviet Ukraine, eastern Galicia and Wolynia, is now come under his domination. This may yet turn out to be a source of trouble for the Soviet regime.

The composition of the new emigre Polish government in Paris does not inspire much hope for any change of policy on the part of the former Polish ruling class. The new president, Rackiewicz, was a member of the ruling clique. The new premier, General Sikorski, is a man of the right wing and very close to the National Democratic Party. The vice-premier, Stronsky, is the theoretician of the National Democratic Party, its most pronounced anti-Semitic journalist, altho he himself is a descendant of Jews. And the Minister of Finance, Koc, was the first leader of the "Ozari", the one who gave it its anti-Semitic program. Not even the addition of the new man and former socialist deputy, Stanczyk, as Minister Without Portfolio, can change the utterly reactionary character of this cabinet.

THE HISTORICAL LESSON

An analysis of the political and social conditions prevailing in Po-

land before it was invaded shows clearly that the seeds of destruction were inherent in it before the Hitler-Stalin attack and subsequent partition. But the fact that a ruling clique mismanaged the affairs of a nation doesn't mean that this nation should be doomed to slavery. Twenty-five million Poles, a nation with a rich cultural background, with a fighting revolutionary tradition, with a highly developed working-class movement cannot remain in perpetual bondage. But the lessons of the past twenty years cannot be forgotten. A country to be properly defended, a people expected to defend a country, must have something tangible to fight for—namely, land for the peasants, social and economic benefits for the workers, complete freedom of cultural development for the national minorities and full democratic liberties for its population at large.

In Wilson's Footsteps

ACCORDING to Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen in their "Washington Merry-Go-Round" column of October 11, President Roosevelt recently confided to some Congressmen the "fear that is haunting him . . . that his New Deal reforms will be nullified by war." Said he:

"This war in Europe is throwing a monkey-wrench into our New Deal. I shudder to think what may happen to our reforms as a result of measures we may be forced to take to protect ourselves in this world turmoil; especially labor may suffer if it ever becomes necessary to de-emphasize the functions of the Labor Board and Wage-Hour Administration." So, too, in the early part of 1917 did Woodrow Wilson express his "haunting fear" that democracy and civil liberties would go by the board should this country get into the World War. Yet a few weeks later, it was Woodrow Wilson himself who led this country into the slaughter. He turned out to be only too good a prophet, but he himself helped to make his prophecies come true!

Two Timely Books:

"The Devil Theory Of War"

By Charles A. Beard

How America got into the last war and what to do to stay out now.

60 cents



"Karl Marx"

By Leon Trotsky

\$1.00

including postage

Order Now—The Supply Is Limited

WORKERS AGE BOOKSHOP
131 W. 33rd St., N. Y. C.

Workers Age

Organ of the National Council, Independent Labor League of America, 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Pub. Ass'n. Subscription Rates: \$1.50 per year; \$85 for six months; 5c a copy. Foreign Rates: \$2.50; Canada \$1.75 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. Phone: LACKAWANNA 4-5282.

WILL HERBERG, Editor

Editorial Board: Lyman Fraser, Jay Lovestone, M. S. Mautner, George F. Miles, Bertram D. Wolfe, Charles S. Zimmerman.

VOL. 8. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1939. NO. 44.

THE ARREST OF EARL BROWDER

LAST week, we had occasion to raise our voice in protest against the arbitrary removal from the ballot of four Communist Party candidates for the New York City Council. However much we may execrate Stalinism and all it stands for, we pointed out, we could not remain silent in the face of such an outrageous invasion of fundamental democratic rights. Now we must add to our protest the case of Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, who has just been indicted by the federal government on the charge that he traveled to Europe on a false passport.

Browder admitted the charge in his testimony before the Dies Committee, so Attorney-General Murphy probably thinks he has what is known in police circles as an open-and-shut case. But whatever infractions of the law Mr. Browder is now charged with in the way of traveling on false passports were, there is good reason to believe, well known to the federal authorities for quite some time, for several years, in fact. Why the sudden fit of "law-enforcement"? This is the point, and it is here that the essential political significance of the whole affair rests.

The sudden energy of Attorney-General Murphy in cracking down on the Communist Party, in contrast to the extraordinary tolerance shown to Stalinism in Administration circles in the past, is directly connected with President Roosevelt's foreign policy. As long as Soviet Russia was flirting with England and France, the Administration, taking its cue as usual from London, was ready to look the other way on more than one occasion, for then the Stalinists, as Russian agents—which they are—were agents of a "friendly" power. Now that Stalin has lined up with Germany, much to the discomfiture of Downing Street, the White House is ready to let loose on Stalin's henchmen in this country, the "passport-fraud" indictments are pulled out of the ancient files of the Department of Justice, and the G-men are put on the trail. At bottom, it's as simple as all that.

We most emphatically protest against police measures being taken against anybody in this country for reasons of foreign policy, as part of President Roosevelt's efforts to align the United States in a war front with England. Such practices are the usual procedure of authoritarian regimes everywhere and we certainly do not think the American people should stand by and see them introduced into this country.

There is still another and perhaps more sinister aspect to the affair, also connected with the war crisis. President Roosevelt, it is well known, is hell-bent for "national unity"; he is determined to rally the American people behind him and his war-making policies at all costs. So far he has had mighty little success in throwing the country into a panic of jingoism in which all opposition, even all criticism, would be crushed. What better way of arousing a patriotic frenzy of "national unity" than by building up a "Red menace" as bogeyman and then launching a frantic crusade against it? It's a dirty game, all right, but it's the kind of game jingoistic, war-mongering governments are particularly prone to play.

We abhor Stalinism and all its works. We regard it as a most pernicious influence in the labor movement and in American social life generally. We are eager to help in every effective way to eradicate this influence. But government persecution is not the way. For one thing, it will most probably help rather than hurt the Stalinists by making martyrs out of them. For another, in the process, vital democratic rights and liberties are bound to be sacrificed and the power of the government to persecute unpopular minorities greatly strengthened. Stalinism can be eliminated as a force for evil only by an aroused popular consciousness turning away from it in contempt and execration, not by arbitrary police measures and suppression.

We have not forgotten that Mr. Browder less than a year ago pledged himself and his party to serve as stool-pigeons and finger-men against "subversive" elements in case of war, and that among these "subversive" elements he very kindly put us in the front rank. Well, a lot of water has flowed under the bridge since. But to we remember all this, we believe it our duty to raise a voice of protest against the persecution of Earl Browder today.

A "GOVERNMENT OF COLONELS"?

THE resignation—perhaps it would be better to say, removal—of Elmer F. Andrews as Wage-Hour Administrator and his replacement by Colonel Philip Fleming of the Army Engineering Corps, is a development of considerable significance, reaching far beyond the importance even of the high administrative post involved. For it is another example of the practise that has become a system during the past two years of filling key posts in the civil establishment of the federal government with military men, bred to military habits of thought and military methods of administration and discipline.

It would be little to the point here to list in full the increasing number of army men in strategic governmental positions. From the point of view of labor, the three most important—and most galling—cases are Colonel Harrington as head of the W.P.A. nationally, Colonel Somervell as head of the New York W.P.A., and now Colonel Fleming as head of the Wage-Hour Division. Three more vital posts from labor's standpoint could hardly be imagined and all three are in the hands of army colonels! What is it we're getting here—a "Government of Colonels" as they used to have in Poland?

The ruthless, bureaucratic, essentially militaristic attitude displayed by Colonels Harrington and Somervell a few months ago in connection with the relief crisis and the strike of the A. F. of L. against the abrogation of the prevailing wage is well known. There is no reason to believe that Colonel Fleming will show any better understanding of labor's needs or any more democratic and constructive attitude in his department than his fellow colonels have shown in theirs. They are all of the same breed and that breed has no business in posts of civil administration, above all, in posts involving labor relations.

This whole tendency is utterly foreign to the American democratic tradition and would by this time have caused a nationwide scandal were not our national life already so badly corrupted by the poison of imperialism and militarism. It is a sign of the encroaching militarization of American life under the New Deal; it is also a definite preparation for the war in which the Roosevelt Administration is doing everything in its power to involve us. Once in this war, the various New Deal agencies will become mechanisms of military-authoritarian control, and it will prove mighty convenient for Roosevelt to have army men already on the job.

The A. F. of L. is to be congratulated for taking up this fight. Some months ago, at the convention of the New York State Federation of Labor, Matthew Woll issued a clear warning against this insidious danger. The Cincinnati convention adopted a resolution to the same effect. Now the Federation has announced that it will fight the appointment of Colonel Fleming. In this fight it deserves the support of all labor, of all liberty-loving and democratic people throughout the country.

Towards A Better America:

Socialism and Democracy

By ABRAM L. HARRIS

(We publish below the paper presented by Abram L. Harris to the symposium, "Towards A Better America," held recently in New York under the auspices of the Independent Labor Institute. Dr. Harris is professor of economics at Howard University.—Editor.)

THE past decade of changes that have taken place thru the world demands a reexamination, perhaps, a revision, of our ideas concerning the means of making the world a better dwelling place for the great masses of human beings. Such a reexamination of means would of necessity involve a reexamination of ends. Many of us have thought and still think that the banishment of poverty and periodic unemployment, the elimination of mutual hatreds between races and national groups, the ultimate cause of which is rooted in the competitive struggle for a living—in brief, the correction of all those ills that are usually attributed to capitalism and imperialism—depend upon the socialization of the means of production and exchange, the establishment of a socialized economy. This end, it was maintained, could only be achieved by a revolutionary labor movement which would take over the productive resources of the state and administer them for the benefit of the community as a whole. In thus socializing the means of production, the dictatorship of the proletariat was to be raised only to disappear in the classless society.



ABRAM L. HARRIS

In attempting to reconstruct society along these lines, the experiences of Germany and Russia warn us to proceed cautiously. In Germany, a ruthless dictatorship fashioned out of the discontent of the middle classes has not only destroyed the labor movement itself but also democracy, civil liberty, and those individual rights we have sought to establish during the past three hundred years. In Russia, another dictatorship has been reared but on the basis of the "dictatorship of the proletariat." It is characterized by the same cynical disregard for human liberty and individual rights that guides the policies of its counterpart in Germany. It is obvious today that the dictatorships of Stalin and Hitler are only concerned with the maintenance of power and that each will use any means, however medieval in character, to accomplish this end. It is no longer possible to distinguish these feudal brothers-in-arms by their respective attitudes to capitalism and private property. Property in Russia has been collectivized but the benefits of it accrue to a small group of individuals who rule over a ruthlessly subjugated proletariat. While property has not as yet been socialized in Germany, Hitler has shackled the profit motive; and, according to the former Nazi, Rauschning, he holds collectivism as his final trump card. A collectivism which proceeds upon the destruction of the democratic rights of man, of civil liberty, of individual rights, of freedom of press and assembly, and with a wanton disregard of sheer human decency, must be fought against rather than fought for. But must not the "dictatorship of the proletariat," which has been looked upon as the means of bringing about socialism and the classless society, inevitably raise up its own brand of Caesarism and praetorian guards in place of the state which it destroys? Furthermore, does not Germany afford us an example of what happens in a large industrial country when the middle class has to choose between constant threats to its existence under capitalism and annihilation by the "dictatorship of the proletariat"?

There was a time when theoretical economists denied the feasibility of socialism. They said that in the absence of private property and the price system no economy could rationally apportion productive resources to the needs of the community. Socialism was thus foredoomed, in their opinion. Today, only a few die-hards among orthodox economists deny that socialism is practicable from the economic or industrial standpoint. The great question of our generation is not the economic workability of socialism. It is rather how the recognized advantages of a socialist economy can be achieved without at the same time establishing the power of a small clique which, however benevolent in its original purposes, soon becomes destructive of civil liberty, human freedom, and individual right.

FDR Spokesmen Try to Confuse Embargo Issue

Arms Ban Plus "Cash-Carry" Is Needed

Washington, D. C. WHAT is the real issue in the neutrality debate now going on in Congress? The spokesmen for the Administration, on the floor of the Senate, over the radio, and in the public press, are telling the country that the issue is the arms embargo OR "cash-and-carry" on everything. That is not the issue. Far from it!

The real issue is the arms embargo PLUS "cash-and-carry" on everything else or "credit-and-carry" on everything. Those who are leading the fight to retain the arms embargo, those who have fought hardest for the arms embargo in the past, are and have always been supporters of a strict "cash-and-carry" program for goods other than arms. They are the ones who have fought four years for mandatory "cash-and-carry" provisions to cover goods other than arms.

The record is clear. Four years ago, in 1935, before there was any neutrality law, Senators Clark and Nye introduced resolutions in the Senate for an arms embargo and a "trade at the risk of the shipper or purchaser" policy for other goods. They were then opposed and defeated by the Administration.

Three years ago, 1936, the same Senators were fighting to write into the neutrality law a mandatory "cash-and-carry" provision and a peacetime-quota system on goods other than arms. The Administration first espoused the idea, but with a large degree of Presidential discretion, then, at the last minute, dropped the plan and rushed thru a law without either provision.

Two years ago, in 1937, Senators Clark and Nye were asking for a permanent mandatory "cash-and-carry" law and the arms embargo. The Administration refused to agree and instead approved the arms embargo and a discretionary two-year "cash-and-carry" law on other goods.

Last Spring, when neutrality revision was hung up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the discretionary "cash-and-carry" section of the law was about to expire (May 1) under the two-year limitation, those who are supporting the arms embargo now offered to cooperate in extending the "cash-and-carry" section until the whole neutrality question could be examined at a later date. The Administration, intent on killing the arms embargo, refused to accept this offer and by refusing left the American people open to the dangers which it now points to as justifying immediate action. That is the history of "cash-and-carry" during the last four years.

The real issue is clear. The Administration, in the pending resolution, does not even propose an honest "cash-and-carry" law. The resolution, as it was written by the Administration leaders in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, proposes a "title-and-carry" law and not a "cash-and-carry" law. The door is wide open to the granting of

credits under the present language of the resolution. In many ways, the pending resolution now before the Senate is stronger legislation than any proposed by the Administration to-date, but in the eyes of the strict neutrality group it is weak because it lifts the ban on arms exports and keeps the way open for credits. The arguments made to-date by Administration spokesmen on the floor of the Senate are evading the real reason they have for scrapping the arms embargo. The President, in his message to Congress, also sidestepped the question. No one in Washington has any illusions as to why the Administration wants the arms embargo scrapped. Everyone knows they want it scrapped because that would help the British and French, morally and materially, in the present European war. The President has repeatedly expressed his views on that question in the

The Merry-Go-Round Broke Down . . .

"ONLY thanks to the relentless criticism and propaganda of the Fourth International have the centrists begun to stir, the left centrists to separate themselves from the right centrists, the latter to demarcate themselves from the avowed social-patriots." — Leon Trotsky: "Trotskyism and the P.S.O.P.," in the New International, October 1939.

past. He has made no bones about his desire to assist the so-called "democracies" against the dictator states. It was only recently, when it became good politics, that he has been silent on this point. It is to be hoped that the question will be completely aired before the neutrality debate is concluded. Opponents of the President can be depended on to raise the question repeatedly and there are some signs that Congressmen supporting the President likewise will take up the question. Any evasion on this point will preclude a real debate on the vital issue of American foreign policy.

Indian Nationalists Face The Crisis of War

(Continued from Page 3)

changed, and there is every reason to believe that some "compromise" will be worked out in the end.

POSITION OF M. N. ROY

The New York Times of September 10, 1939, carries the following dispatch from India:

"M. N. Roy, leader of the left-wing group of Congress, which met today to consider its attitude in the situation, said that all freedom-loving people congratulated the British government on the decision to put and end to Hitlerism."

If this statement is true, it exhibits an abrupt change in Roy's position. If it is true, it is a betrayal of the revolutionary line of no support to England's imperialist wars which he himself has for years propagated inside Congress as the most consistent and violent critic of the right wing's capitulatory attitude to British imperialism. In his paper, Independent India, of September 25, 1938, Roy said:

"The Congress is pledged to oppose every imperialist war, and has maintained that the people of India will not participate in it, in any form. It is time now to act on this resolution."

In his issue of May 14, 1939, Roy violently castigated the right-wing leadership of Congress because it "is preparing for a support of England in the event of a war." In the issue of August 20, 1939, on the very eve of the war, Roy was still criticizing the Congress leadership for its do-nothing attitude:

"The Congress stands committed to a policy of complete non-cooperation in the case of a war involving Britain. . . . Yet nothing has been

Administration Worried Over Embargo in House

"THEY are not saying anything, but worried Administration chiefs are beginning to wonder whether the final show-down (on the arms-embargo question) won't find the House, not the Senate, deciding the fate of neutrality.

"When the battle opened, leaders were confident that if they could win the Senate, the House would be a push-over. But recent reports indicate an undercover situation there.

"Inside tips have come from a number of state delegations that members whose votes were considered certain are far from in the bag. One reported instance is the five Massachusetts Democrats, normally Administration supporters, now secretly split 4-to-1 against embargo repeal.

"Several of the Liberal Block are completely off the reservation or on the fence.

"It is not generally realized that the House, unlike the Senate, voted on the embargo at the last session and turned down repeal by 41 votes. It is true that due to inefficient floor leadership some 50 Democrats were absent—many drinking beer and eating sandwiches in the House restaurant while others gossiped in the galleries.

"Even so, turning over 41 votes on as hot an issue as the embargo is no easy job.

"Administration leaders have just awakened to the fact that while they have been concentrating in the Senate, pro-embargo forces have been putting tremendous pressure on Representatives.

"There is every indication that this organized pressure is having its effect."—Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, in their "Washington Merry-Go-Round" column of October 11, 1939.

Letters From Our Readers:

Too Much Diatribe?

New York City. Editor, Workers Age:

I'M sending you my subscription to the Workers Age, as I think you have on the whole a most sensible and decently consistent attitude toward the issues that matter. Sometimes, you present an angle on current happenings that I haven't seen in other publications and that hasn't occurred to me.

However, on the other side, like all the other groups, sects, factions or whatever you call them on the left, your animus against another group, in this case, the orthodox communists, amounts to an obsession. Not that I have much good to say for Stalinism, particularly now. But to me the constant diatribes against the Stalinists, which manage to creep into every page, if not into every article, seem (1) an undue exaggeration of their import-

ance, and (2) downright fanaticism which happens to be extremely distasteful to me. I know I'm not a good hater—I'm not sure whether that's a strength or a weakness. But I do know that the disunion and fratricidal warfare going on among the various left groups seems to me the worst enemy we have to combat—practically suicidal. Sometimes, they all seem much more interested in slinging mud at each other than in working for a better order; this goes for all of them.

I think it was La Rochefoucauld who said we would rather be badly spoken of than not spoken of at all, and I know damn well the communists would. Why doesn't somebody think of giving them the silent treatment? Maybe this is just my own little mania—I think not, because I know many other who have the same reaction. A READER.

The Editor Replies:

We have discussed the point made in this letter—that we devote too much of our space and consideration to the Stalinists to the point where it amounts to an "obsession"—more than once in these columns, and it is hardly necessary to repeat everything we have already said on this occasion. But in connection particularly with the remarks made by our present correspondent, we would like to say the following:

1. Whether our "constant diatribes against the Stalinists" are an "undue exaggeration of their importance" is, of course, a question that can be answered only on a factual basis in each particular case. We surely do not enjoy denouncing the Stalinists or even writing about them; and we certainly do not want to inflate their importance. But if we really make a serious effort to help bring a measure of health, responsibility and democracy to the labor movement where it is most badly needed, we cannot possibly avoid coming to grips with the Stalinist menace. Does our correspondent really believe it is possible to carry on constructive work in the automobile, maritime, white-collar, or practically any other important field without coming into direct collision with Stalinism? Or does he think a real struggle for labor unity, independent political action or keeping America out of war can be undertaken without fighting Stalinism?

2. We may or may not give undue emphasis to the struggle against Stalinism but it is certainly incorrect to picture it as a case of the "disunion and fratricidal warfare going on among the various left groups" which our correspondent correctly declares to be "suicidal." For the Communist Party is in no sense of the word, not even the most remote, a "left group"; nor is it a bona-fide part of the labor movement of whatever tendency. Stalinism is in literal fact an agency of the Soviet Foreign Office and the G.P.U. It is a force outside of and hostile to the labor movement, its organizations, aims and aspirations. It is on the same plane with the German-Army Bund of Fritz Kuhn, which is notoriously an agency of the German Nazi regime and the Gestapo. Whatever else it may be, the struggle against Stalinism is not a case of "disunion and fratricidal warfare" in the ranks of labor!

Not Enough Diatribe?

New York City. Editor, Workers Age:

THE Communist Party condemns the present war as imperialist, but it fails to condemn all participants as imperialists. Up to the time of the latest change of line, the C.P. condemned the imperialist governments of Great Britain and France for not participating. Today, it condemns them for participating but does not condemn the Stalin government of Russia for participating. There is not one word of con-

demnation for the Soviet Union's reversion to imperialist aims of the Russia of the Czars.

Both the I.L.L.A. and the Socialist Party, it seems to me, should amplify their condemnation of the present war so as to include the present government of Russia as a participant. In so doing, they would draw a most necessary distinction between steadfast opposition based on principle and wavering opposition based on expediency of one or the other imperialist participant.

A most necessary distinction, failure to make which by apologists of of Stalin has brought down on them and the movement they represent the contempt that the unscrupulous opportunism of the C.P. has brought upon itself. There is no place in a united anti-war front for a change-ling, whose position is dictated by no principle but imperialist necessities of their chief. But there must be a place for all anti-war parties whose opposition is neither that of hirelings of Hitler nor stooges of Stalin but whose opposition rises from genuine devotion to the cause of the exploited. FRANK D. SLOCUM

Don't Miss These Lectures:

"The World at War"

Friday Evenings, Beginning November 3

Nov. 3: ECONOMICS OF WAR AND PEACE, . . . Lewis Corey

Nov. 17: TWENTY-TWO YEARS OF SOVIET RUSSIA . . . Jay Lovestone

Dec. 1: NATURE OF THE WAR IN EUROPE . . . B. D. Wolfe

Dec. 8: AMERICA AND THE EUROPEAN WAR . . . B. D. Wolfe

Dec. 15: FASCISM, DEMOCRACY, STALINISM . . . Will Herberg

Dec. 22: SOCIALISM AND WAR . . . Will Herberg

Single Admission: 25 cents

INDEPENDENT LABOR INSTITUTE
131 West 33rd Street, New York City

STOP THE WAR-MAKERS!

"Keep America Out Of War"

An Appeal of the Independent Labor League of America

5 cents a copy

WORKERS AGE BOOKSHOP
131 W. 33rd St., N. Y. C.