

Next Week:
**AMERICAN DEMOCRACY
AND THE WORLD CRISIS**

By Luigi Antonini

Workers Age

Weekly Paper of the Independent Labor League of America

I. L. P. FORGING AHEAD IN WAR
CRISIS . . . page 3.
C.I.O. ISSUES PROGRAM OF ACTION.
. . . page 2.

Vol. 8, No. 52.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1939.

5 CENTS

Organized Labor Against War Dictatorship

By MATTHEW WOLL

(We publish below an address delivered by Matthew Woll, vice-president of the American Federation of Labor, on December 1, 1939 before the Trenton, N. J., Central Labor Union.—Editor)

ONE of the tragic outcomes of the march of dictatorship in the world is not only the suppression of free trade unions in many lands, but the means that have been employed to suppress racial and religious minorities in one country after another. Envy, hatred, malice and intolerance have been let loose by tyrannical dictators and the liberties of people everywhere have been jeopardized. The right of men to worship God in accordance with conscience, the privilege of men to be secure in their homes and in their personal and property rights, have been ruthlessly set aside. At such time of world crisis, it is inevitable that movements founded upon freedom and liberty and nations built upon democratic principles should look to their own needs, requirements and defense.

In that spirit and in that light, the recent convention of the American Federation of Labor declared its unalterable opposition to our nation and our people becoming involved in the present European conflict. While we favored the exercise of neighborly and friendly influence by our government in all efforts to promote peace and to compose differences between nations, we likewise insisted that our government shall at all times pursue a judicious policy, exercising care and caution and a firm determination to avoid involvement in European conflicts or European wars.

The convention unequivocally opposed participation by our nation in the present war for many sound and valid reasons, particularizing and emphasizing the unquestioned prediction that if called upon to approve a war program, we would be subject not alone to an incalculable toll of American lives on foreign soils and the leaving there of hundreds of thousands of our young men horribly mutilated, but we would be compelled to surrender as well many of the liberties and rights so essential to the protection of our own well-being. It must be clearly evident that a democracy at war requires regulations and conditions which would not and could not be tolerated during normal times. If there be doubt regarding this truth, then Great Britain and France present striking examples of the transition taking place in a democracy at war. Today, England and France seem heading toward an eclipse. Under guise of war-emergency measures, labor societies in England, representing 5,000,000 workers, are being gradually shorn of their powers by government bureaucrats. Stage by stage, the British government has tightened its hold on the nation's industry, commerce and labor under the aegis of war. It has taken control, more or less, of public transport and power of all kinds. It has entered world commodity markets and directly and indirectly has appointed itself the chief buyer, seller, investor and employer of the nation. What is true of England is equally true of France, if not more so.

Experience has likewise demonstrated that powers once acquired by governments, whether due to an extreme emergency or not, are seldom abandoned. Thus, the liberties of a free people are easily whittled away, in one way or another. Under existing circumstances and menacing clouds, it behooves American labor, indeed, all Americans who value the principles of freedom and the institutions of democracy, not alone to retain calmness of mind and of balanced judgment to prevent our being drawn into the vortex of the European conflict, but likewise to be alert and active against any and all attempts, legislative, executive or otherwise, that may be made or may be conceived under guise of emergency and that threaten the very foundation of the rights and liberties of our people.

Already legislation has come to our attention and further legislative measures are in contemplation that, should a national war emergency arise, we would not need to ask: "Can It Happen Here?" We might not then be accorded even the right to discuss the manner and means by which our rights and liberties and our free institutions had been suppressed, if not destroyed. It is therefore urgent we take counsel now, while we can, and not wait until it may be too late. We cannot afford to rest under ill-

(Continued on Page 2)

Edwards Raises Issue of War in English Election

I.L.P. Bars War-Time Political Truce

London, England. "smear" campaign against Bob Edwards. Bob Edwards, member of the National Council of the Independent Labor Party, made the issue of a "socialist international peace" the big issue of his campaign in contesting the Stretford, Lancashire, by-election recently. He received 4,424 votes, as against 22,408 for the Tory candidate, Ralph Ether, and 1,519 for the Communist Party candidate.

(Bob Edwards will be remembered by the readers of the Workers Age for his visit to this country in 1938, during which he made an extremely favorable impression on all those with whom he came into contact. Just before his visit to this country, he had fought with the I.L.P.-P.O.U.M. forces in Spain.—Ed.)

In putting Edwards forward, the I.L.P. demonstrated its refusal to recognize the so-called "political truce" concluded between the Labor Party and the National government for the duration of the war, according to which by-elections were not to be contested but were to be retained by the party holding the seats. It is the position of the I.L.P. that never more than in war time is it necessary for the forces of labor to maintain their independence free from all entanglements with the government.

Despite the "political truce," Bob Edwards was supported by several Labor M.P.s, important leaders of the trade-union and cooperative movements, as well as by the peace movement. On the other hand, the Communist Party entered a candidate in the contest for the express purpose of offering competition to Edwards and diminishing his vote. Edwards's candidacy was announced on November 14. Three days later, on November 17, the Communist Party put forward its candidate. The C.P. campaign was one of the most filthy on record. It was a systematic

President Offers New Health Bill

Proposes Measure as Substitute for Wagner Bill, Claimed to be too Costly

Washington, D. C.

President Roosevelt last week announced his advocacy of a program of federal construction of hospitals and medical centers in communities throughout the country which now lack them. He indicated that he would recommend the plan to Congress after the Interdepartment Committee on Health had studied it.

In making this recommendation, the President rejected the far more extensive health bill introduced into the last session of Congress by Senator Robert F. Wagner. The Wagner bill, Mr. Roosevelt said, was too costly and would involve state appropriations to match federal grants, which his own measure would avoid.

The President's announcement is regarded as part of the Administration drive to quash or to head off all important new social-welfare legislation during the coming year.

THE BEST DEFENSE



—from Justice

Russian Invasion is Halted; Purge On

Soviet Army Report Admits "Serious Difficulties"; Zhdanov Rumored Out

The Russian invasion of Finland appeared to have been halted on all fronts last week, with the invading forces definitely in retreat in the Arctic. In Russia, these serious setbacks found their repercussion in a "purge" launched, according to rumor, against certain political and military leaders of the invasion.

An official Red Army communique admitted that the Soviet forces were facing "most serious difficulties" in Finland but claimed that the drive into that country was progressing "normally." The communique also denounced foreign military observers for the "slander" that the Russians had shown "low fighting capacity." Even from Soviet sources, however, it was clear that the great Russian war machine had faltered badly during the week, due apparently to a combination of unfavorable

weather, difficult terrain, grave errors on the part of the invader, and skillful and courageous resistance on the part of the defenders.

As the Russian forces continued to retreat in the far North, they were believed to be abandoning any idea of a new offensive there for the Winter. The original plans along the other routes of invasion seemed to have been considerably modified as well.

Russian casualties were reported to be very heavy, thus far generally estimated at 30,000. Finnish losses were very much smaller.

Expert observers believed the great shortcomings displayed by the Red Army were due not merely to external difficulties, which had presumably been foreseen and allowed for, but primarily to the devastation wrought by the sweeping "purges" of the past few years in which Stalin had liquidated his best officers and had undermined the morale of the entire army.

Nevertheless, observers stressed that the setbacks suffered by the Russians, big as they were, did not by any means imply that the Finns could hold off the invader indefinitely. But the Russian conquest of Finland would be costly, arduous and long-drawn-out, and even if it ended successfully, it might have many of the consequences of a defeat for Stalin.

The failure so early of the Russian "lightning war" apparently called for some sacrificial scapegoats and a "purge" was definitely set going last week both among the armed forces and in political circles at home. It seems certain that the chief victim will be Andre Zhdanov, dictator of Leningrad, popularly believed to be Stalin's "heir-apparent," and chief advocate of "vigorous measures" against Finland. The absence of any offering from Zhdanov to the chorus of fulsome eulogy appearing in the Russian press on the occasion of Stalin's sixtieth birthday was regarded as of the most ominous significance. General K. A. Meretskov, chief of staff of the Leningrad military district, in charge of the invasion, was removed by being "promoted" to membership in the Leningrad Soviet. There were also rumors that Otto Kuusinen and other figures of the Stalinist puppet government at Terijoki were among the other victims. According to reports, G.P.U. commissions with full powers were dispatched to the fronts to carry the "purge" into the ranks of the officers and men of the invading armies.

Aside from the Russo-Finnish sector, there was comparatively little doing in the war last week, the sixteenth week after the outbreak of hostilities. The scuttling of the German pocket battleship Admiral Graf Spee on orders from Berlin was followed a few days later by the suicide of its captain, Hans Langsdorff. In less than a week, the Germans were also forced to scuttle the luxury liner Columbus, trapped in the Atlantic on a vain dash for Germany from Veracruz. These were severe losses to the Reich, overbalancing the damage to British and French shipping by German mines and submarines.

In Berlin, talk of new "peace" moves suddenly flared up again. It was officially denied that the German government had extended "feelers" aimed at intervention by Washington, but that something was happening behind the scenes was clear enough. Rumors continued to circulate that unofficial contacts were being established between Berlin and the Allies to discuss cessation of the present war and the formation of a joint front against Soviet Russia. The Pope was also said to be actively promoting a "peace" drive of his own, probably along generally similar lines.

Rumania signed a new trade treaty with Germany last week, agreeing to increase its valuation of the German mark, thus automatically increasing Germany's buying power in terms of Rumanian goods.

The week was a busy one in Washington. President Roosevelt announced the appointment of Myron C. Taylor, the steel magnate, as his personal representative at the Vatican. This was generally regarded as a first step towards establishing diplomatic relations with the Papal Court, lapsed since 1867.

Under Washington guidance, twenty-one American republics, including the United States, issued a joint protest to Britain, France and Germany against the battle involving the ill-fated pocket battleship Admiral Graf Spee and against other violations of the "safety zone" drawn around the shores of the western hemisphere by a recent pan-American conference.

The New Stalin Imperialism

By WILL HERBERG

WHO ten months ago would have ventured to predict that before the year was over Soviet Russia would have embarked upon an imperial career of aggression and armed conquest? Even those of us who insistently forecast a Stalin-Hitler accord did not envisage such an outcome. And yet it has happened; indeed, it is already taken for granted as one of the "facts of the situation." With such breakneck speed does history move these days!

STALINIST SELF-JUSTIFICATION

What is this new Soviet policy of aggression and conquest initiated with the overrunning of Poland? Where does it come from and what does it mean? We gain no light on these questions from the official "explanations" advanced by the Stalinist spokesmen in Moscow or New York. For these "explanations" are really no more than official apologies, in brazen disregard of the most obvious facts. In the first place, there are the usual governmental propaganda lies that have done service to justify aggression for these many thousands of years. Coming from Moscow, they sound like a weird parody of the outpourings of Herr Goebbels's Ministry of Enlightenment. Then there is the appeal to nationalism, even to racialism—the stress on "national interests" and "military necessity," on the plight of "our blood-brothers" (Molotov's phrase, a translation of the Nazi "Rassengenossern") under foreign rule. Finally, because of the peculiar ideological background of the Stalin imperialism, there is the appeal to "revolution," with all the trappings of a puppet "revolutionary People's Government" of Finland. Diplomatic concoctions, the call to nationalism and race, the mockery of sham "revolution"—these constitute the threefold self-justification of Stalinist aggression today.

It is hardly necessary to waste much time over the first two lines of approach; they impress us no more when coming from Moscow than when coming from Berlin. This program met with considerable response among the people, as Edwards's vote, obtained in the face of overwhelming odds, testifies. The I.L.P. is vigorously pushing its efforts to gain support in the ranks of labor for its program of a "socialist peace." Scores of Labor Parties, trades councils, unions and similar groups have already gone on record in favor of its program, and the Edwards campaign will most probably stimulate the movement to a considerable degree.

gression is made with vigor and, apparently, with sincerity.

MAIN LINE OF THE TROTSKYIST APOLOGY

The main line of the Trotskyist justification of the new Stalin imperialism, a justification that is naturally indirect, unofficial and entirely thankless, seems to be that Stalin's "objectives" are fundamentally right and proper but that his "means and methods" are bad; that Stalin is doing in his "bureaucratic" way what Trotsky would do in his "revolutionary" way—but doing essentially the same thing. A careful reading of the three main Trotskyist documents on the Finnish crisis—editorials in the December 1 and 16 issues of the Socialist Appeal and a statement of the Socialist Workers Party in the December 9 issue—indicate this very clearly. In addition, the Trotskyites make an analysis of the Finnish situation which not only echoes the Stalinist analysis point by point but in the end leads to the conclusion that the Russian invader is to be supported by the workers of Finland and of the outside world. What more could Stalin want?

The Trotskyist argument that leads to so remarkable a conclusion begins with the assertion that "Finland is not an independent small state fighting for its independence against an imperialist power. Bourgeois Finland is and always has been a vassal state of the imperialists" (S.W.P. statement). It is quite true that Finland, bourgeois Finland, is a small state in the orbit of British imperialism, but that does not make it less of a "small state fighting for its independence"; nor does it in any way justify invasion in order to crush and annex it. Loyalist Spain was also a "bourgeois vassal" of imperialism, of Anglo-French imperialism, as the Trotskyites never tired of pointing out. Yet the Italo-German assault on Loyalist Spain (this was one aspect of the civil war, not the only one) was not thereby rendered blameless. Ethiopia, too, was a small state (not even bourgeois but feudal in character) in the orbit of Anglo-American imperialism; indeed, it was "guided" by English and American "advisers". Was the Italian assault upon Ethiopia therefore justified? We gave our sympathy and support to the Ethiopian and Spanish peoples against the foreign invaders despite the fact that their governments were linked up with imperialist powers; certainly, we didn't justify the invasion or ask the threatened peoples to side with the invader!

Oh, but this is a "war of the Finnish bourgeois government against

the Soviet Union", rejoin the Trotskyites (S.W.P. statement). Yes, the Finnish bourgeoisie, in this case backed by the masses of the people, are fighting to beat back the Russian invader. But again, the Ethiopian feudal chieftains fought to beat back the Italian invader; yet it was no war of Ethiopia AGAINST Italy. The Republican bourgeoisie of Loyalist Spain fought to beat back the Italo-German invader; yet that did not make it a war of Spain AGAINST Italy and Germany. Why then is it now a war of Finland against Russia rather than a war of Russia against Finland? Or perhaps Finland is the "aggressor", as the Daily Worker tells us?

BLESSINGS AT THE POINT OF THE BAYONET

As the Trotskyites continue their apology, they sink deeper and deeper into the mire of Stalinism. After a certain point, it appears that conquest by the Russian army is actually desirable! "In the present military struggle", the Socialist Workers Party declaration tells us, "a victory of the Red Army is a 'lesser evil' than the victory of the army of the Finnish puppet government of Wall Street and London". Such a statement would make sense only if it were seriously maintained that the Russian army is actually bringing the Finnish masses socialism and freedom at the point of the bay-

onet—which we may be permitted to doubt. On what other ground is a victory of the Russian army the "lesser evil"? Certainly the blessings of Stalin's G.P.U. "socialism" and "democracy" are not enough to account for it. And no mystical reference to the "economic foundations laid down by the October Revolution" will do.

A variant of this same type of argument, not so absurd on the face of it, is the contention that Russian conquest would at least result in an advance in the economic relations of the conquered countries if not to socialism, at any rate to a higher level, in the sense that a nationalized ("statified") economy is on a higher level as compared with private capitalism. Even if this were true, and it would be interesting to know what economic changes the invading Russian armies are actually introducing into the conquered countries, it is no justification of invasion or conquest and no reason why the people of these countries should accept or welcome it. In fact, this is imperialism's favorite form of self-justification; the English, in particular, never tire of boasting of having brought the more advanced institutions of capitalism and industrialism to backward Africa and Asia. Undoubtedly they have; only they have brought many other things as well, all summed up in the hated words, foreign rule. And the

(Continued on Page 3)

F.D.R. Bans Strike for Government Employees

Reiterates Stand Taken Last Summer

Washington, D. C. President Roosevelt again declared last week that workers on W.P.A. projects have no right to strike against the government, even though the defense of standards or the redress of intolerable grievances may be involved. He made this pronouncement at a press conference in reply to a question relating to events in Minneapolis in connection with a W.P.A. strike.

Mr. Roosevelt contended that W.P.A. workers had no more right to strike than had government employees, in which category they were to be classed. They might organize but strike they could not, he added. Mr. Roosevelt's remarks recalled the situation last Summer when scores of thousands of A. F. of L. building-trades workers went out on strike against the abolition of prevailing (union) wage rates on W.P.A. projects in the 1940 relief act. At that time, both the President and Attorney-General Murphy made repeated statements that the W.P.A. workers had no right to "strike against the government." This was flatly challenged by A. F. of L. leaders and the strikes went on, tying up many W.P.A. construction projects, until Mr. Murphy ruled that the old rates could be paid on projects commenced before the passage of the 1940 act.

It was pointed out then, and again last week, that labor could not and would not accept any ban on the right to strike either for W.P.A. workers or government employees generally. Without the right to strike, it was stressed, labor would be left completely helpless, and if government employees were deprived of this right, other workers could not long retain it. Furthermore, since the trend was for the government to extend its economic activities, the denial of the right to strike

to government employees would mean that increasing numbers of workers would be deprived of this fundamental civil and industrial right.

Senator Nye Maps Program for U. S. Keeping Out of War

Washington, D. C. Senator Gerald K. Nye last week outlined a program to keep this country out of war in an address at the New Britain, Conn., Teachers College. Among the points he stressed were: A national referendum on participation in war, in which boys between eighteen and twenty-one could vote; restoration of the arms embargo; strengthening of the neutrality law; prohibition of war profits; inauguration of an educational program compelling labeling of foreign propaganda under penalty that propagandists be treated as spies.

Form New Anti-War Group

New York City. A nation-wide drive to organize men subject to war duty in opposition to United States entrance into a foreign war was started recently by a group of New York business men, lawyers and writers. The organization, which has an enrollment of some 400, was named "the New Western Front." The organization was described as non-pacifist. Members must be from eighteen to forty-five years old, not affiliated with "the German-American Bund, the Communist Party or any other organization directly or indirectly subservient to a foreign power."

AND A HAPPY NEW YEAR

A VERY, VERY MERRY



—and of course we'll be seeing you at our New Year's Eve Party—Why, you can't miss the International Floor Show or the Swing Band—It's on Sunday night, December 31st, at MANHATTAN CENTER, 34th St. and 8th Ave.—Refreshments—wet and dry—One buck per person—By the way, the floor show starts at 11 P.M.

INDEPENDENT LABOR LEAGUE OF AMERICA - 131 WEST 33rd STREET.

CIO Issues Comprehensive Program of Labor Action

Proposes Amendments to Strengthen Wagner Act

Washington, D. C. AN extensive, long-range program covering economic reform as well as social and labor legislation was made public last week by John L. Lewis in the name of the legislative committee of the C.I.O. The program includes demands for amendments to revise the National Labor Relations Act.

In addition to various proposals directly related to labor problems, the program called for keeping America out of involvement in war, a far-reaching federal job-making effort to provide work for 3,000,000 unemployed, revision of the tax system to reduce consumer taxes and levy more heavily on large concentrations of income and savings, a national health program, legislation to protect civil liberties, and various other legislative actions.

The recommendations for changes in the Wagner Act reverse the previous policy of the C.I.O., which, in the last session of Congress and earlier, stood out against any changes, in contrast with the attitude of the A. F. of L., which demanded revision.

CHANGE ON WAGNER ACT

The C.I.O. explained its change of front on the ground that "two serious difficulties have arisen in the administration of the act which have frustrated to some extent the efforts of organized labor to achieve the protection to which it is entitled."

First, it said, the enforcement provisions, now limited to cease-and-desist order and back-pay requirements, "are not sufficiently severe to obtain actual enforcement from those corporations which are still determined to violate the rights of labor." Imposition of criminal penalties, it added, would bring the law into line with the railway-labor and wages-and-hours laws.

Secondly, the report asserted, "the National Labor Relations Board in an attempt to appease the reactionary interests, including the leaders of the American Federation of Labor, has issued decisions which have threatened the existence of the industrial unions of the C.I.O. by carving out of the C.I.O. unions and passage of the La Follette-Thomas oppressive labor practices bill to outlaw the use of industrial spies and the purchase of munitions by private corporations also were necessary to protect labor's rights, the report said.

An amendment to prevent the "carving up" of C.I.O. unions and passage of the La Follette-Thomas oppressive labor practices bill to outlaw the use of industrial spies and the purchase of munitions by private corporations also were necessary to protect labor's rights, the report said.

Warning that the Fair Labor Standards Act was threatened with amendments actually intended to destroy it, the C.I.O. said Congress should reject these demands "after the law has had time to demonstrate its value, it was added, its protection should be extended to the millions of workers not now covered.

PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Passing to broader fields, the C.I.O. program held that unemployment was still the No. 1 Problem of the nation. The fact that the large gains in business activity had not diminished the existence of a body

of 9,000,000 to 10,000,000 jobs, it stressed, made these people "ready subjects to the wiles of the demagogues who actually desire to undermine and destroy our democratic institutions."

"No group in the United States today," it added, "is in the position of presenting any single formula for the solution of the ills arising out of unemployment. For this reason, we recommend that the President immediately convene a conference of the responsible leaders from the government, industry, labor and agriculture, who should be commanded by the government to work at this problem until some concrete plans have been formulated."

Pending such action, the report continued, a public-works program providing an absolute minimum of 3,000,000 at fair wages and not subject to work rotation and the means test, is required. In addition, it asserted, a work program is needed sufficient to employ all of the 4,000,000 unemployed youth between 15 and 25 who are out of school. This would involve a substantial increase in the National Youth Administration program.

The C.I.O. offered a broad program for changes in the Social Security Act. Its old-age pension program calls for pensions of \$60 a month at age 60, with an additional \$30 monthly allowance for aged wives. This was necessary, it held, because the best estimates indicated that during the next five years pension payments would range only between \$15 and \$25 a month at the best and be available to "only a small percentage of our aged people."

In the field of unemployment compensation, it was stated that the "absence of definitive federal standards has resulted in chaos among

the state unemployment-compensation laws, a complicated system with narrow coverage which includes high eligibility conditions, severe disqualifying clauses, small benefits and interminable red tape."

This calls, it was held, for closer federal standards simplifying and liberalizing the benefits paid, reducing eligibility conditions, eliminating penalizing disqualifications and extending coverage.

Agreeing that large reserves were being piled up under both the old-age and unemployment-insurance systems, causing a substantial withdrawal from consumer purchasing power, the report held these should not be used by reactionary groups as an excuse for reducing taxes but should be paid out in increased benefits to more people.

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM

The C.I.O. offered a four-fold national health program. This consisted of widespread construction of hospitals and clinics with federal aid; expansion of public health services to care for "social diseases such as pneumonia, tuberculosis and syphilis"; establishment of federal standards for the control and prevention of industrial diseases; and a general system of medical care, including free care for lower-income groups, and cash benefits, contributed by employers and the government, for temporarily disabled workers.

"The C.I.O. is opposed," the report said, "to any scheme which would attempt to segregate the medical services available to the lower third of the population. A thorough scheme of medical care can more efficiently and more economically make adequate medical services available to the entire population, including..."

Labor Must Protect Self Amidst Industrial Chaos

Dorothy Thompson's Attack Answered

By CHARLES CAMPBELL

IN her column of November 24, Dorothy Thompson applauds the letter which Assistant Attorney-General Thurman Arnold sent to the Central Labor Union of Indianapolis, in which he "attempts to define what are and what are not legitimate rights of labor unions."

Miss Thompson selects for the text of her sermon to the labor unions the following excerpt from Mr. Arnold's letter, characterized by him as "illegitimate": "Unreasonable restraints designed to compel the hiring of useless and unnecessary labor."

According to Miss Thompson, "it is high time that somebody has gotten around to the labor unions," because certain practices "are getting the American public fed up." Miss Thompson does not state from what poll or from what source she gets her information that "the American public is getting fed up," but she does cite several examples of trade unions "forcing" employers to hire "unnecessary" labor, and becomes especially incensed because a member of the electricians union sent a bill to the Mercury Theater for \$21, merely for "turning on a light." She cites several other examples, which I will not list here,

but which may be found by referring to the column itself.

DICTATORSHIP AND UNEMPLOYMENT

I have been reading Miss Thompson's column for quite a while, and I have often marveled at her ability to work herself into a lather over so many and varied subjects. As anyone who has heard of the lady knows—and who has not since she hoisted herself out of obscurity by predicting that Hitler would never attain power, and if he did, would not hold it for six months?—one of her favorite subjects for discussion is dictatorship, its causes and effects in Europe, and how it can be prevented here. She has often pointed out that we in the United States are in danger of dictatorship, that we must ever be on guard against it, and has warned that unless certain conditions existing here are promptly rectified, a dictatorship is nearer than many of us realize. One of those conditions which she says must be rectified at once is our problem of unemployment.

I don't think anyone can gainsay Miss Thompson in these statements, and I think she should be commended for her timely warnings. Now, however, she reaches a state of righteous indignation at certain practices of trade unions, practices which are aimed at but one thing, to provide work for as many members of the unions as possible and to prevent unemployment from spreading among the members of the unions.

In "normal" times, that is, in times when there is no unemployment, it would be difficult to see any reason for these practices against which Miss Thompson is so incensed, but these are not "normal" times. We have nine million unemployed in this country, in spite of the fact that we are in the midst of a war boom, and the business index is higher than at any time since 1929, and in some cases higher even than in 1929. Caught in the grip of a sick, chaotic economy, in which security is unknown and even the right to work for a living is denied to millions, can organized labor be blamed for adopting all and any measures of self-protection? Anyone who has ever faced the prospect of months of hopeless unemployment will know what I mean.

HOW ABOUT THESE PRACTICES?

While Miss Thompson is in such a dither about the unions, I wish she would become indignant about certain practices of employers, industrialists and our own government, practices which are at the expense of the lower-income groups, which, of course, include the members of the unions. I will not mention a few here, but there is a wealth of material which Miss Thompson can find thru a little diligent research.

1. Suppression of inventions by manufacturers. It is well known that many inventions which would outmode articles now in use, and pro-

A Victim of the Stalin-Hitler Pact

New York City Editor, Workers Age:

I went to Spain to fight against fascism. After I was wounded there, I came back and was given a job in the Furriers Joint Council. As long as I believed in the "line" of the Communist Party, they called me a "hero."

But I didn't quite believe everything I was told by the C.P. leaders, and soon I began to question the policies of the party in Spain as well as here in America. So Mr. Potash, the manager of the Furriers Joint Council, told me not to go to any lectures given by anybody who spoke against them. But it didn't take long and the Stalin-Hitler partnership was made.

Hundreds of my comrades and friends had given their lives against the fascist armies in Spain and now the party and the leaders that they had believed and followed were back-

ing Stalin's betrayal. Mr. Potash forgave me for asking questions, for which they called me confused, but once I began talking against Stalin and his party here, they could no longer forgive me. They fired me. After I had worked in the office of the union for a year and ten months, Mr. Potash all of a sudden discovered that I was only a "temporary" worker. It seems that you can work for them only as long as you keep your mouth shut about what you think of Stalin and Stalinism.

I have appealed with my case directly to the furriers by walking thru the market with a sign pointing out how I had been victimized by the officials of the Furriers Union. The attitude of the fur workers to me is very cordial and friendly. I hope I may be able to get my job back again.

BILL HARVEY
Veteran of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Harlem ALP Launches Big Drive

A coordinated drive to cover the Harlem area with a network of American Labor Party clubs has already borne fruit. Missionary work was done during the Crosswalk campaign, and since the election, Edward Welsh and Gerald Allen have been on the job every day.

Five new A.L.P. clubs have been opened in Harlem during the past month. On Friday, December 15, a celebration was held to officially launch the new district organizations at the Association of Trade and Commerce Building, located at 2370 Seventh Ave., which will be the central headquarters of the Harlem clubs. Local neighborhood clubrooms have already been opened.

Alex Rose, state secretary of the American Labor Party, and Frank R. Crosswath, chairman of the Harlem Labor Center, headed the list of speakers on Friday evening. Harold Baer, executive secretary of the New York County Executive Committee, and Thomas Young, vice-president of Local 32-B Building Service Employees, also spoke. Edward Welsh presided at the meeting.

"The old-line political parties have never given the residents of Harlem anything but promises," Mr. Crosswath declared. "The residents of Harlem have been the victims of the most unjust practices of discrimination. The American Labor Party is pledged to fight these evils and to work vigorously to solve the many problems besetting the people of Harlem."

duce articles that would last much longer and cost the consumer much less, are bought by the interested companies and are never used because less profit would be derived than from those now manufactured. Electric-light bulbs which can be made to last practically a lifetime thru elimination of vibration are not manufactured because the profits from the sale of bulbs which wear out quickly would be lost, and radio tubes which will last practically the life of any radio set are not manufactured for the same reason. Here are but two, but there are hundreds of examples. It is the consumers, the low-income groups, including the members of the unions, who must pony up to make profits for the manufacturers and the stockholders.

2. Laws passed by various states against chain stores. Here we have an example of modern merchandising methods being used to enable goods to be sold to the consumer at a lower price than merchants who use old, outmoded and antiquated methods. Yet we find the chain stores being legislated against to prevent them from doing this. Who loses? Again it is the small-income groups, including the very same members of the unions. This is restraint of trade approved by law, and at the expense of those who can afford it least. Secretary of Commerce Hopkins is now engaged in a study of these laws with the view of challenging them. I wonder if his efforts will be applauded by Miss Thompson?

3. Lower utility rates. The government has shown conclusively that government-owned utilities can be sold to the consumer at a much lower cost than those privately owned. Yet the utility magnates, supported by most of the press, fight such government ownership bitterly. Who loses under private ownership of the utilities? Again it is the lower-income groups, those who can least afford it.

4. Crop restriction. Here the government itself takes a hand. It restricts the growing of crops in order to raise prices. The examples of the little pigs and the dumped food are now notorious. From reading Miss Thompson's columns, I know she is not wholly in favor of crop-restriction, but only because she considers it an abridgement of the rights of the rugged individualist, and not because it raises the price of commodities to the consumer, the same low-income groups, which include the trade-union members, those who can least afford it.

I could give other examples, but I think these will be enough to prove that Miss Thompson is slightly

Chicago Milk Drivers to Hold Election

MEMBERS of the Milk Wagon Drivers Union, at a session last week marked by considerable conflict, nominated candidates for the union's first election of officers in eighteen years. Among the long-time officers who will face opposition are Robert G. Fitchie, veteran president, and Steve Sumner, 90-year old secretary-treasurer.

More than 1,500 of the union's 4,700 members crowded into the hall for the big session. They not only decided on the election, to be held December 28, but voted that henceforth an election should be held every three years, and sliced salaries of all officers drastically.

A full set of candidates was nominated to oppose the present officers who have held their position since 1921. In the last two years, a growing faction has demanded a showdown on the permanent officers issue.

The result of this demand was that the union was ordered by its parent body, the International Brotherhood of Chauffeurs, Teamsters, Stablemen and Helpers, to hold an election.

A modified list of salary cuts was approved. The officers to be elected December 28 will be paid as follows: president, \$10,000 instead of \$13,000; vice-president, \$9,000 instead of \$10,200; secretary-treasurer, \$10,000 instead of \$13,000; recording secretary, \$7,500 instead of \$9,000; business agents, \$7,500 instead of \$9,000, and trustee, \$5,000 instead of \$7,200.

The union voted without debate to pay the legal expenses of its officers who are among defendants indicted in the Chicago milk case alleging conspiracy and restraint of trade. There was also a move to defer the election until after the trial. This was voted down.

Public Favor Union but Also Federal Control

Vast Majority Call for AFL-CIO Peace

WHAT is the present public attitude to trade unionism, to the split in the labor movement and to plans for governmental "regulation" of labor organizations? The latest soundings of public opinion, completed recently by Dr. George Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion, reveal three basic attitudes:

1. The great majority of voters (74%), as judged by the survey, continue to be in favor of the principle of labor unionism. Labor's right to organize for collective bargaining has received consistent support from the public, the Institute pointed out.

2. There is strong sentiment, however, for greater government "regulation" of labor unions. More than three voters in every four (79%) questioned in the survey favor increased regulation. These voters give two main reasons for their belief—first, "protection of the public from violence and disorder"; and, second, "protection of labor itself from possible exploitation by its own leaders."

3. An overwhelming majority of voters believes that the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. should settle their differences. Especially significant is the fact that labor-union members reached in the survey are just as strongly in favor of peace between the rival unions as the general public is. Over 90% of the union members interviewed think settlement of the feud would be good for labor.

"The greatest sentiment for increased government regulation of labor unions, come from the farm population," the survey stresses. "Since 1935, when the Institute began its continuous surveys of public opinion, farmers have been found the least sympathetic of all groups toward the aims and activities of labor unions."

"The farmer's attitude probably springs from the fact that, in many cases, he is an employer of labor himself. So long as his attitude persists any movement toward the formation of a farmer-labor party probably faces an uphill climb."

"The farm vote for greater regulation of unions is higher than the vote of any other group. The following few comparisons serve to illustrate the difference in the survey: "Do you think labor unions should be regulated to a greater extent by the federal government?"

| | | |
|---------------------|---------|---------|
| Total national vote | Yes. | No. |
| Urban voters | 79% 21% | 78% 22% |
| Small-town voters | 77% 23% | 77% 23% |
| Farmers | 84% 16% | |

New York City. A contract specifying that for every 10 younger men employed on any job one man of 55 or older must be hired was signed last week in the electrical trades.

Parties to the new pact guaranteeing opportunities to older men were the New York Electrical Contractors Association and Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L.

The contract will run one year from January 1, 1940. It provides a \$2-an-hour minimum with a thirty-hour, five-day week.

Labor and the Law

by Joseph Elwood

GEORGE MEANY AND THE STATE LABOR BOARD

UNTIL the beginning of this month, the New York State Labor Relations Board, unlike the National Labor Relations Board, had entirely escaped the accusation of alleged favoritism towards one labor federation at the expense of the other.

On December 5, however, George Meany, leaving his post as president of the New York State Federation of Labor to assume his new duties as secretary-treasurer of the A. F. of L., opened a sharp attack on the State Board charging it with "favoritism" towards the C.I.O.

The occasion for the charge was a recent decision of the Board directing an election among the workers of the Triborough Coach Corporation of New York City. An A. F. of L. affiliate, the Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees, had made a three-year contract with the company in 1936, before the New York act came into existence.

In June 1937, the C.I.O. Transport Workers Union began organizing the workers and sought recognition. On May 8, 1938, it won from the Board a direction for an election despite the existence of the A. F. of L. contract. On reargument, the direction of election was withdrawn.

Recently, when the A. F. of L. contract was about to expire, the C.I.O. union renewed its petition for an election, claiming to represent a majority of the workers. An election was directed by the Board and was won two to one by the C.I.O. union. Before the election was held, and when the proceedings were already pending before the Board, in order to forestall a C.I.O. victory in the election and the consequent demand for a closed-shop agreement, the company and the A. F. of L. union renewed their contract.

After the C.I.O. won the election, the contract with the A. F. of L. was naturally void and the company had to start negotiations with the victorious union. Hence, Mr. Meany's attack against the State Labor Relations Board, accusing it of "turning A. F. of L. contracts over to the C.I.O."

According to Father Boland, chairman of the S.L.R.B., Mr. Meany also made a flat statement at a Board hearing that "once the A. F. of L. had a contract, it had the contract forever, no matter whether the employees liked it or not."

Mr. Meany's entire attack was, in our opinion, entirely unjustified. Besides, it was uninformed and dangerous to the labor movement. In fact, if the Board had accepted Mr. Meany's argument it would have had to violate the New York "Little Wagner" Act and depart from democratic principles. Furthermore, Mr. Meany's argument for a "permanent" A. F. of L. contract is completely at variance with the argument made recently by Joseph Padway, A. F. of L. general counsel, before the United States Supreme Court, that a minority's right to strike must be retained in order to protect its members against possible "dishonest" agreements by a majority organization. It is also worth remembering that one of the A. F. of L.-sponsored amendments to the Wagner Act favors one-year contracts.

We wish somebody would tip off Mr. Meany about all this. We hope

that the A. F. of L., after realizing the implications of Mr. Meany's remarks, will repudiate them completely.

Label Suit Against the N.L.R.B.

Last week, the Circuit Court of Appeals at Cincinnati, dismissed the first label suit ever brought against the National Labor Relations Board a suit by the Clover Fork Coal Company. The company alleged injury thru the Board's statement that the company used "strip-tease" shows as a means of defeating unionization of its employees. Because the Labor Board is an agency of the United States government, federal consent must be obtained before any damage suit may be brought against it. The company had not obtained that consent.

Insecurity of Farmers Causes Wide Distress

Washington, D. C. THE ever-growing alertness on the part of farmers to their close interest with city labor is in no small degree influenced by the increasing insecurity of the farm population. The devastating effect of mechanization is being felt in agriculture as it is in industry.

The machine is proving to the farmer that his kinship with the city worker is based on the irresistible force of economic development more than on the fact that they both wear overalls.

On the other hand, the growing insecurity of the farm population directly affects the city workers and the latter also are realizing that the plight of the agricultural worker is their concern.

The farm problem has been brought into the news by the annual report of Dr. W. W. Alexander, Farm Security Administrator. In his own matter-of-fact way, he is saying almost exactly what John Steinbeck said more dramatically in his "Grapes of Wrath." Only Dr. Alexander's report provides the latest information on the subject, which if done in Steinbeck's manner could have been entitled, "The Grapes of Wrath Grow More Bitter."

Dr. Alexander's report presents a harrowing picture of insecurity, economic instability and almost complete hopelessness of the agricultural workers. There seems to be no hope for improvement.

The large commercial farms with mechanized equipment, the report says, can give employment to farmers for only a few weeks during the year. The rest of the time they must seek relief to keep alive.

During the past ten years, "hundreds of thousands of families have been pushed off the land," Dr. Alexander notes. These families take to the highways in search of employment. Whatever jobs they find are seasonal farm work lasting only a few weeks, thus making it necessary that they keep moving from one crop area to another.

"Usually they find little or no provision for shelter, health protection or schooling," the report continues. "Winter weather brings a sharp increase in cases of pneumonia, influenza, and other pulmonary diseases. The risks of epidemics of smallpox, typhoid, scarlet fever and similar diseases is a year-around menace."

Eventually these migratory workers will begin to realize that salvation lies in their own hands, as city labor has learned and is learning faster from year to year. Efforts at organization are being ruthlessly frustrated, but with the aid of the labor movement, they will lay the foundation for strong unions of their own, to unite with urban workers.

At the same time, agricultural labor is learning that its citizenship rights are a powerful force in its own behalf and will join the urban populations now advancing in their political thinking.

By united action between city and farm worker the vine that bears the grapes of wrath can be uprooted and new vines planted whose fruits will be the grapes of justice, security, stability and happiness.

VISIT OUR CIRCULATING LIBRARY WORKERS AGE BOOKSHOP (Headquarters for Labor Literature) HUNDREDS OF TITLES From "Das Kapital" to "Grapes of Wrath" Room 707 — 131 W. 33rd St.

I.L.P. Forging Ahead Despite War Crisis

Membership Grows and Activity Expands

(Special to the Workers Age)
 London, England.
 THE war has taken an unexpected line. We anticipated fierce military action at once with air bombing, but as you know, we have had a lull of nine weeks with only a few air attacks on isolated military objectives. On the western front, the armies stand ranged against each other, but with no big offensives. We had anticipated that fierce military action would be accompanied by suppression of liberties. In the first few days, it looked like it. We had an air warning within ten minutes of the Premier's speech declaring war and our printers refused to print our first issue (of the New Leader, official paper of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain.—Editor) after the war and indicated that they would not print further issues.

We had made fairly complete preparations for such a situation, but after the first week, political activities became fairly normal. We are still running public meetings; we are able to get fairly outspoken leaflets printed and they are being widely distributed; and whilst in the New Leader we can't say all we want, we have been able to get across a large part of our case. The interference with any political liberty has been rare and I get the impression that during this period of lull the government has not been unwilling for some anti-war propaganda to be carried on in case a situation arose when they want to begin negotiations. I have little doubt that whilst they want to get rid of Hitler, they would begin to negotiate with any right-wing government which replaced the present regime in Germany.

The present signs are that the war is about to begin on a more serious scale. If this happens, I think suppression of liberty will also begin. The lull has given us an opportunity to prepare for this. You can be quite sure that whatever happens our party will carry on the struggle.

MEMBERSHIP REACTS MAGNIFICENTLY

The membership has been magnificent. In 1914, I suppose that we lost 20% of the membership. I have not heard of a single resignation from the party on the war issue. There has been a lot of dislocation because members have been called up or transferred to new jobs or evacuated, but otherwise ordinary work has not only been maintained—it has been intensified.

New members are pouring in. We are getting a certain number of disillusioned Communist Party members, but not many. It's astonishing how they are ready to turn with the "party line," and others when disillusioned tend to drop out of the fight altogether.

We are now making very wide and valuable contacts within the Labor Party, the trade-union movement and the cooperative movement. The degree of opposition to the policy of the leadership is much stronger than appears on the surface.

Public psychology is extraordinary. There is no war fever like there was in 1914. There isn't the spy mania against aliens or the ferocity against those who are opposed to the war. War enthusiasm

requires action and war hate requires imagination. The absence of exciting military action has dulled war zeal and the absence of air raids has meant that there is so far little anger against the enemy. If the war now begins on a dramatic scale, this may be changed, but at the moment there is no dynamic psychology for war. Underneath, there is a very wide feeling that Hitler is the devil of the piece and that he must be overthrown. But support of the war does not go much beyond that. The government must be aware of the prevalent psychology and, quite apart from the difficulties of a military victory now that the effect of the blockade has been so much lessened by Russian and east European supplies, not to mention the disturbing effect of India's attitude, it must realize that a long war will be a difficult proposition.

WHAT MAY BE AHEAD

My reading of the situation is that if the war now develops actively, the public will become hotter in its favor for a time and we shall have a more difficult struggle, but after that, opinion will change again and we shall have a still bigger opportunity. Certainly, the rank-and-file opinion in the labor movement, expressed thru Labor Parties and

War Boosts Unemployment

London, England.
 OVER 1,400,000 people are still unemployed in Great Britain altho over 1,250,000 men are under arms, Ernest Brown, Minister of Labor, reported last week.
 The change from peace-time to war-time industry, he said, has caused much dislocation and joblessness.

Trades Councils, will become increasingly opposed to the official leadership. There is widespread opposition to the political truce and sooner or later an opportunity will come to put up I.L.P. candidates in by-elections against National government candidates with good results. The degree to which both the political and industrial leaders are surrendering democratic rights is almost incredible. The action of the Labor Party in supporting the suspension of all local elections and the recent Trades Union Congress agreement with the government and the employers federation are causing shocked indignation among both the political and industrial rank and file. Some of the big trade unions, including the National Union of Railwaymen and the Post Office Workers, are beginning to move hopefully. The former has declared against the political truce and the latter has already come out cautiously for peace.

(This letter was written by an outstanding leader of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain—Editor)

"War Prosperity" Is Illusion for Masses

Welfare and Living Standards Hard Hit

By
 MAXWELL S. STEWART

LARGE groups of Americans—probably the majority—stand to lose far more than they gain from war-time prosperity. This fact should be faced frankly and fairly. The experience of the last war shows that white-collar workers as a whole were heavy losers. This was particularly true of the employees of federal, state and local governments. School teachers fared somewhat better than other government employees because there was a scarcity at a time when the schools were growing rapidly. Such conditions are unlikely to be repeated. Today, attendance at grade schools is diminishing. Nearly all the larger school systems have long waiting lists of teacher applicants. Teachers, therefore, like other persons on a fixed income, are likely to find that the cost of living rises more rapidly than their salaries. Unskilled workers may also in the end pay heavily for war prosperity, tho the first stages of a boom are generally beneficial to labor: the unemployed are put back to work; men who have been working part time get more hours of work a week; there is perhaps a long-sought raise in wages. But altho wages are adjusted more readily than salaries, wage rates tend—in all but a few industries—to lag well

behind prices. Inflation involves a concealed but none the less painful cut in real wages.

HAVOC OF INFLATION

Inflation, too, works havoc with the savings of the average family. While stocks are booming and speculators are amassing profits in commodities, the purchasing power of savings accounts, life-insurance policies and mortgages is steadily undermined as prices rise. Our entire system of social security, one of the greatest achievements of recent years, would be gravely threatened. The federal old-age-insurance system is really a form of forced savings. The size of the benefit, in dollars, is linked with past wages. A substantial decline in value of the dollar such as would occur in an inflationary period would make the benefits hopelessly inadequate. This could be corrected only by abandoning the principle upon which the system is based. A somewhat different problem would arise in connection with the federal-state old-age pensions and unemployment insurance. Maximum benefits are established by law in each of the forty-eight states. While changes could ultimately be made, it is probable that the existing standards of security would be at least temporarily impaired.

Those who seem to gain the most from war-time prosperity may turn out to be the heaviest losers. Take the farmers, for instance. During the last war they enjoyed several excellent years. Stimulated by the prospect of profits, they expanded their output, bought new machinery, and went deeply into debt. When the war boom finally ended in the Fall of 1920, they found themselves saddled with an impossible burden of indebtedness and permanently bereft of markets for their increased output. American farmers have been paying for their mistake ever since. And the same kind of thing occurred in many branches of industry. War profits are the most treacherous of profits.

DIVERSION OF RESOURCES

Reference has been made to the silk shirts and similar luxuries which ordinary workers are supposed to have enjoyed during the first world war. What we do not hear about are the basic necessities which could not be obtained because so great a part of the world's resources were being utilized to make engines of destruction. The war brought about a fundamental dislocation in our economic structure. Good shoes and good suits were unobtainable at prices the ordinary man could afford to pay. Home building came to a standstill. Decent houses became so difficult to get that they were out of reach of the typical worker. It was not until some five or six years after the war that this shortage was remedied. An even graver situation may develop as a result of the present conflict. Ten years of subnormal building activity have left the United States short at least seven or eight hundred thousand homes. During the last year, we have nearly reached a normal building schedule, but the shortage remains. A full-fledged war boom might force millions of individuals to continue living in sub-standard houses regardless of their increased wages.

Housing is but one example of the inevitable consequences of a war. An overwhelming majority of persons are bound to lose from an extended war boom, for the simple reason that our energies will be devoted to other purposes than satisfying our basic economic needs. The experience of Germany in the years since Hitler came to power is enough to show that a nation cannot squander its resources for non-productive, non-consumable war supplies without suffering a severe cut in its standard of living. A neutral country is hardly likely to devote as great a part of its resources to war purposes as a belligerent. But if the pattern of the last war is followed at all, the United States will be called on, as a neutral, to export many more billions of dollars worth of goods than it imports. This difference will be America's material contribution to the war. If it is substantial, as it may eventually become, it will inevitably interfere with the normal production of goods for American consumers.

(These paragraphs are from an article, "That War Prosperity," by Maxwell S. Stewart, in the October 28, 1939 issue of the Nation—Editor)

Such is the "legal" road to totalitarian dictatorship in America prepared in the guise of a war emergency. It's a vicious circle, for its provisions do not cease to be effective until the President says so—and the President is the man who runs the works.

Uncensored is published weekly at 112 East 19th Street, and its subscription rate is \$2.50 for six months.

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

Books

—by Jim Cork—

A SHORT HISTORY OF POLITICAL THINKING, by Paul W. Ward. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N. C. 1939.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL IDEAS, by F. J. C. Hearnshaw. Thomas Nelson and Sons, London. 1937.

NEITHER of these very brief sketches is likely to cast much light on the development of political ideas or on contemporary problems of political thought. They are conventional digests, with a gesture made here and there to relate the history of political ideology to the fundamental forces at work in society.

The Ward book is to some degree successful in embodying the rather obvious idea that "the political and social theories of men always concern the problems of their culture and age, and are to be understood in that context," perhaps more successful when dealing with the Greek city-state than with "contemporary viewpoints." Particularly weak are the "explanations" of the changes and shifts of the socio-historical background. Another grave defect is the unaccountable omission of any real treatment of European feudalism and its political philosophy.

Dr. Hearnshaw's book, first published in 1927, and then rather hastily brought up to date in 1937, is marked by a somewhat more penetrating insight and by a fuller treatment of the cross-currents of political thought of the middle ages and early modern times. But his com-

Selective Service Act Sets Up Dictatorship

Full Text Bared in New Anti-War Bulletin

By M. S. M.

WHAT is the "Selective Service Act"? In the labor and liberal press, especially in the columns of this paper, much space has been devoted of late to the war plans of the Administration. Various aspects of the M-Day plans have been described and the general outlines of the threatened totalitarian conscription of the people discussed.

Now the full text of the Selective Service Act has been made available for the first time in the weekly bulletin, *Uncensored*, whose editorial sponsors include John T. Flynn, chairman of the New York Keep America Out of War Committee; Alfred Bingham; Quincy Howe; George Leighton; Ferdinand Lundberg; and Ernest L. Meyer.

In a special supplement to the November 18 issue of *Uncensored*, the new conscription law, as prepared by the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, is presented. The act empowers the President to prescribe regulations to carry it into effect. These regulations

ments on contemporary political philosophies are neither contemporary nor philosophical.

The reader will have to look elsewhere for a worthwhile summary of the development of political ideas.

Reviewed by W. H.

C.I.O. Issues Program

(Continued from page 2)
 ing workers, farmers and professional people."

In the field of housing, the government should take steps at once to expand the construction of houses from the present low level of 450,000 per year to not less than a million a year, the report held. The United States Housing Authority program, it said, should be enlarged from the present 50,000 homes a year to at least 300,000 a year, which would involve the annual expenditure of about \$30,000,000.

Other steps should also be taken by the government to stimulate private residential construction to at least 700,000 dwellings a year against the present rate of less than 400,000, the report continued, this to be accomplished in part by the further lowering of private interest rates on construction loans and the extension of the repayment period for such loans thru appropriate action by the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

A combined program of this kind would not only alleviate the existing housing shortage, but would provide employment for about 2,000,000 directly and indirectly, as against much less than half that number at present, it was asserted.

"One of the changes that is most essential to the stabilization of our economy is a drastic revision of the tax structure," the report concluded. "With the recent payroll and wage taxes for social security and the numerous sales taxes levied by states, the proportion of govern-

mental revenue derived from direct taxes upon wage earners has increased tremendously.

"Of all the federal revenue collected in 1929, 30.2% came from taxes bearing primarily upon consumption, such as excise taxes, customs, tobacco and liquor taxes, and 69.8% came from other taxes, such as those on corporate incomes, comes above \$5,000 per year, estates and gifts. By 1938, the percentage of taxes based primarily upon consumption was 51.3% and the other taxes constituted only 48.7% of the total tax income.

"In other words, it is not business, but rather labor and consumer groups who are bearing the brunt of our increased expenditures for social welfare and national defense.

"We are therefore determined that there must not be any increase of taxes for the low-income groups; on the contrary, the present tax burden upon the consumer groups and wage-earners must be substantially reduced, and a far greater proportion of total tax revenue must be derived by tapping the large concentrations of income and savings thru higher taxes.

"The C.I.O. tax program, accordingly, calls for such taxes as an excess profits tax to reach the swelling profits of industry resulting from increased industrial activity and war contracts, elimination of tax exemption for government securities, increased inheritance and gift taxes and increased rates and elimination of loopholes in taxes upon upper-bracket income."

Cultural Freedom Group Protests French Arrests

New York City.

THE Committee for Cultural Freedom last week sent to the French ambassador for transmission to his government, a letter protesting the measures taken against thirty French intellectuals and trade-union leaders for their opposition to the war. Jean Giono, one of those imprisoned, is the author of "Harvest", from which the prize-winning French film was made.

The text of the Committee's letter, signed by Sidney Hook, chairman of the Executive Committee, follows:

"Your Excellency:

"I am directed to submit to you the deep feeling of surprise and shock of the members of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, on hearing of the arrest and imprisonment of MM. Giono and Lecoin, renowned anti-fascists, and of the proceedings against twenty-eight other French intellectuals and trade-union leaders whose names are well known to all friends of freedom and of France here in the United States.

"In this group were Victor Marguerite, Alain, Professor Felicien Chalay, George Yvetot, Professors Jeanne and Michel Alexandre, and Rene Gerin. They were proceeded against because they signed a manifesto in opposition to the war and in favor of an immediate peace.

"I beg to submit, Your Excellency, that the members of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom are unfavorably impressed by this action, which conflicts in such flagrant fashion with the avowed purposes of the French and British governments in their contest with the Nazi and other totalitarian foes of freedom. We call your attention to the fact that there is no record of repression by your ally of any anti-war sentiment, or for that matter, even of communist or fascist manifestations, insofar as they do not involve espionage.

"Do the agents of the government of the Republic of France wish its friends here to believe that free discussion is a greater danger to France than it is to England? It would be hard for us to accept that. We feel that a democracy which declares that it is engaged in a war in defense of democracy, must be at particular pains not to destroy that which it purports to defend.

"The circulation of a simple pamphlet signed by a number of intellectuals cannot, under any circumstances, have justified the severe action of the military governor of Paris under the decree of September 1, 1939, which forbids 'all manifestations that might exercise an unfortunate influence on the morale of the army and the people.' The idea that such a pamphlet could have such an effect gives American public opinion a regrettable impression of the state of mind of the French people.

"We urge you to liberate the victims of what seems to us an administrative and tactical error, and thus to strengthen the hands of those who are striving to preserve freedom and justice everywhere."

The New Imperialism Of Stalinist Russia

Trotskyites Urge Support of the Invaders

(Continued from page 1)

case is but little different with the new Russian imperialism.

Apparently, even the Trotskyites realize that the prospect of conquest by the Russian army and incorporation in the Stalinist realm is hardly entrancing enough in any form, and so they come out with great intrepidity in favor of an "independent Soviet Finland" (S.W.P. statement). That's very noble, no doubt, but under present circumstances, it appears somewhat of a pious platitude. Worse than a pious platitude if it means opposition to the national self-determination and independence of a Finland that may not be Soviet. Thus, being for an "independent Soviet China" is all very well, but what would this slogan really mean if it implied hostility to the struggle of Nationalist China, Chiang Kai-shek's China, against Japanese aggression?

DENOUNCE STALIN—BUT SUPPORT HIM!

But we can't fight the Red Army, comes the last desperate plea. "Only agents of imperialism, standing for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, can desire the defeat of the Red Army," the S.W.P. statement proclaims in thunder tones. We are not impressed one bit. Such a conception means simply that we must go along with every atrocity Stalin chooses to commit, once he sends out his Red Army to enforce that atrocity! We may criticize his policies all right, the Trotskyites tell us, but once he starts military operations and throws his armies into action, then we must support him for we cannot "desire the defeat of the Red Army." We may denounce the invasion but we must support the invader! It's a case of "My country, right or wrong," only in this case, Stalin is "my country". Thank you, not for us!

By this time, it is abundantly clear that the Trotskyist position is in essence a mere repetition of the

Stalinist "arguments", a sham—"revolutionary" apology for Stalin's aggressions, tempered with the usual routine denunciations of "Stalinist bureaucracy"! With all their super-revolutionary "dialectics", the Trotskyites cannot make the new Stalin imperialism palatable to any one who still possesses the least spark of democratic or socialist decency.

Much more to the point than all of the pseudo-"revolutionary" beating around the bush of the Trotskyites is the straight Stalinist plea of military necessity, cynical but revealing. Russia must dominate the Baltic in order to control vital military positions and to forestall their seizure by another power as a basis of hostile military operations. This argument rings familiarly in our ears; it is the unflinching argument of every imperialist power bent on aggression, made with equal justice by Hitler with regard to the Sudeten region or by the United States with regard to Porto Rico. Indeed, on that ground, the United States is entitled to the whole Caribbean, to Mexico, to all of Central America! If Stalinist Russia now argues in such terms, it only means that Stalinist Russia argues in the traditional terms of imperialism. It must therefore expect to be judged as any other imperialist power is judged!

I need not surprise the reader to find Trotsky playing the role of apologist for Stalin. After all, Trotskyism is in essence an inverted, frustrated Stalinism.

(The second article in this series by Will Herberg will deal with the background, nature and driving forces of the new Russian imperialism—Editor.)



For a
**HAPPY
 NEW YEAR**
 (see Ad on page 1)

The Best Protection . . .
For Workers and Their Families
 can be offered only by consolidated forces of the workers.

FOR

- HEALTH INSURANCE
- LIFE INSURANCE
- MEDICAL CARE
- HOSPITAL AID

RECREATION SOCIABILITY

Join the
WORKMEN'S BENEFIT FUND
 714 Seneca Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 organized 1884

All Out for the Big NEW YEAR'S EVE DANCE & FLOOR SHOW

The Best Time of Your Life — Floor Show Begins 11 P. M. — See Ad on Page 1

Workers Age

Organ of the National Council, Independent Labor League of America, 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published every Saturday by Workers Age Publishing Association. Subscription Rates: \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 for six months; 50c 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. Will: HERCKAWANNA 4-5282.

PHILL HERBERG, Editor

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

VOL. 8. SATURDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1939. NO. 52.

STALIN DISARMS RUSSIA

RUMORS are flying across Europe that informal contacts have already been established between Germany and the Allies for the purpose of discussing terms on which the present war could be ended and a joint four-power attack launched on the Soviet Union by England, France, Germany and Italy. Very probably, there is no substance to these rumors at the moment but it would be sheer folly to ignore the fact that just such an outcome of the war is growing increasingly probable in the present situation. And in what position is Soviet Russia to meet this crisis?

Obviously, Stalin's new imperialism is preparing the way for and encouraging a united capitalist attack on Russia. What Stalin is doing greatly facilitates—indeed, practically invites—a rapprochement between Anglo-French and German imperialism directed against the Soviet Union. Obviously, too, Stalin's course of predatory aggression has already deprived Russia of its most reliable support, at least as vital for its defense as its armed forces, and far more vital than naval bases on the Baltic—the sympathy, good-will and support of the popular masses in western Europe and America.

What saved Soviet Russia in the terrible days after the World War? Surely not merely its ill-equipped, ill-organized armies, raised by a heroic revolutionary effort out of the vast chaos! No; what saved Russia in those days of despair was the active sympathy of so many millions of people in England and France and Germany if not for everything the new Soviet government was doing, at least for the great and generous aspirations that were undeniably animating its work. What saved Russia was the active opposition of these millions to the interventionist plans of their governments. That was the shield that protected the new worker-peasant regime in the days when the danger was greatest.

Something of same sympathy and good-will remained with the Soviet republic in the years that followed. Less than a year ago, great numbers of people in the western "democracies" were still saying: "Of course, Stalin is a dictator. But at least nobody can accuse him of coveting one inch of foreign territory. At least no one can question Russia's desire for peace or its opposition to armed aggression." A conviction of this sort, so widespread among great masses, was an immensely powerful factor in Soviet defense.

Today, all this is gone—swept away by the atrocities of the new Stalin imperialism. Today, there is probably more hostility towards Soviet Russia in the "democratic" countries than even towards Nazi Germany. Stalin is now the prize devil, not Hitler. No war or England and France than a crusade against the Russia of Stalin. Russia is isolated, shunned, hated, not merely by the governments, which might be expected, but by the great masses of the people.

For the miserable mess of portage of a few Baltic outposts, Stalin has bartered the inestimable birthright of Soviet Russia—the confidence, good-will and sympathy of the great masses of the people throughout the world. He has disarmed Russia!

THE LABOR BOARD INVESTIGATION

IT is still too soon to decide whether the Congressional investigation of the National Labor Relations Board, now under way, will turn out to be what many have feared, simply a fishing expedition to provide red herrings for the enemies of the Wagner Act to use in the campaign to undermine or destroy it. However that may be, it is already clear that labor must take a firm and positive stand on the issues and not rest content with warnings and denunciations.

In the first place, no section of the labor movement can afford to take the position that the Wagner Act is perfect and unchangeable, that it is treason merely to suggest that it could possibly be amended in spots. The A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. each has its program of amendments. We cannot endorse in full the program of either but each includes points that deserve serious consideration. At any rate, the whole question should be approached realistically and concretely and not in any fanatical, partisan spirit. Just what are the shortcomings in the Wagner Act and its administration from the point of view of labor? How can these shortcomings be best overcome, by legislative revision or by improvement in administration? These are the real questions. And in answering them, let us remember that we should not expect all our problems to be solved for us by legislative enactment. Such an attitude has become all too common in the ranks of labor, and it is dangerous. With all the assistance that proper labor legislation may give, it is still, as always, to their own organization and independent action that the workers must look for security and power in the present critical period.

Nor can we refuse to see that there have been many serious abuses in the functioning of the National Labor Relations Board and its administration of the act. The scandalous behavior of Nathan Witt, the Board secretary, the shocking G.P.U.-like espionage activities of which the New York regional office was made the victim, speak for themselves. The Board certainly needs a good cleansing and a thorough revision of its inner relations and methods of work.

But above all we must recognize with complete clarity that the acute, far-reaching problems that have gathered around the Wagner Act cannot possibly be solved as long as the trade-union movement remains divided against itself, split into two bitterly hostile camps. The fundamental difficulty in administering the Wagner Act is rooted in the problem of determining the appropriate unit of collective bargaining. How can this difficulty be overcome, this problem solved, as long as civil war rages in the ranks of labor? Shall it be a type of collective bargaining unit be fixed mandatorily by law? Then it is certain to prove totally unsatisfactory either to the A. F. of L. or the C.I.O., depending on which way it is fixed. Shall it be left to the discretion of the Board? Then you will have a continuation of the present intolerable situation where the Board satisfies neither side and is attacked by both. The wisdom of Solomon could not find a way out of this dilemma short of the reunification of the labor movement!

Yes, most of the troubles of which labor complains in the operations of the Wagner Act are the direct consequence of the division in labor's ranks. And before labor can take adequate advantage of the benefits of the legal recognition of the rights of self-organization and collective bargaining embodied in the Wagner Act, it must overcome this fatal division and achieve unity in its own ranks.

HEYWOOD BROUN

HEYWOOD BROUN, whose sudden death shocked the country last week, was a man of wide human sympathies and unchallenged courage in his convictions. He was moved by injustice everywhere and never feared to speak out his mind whatever the pressure. A mere record of the journalistic battles he fought so valiantly—or even in one alone, that great fight on behalf of Sacco and Vanzetti—may well serve as his monument to posterity.

We disagreed with Heywood Broun on many occasions, perhaps more often than not. His political simplicity and natural ingenuousness of mind made him for a time a Stalinist fellow-traveler, exploited by the Stalinists for their vicious purposes. He broke with them towards the end, unable to swallow the Stalin-Hitler pact, but he never quite freed himself from the insidious poison of Popular Frontism and "democratic" war-mongering he had imbibed from them.

We do not forget this, but we prefer to remember his courage and his devotion in the good fight to save Sacco and Vanzetti. And, remembering this, we bow our head in sorrow at the untimely death of Heywood Broun.

LA VIE SYNDICALE

LE REDRESSEMENT SYNDICAL

par L. CANCOUET de la Fédération de Cheminots

La Commission administrative de la C. G. T. prend d'importantes décisions

La Commission Administrative de la C. G. T. a tenu sa séance, le 29 décembre 1939, à 17 heures, au siège de la Fédération de Cheminots, 10, rue Lafayette, à Paris. Elle a été présidée par le secrétaire général, M. L. Cancouet. Elle a entendu le rapport de M. L. Cancouet sur l'activité de la Fédération de Cheminots pendant l'année 1939. Elle a ensuite décidé la publication d'une feuille hebdomadaire de politique syndicale, sous le titre de "La Vie Syndicale". Elle a enfin décidé la publication d'une feuille hebdomadaire de politique générale, sous le titre de "Le Service Juridique".

LE SERVICE JURIDIQUE DES SYNDICATS PARISIENS

ABONNEZ-VOUS AU « PAYS SOCIALISTE »



Feut 1939 on l'ém vendus au double

ABOVE is a reproduction of an entire page of the French socialist weekly, Le Pays Socialiste, published by Paul Faure, a leader of the center wing of his party and a supporter of the present war. This page, as the caption ("La Vie Syndicale"—"Trade-Union Life") shows, is devoted to problems of the trade-union movement. Of this entire page, the censor has left just two things,

an official notice of the C.G.T., and a cartoon against Stalin and Hitler. All the rest, including two articles by leaders of the railwaymen's and postal workers unions, has been ruthlessly slashed. Only white spaces remain. Such is the democracy of the France that is fighting another war to "make the world safe for democracy"!

By Rosa Luxemburg:

The Russian Revolution

(Continued from last issue)

Take the course of the English Revolution from its onset in 1642. There the logic of things made it necessary that the first feeble vacillations of the Presbyterians, whose leaders deliberately evaded a decisive battle with Charles I and victory over him, should inevitably be replaced by the Independents, who drove them out of Parliament and seized the power for themselves. And in the same way, within the army of the Independents, the lower petty-bourgeois mass of the soldiers, the Libburnian "Levellers" constituted the driving force of the entire Independent movement, just as, finally, the proletarian elements within the mass of the soldiers, the elements that went farthest in their aspirations for social revolution and who found their expression in the Digger movement, constituted in their turn the leaven of the democratic party of the "Levellers".

Without the moral influence of the revolutionary proletarian elements on the general mass of the soldiers, without the pressure of the democratic mass of the soldiers upon the bourgeois upper layers of the party of the Independents, there would have been no "purge" of the Long Parliament of its Presbyterians, nor any victorious ending to the war with the army of the Cavaliers and Scots, nor any trial and execution of Charles I, nor any abolition of the House of Lords and proclamation of a republic.

And what happened in the Great French Revolution? Here, after four years of struggle, the seizure of power by the Jacobins proved to be the only means of saving the conquests of the revolution, of achieving a republic, of smashing feudalism, of organizing a revolutionary defense against inner as well as outer foes, of suppressing the conspiracies of counter-revolution and spreading the revolutionary wave from France to all Europe.

Kautsky and his Russian colleagues who wanted to see the Russian Revolution keep the "bourgeois character" of its first phase, are an exact counterpart of those German and English liberals of the preceding century who distinguished between the two well-known periods of the Great French Revolution: the "good" revolution of the first Girondin phase and the "bad" one after the Jacobin uprising. The Liberal shallowness of this conception of history, to be sure, doesn't care to understand that, without the uprising of the "immoderate" Jacobins, even the first, timid and half-hearted achievements of the Girondin phase would soon have been buried under the ruins of the revolution, and that the real alternative to Jacobin dictatorship—as the iron course of historical development posed the question in 1793—was not "moderate" democracy, but... restoration of the Bourbons! The "golden mean" cannot be maintained in any revolution. The law of its nature demands a quick decision: either the locomotive drives forward full steam ahead to the most extreme point of the historical ascent, or it rolls back of its own weight again to the starting point at the bottom; and those who would keep it with their weak powers half way up the hill, it but drags down with it irredeemably into the abyss.

Thus it is clear that in every revolution only that party is capable of seizing the leadership and power which has the courage to issue the appropriate watchwords for driving the revolution ahead, and the courage to draw all the necessary conclusions from the situation. This makes clear, too, the miserable role of the Russian Mensheviks, the Dans, Zeretelli, etc., who had enormous influence on the masses at the beginning, but, after their prolonged wavering and after they had fought with both hands and feet against taking over power and responsibility, were driven ignobly off the stage. The party of Lenin was the only one which grasped the mandate and duty of a truly revolutionary party and which, by the slogan—"All power in the hands of the proletariat and peasantry"—insured the continued development of the revolution. Thereby the Bolsheviks solved the famous problem of "winning a majority of the people," which problem has ever weighed on the German Social-Democracy like a nightmare. As bred-in-the-bone disciples of parliamentary cretinism, these German Social-Democrats have sought to apply to revolutions the homed wisdom of the parliamentary nursery. In order to carry anything, you must first have a majority. The same, they say, applies to revolution. First let's become a "majority." The true dialectic of revolutions, however, stands this wisdom of parliamentary moles on its head. Not through a majority to revolutionary tactics, but through revolutionary tactics to a majority—that is the way the road runs. Only a party which knows how to lead, that is, to advance things, wins support in stormy times. The determination with which, at the decisive moment, Lenin and his comrades offered the only solution which could advance things ("all power in the hands of the proletariat and peasantry"), transformed them almost overnight from a persecuted, slandered, outlawed minority whose leader had to hide like Marat in cellars, into the absolute master of the situation. Moreover, the Bolsheviks immediately set as the aim of this seizure of power a complete, far-reaching revolutionary program: not the safeguarding of bourgeois democracy, but a dictatorship of the proletariat for the purpose of realizing socialism. Thereby they won for themselves the imperishable historic distinction of having for the first time proclaimed the final aim of socialism as the direct program of practical politics. Whatever a party could offer of courage, revolutionary far-sightedness and consistency in an historic hour, Lenin, Trotsky and the other comrades have given in good measure. All the revolutionary honor and capacity which western Social-Democracy lacked was represented by the Bolsheviks. Their October uprising was not only the actual salvation of the Russian Revolution; it was also the salvation of the honor of international socialism.

5 A term first applied by Marx to those parliamentarians who think that all history is decided by motions, votes and points of order in parliamentary debate.

(This concludes the second section of Rosa Luxemburg's work. The third section will begin in the next issue.—Editor.)

Letters From Our Readers:

On the Russian State

Editor, Workers Age:

I believe that it is about time we made a definite statement on our attitude towards the Russian state. I mean editorially in the Age. Is Russia still a workers state with bureaucratic distortions? What about the invasion of Finland? On the basis of the amount of production (1939 over 1913) do we still call for a defense of the Soviet Union, like the Trotskyites? There are other questions on Russia that are linked—Stalinism and Bolshevism, for instance. These points are important in relation to the American labor movement, and surely must be cleared up at this time.

May I also express my disagreement with the editorial that appeared in the Age a few weeks ago why we should protest this action. Did we, for instance, protest Fritz Kuhn's arrest and conviction. Both are representatives of a foreign power and are being persecuted for similar reasons. A protest such as the Age made should have been logically followed by action. Should we deluge Roosevelt and Murphy with protest postcards and telegrams? Should we contribute and aid in the Browder Bail Fund? I feel the Age was wrong (as was the Socialist Appeal) while the Socialist Call was right in this case. We cannot really differentiate between the Gestapo and the G.P.U. or their representatives, the Bund and the Stalinist party. JAMES THORPE

Lenin Responsible For Stalin?

Westminster, Maryland

HERE is the check for \$1.50 for the year's subscription to Workers Age I could not do without it nor do without the New Leader of London, tho I do not by any means agree with all your points of view.

I am sure that Lenin was partly responsible for Stalin I felt as Angelica Balabanov felt strongly in 1921, that Lenin was using violence and intrigue and subterfuge which meant riding to a fall in so far as the real end of communism was concerned. Given Lenin's use of violence, use of dictatorship (in the hands of a few), use of espionage, some Stalin or Napoleon would have inevitably been the result. Grapes cannot be gathered from thistles and freedom and justice cannot be gathered from violence of the G.P.U. I wish you wouldn't use so many abusive epithets in regard to the man Stalin or the man Hitler. You seem to see that Hitler is the result of a cause—the result of something vicious which could not have produced a Hitler; but you do not seem to see that Stalin also is the result of a cause—the result of something vicious which could not have produced a Stalin. It seems to me rather than the heaping of abuse on the result, it would be well to do some searching in regard to what inevitably leads to Stalinism, and to condemn and to root out that ANNA MELINA GRAVES

Sees Governments In Dilemma

New York City

LIKE the man who started a race outside and finished it inside a tiger, the governments of the world have started a race on top of a powerful military machine. The finish is not yet but there is no government that is confident that the finish will find it on top of the machine. Not one but would retire from the race if it could, but it cannot, any more than a man can give up a business in which he has invested a billion. With each one, it is a case of "damned if I do, damned if I don't." Ruined if it disarms the machine, ruined if it continues to sink money in rearming it and not putting it in operation. And, in operation, there are no profits that can compensate for the terrific costs. It is a race in which no prize to the winner can come anywhere near compensating for the terrific expenses that this race demands. To an impasse that is neither peace nor war the powers have brought the world—to a position where the return to peace is impossible, an advance to war disastrous. And as through history, rulers are never so tyrannical as when they feel the insecurity of their rule. There is a terrible threat to the lives and liberties of all peoples in the hopeless condition in which the governments of the world feel themselves today. Rulers in the past rather than confess hopelessness of their position, have generally attempted to conceal it in floods of blood. And today, in view of what has happened in Germany, Russia and elsewhere, the delusion of the 19th century that progress had put an end to barbarism offers no assurance whatsoever that life and liberty are secure anywhere at all. There are times that try men's souls; there are grayer times that search men's brows. To such a time, fate has brought this generation and it finds in our souls no more fixed purpose than common-sense and opportunism provides to fair-weather pilots, the present will mark no dawn of a brighter day but the twilight that precedes the night of "dark ages." FRANK D. SLOCUM.

Approves Idea of United Socialist Block

Chicago, Ill.

THE aims and realities of a socialist block as outlined by Will Herberg presents an additional opportunity for non-Stalinists to gather together their forces in some more effective manner than at present. A large part of the successful following the C.P. has been able to get its due to their cultural and social activities which far surpass anything the other groups possess, especially outside of New York City. Theatre groups, film fans, dancers, writers, all have had their clubs and social groups under the communists. The C.P. gets under the benefit of this support due to the fact that there is no other rival to whom anyone interested in the socialist movement could go. By combining together under a Socialist Block, it would be possible for the non-Stalinists in smaller cities to get together socially and culturally. This form of social life is a most powerful stimulus to intense political work and friendship. Neglect of it has possibly caused much loss in the more academic radical circles. A socialist block will provide enough people to make such groups possible in the smaller cities. C. P.

Doesn't Like the Furriers Union

Bronx, N. Y.

THE articles by our Comrade Baraz about our racketeer Furriers Union are great I would like to see more of our union has \$6,000, it wouldn't be enough for the leaders they will be kicked out when they will be in jail. Permits are given for overtime and yet I made only \$150 the whole season, not even as much as unemployment insurance at \$7 a week. FUR WORKER

Comments the Workers Age

Montreal, Canada

IT will not delay any longer in sending something to the Workers Age. It is not much this time but every little bit makes it that much better. From time to time, not too far apart, I will send in small remittances. If any workers paper deserves support, it is the Age. I wish I could make it ten times as much. To one who is as devoted to a paper as I am to the Age, sending in a subscription is not enough. There are so many good things in the Age that I can't at this time mention all. But I would like to mention the high literary quality of the editorials, and yet they are made plain to every worker. I must also commend your stand against war and your position for unity. It is gratifying that closer unity is approaching, but there is still a vast area for improvement. I do not glance or skim over what is written in the Age I read it slowly and analyze and weigh and consider. In a recent issue, I recall where a reader takes issue because the Stalinists have been too much criticized in the Age. I think that such criticism is only given where required. Had I not actual experience, I would not say this. F. H. M.

Another Appreciation

New York City

LIKED this week's issue very much. The article on Thurman Arnold is fine economics; in fact, I use it in teaching my pupils. The letter on "C.P. Trickery" is swell, all the arguments marshalled in a nutshell. So here is my buck for a year's subscription. SAM

And Still Another

New York City.

YOUR paper is very good these days, the best yet. It's a shame you don't have the money to get out a sheet as big as the New Leader. If you did, you would be able to get out something which would be monumental in the American labor movement. GEORGE

And Another One Yet

Fort Worth, Texas

THE Workers Age continues to stand out in the array of socialist papers. It is important reading for everyone interested in achieving a real peace. S. J.

JUST OUT!

KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR

By Norman Thomas and Bertram D. Wolfe

\$1.50

WORKERS AGE BOOKSHOP

131 W. 33rd St., N. Y. C.