

NEXT WEEK
ON OUR ATTITUDE
TO THE WAR
By BERTRAM D. WOLFE

Workers Age

Weekly Paper of the Independent Labor League of America

I.W.F. APPEALS TO GERMAN WORKERS page 3
PROBLEM OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—
by W. Herberg page 4

Vol. 9, No. 27.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JULY 6, 1940.

5 CENTS

Behind the Headlines:

Our Attitude to the War: Yesterday and Today—III

By JAY LOVESTONE

(This is the third and last of a series of discussion articles by Jay Lovestone.—Editor.)

It is neither wrong nor immoral nor unsound for the labor movement of any land to make demands on its capitalist government—in foreign as well as domestic policy. Making such demands does not mean that we must associate ourselves directly or indirectly with the politics or aims of any of the imperialist powers or combination of powers. Our readers will surely recall that during Italy's war on Ethiopia we advocated governmental—in addition to independent working-class—sanctions against Mussolini. In doing so, we only advanced world labor's anti-imperialist aims and strengthened our entire anti-imperialist program. In our resolution, "Sanctions and the Proletariat," our organization then stated: "That as a matter of principle, the working-class movement, and the revolutionary movement in particular, may make demands upon the various bourgeois governments in the realm of foreign policy as well as domestic, can hardly be doubted." We then criticized sharply the League of Nations and Messrs. Hoare and Laval for sabotaging sanctions against Mussolini, for failure to use the resources and forces of British and French imperialism against Italian imperialist aggression.

It is in this manner that I believe socialists should approach the problem of national defense. A sound attitude to this question was thus formulated in the resolution on war proposed by Louis Nelson of Local 155 at the recent International Ladies Garment Workers Union convention:

"Congress should select a commission representing labor, farmers, business men, civilian and military experts, to define the aims and purposes of defense and the needs of a defense policy as so defined. Particular emphasis is to be laid on:

- maintaining and extending social and labor legislation;
- maintaining inviolate all civil liberties and democratic rights for all people of this country regardless of their place of birth, occupation, or momentary citizenship status;
- maintaining and extending the right of labor to organize and strike in defense and for the improvement of its wages, hours, and working conditions;
- to insure the cost of all expenditures incurred within the above composite defense program by direct taxation of the incomes in the higher brackets."

The New York World-Telegram of June 7 declares in its leading editorial captioned, "The Lesson of France": "As William Philip Simms cabled yesterday from Paris, France is paying the price for having attempted too rapid social progress at the expense of national defense, while Germany was doing the exact reverse." We unreservedly reject this attitude towards the problem of national defense. We reject the formulation of national defense versus social progress. To us, genuine, effective national defense can come only thru social progress and is not opposed to social progress. Let me underline the sound viewpoint taken by the influential trade union spokesman, Labor, in its issue of June 11: "In such an abnormal atmosphere, there is danger that the American people may be stampeded into decisions which will cost them dearly. When the storm has passed, they may see that the democratic institutions they cherish have been seriously impaired. The workers will be among the first victims of such a catastrophe."

In general, it is a safe rule that the more we will be hearing about democracy in the coming months, the less we will be seeing of it—if our ruling-class preparedness drummers and national-defense boosters have their own way. I repeat, it is national defense thru social progress; there can be no adequate defense without social progress.

We would do very well to study the line of action proposed by Engels for the German proletariat in the Franco-Prussian War. I do not hesitate to say that, granting full recognition of the different world situation today and without mechanically copying the above course of strategy, one finds the essence of Engels' approach applicable today. Mehring tells us that:

"The conclusion which Engels drew for the policy of the German working class from his estimate of the situation may be summed up as follows: To join the national movement as long as it limited itself to the defense of Germany (an action which did not under certain circumstances exclude the conduct of an offensive until the signing of peace); to stress the difference between German national interests and dynastic-Prussian interests; to oppose any annexation of Alsace and Lorraine; immediately a republican government had taken the place of the chauvinist government in Paris to work with it to secure an honorable peace; always to stress the unity of interests between the French and German workers who had not approved of the war and who were not fighting against each other.

"Marx declared himself in complete agreement with this summing up and he wrote the Brunswick Committee in this sense."
Applying the above to the present world situation, I would propose the following course:

A. KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR

On the basis of what we have already seen of the present war, I would say that today it is more urgent than ever to keep the United States out of it. My main reasons are:

- America should stay out so that we may have some relatively uninfected and sane sector of the world available for playing a civilized—or at least semi-civilized—role in the era of reconstruction after the conflagration.
- Modern war, particularly imperialist total war, gravely endangers every vestige of democracy, including labor's conditions and rights. We must keep America out in order to be better able to preserve our labor organizations and democratic rights.
- I want to keep America out of the war so that there might be at least one genuine independent labor movement to counteract the trend of Nazification or to act as a point of counter-attraction to what I have called the menace of Stalin's maximum program.

Events move with such reckless speed these days that we tend to overlook too much. Within the last seventy days, the powerful labor movements of Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and France have been decimated, totally wiped out. At this moment, there are left but two organized labor movements of any real consequence—the British and the American. How long the British labor movement will be able to continue, unfortunately depends today on the ability of the British imperialist armed forces to withstand the Nazi onslaught. And how little we can count on the ability of the democratic imperialist powers to resist and defeat Hitler, the fateful happenings of recent days only emphasize. Should the Nazis overrun England, we would see the total destruction of the mighty British labor movement. Obviously, the maximum strength of American labor—united, if at all possible—is vital to the reconstruc-

Russians Seize Bessarabia, Straining Axis; Anglo-German 'Peace' Talk Grows

G.O.P. Nominates Willkie and McNary as Standard-Bearers

Utilities Magnate Wins on Sixth Ballot; Platform Against Foreign War, Thoroughly Reactionary on Big Domestic Issues

Philadelphia, Pa. Wendell Willkie, well-known utilities executive of New York, and Charles L. McNary of Oregon, were chosen Republican standard-bearers by the national G.O.P. convention that met here last week. Willkie won the presidential nomination in the sixth ballot, in one of the most surprising upsets in convention history. McNary was named vice-presidential candidate the next day.

Willkie came to the convention without the support of any of the powerful machines in control of the Republican party. He had, however, the support of a number of influential newspapers, especially the Scripps-Howard chain; of important business interests much impressed with his spectacular fight against the T.V.A. and trenchant criticism of Administration policies; and of large groups of independent delegates who believed they saw in Willkie a candidate that had a chance of winning even against Roosevelt. Dewey and Taft, candidates with strong state machines behind them, led in the first two ballots, with Willkie a good third. In the third ballot, Willkie moved up to second place and the trend towards him was established, as numerous "instructed" and "favorite-son" delegations began to break. In the fourth ballot, he was already first, but still short of the votes needed for nomination. Meanwhile Dewey had fallen behind to third place and Taft had moved up to second. The fifth ballot saw the release of the Dewey delegates in view of the hopelessness of their candidate's position, and Willkie and Taft were now the leading candidates, with the former in the lead. Despite the expectation of the veteran convention leaders that Willkie could go no further in the face of the "stone wall" they had erected out of southern and western delegates, the sixth ballot gave the nomination to Willkie by a vote of 659 as against

tion of genuine, free labor movements in the principal European lands. Only by America keeping out of the war can this maximum strength of American labor play such a role.

4. Finally, America's entry into the war would today mean—technically and physically—just parceling out people for wanton slaughter.

B. FOR GENUINE ADEQUATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

It is unnecessary for me to repeat what I have already proposed above as a sound approach to this problem. In substance, I would further stress: DEFEND AMERICA IN AMERICA! I cannot emphasize too strongly that the denial of democratic rights, the cutting of social services and labor standards, and soaking the poor via oppressive taxes constitute the first grave danger of fascism to the U.S.A. We should never forget that fascism can overwhelm a country from within much more easily and completely than from without. And often the ground for fascist armies overwhelming from without is prepared by reaction within the country. Look at Laval, Flandin and Petain.

Chamberlain, Daladier and Company failed to stem the Hitler hordes not because they failed to suppress democratic rights and social services in England and France, but because they did so much—financially and politically and even militarily—to make possible Hitler's accession to power with its consequent suppression of democratic rights in Germany and subsequent overrunning of western Europe.

C. FOR ECONOMIC MEASURES

I favor immediate decisive economic moves—prohibition of the export of war materials and economic boycott—against powers which invade other lands or destroy

316 for Taft, with a few scattering ballots for other nominees. A majority of 501 was necessary for nomination. The choice was then made unanimous.

Equal in interest with the nomination of G.O.P. standard-bearers was the drafting and adoption of a party platform. Here the controversy raged primarily over the foreign-policy plank. The clash was between an "interventionist" group that wanted to include an explicit statement favoring aid the Allies "short of war" and were reluctant to stress any pledge to keep America out of war, and the "isolationists," who desired precisely the reverse. The outcome was a compromise, leaning somewhat towards the "isolationists." The platform, as finally adopted, declares the Republican party to be the party of "Americanism, preparedness and peace"; denounces the Administration foreign policy as making for war; takes a stand against involvement in foreign war; urges "an army and navy so strong that no unfriendly power can successfully attack America or its essential outposts; and expresses sympathy with the victims of invasion or aggression abroad, favoring "the extension to all peoples fighting for liberty, or whose liberty is threatened, of such aid as shall not be in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of our own national defense" (no mention of England or the Allies by name). The plank also includes a strong paragraph describing the disastrous effects of American participation in the World War a quarter of a century ago.

Wendell Willkie was understood to be rather sympathetic to the "interventionist" attitude and in disagreement even with the vague position embodied in the platform. Since the Democratic convention, meeting in Chicago on July 15, is practically certain to nominate a supporter of the Roosevelt foreign policy, this leaves Norman Thomas, socialist standard-bearer, the only

anti-war candidate in the field. In certain quarters, definite "ap- peasement" sentiments stressing the advisability of America "working with" a triumphant Germany dom-

(Continued on Page 2)

The People Say: 'Keep Out of War!'

"A FLOOD of telegrams and letters imploring that the United States be kept out of war is deluging members of Congress. This activity has been accentuated greatly since the President's speech at Charlottesville, and members attribute the uneasiness which has been aroused, especially among women, to the tone employed by the Chief Executive rather than to his words. The result is a stiffening of congressional determination to maintain non-belligerency."—United States News, June 21, 1940.

Nazis Declare Stalin Move 'British Trick'

"Appeasement" Elements in London Cabinet Said to Be Behind Advances to Hitler

Stalinist Russia struck out again last week and in a bloodless coup annexed big slices of Rumania and won important concessions on the Black Sea. Bessarabia, once a province of the Russian Empire, and Bukovina, of the old kingdom of Austria-Hungary, were ceded outright by King Carol, while Constanta became a Soviet naval base and certain rights were obtained in the Danubian delta ports of Galati and Braila. By the end of the week, the ceded territory had been occupied by Russian troops. All indications were that Stalin had embarked on a far-reaching Balkan adventure, ultimately involving the Dardanelles.

The Rumanian government acted in response to a brusque ultimatum from Moscow, backed up by the mobilization of Russian troops on the Rumanian border. Upon receipt of the ultimatum, King Carol, according to reports, appealed to Germany for aid, but was informed by Berlin that he had better bow to Russian demands, and this he did. For a time, a serious "incident" threatened as it was reported that the Russian troops occupying the ceded territory had gone beyond and were invading Rumania proper, but this was later explained to be a "mistake," and the Russian troops were withdrawn to the newly acquired Soviet provinces.

The Russian seizure was the signal for moves of the part of Hungary and Bulgaria to recover parts of Rumania that had been taken from them after the World War of 1914. King Carol, however, declared that these demands would be resisted. The Rumanian army was said to be concentrating on the Hungarian frontier. No action was taken by Hungary, apparently on German advice.

The Russian move in the Balkans was understood in informed quarters to be of vast significance for the relations between Moscow and Berlin. German spokesmen said that Stalin had acted within the framework of the Russo-German pact and on the basis of a tripartite agreement with Germany and Italy for the division of the Balkans. But other equally authoritative Nazi sources let it be known that German consent had been given only in order to avoid trouble in eastern Europe just at this critical juncture. Indeed, German Legation officials in Buch-

(Continued from page 2)

MASTER OVER EUROPE



—from the New York Daily News

Arms Program Of Little Aid To Jobless

Harrington Tells Senators Unemployment Will Remain At Eight Million in 1941

Washington, D. C. Testifying behind closed doors before a Senate subcommittee considering appropriations for the 1940-41 relief program, Colonel F. C. Harrington, W.P.A. commissioner, gave no encouragement to the hope that a vast defense program would at least mean a partial solution of the unemployment problem. Colonel Harrington said:

"I think it is certain that regardless of events abroad unemployment in the fiscal year 1941 is likely to number 8,000,000 to 9,000,000. . . . The expanded armament program will not materially affect the volume of unemployment or the pressing need for relief. In the first place, the sums appropriated for armament cannot be spent immediately. It will take time for those expenditures to get under way in important volume. There is no question that tens of thousands of workers will be re-employed as a result of these expenditures, but the total potential reemployment is small in relation to the total number of workers who need jobs. The national-defense expenditures will be concentrated in a few key industries, principally aircraft, machine tools and shipbuilding. Employment resulting from these expenditures will be heavily concentrated in specialized skilled trades and other skilled groups and un-

(Continued on Page 2)

"Peace" Party With Wheeler Is Proposed

Johnson, Colorado, Threatens New Party If Democrats Name "Interventionists"

Washington, D. C. Talk of a third party, possibly with Senator Wheeler at its head, grew to considerable proportions in the nation's capital last week.

A definite threat in that direction was made by Senator Johnson of Colorado as Democrats began an offensive against the Republican ticket of Willkie and McNary. Johnson, himself a Democrat, said that the new party, if formed, would be known as the "peace" party, and would be headed by Wheeler because "he is the only Democrat who could beat Willkie."

The Colorado Senator, spokesman for a group of Senate "isolationists," declared flatly that a new party would be launched if the Democrats selected an "interventionist" as presidential candidate at the Chicago convention opening July 15. He did not say whether he regarded Roosevelt as an "interventionist," but such was obviously the implication of the continuous fight that he and Wheeler and others have been making for some months against Roosevelt's foreign policy on the ground that it was heading for involvement in war!

It was recalled here that some weeks ago Senator Wheeler also declared that he would bolt the Democratic party if it became a "war"

Schlossberg Warns Against War Hysteria

Veteran Union Leader Says Rampant Reaction at Home Is Growing Menace

New York City. Declaring that the labor baiters, the reactionaries and pseudo-patrioters have all jumped on the bandwagon to destroy the gains made by the labor movement, Joseph Schlossberg, secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and a member of the National Council of the Labor Anti-War Council, in an address delivered at the annual conference of the League for Industrial Democracy, warned the American labor movement that it was playing with fire in the present war situation if it gave up any of those hard-won gains in the name of patriotism or national unity.

Calling the fall of Paris to the Nazis "a supreme symbol of the triumph of modern barbarism and the destruction of civilization in Europe," he said he "feared the terrible hysteria over some vague 'Fifth Column' activities that seem to be spreading thruout the land and which has seized the American people—such hysteria having been stimulated by people in positions of influence and power." He stated that Hitlerism had already won a victory in this country in the drive against the National Labor Relations Act, in the legislative enactments of restrictions against aliens and in the

(Continued on Page 2)

Behind the French Capitulation

HOW the Cagoullards and other fascist forces in France began to raise their heads under the protection of important personages in the Reynaud cabinet, is bared in a letter that has just reached us from adherents of the International Workers Front Against War in Paris. The letter was written in the early part of May. It casts a revealing light on the circumstances that led up to the capitulation. The letter reads in part:

"An important Cagoullard told one of our friends whom he thought he was sure of: 'We are ready. We have reorganized everywhere. Our organizations have been reestablished everywhere in the army and the administration. We will not be as stupid as we were in 1934. We will march to a sure thing. All those who are really against us are being persecuted by the government itself as anti-national. Working-class resistance has already been neutralized. The workers are more fed up with the regime than in 1851. All that is left to our mill. We even have some sympathy among certain Socialist Party deputies. The communists will march with us as they did in 1934, hoping to profit by the disorder. We will know how to forestall them. Furthermore, we will also know how to hasten peace, and the masses, who have a horror for the war, will be so happy that they will receive us as saviors!'"

WORKERS AGE IN DANGER! RUSH AID IMMEDIATELY!

C.I.O. Plans Invasion Of I.L.G.W.U. Field

Lewis Group Endorses Dual-Unionist Move

New York City. AN inter-union conflict that may develop into the same type of situation as exists in the building trades, seemed looming last week as it became known that the C.I.O., with the approval of John L. Lewis, was planning to invade the jurisdiction of the powerful International Ladies Garment Workers Union. The decision to make a grab at the I.L.G.W.U. was reached at the recent session of the C.I.O.'s Executive Committee, apparently in retaliation for the decision of the I.L.G.W.U. to return to the A. F. of L.

The I.L.G.W.U. is one of the strongest labor unions in this country, with the firmest roots in its industry. Its 250,000 members cover every phase of the women's garment field, in every one of which the union has a high degree of control. Not long after the I.L.G.W.U. joined the C.I.O. in 1935, there were some signs that certain A. F. of L. unions might try to invade its jurisdiction, but a protest from David Dubinsky, head of the I.L.G.W.U., to President William Green brought a cessation of these activities. Later, when the I.L.G.W.U. had already left the C.I.O., there developed some trouble over jurisdiction with the C.I.O.'s Amalgamated Clothing Workers and Textile Workers Union. But an understanding was reached with Sidney Hillman, which seemed to allay the friction considerably.

ANGLING FOR RUNAWAY SHOPS

The new attempt to start a dual movement against the I.L.G.W.U. will apparently be centered mostly on grabbing runaway shops that flee the big garment centers in order to escape union control and standards. For some time, certain C.I.O. groups have made it their practice to watch for these runaway shops and to forestall efforts of the I.L.G.W.U. to pursue and organize them by offering the employers much lower conditions in return for a contract with the C.I.O. It is expected that such practices will now be intensified and turned into a systematic campaign, particularly in the Pennsylvania anthracite area, favorite refuge of runaway employers. Since Mr. Lewis's United Mine Workers is dominant in this region, C.I.O. leaders apparently believe, they will have no difficulty in grabbing up such shops. Sub-standard shops, which the I.L.G.W.U. believes have no place in the industry, also enter into the plans of the C.I.O.

Officials of the I.L.G.W.U. ridiculed the attempt of the C.I.O. to set itself up as a rival in the women's garment field. "I can't take the C.I.O. plan seriously," said David Dubinsky, president of the I.L.G.W.U.

Russians Grab Bessarabia, Axis Strained

(Continued from Page 1)

rest were quite outspoken. The whole thing, they said, was a "British trick" to make Germany fight on a new front in the Balkans. Stafford Cripps, the British ambassador in Moscow, had "pushed" Stalin into Rumania in an attempt to create a new embarrassment for the Reich and to cause it to turn its attention away from the West. They declared plainly that German diplomats had advised Carol to yield to Moscow but had assured him that the surrender of the territory was only a "temporary adjustment" and that Germany "will definitely settle things later." They pointed out that the Reich could not permanently permit Russia to dominate the mouth of the Danube and northern Bukovina because of the potential long-range military danger and the possibility open to Russia to block Germany's approaches to the Black Sea. In Rome, the Russian grab caused undisguised resentment, but no official protest.

From all this, it was clear that the Berlin-Moscow Axis was under very severe strain, perhaps near the breaking point. Some even suggested that a definite Anglo-Soviet understanding was in the making envisaging a possible British-Russian-Turkish alignment, perhaps in order to bargain with Germany in some sort of peace move. Others said that Stalin had indicated that he might intervene against Hitler at a later day if the British were able to hold out and the German position was materially weakened.

Russia was the object of vigorous "wooing" on the part of London and Washington, both pressing on Stalin the advisability of breaking with Hitler. President Roosevelt in the last two weeks removed most of the earlier restrictions on the exports of machine tools and similar material to Russia, and in other ways indicated a sharp change of attitude.

At the same time, reports multiplied in Washington and London that informal peace talks were under way between Britain and Germany. Most of rumors had it that these talks were being carried on thru Sir Samuel Hoare, British ambassador at Madrid, a notorious "appeaser." It was recalled that French negotiations leading to the armistice

G.W.U., "It seems too foolish to be true." Officers of the New York Dressmakers Joint Board took the same attitude.

Some observers, however, pointed out that altho the C.I.O. had no chance of making serious inroads on the membership or control of the I.L.G.W.U., it might be able to develop considerable effectiveness as a force for confusion, disorganization and disruption. The C.I.O. dual-union drive, they said, would be eagerly aided by the communists, to whom David Dubinsky and the I.L.G.W.U. are Public Enemy No. 1. Thru these communists; who have wide contacts in certain branches of the women's garment industry, and thru locals of the U.M.W.A. and other Lewis unions in the runway-shop areas, the C.I.O. might prove able to hamper the activities of the I.L.G.W.U., or at least to cause it a great deal of trouble and expense. At its last convention, the I.L.G.W.U. authorized a series of high-pressure organization campaigns precisely in the areas which the C.I.O. now hopes to invade and grab.

FOLLOWS INVASION OF BUILDING TRADES

The Lewis plan to start a dual-union attack on the I.L.G.W.U. follows a similar attempt initiated last year to invade the jurisdiction of the A. F. of L. building-trade unions. In pushing this attempt, the C.I.O. has openly offered building-trade employers much lower conditions than demanded by the A. F. of L. in return for a closed-shop contract. Despite the most strenuous efforts, the C.I.O. dual group has made but little headway, altho the attempt itself has caused a great deal of scandal and confusion in labor circles.

"Fifth Column" Hysteria Menaces Labor Rights

A vicious assault on democracy and the rights of the American citizen as any yet perpetrated in the current orgy of "patriotic" emotionalism is the demand of certain steamship companies that American longshoremen and seamen of German or Italian extraction be barred from work in connection with Allied ships or ships touching at Allied ports. Remember, the men against whom this discrimination is demanded are in most cases American citizens, but they happen to have been born in countries with which the Allies are now at war; therefore they are to be deprived of their equal right to make a living and are to be thrown into the category of "suspicious" characters, if not outright "Fifth Columnists!"

The logic of persecution is ruthlessly plain: directed first against aliens, then against citizens of "enemy" extraction, then against citizens of "undesirable" affiliations, it finally reaches all those who hold unpopular views or who so much as raise a voice of protest against the hysterical madness that is gripping the country.

Joseph P. Ryan of the International Longshoremen's Association deserves hearty commendation for his flat refusal to let the companies have their way. Whatever their extraction may be, Mr. Ryan has declared emphatically, the men are members of the union and are entitled to equal rights and protection from discrimination, and this the union is determined to give them. Officials of the National Maritime Union have announced that they are taking a similar stand where their employees are involved.

That is emphatically the right spirit and the right attitude. If organized labor allows itself to be stampeded by hysteria and emotionalism to the point of abandoning its own members to outrageous discrimination because of their "extraction", it will not only help destroy everything worth-while it has itself achieved in decades past, but it will also do a grave ill service to the American people as a whole.

To those labor leaders and liberals who have joined the howling pack in the "Fifth Column" hysteria, we recommend sober consideration of the following two items in the news.

The first is an editorial in a recent issue of the Chattanooga News-Free Press: "Loyal Americans are becoming seriously concerned about those soap-boxers who, in this time of national peril, are still talking in terms of a 'new socialistic system' and a 'redistribution of wealth'. Unless these croakers close their mouths, and fall in line, they will be dangerous defective human 'machinery' to have around."

The second is a report by Dorothy Dunbar Bromley, in the New York Post recently. Mrs. Bromley is making a trip thru the South. Her story is headed: "FIFTH COLUMN STIRS SOUTH—Even Unionists Suspected."

It would be well for these labor leaders and liberals to heed the warning about sowing the wind and reaping the whirlwind!

Thomas Platform Hits Attack on Labor Laws

Socialist Leader Urges A.F.L.—C.I.O. Unity

PROTECTION and extension of labor is pledged in the socialist platform for 1940, on which Norman Thomas and Maynard Krueger are running for president and vice-president.

Socialists, the platform declares, are "steadfastly opposed to any effort to weaken or destroy protection for collective bargaining either thru the vicious Smith amendments or the underhand slashing of the already meager appropriations for the proper enforcement of the law. We propose immediate extension of the Wages and Hours Act to all lines of employment and the raising of the minimum wage level. Technical progress makes possible steady reduction of hours as a necessary safeguard against technological unemployment."

The platform also calls "upon the unions to end the civil war in labor's ranks. This conflict not only endangers the progress made by labor during the past half-century but threatens to block further advancement."

The Administration's use of anti-trust legislation against the unions is condemned by the socialists as "anti-democratic and anti-social." But, the platform declares, "if labor is to prevent government intervention, it must eliminate bureaucratic and racketeering trends in its ranks. Democracy in public life must have, as a basic example, democracy in the ranks of labor."

The platform opposes dictatorship, "either fascist or communist." "Socialism means freedom," it declares. "Under true socialism, our civil liberties will not only be preserved but extended."

Support for organized labor is

pledged in a plank which calls upon all supporters "to be active in labor unions of their industry and trade, to seek democratically within them to advance an understanding and acceptance of the principles of socialism, but not to seek control over them by power politics."

Other sections of the platform commend "the method and aims of the LaFollette Committee", favor a public-works program and expansion of the W.P.A., N.Y.A. and C.C.C. Unemployed benefits, it is declared, should be extended "to all workers now unprotected, particularly agricultural, domestic and maritime workers, and provide more liberal benefits and shorter waiting periods."

"Defeat of Hitler will be welcomed by all anti-fascists," the platform stresses, but it condemns any steps by this country toward intervention in the European war. "If America enters the war," it declares, "we shall be subjected to military dictatorship, the regimentation of labor and the ultimate economic collapse that must follow war. However hard the decision, the American people must resolutely determine to avoid all roads to war and pursue only the paths of peace."

Chief of the socialist planks is a separate platform which demands "immediate socialization as the only program capable of solving the economic plight of America, of putting men and machines to work, of giving abundance and plenty to all."

cases where such national or international unions or federal locals have failed to do so:

2. That all constitutions of national and international unions and of federal locals affiliated with the A. F. of L. contain appropriate provisions for adequate disciplinary action against such of their officers as may be charged with the above acts;

3. That whenever any union fails to institute proceedings in accordance with its constitution against any officers charged with the above acts, the A. F. of L. shall use its full moral force to compel the filing of charges and the holding of a hearing upon the same.

(This resolution was carried unanimously.)

G.O.P. Nominates Willkie, McNary

(Continued from Page 1) inating Europe were heard, and there were rumors that Herbert Hoover was associated with them. But these views did not reach the convention floor in any way, not even in Hoover's address early in the sessions.

The domestic section of the Republican platform is hardly more than a denunciation of the New Deal on all fronts and a restatement of the traditional reactionary position of the anti-New Deal Old Guard. It does not by any means reach the level of Wendell Willkie's pronouncements on domestic policy, and Willkie is no friend of the New Deal, altho he did support Roosevelt in 1932 and was a registered Democrat as late as two years ago.

Particularly reactionary are the planks dealing with labor and the problem of relief. The Wagner Act and its administration so as to guarantee genuine collective bargaining are practically denounced as a menace to defense, and in the light of this attitude, the clause calling for the modification of the labor-relations law can only be interpreted as a demand for its virtual destruction. On the second point, the program urges the turning over of the administration of relief to the states, which would result immediately in a drastic slash in benefits to the unemployed.

Arms Program of Little Aid to Jobless Masses

(Continued from Page 1)

skilled workers will not be directly affected.

"In this connection, it might be noted that the additional defense program recommended by the [President's] special defense message of May 16, 1940, will about offset the decline in expenditures under the P.W.A. program. About \$900,000,000 of federal and sponsors funds will be spent on P.W.A. projects this fiscal year but no new appropriation has been made for this purpose during the fiscal year 1941 and the carry-over of the existing program into next year will be small. We hope for a slight increase in [industrial] production in the next fiscal year 1941 over 1940. There is, however, no certainty of this. The index of industrial production for the fiscal year 1940 will show an average of about 112. For the next fiscal year, an extremely optimistic estimate of this index is an average of 115 to 117."

Colonel Harrington testified that the need for skilled workers in the arms industry would not materially relieve demands on W.P.A. because only 10% of W.P.A. employees are skilled. Therefore, he declared, only about 10% of the W.P.A. rolls could be absorbed "even if they go up to 45, 50 and 55 years old men, which industry isn't doing."

ceaselessly in that direction.

(The vote on the Committee's recommendation to rejoin the A. F. of L. stood 640 in favor and 12 against.)

After the vote was taken, the Committee on Officers Report submitted an additional resolution to the convention which follows.

The labor movement in America will grow in importance and prestige so long as it inspires public confidence and respect. It cannot do so unless it is concerned with keeping the labor movement clean and free from the taint of racketeering. Officers of unions who administer its affairs occupy positions of public trust and responsibility and in the discharge of their duties and in their every act, they must be above suspicion.

To remedy such situations as have recently come to light and without attempting to infringe upon the autonomous powers enjoyed by national and international unions and federal locals under the constitution of the A. F. of L., the following resolution has been drawn up for introduction by our delegates in the convention of the A. F. of L., and offers a formula to meet the situation:

BE IT RESOLVED that the delegates of the I.L.G.W.U. at the coming convention of the American Federation of Labor be instructed to introduce proposals and to work for their adoption embodying the following points:

1. That the American Federation of Labor, thru its Executive Council, or any other authorized agency, have summary power to order the removal by any national or international union or federal local affiliated with it, of any person or persons convicted for any offense involving moral turpitude or convicted of using their official positions in their unions for personal gain, in all

ILGWU Pledges Full Support to Frisco Strikers

Convention Promises Every Possible Help to Gantner-Mattern Workers

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, held in New York recently, pledged wholehearted support and cooperation to the workers of Gantner and Mattern, who have been locked out for the past six months. A large demonstration of knitgoods workers from the eastern seaboard states, with placards and signs calling for support to these locked-out Frisco workers, brought thunderous applause from the delegates. A group of girls in bathing suits carried banners, "We will not wear Gantner and Mattern bathing suits."

Praising the demonstration of the New York knitgoods workers, who are helping their fellow-workers 3,000 miles away, President Dubinsky said: "I interpret this demonstration that the knitgoods workers have put on here as an appeal to you to start an energetic campaign on a national basis against the Gantner and Mattern product in your stores. And also that you urge unionists, that you urge the friendly public, in accordance with the law, not to buy any of the garments manufactured by Gantner and Mattern because they are unfair to organized labor."

"And just as we have not given up our fight with former Senator Reed or Nell Donnelly, whether it be before committees, whether it be before courts, whether it be before the Supreme Court, so we will not give up and we will not surrender to the challenge of Gantner and Mattern. We will continue to fight until we win!"

"I say to the firm from this platform that whether the fight will last six months or six years, we will not give up because we have a splendid group there that deserves all the support and assistance that we can give them!"

This firm is one of the largest manufacturers of bathing suits in the country. Located on the West Coast, it also has a showroom in New York City. The firm uses several trade names such as Golden Gate, Wikies, Bo-Sun and Hi-Boy. Most of the workers who have been locked out had been employed by the firm for over two decades. All attempts of the I.L.G.W.U. to reach an agreement have failed in the face of the open anti-union attitude of the employers.

The campaign is gaining support of the public and the labor movement. A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions, railroad brotherhoods and independent groups have aligned themselves on the side of the locked-out workers.

Labor organizations are urged to adopt resolutions and send them to the strike committee.

Schlossberg Warns Against Hysteria

(Continued from Page 1)

proposed exclusion of single men from the New Jersey relief rolls unless they enlisted in the army.

"I fear these trends in America more than I do a rampant European Hitlerism. The American labor movement, divided into two great camps, must wake up to those dangers and unite to fight a common foe—the labor baiters, reactionaries and pseudo-patrioters who have all jumped on the bandwagon in this dark hour to attempt the emasculation, under guise of national unity and patriotism, of all those hard-won gains made by the entire labor movement."

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

KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR
By Norman Thomas and Bertram D. Wolfe \$1.50
WORKERS AGE BOOKSHOP
131 W. 33rd St., N. Y. C.

INFORMAL HOUSE
KERHONKSON, N. Y.
(7 miles from Ellenville)
Sited at the foot of the Catskills midst all the wonders of woods and water. An ideal vacation spot for adults—known for its friendly, informal spirit and rustic charm.
Rates: \$2.75 per day—\$16.00 per week
SPECIAL RATE JULY 4th WEEK-END \$10.00
(Wednesday night, July 3, thru Sunday night, July 7)
For further information call or write
ARTHUR BOYER, Manager
Informal House
Kerhonkson, N. Y.
Tel. Kerhonkson 8118 R
EDWARD K. WELSH
40 Morningside Avenue
New York City
Tel. MOument 2-3177

I.L.G.W.U. Rejoins A.F.L.

(We conclude the publication of material from the recent convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union on the subject of labor unity by presenting the letter sent by President William Green of the A. F. of L. to the convention and the decision reached by the convention on reaffiliation to the A. F. of L. In the next issue, we will present material dealing with the discussion of the war question at the I.L.G.W.U. convention.—Editor.)

President Green's Letter to Dubinsky

(This is the letter sent by William Green, president of the A. F. of L., to David Dubinsky, head of the I.L.G.W.U., and presented by Mr. Dubinsky to the convention.—Editor.)

Washington, D. C.

I am taking the liberty of sending you this letter because I learned thru press reports of the address you delivered at the opening session of the International Ladies Garment Workers convention, which is being held in New York City.

In your address, you referred, in a speculative way at least, to the one-cent per month assessment which all members of the American Federation of Labor are required to pay, in addition to the one-cent per month per-capita tax. You also referred to the exercise of power by the Executive Council to suspend international unions from affiliation with the American Federation of Labor for certain offenses regarded as violation of the laws, rules and procedure of the American Federation of Labor.

Because of your reference to these matters in the address you delivered as herein referred to, I deem it both fitting and proper to advise you that the Executive Council

with Germany were also initiated thru Spain, by Marshal Petain, who had been French ambassador at Madrid.

In the British cabinet, it was reported, there was a strong "appeasement" group, centering around Chamberlain, Simon and Halifax. This group was working for a rapprochement with Hitler. Should the British position become very critical in coming weeks, it was said, these elements might win control in Parliament in a form a "peace" cabinet to negotiate with Germany. Despite official denials in Berlin and London, informed quarters insisted last week that "a peace move is definitely in the air." It was even hinted that the projected German assault on Britain might be held up pending these talks, but this suggestion was generally discredited.

Meanwhile, the Campaign of Britain seemed to be getting under way in its initial stages last week, the forty-third week of the war. Unremitting air warfare between Germany and Britain continued. Waves of Nazi raiders flew over England and did some damage. The British, however, wrought considerably more havoc in their raids on shipping bases and oil stations on the continent. The British also scored successes against the Italians in Africa.

After weeks of deliberation, the Japanese government apparently reached important decisions on foreign policy last week. Henceforth, Foreign Minister Arita stated in a radio broadcast, Japan would pursue an "independent" policy in Asia along the lines of an Asiatic Monroe Doctrine, whereby other na-

tion took action on these matters a short time ago.

At a meeting held in the city of Washington beginning May 13, the Executive Council decided to recommend to the sixtieth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, which will be held at New Orleans beginning November 18, that the one-cent per month assessment be discontinued.

The Executive Council further decided to recommend that the per-capita tax paid by international unions be increased in an amount sufficient to provide a revenue income which would be equal to the one-cent per month per-capita tax and the one-cent per month assessment now being received by the American Federation of Labor, for the purpose of meeting administrative expenses and for the purpose of carrying on a campaign for organization among the unorganized workers of the nation. This would mean that the revenue to the American Federation of Labor would be placed upon a per-capita tax basis instead of, as at present, a partial per-capita tax and partial assessment basis.

The Executive Council decided at the same meeting herein referred to, to recommend to the sixtieth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor that all suspension of international unions, in the event such action seems absolutely necessary, be ordered by a majority vote of the delegates in attendance at an annual convention of the American Federation of Labor.

This would mean, if the recommendation of the Council is followed that the power and authority to suspend national and international unions would be vested exclusively in conventions of the American Federation of Labor.

These decisions were not intended by the Executive Council for premature publication, inasmuch as they embody recommendations by the Executive Council to the coming convention of the American Federation of Labor to be held in New Orleans, November next.

I hope and trust this information

will be of help to you. I am sending you will clear up the question to which you referred in the address you delivered at the opening session of your convention.

I extend to you my best wishes for a successful convention, and to the delegates in attendance my fraternal greetings and my personal felicitations.

Resolution of Convention

(This is the concluding section of the report of the Committee on Officers Reports at the I.L.G.W.U. convention.—Editor.)

YOUR Committee is impressed with the fact that President Green's letter, which comes as a decision by the Executive Council, definitely removes in their entirety the two first major objections as listed by President Dubinsky in his opening address at this convention. The elimination of the anti-C.I.O. tax and the curbing of the power assumed by the Executive Council to suspend unions between conventions, are a clear-cut victory for progressive thought and action in the American labor movement. They are indicators of a widening of genuine democratic practices in the American Federation of Labor. They can have no other result but to strengthen and encourage progressive trends and progressive action within the A. F. of L. and to fulfill the hopes and aspirations which our union has cherished for the many years while we were affiliated with the A. F. of L.

And, while we hold that the autonomous powers enjoyed by the national and international unions under the constitution of the A. F. of L. are not to be infringed upon, nevertheless, they must not be used for harboring individuals who exploit the labor movement for personal gain and aggrandizement or who have been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. Your committee believes that it should be the primary duty of all concerned with keeping the labor movement free from the taint of racketeering and with protecting the good name and prestige of organized labor, to press for immediate legislation at A. F. of L. conventions to the end that such corrupt elements and persons be eliminated forever from it.

Your Committee, therefore recommends that the I.L.G.W.U. rejoin the A. F. of L. and your Committee further recommends that the incoming G.F.B. take immediate steps to rejoin the A. F. of L.; and

That, upon such reaffiliation, our delegates to the coming convention of the A. F. of L. in New Orleans, be instructed to offer legislation at that convention and to press for its enactment, which would embody an effective formula that would remove from position of trust and responsibility in the labor movement any individual whose record reflects discredit upon and is therefore injurious to the best interest of the labor movement; and

That, upon rejoining the A. F. of L. our union redouble its efforts in exploring further every opportunity within the A. F. of L. for peace in the labor movement and in working

I. W. F. Appeals to the German Working Masses

(We publish below an appeal issued by the International Workers Front Against War immediately after Hitler's invasion of the Low Countries and northern France. Arrangements for distributing it secretly among German soldiers in France and Germany were made by adherents of this organization. The appeal reached us thru Stockholm.—Editor.)

GERMAN WORKERS: GERMAN SOLDIERS:

We are your class brothers and we address ourselves to your conscience as workers!

Our comrades, organized in the International Workers Front Against War, have fought since the beginning of this war against their own imperialism.

That is why in the countries of western Europe as well as in the colonies, our supporters are everywhere persecuted, condemned, imprisoned and even executed by their governments, fighting to control the world.

Comrades! We want to address you in terms that your great leaders, now dead, might have used: Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, symbols universally admired by the working class of the world.

We have at no time allowed our voice to mingle with or become confused with that of the imperialist brigands who have provoked this war.

From the very first, we have stood up against the imperialist governments of London and Paris as well as against the bloody dictatorships of Berlin and Moscow.

We are the Third Camp—the camp of the oppressed of all countries—the camp of those who are dying without really knowing why, of those who are dying for no good reason—the camp of the colonial slaves the possession of whom is being disputed by the major powers—the camp of the widows and orphans—the camp of the hungry, the miserable, the poverty-stricken—the camp of the international socialist revolution!

That is why you will understand us. . . .

Workers of Germany!

Your Fuehrer is leading you to the most sterile of "victories." His militarized divisions and his bombing planes may succeed, at the cost of terrible sacrifices, in reducing neighboring nations to slavery.

But for how long?

The triumph of mere brute force has always resulted in arousing the hatred of peoples, and in firing their will to vengeance. A military victory cannot succeed in solving the problems which face the modern world; it can only aggravate these intractable contradictions.

It is in the name of this fundamental truth that in 1919 we fought against the Versailles Treaty, just as the elder Liebknecht fought against the Treaty of Frankfurt in 1871!

How long must the world follow this murderous road that leads from one bloody war to another still more bloody?

How many generations must be sacrificed for the consummation of collective and universal ruin? How many scientists and laborers must be torn away from their life-giving work and devoted to works of destruction?

Your military victories are but tragic illusions which will be paid for dearly by the working masses of the entire world. The capitalist exploiters and the bureaucrats will have to intensify their oppression in order to repair the ruins piled up by war. Economic crisis, unemployment, epidemics, famine, threaten all countries, victors as well as vanquished.

Your Fuehrer, who is responsible for massacring you by the hundreds of thousands to satisfy his ambitions, is lying to you when he leads you to believe in the possibility of making colonies of other peoples who love liberty.

For a people which consents to the oppression of others cannot itself be free or happy.

(Continued on Page 4)

Socialist Fundamentals Reexamined:

The Basic Core of Marxism

By BERTRAM D. WOLFE

(Concluded from last issue)

Now some lessons from Russia. Here I tend to see pretty closely eye to eye with Corey. Lincoln Steffens came back from Russia and said: "I have seen the future and it works." Disillusioned radicals who are falling out of love with Russia today say: "I have seen the future, and it doesn't work." I say in both cases love was blind, and the hatred and disillusion which follow are blind also.

No, we have not seen the future in Russia. What we have seen is a backward land undertaking very late in history the smashing of a feudal, autocratic system; doing it with a cowardly and impotent bourgeoisie, with a very small and weak proletariat and an overwhelming peasant mass; making a strange and inevitably mixed revolution in a backward land, lacking sufficient industry, lacking democratic conditions and institutions, bourgeois or proletarian, lacking democratic habits and traditions, a land of personal totalitarian dictatorship long before Stalin was ever born. Such was Russia: a land of general submergence of personality, a land where only one personality made his will felt by ukase and the rest were subject to prescription and that untranslatable Russian word, "nevolya," absence of will; a land of torture, hostages and the knout thru-out its history. In such a land came an overdue bourgeois revolution, with a bourgeoisie too cowardly to make it, a peasant jacquerie led by a small concentrated proletariat lacking in culture and preparation, in the midst of war, invasion, breakdown, chaos.

Inevitably, this coarsened all the things in the name of which it professed to operate. It debased them to the level of Russian life and the Russian masses. Having been under its hypnotic spell, Corey is today awakening and rediscovering certain commonplaces of western socialism, a socialism which never dreamed of saying "workers" without saying "workers of hand and brain," which never dreamed of speaking of collective ownership without adding democratic control, and which pointed with the finger of scorn at those reformists who thought that state capitalism was identical with socialism.

There are significant lessons, positive and negative, to be drawn from the Russian Revolution. I can give a few of them only briefly, in summary form:

1. That the bourgeois revolution can be realized today, even in such a land, only by the more democratic process of being carried out by the masses in action.
2. That the masses, aroused even for brief periods, are capable of accomplishing miracles of heroism and achievement.
3. That even industrialization and reconstruction of ruin is helped by planning and by mass initiative.
4. That the road out of war is thru fraternization and international solidarity.

Some negative lessons from Russia—certainly here Corey and I, I believe, are in agreement:

1. That socialism is inseparable from democracy.
2. That nationalization or statification involves new dangers to economy, to thought, to freedom.

3. That a breach between culture and the masses, between the intelligentsia and the specialists, on the one hand, and the manual workers and peasants, on the other, is harmful to both of them and to society.
4. That we cannot make a backward land a model nor make virtues of its very deficiencies without harm to the international movement.
5. That planning, that industrialization, that socialism, cannot be introduced by despotic methods.
6. That one-party dictatorship, that monolithic dictatorship of the apparatus, personal dictatorship, inevitably fetter production, destroy initiative and make impossible the building of a new socialist society.

NEED SHIFT IN EMPHASIS

To close these brief remarks, I want to make a shift in emphasis in what we are to derive, and what we want to outgrow or reject, of Marxism. In that also I agree with Corey. A wrong emphasis has been made. There are certain things in Marx's personality which were easy to imitate and which have been imitated—how to spit, how to sneer, his use of abuse and invective, his impatience with differences and disagreements. These are all characteristics of Marx the man, and the man, like other men—including all of us—was human. However, these are not the strengths of Marxism. These are some of its weaknesses.

Moreover, Marx engendered his mode of approach in conflict with Utopian socialism, with sentimental, phillistine brands and varieties of socialism, and so he emphasized a certain hard-boiled realistic, scientific attitude as against theirs.

But today, living as we do in the midst of a general brutalization of mankind, it is time that we outgrow this outlived polemical slant, and emphasized the essential humanism which is at the core of the Marxian outlook on life—the strong side and the more fundamental: the core of that economic analysis which at heart is an exposure of the exploitation of man by man, an exposure of the slavery of man to things, an exposure of the fetishism of commodities, the fetishism of money, the fetishism of production for production's sake, of machinery for machinery's sake, of profit, of the scarcity of things of the subjection of man to his products. The Marx that thought, that analyzed, those things, that Marx has much to contribute in the brutalized world of today, here in America just as much as in Russia. For the essence of Marxism lies in this humanism. It exalts the role of planning and consciousness. It exalts the sense of historicity and change. It represents a critical experimental scientific temper in sociology; a respect for the great mass of mankind, a respect for democracy which includes the determination to extend it from mere formal, political democracy to economic and social democracy; and an underlying humanism which aims to make man's mastery of nature, man's welfare, man's mastery of his own nature, the conscious goal of man's effort. In this sense, Marxism has much to contribute to our century and to our efforts to cut our way out of the social jungle and find the path to a better society.

French Airplane Failure Not Due To Reforms

Facts Disprove Attempt of Reaction to Shift Responsibility to Workers

Washington, D. C.

AN effort to bedevil organized labor and government control of national defense, aviation magnates and their Senatorial spokesmen have been pointing to what they call the "awful example of France" where "communized war industries" and the "sabotage of the Popular Front government" are alleged to be the cause of France's present plight.

The facts do not support these charges. The widest nationalization of France's defense industries was introduced in factories making cannon, guns, tanks and ammunition. In France, there has never been any criticism of the production of these implements of war. France's failure to mechanize and motorize sufficiently was due to certain conceptions of strategy.

Criticism of defense production in France has been directed solely at the so-called nationalization of airplane manufacturing. This industry was only partially nationalized. Many aircraft factories were left entirely in private hands. A number were involved in a complicated set-up by which the government acquired majority shares of stock, left minority holdings in the hands of the owners, allowed the old boards of directors to remain intact with the exception of one government director, and permitted the old managements to continue to run the factories. The two biggest airplane motor factories, Hispano Suiza and Gnome and Rhone, were left entirely in private hands.

With this background the actual

Villard Urges F.D.R. To Call Refugee Talk

Suggests Large-Scale Plan Of Resettling Refugees in Western Hemisphere Lands

New York City

A CONFERENCE to discuss the resettlement of refugees from war-torn Europe on a large scale in the Americas, was urged last week by Oswald Garrison Villard, chairman of the New World Resettlement Fund.

In a letter to President Roosevelt, Mr. Villard said there was a very important way to aid the Allies in addition to direct relief to refugees. This, Mr. Villard pointed out, was to bring refugees to the Americas.

The two major reasons for doing this, according to Mr. Villard, are:

1. To give the victims of fascism an opportunity for a useful life of peace and hope in the new world.
2. To bring over refugees who migrated to France from Germany, Italy and Spain who are known to be loyal and effective fighters of fascism to counteract the insidious tactics of "Fifth Columns" in the western hemisphere.

Mr. Villard pointed out that the committee of which he was chairman had just signed a contract with the Republic of Ecuador to resettle 5,000 Spanish Republican families. This, according to Mr. Villard, must be multiplied all thru the Americas and he urged the immediate calling of a conference by Mr. Roosevelt to discuss the refugee-resettlement problem and to take immediate action.

picture of France's aviation problem emerges as follows:

1. One of the most serious delays in production was caused by the mo-

(Continued on Page 4)

Letters from Our Readers:

Some Questions on Lovestone Article

New York City.

Editor, Workers Age:

I have just read very carefully Jay Lovestone's first article in the last issue of the Workers Age ("Our Attitude to the War: Yesterday and Today—I," in the June 22, 1940 issue). There are many good things in it, but it seems to me to forecast a "turn" which, in my opinion, is not justified. It seems to me there are certain objections to the system of reasoning employed in the article.

1. Marx and Engels were situated in a Europe where nationalities had hardly reached their maturity, where wars were still national in character, and where the destruction of the feudal system had not yet been accomplished.

Today, however, we are in a century when nations represent economic structures that are fully as outlived as provinces were in the eighteenth century. We live at a time when Europe, in its turn, must be unified.

The argument in Lovestone's article is therefore very dangerous since, on that basis, it is Hitler who now plays the role—in Europe—that Wilhelm I played in Germany. And then . . .

2. I also believe that Marx and Engels were wrong as against Wilhelm Liebknecht. The role of the working class should not, even at that time, have been to support the bourgeoisie, even when the latter was doing a "progressive" work—and all the social-patriots have always, as far back as 1914, justified their abandonment of a consistent internationalist position by the "progressive character" of their bourgeoisie! Only working-class opposition is progressive. Despite all "progressive" appearances of this or that bourgeoisie, the only way of extracting anything out of it is to oppose it and not to submit to its designs.

In France, today more than ever, only the upsurge of the revolutionary forces, if that is possible, could change the situation fundamentally, and not their abdication, not their desertion, not their abstention. This is not an abstraction, but, on the contrary, something very concrete.

Today more than ever, I believe, the internationalist position should be maintained with the greatest firmness.

P. F. M.

(Jay Lovestone will comment on this letter in the next issue of this paper.—Editor.)

Criticizes Wolfe's Appeal Against War

Montreal, Canada

Editor, Workers Age:

PLEASE permit me to comment on the "appeal" written by Bertram D. Wolfe in your June 1st issue.

To any careful reader it becomes immediately evident how devoid the author is of a sense of realism. I quote: "The job of defeating Hitler is the task of underground Germany." Or the following: "The duty of every American socialist to this country is to extend democracy and to give aid, not of our government to the warring governments in either camp, but of our people to the war-ridden peoples of both camps, so that this time," etc., etc.

I challenge the author to assert

Our Attitude Toward War

(Continued from Page 1)

the national independence of other countries. Here, independent working-class action can be decisive. I have in mind refusal of labor to transport materials to such aggressor powers.

D. ON AID TO ENGLAND

We recognize that the United States is giving increasing material aid to Great Britain and we strive to do everything to have this aid accompanied by insistence on: (a) the preservation of democratic rights in England; and (b) a peace settlement free from indemnities and annexations, and (c) based on self-determination and national freedom for colonial and all other peoples.

Should the House of Commons decide to arm the entire British people to resist the Nazi juggernaut, I would be in favor of giving England still more aid consistent with the prime necessity of keeping America out of war. Under such circumstances, the armed working masses of England would be battling not only in behalf of British labor but also for the freedom of Belgium, Danish, Dutch, French, Norwegian and even German labor. It is significant to note that our comrades of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain have realized the new situation confronting them and have adjusted their policy accordingly. In a conflict between an armed British people—the decisive majority of which is the working class—and the savage Nazi bandits, no self-respecting, no class-conscious worker can doubt or hesitate for a moment where he stands or whose victory he wants.

E. INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONTACTS

It is imperative to make every effort to develop and maintain international working-class contacts and international labor action during the war. Regardless of how feeble such connections may be today, their potential import is great. Military victory will leave much to be settled—and very much unsettled economically, socially and politically.

F. AID TO UNDERGROUND MOVEMENTS

We appeal for and pledge aid to underground opponents of fascism in the fascist and fascist-conquered countries in their efforts to reestablish a bona-fide labor movement and to destroy totalitarianism.

G. AGAINST JINGOISM AND HYSTERIA

In all warring and non-belligerent countries, an indispensable task of the workers is to maintain their democratic rights and working and living conditions. For us in America, it is particularly important not to make—on any account—the slight concession to the anti-alien drive and to the wave of hysterical reaction threatening to engulf the country. Jingoism is the mortal enemy of labor under all circumstances. Labor must unhesitatingly fight jingoism no matter who its banner-bearer be at the particular moment.

H. FOR A LABOR PEACE PROGRAM

The international labor movement—or whatever is still left of it—should prepare its own world peace program. For such a peace program, labor in the U.S.A.—and wherever else it still can do so—should work unflinchingly.

The world has changed much since April 9th, to put it very mildly. But changed though it be, it is clear that the entire bourgeois world has for ten years been steeped in economic crisis and now is entering a long period of wars. From permanent economic crisis to permanent war—this is the downgrade road of capitalism in decay and collapse.

In retrospect, it is clear to me that I made a number of miscalculations in my previous analyses of the world in crisis:

1. I did not foresee the lightning success, the knockout blow, of the Nazi military machine, tho I never underestimated the prowess of the Hitler hordes.
2. Too many, altogether too many, of us, have been underestimating the prestige that would accrue to the Nazi idea thruout the world—to sav-

age counter-revolution on the march—thru a sweeping military victory. Likewise, too many of us have failed to see the terrific setback and debacle that would befall the fascist movement thruout the world as a result of a defeat for the Hitler-Mussolini combination.

Let me remind our readers that we have witnessed a similar trend of consequences for the labor movement thruout the world as a result of the fortunes or misfortunes, achievements or failures, progress or defeat for the revolutionary idea once symbolized by the Soviet Union. A victory for the socialist cause in the U.S.S.R. meant a victory for labor in all other lands; a defeat for or a crime against the idea of socialism in the Soviet Union meant a blow to the labor movement everywhere. None can now deny that the Nazi military victory has already dealt a knockout blow to the millions organized in the labor movements of five European lands. And the end is not yet in sight! Nor can any one in his right senses deny that this Hitler victory has served to strengthen his death-grip on the German masses. Obviously, a defeat for Hitler would have the opposite effect on the Nazi stranglehold on the German people.

As long as the Nazi armies are intact, all talk of a socialist peace is just plain day-dreaming and, if persisted in, becomes only an empty shibboleth which can lead only to nightmares.

No pious wish as such has ever created or changed any condition on earth. Stern reality is made of a different fabric. No dogma should ever throw our minds into static, paralyze our thinking, or freeze the mobility and freedom of independent working-class action. Continued mousing of meaningless phrases and sterile inactivity should never be confused with independent working-class action. Such "activity" is at best independent of all life, reality and responsibility.

In our attempting to utilize the present world war crisis for the enhancement of the international labor and socialist movements, we must not lose sight of what we build on, where we begin, and towards what we are headed. Let me underscore, in this spirit, that in our effort to have socialism replace capitalism, we take over two great contributions made by bourgeois society to humanity. These contributions are productive efficiency and the dramatic ideals of the great French Revolution. But these two sources of social progress, of the strength of the capitalism of yes-

terday, have become the sources of its social and economic reaction and weakness. Today, capitalism is a fetter on its own productivity and more and more stifles its early democratic ideals. The very appearance of fascism—brutal political receivership of a bankrupt economic system—affords painful confirmation of this. Concretely speaking, this is the tragedy of the maturing of the inherent contradictions of capitalism as a socio-economic order—without a class-conscious proletarian movement strong enough to replace it with socialism.

We cannot build a genuine socialist society if we should lose or undermine either of these historical contributions. Our criticism of the U.S.S.R. is precisely predicated on its failure to enhance democracy, on its actual liquidation of democratic rights. More genuine democracy and less false tempo in industrialization would go a long way toward making the Soviet Union a real socialist fatherland. But, in life, it has been shown that Stalinist totalitarianism is the very antithesis of socialist productive efficiency and democracy. Clearly, in order to build socialism, we must extend, expand and enlarge the content of both productive efficiency and democracy. It is only because of such extension and enlargement that socialism is a higher social form and the next stage of social progress. It is only thru such a forward trend that socialism can free society from the curse of poverty and war and thus enable humanity to march still further on the road towards a better day, a better life, and a better world.

It is in organic connection with this basic attitude, towards salvaging capitalism's contributions to humanity for advancing towards socialism, tied up with such a fundamental approach, that I propose the above new tactical course that we should pursue towards the war. One need not reflect for a moment, in this light, to see what an unmitigated disaster a Nazi triumph would spell for the working classes and the progressive forces of all lands—for the socialist ideal, for the future of humanity.

U.S. Scrap Iron Gave Mussolini His Dagger

Washington, D. C.

PRESIDENT Roosevelt's denunciation of Mussolini's entry into the war as a "stab in the back" was a tragic reminder to observers cursed with memories of the "stab in the back" Franklin D. Roosevelt and his Secretary of State once gave defenders of democracy in Spain by insisting on an embargo against the loyal Spanish government. The embargo virtually disarmed the Loyalists and left them at the mercy of Mussolini and Hitler who were directing General Franco's insurrection.

Another irony emerges from the President's denunciation. At the very moment Mussolini was screaming "Now the die is cast" in Rome, ships were being loaded in U. S. ports with scrap iron consigned to Italy. U.S. scrap iron has been the source of much of the steel that makes the Italian war machine formidable. In recent years, more than half of Italy's steel output (2,300,000 tons a year) has gone into munitions. Hardly a third of Italy's steel comes from her own ores. More than half is produced from scrap iron. According to the Department of Commerce, Italy imported more than 400,000 tons of scrap iron from the U. S. in both 1938 and 1939. During the first four months of 1940, Italy's scrap iron imports from the U.S. amounted to approximately 200,000 tons. In April alone, Italy bought 74,459 tons—only 2,701 less than Britain, the biggest buyer, and nearly twice as much as Japan, our third best customer. The steel dagger with which Mussolini executed his "stab in the back" might well have been marked "Made in U.S.A."

Now that President Roosevelt's ardent wooing of Mussolini has been rebuffed, Washington expects the Dies Committee to turn its attention to Italian fascist propaganda here. Dies has done nothing with a mass of material offered him by anti-fascists in deference to the Administration's futile efforts to keep Mussolini out of war.

Discussion on War Policy

WITH this issue, the series of discussion articles on socialist policy on the war by Jay Lovestone and Will Herberg come to an end. Next week, there will begin a series of three articles by BERTRAM D. WOLFE, taking issue with a number of the conclusions reached by Lovestone. Articles and communications by JULIAN GORKIN, JACK CARNEY and others will appear in the next and subsequent issues of this paper. Readers are invited to send in their views and comments.

We take the opportunity to remind our readers that all of these articles including those of Lovestone and Herberg, are discussion articles—that is, the views expressed in them are those of the authors themselves and not necessarily those of this paper or of the Independent Labor League of America. A discussion is under way in the ranks of the I.L.L.A., and a definitive resolution on the disputed questions is being prepared. It will be published in these columns as soon as it is available.—Editor.

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

See
WOODSTOCK
TYPEWRITER

(Continued on Page 4)

Workers Age

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

Entered as second class matter Nov. 5, 1934, at the Post Office New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879. Phone: LACKAWANNA 4-5282.

WILL HERBERG, Editor

Vol. 9. SATURDAY, JULY 6, 1940. No. 27.

WHO BETRAYED FRANCE?

WHAT was responsible for the astounding collapse of France? The answer to this question cannot be given in purely military terms, since even the military debacle seems to need explanation. Technical and material inferiority, the dead hand of routine and outworn tradition, sheer stupidity undoubtedly played their part, but we cannot escape the feeling that there must have been something mighty rotten in the French social structure to account for the way everything crumpled up before the Nazi onslaught.

It may be long before the whole answer to the question becomes available, but already part of it may be given. From the evidence at hand, there is every reason to trace the disasters of France to the fact that the upper layers of French society were literally honeycombed with defeatism, not merely military defeatism but political and moral defeatism as well. These people, who had the fate of France in their hands, were themselves too thoroughly permeated with the fascist spirit, too closely identified with the dark forces of fascist reaction at home, either to desire or to be able to fight against it when it confronted them as a foreign invader. In plainer terms, decisive elements of official France—forces typified by Laval, Flandin, Bonnet; yes, even by Daladier and Pe-tain—never had it in their hearts to fear fascism or to fight against it, because they admired it and wanted it so much. Their attitude was pro-German or pro-Italian—rather, pro-Hitler or pro-Mussolini—from the start; their whole program was conceived in terms of "appeasement", of accommodation with the fascist dictators, however fatal that might prove to the French people as a whole. In their eyes, a reactionary France that was merely a satellite in the German constellation was immensely preferable to a great, strong and independent France that was radical, revolutionary or socialist. To keep France safe for the entrenched interests of big property was their first and only consideration: for the sake of that, they first handed Spain over to the tender mercies of the totalitarian dictators, and then betrayed their own country to Hitler and Mussolini, whether they were conscious of such betrayal or not. So thoroughly rotten had these ruling groups become that they were no longer capable even of national defense. After the first serious setbacks, they rushed headlong to capitulation.

The decay and corruption at the top had its fatal effect everywhere. It cast over the French conduct of the war a deadly pall of uncertainty, shuffling and confusion that destroyed morale and paralyzed all effort. In the New York Post of June 24, Helen Kirkpatrick reports an incident that should be a revelation of what really brought France to its ruin. "The feeling seemed to have spread in the army," she writes, "that politicians were concerned more with safeguarding their own interests than with combating the enemy. Following evidence of treachery beyond anything it is possible for the outside world to realize, the French companies guarding two Somme bridgeheads handed them over to the German troops, convinced that the French government did not intend really to fight." The magnificent courage and determination of the French masses never really had a chance to show itself.

Spokesmen of entrenched reaction everywhere are already trying to lay the responsibility for the French collapse on the shoulders of the French working class for its alleged refusal to "sacrifice"—it merely demanded equality of sacrifice—and for its insistence on social reform and a better life. But events have shown that it was not the workers of France who turned defeatists and capitulators but the men of the bourgeoisie in high places. Perhaps if the French working class had not been quite so moderate, and had pressed its demands for reform to the point of settling accounts with the masked traitors in their midst, the friends of Hitler and Mussolini, it might have fared far better with France today.

JOHN L. LEWIS SOUNDS OFF

THERE is no reason to be surprised or shocked at John L. Lewis' warm defense of the Hoover Administration made recently in Philadelphia at the moment when the Republican cohorts were gathering for their national convention. As far back as last February, when Mr. Lewis first began mouthing his phrases about a "third party," we warned in these columns (February 10, 1940): "Mr. Lewis' address . . . is so full of loopholes in every possible direction that no course of action whatever, from supporting Roosevelt to backing a Republican, is excluded under its terms."

It is not necessary to take either the eulogies or the fulminations of Mr. Lewis any too seriously. It is of course, true that Mr. Hoover was not responsible for the economic collapse of 1929. But that is no reason for overlooking entirely Mr. Hoover's utter lack of social vision in meeting that grave emergency. Above all, it is no reason for blaming the continuation of the economic depression upon President Roosevelt's New Deal, which, by the way, Mr. Lewis enthusiastically supported until very recently. The truth of the matter is that the decade-long depression that has plagued America since 1929 is the result of the breakdown of our entire economy which neither Mr. Hoover's Old Deal nor Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal but only a planned program of economic reform pointing to socialism can cure. In this light, Mr. Lewis' remarks seem a little out of perspective.

Mr. Lewis' stand against involvement in war, against Roosevelt's semi-totalitarian "national-service" plan and against other dangerous policies advocated by the Administration are to be highly commended. But as a political leader, Mr. Lewis is far too arbitrary and self-sufficient, far too erratic and unstable, far too immersed in questionable power-politics, far too little concerned with enduring principles, far too much under the influence of Stalinist "fellow-travelers", to be a safe and reliable guide for the masses.

THERE'S THE "FIFTH COLUMN"

A movement seems to be under way in many parts of the country to drop single men of military age from the relief rolls with the avowed purpose of forcing them to enlist in the army or navy. This neat little scheme, discussed in certain quarters for some time, appears to have been first advanced in a practical way by Arthur Mudd, New Jersey relief director; it was immediately taken up in Pennsylvania, where Secretary of Assistance Russell ordered a drastic purge of the rolls, and by the authorities in a number of communities in other states.

It is hardly necessary to point out the atrocious character of this plan. It is, in effect, a system of illegal, discriminatory conscription hitting the unemployed, the economically weakest and most unprivileged section of the population, but completely exempting the more fortunate members of society. A more outrageously undemocratic idea would be hard to find!

All this is the result of the wave of unreasoning war hysteria that is sweeping the country. There is no atrocity now that cannot be put over in the name of "patriotism" and "national defense". Ah, yes, it is a great day for reaction; wrapped in the Stars and Stripes, it is riding high, wide and handsome.

If any one is really interested in smoking out the "Fifth Column" that is undermining our freedom, our morale, our democratic way of life, let him turn his attention to those who are trying to drive destitute young men into the armed forces under the lash of starvation!

Socialist Policy on the War:

The Problem of Defense

By WILL HERBERG

THE problem of national defense is enveloped in an almost impenetrable fog of hysteria and confusion, primarily because the Administration refuses to speak out frankly and tell the people exactly what is to be defended and against whom. It refuses to speak out frankly because it refuses to avow its true intentions. It talks of defending the United States, but it means defending so-called "vital interests" in the Far East or getting into the European slaughter. In short, it talks in terms of "national defense", but it plans in terms of a foreign war. The Administration is doing something even more criminal and dangerous. It is deliberately whipping up a panic of unreasoning fear at the threat of an alleged imminent foreign invasion. It is helping to unleash a wave of hysteria manifesting itself in alien-baiting, witch-hunting, and a cruel disregard of constitutional rights and the most elementary obligations of humanity. When the Senate can bar non-citizens, as well as citizens of Nazi or communist affiliation, from private employment, after the House had already barred them from work-relief rolls; when members of a religious sect can be arrested for "distributing literature of a pacifist nature"; when women's societies can form rifle clubs in order to shoot down invading Nazi parachutists; when the whole country can go mad over grotesque fantasies labeled "Fifth Columns" and "Trojan Horses"—the state of the public mind can hardly be regarded as healthy. And for this thorough dangerous state of affairs the Administration, and the President in the first place, must bear a large part of the responsibility.

NO REASON FOR PANIC

If "national defense" means what the great mass of American people think it means—defense of our shores against invasion or attack—there is absolutely no reason for panic or hysteria. We would like to repeat here the conclusion, already cited above, to which so outstanding a military authority as Hanson W. Baldwin came last year on the problem of defense. Writing in American Mercury of July 1939 under the significant title, "Impregnable America", Mr. Baldwin said: "I believe that continental United States, even without extraordinary measures adopted by Congress [in 1939.—Editor], is well-nigh impregnable. So are its outlying possessions, except the Philippines, Wake and Guam. Such impregnability can be brought to a point of completeness with relatively small additional effort. . . . No military tidal wave could prevail against our continental and hemispherical impregnability."

Mr. Baldwin's conclusion of last year, shared by practically all military authorities of importance, and still thoroughly sound today, was echoed only a few weeks ago (May 15, 1940) by Arthur Krock of the New York Times, altho in a rather indirect manner. "It is admitted on all sides," wrote Mr. Krock, "that the national-defense establishment is inadequate for anything SAVE TO RESIST INVASION" (emphasis mine.—W.H.) That is, our present military and naval establishment is, to a large extent at least, adequate to resist invasion. Certainly, there is no ground whatever for panic or hysteria.

We do not take a negative attitude to the problems of defense. We recognize the urgency of the issue and we present a positive program:

WHAT DO WE WANT TO DEFEND?

1. A broad national commission, including representatives of labor and other civilian interests, should be set up to inquire into the fundamental questions of defense: What do we want to defend and against whom? What is the present strength of this country? What must be done to render this defensive strength adequate to needs? Unless these fundamental questions are asked and answered in an authoritative manner, the most hopeless confusion is bound to result.

We have already pointed out that the Administration does not want these questions either asked or answered publicly. It does not want these questions to be asked or answered because it wants to go on with its policy of duplicity: talking in terms of defending the United States, but thinking and acting in terms of participation in a foreign

1. It might also be well to repeat that Mr. Baldwin's recent article in the New York Times of June 2, 1940 sustains his earlier conclusions in general, tho in a more technical, less obvious manner. Compare also the statement of Brigadier General George V. Strong, the General Staff's director of war plans, in the New York Herald Tribune of June 10, 1940:

"Under present conditions and in view of the present development of weapons, this hemisphere is safe from any aggression from abroad just as long as two conditions maintain."

"1. That the Panama Canal is open for the transit of the United States fleet; and

"2. That an aggressor from abroad has no bases in this hemisphere from which to operate."

war. The Administration is therefore not too greatly interested in clearing up the confusion enveloping the problems of defense, to put it mildly.

A shocking example of this confusion-mongering on the part of the Administration is to be found in the President's recent call upon Congress for an air fleet of 50,000 planes. As Mr. Baldwin put it very delicately and diplomatically in his article in the New York Times of June 2, 1940, "the 50,000 planes mentioned by the President must have been intended to convey his general conviction and determination that our air forces should be greatly strengthened, but scarcely to such a tremendous figure. For, as Major General H. H. Arnold, chief of the Army Air Corps, has estimated, to construct 50,000 planes would alone cost \$3,500,000,000; to operate and maintain them simultaneously would require 500,000 men, practically double the strength of our present standing army." In other words, Mr. Roosevelt was deliberately befuddling the people, throwing around gigantic figures which he himself knew didn't mean anything, in order to impress public opinion and facilitate his super-arming and war-involvement program.

It is not without significance that responsible military and naval men, for all their eagerness for appropriations, have uniformly been more cautious and conservative in their demands than President Roosevelt or even Congress. "In spite of the President's high plans," reports Time, the weekly news-magazine, in its June 3, 1940 issue, "his army and navy last week were amazingly unresponsive about buying more aircraft. The navy's chief of aeronautics, John H. Towers, upped his final goal from 3,000 to 10,000, but said he wanted no additional combat planes at present; General Arnold, in his emergency estimates, requested cash for only 309 combat planes, 2,237 trainers, left the Air Corp's projected total at 8,066 (by mid-1941). Greatly disgruntled, the Senate wrote in an authorization of \$100,000,000 for naval planes, specifically instructed the army to spend \$103,000,000 on aircraft which it had not asked for."

How much of this intense eagerness to force appropriations on the army and navy was due to such non-military considerations as the hope that a growing arms economy might overcome the decade-old depression, we leave to the reader to judge. At any rate, a public inquiry on defense is obviously necessary.

2. The only national defense that is consonant with the needs and interests of the American people is defense of our shores against invasion or attack. Defense of foreign investments or commercial and financial privileges, defense of so-called "vital interests" in the Far Pacific or in mid-Europe, is not national defense.

RELATIONS WITH LATIN AMERICA

3. To the degree that national defense in this sense requires coordination on a hemisphere basis, as it does at many points, this coordination should be achieved through voluntary consultation and cooperation on a plane of equality, with the independence and self-determination of the Latin American countries preserved unimpaired. There is every reason to fear that the idea of "hemisphere defense" will be used as a cover for another thrust of Wall Street imperialism against Mexico, Central America and South America. Reporting from Washington, Raymond Clapper already speaks plainly of "using American troops in the western hemisphere for protective occupation" (New York World-Telegram, June 3, 1940).

4. Expenditures for arms should be covered not by cutting down on

2. Another example: While in Washington, Administration and Congressional spokesmen are engaging in all sorts of loose talk about an "army of millions," so outstanding a military authority as Major George Fielding Eliot (New York Herald-Tribune, June 22, 1940) takes 600,000 as a far more appropriate figure—on condition, of course, that we are really thinking in terms of defense and not of a foreign war. "Unless we are going to indulge in military adventures overseas," he adds, "which the God that watches over the destinies of this Republic forbid, we do not need a great army of millions."

3. See George Fielding Eliot's article, "The Defense of America," in Harpers Magazine, December 1938.

(This is the third in a series of discussion articles by Will Herberg. The other two articles, published in recent issues of this paper, were entitled "IT DOES Make A Difference Who Wins" and "American Can and Must Stay Out of War."—Editor.)

Letters from Our Readers

(Continued from Page 3)

stances where the German people, instructed by Duff Cooper and other British spokesmen, feel that the Allies are conducting this war to destroy them as Germans and not simply the Hitler regime? In August 1914, wild jingoistic demonstrations swept the main centers of Germany and Russia, and the weak voice of opposition was drowned out. History has shown that the German and Russian peoples weren't simply the "tools" of their governments.

Nor is it quite true that "98% of the British people are behind their government." The British people undoubtedly back the war because, under existing conditions, they can see no alternative. But this is far from being the same as backing the government which is

government social services and mass welfare or by imposing still heavier tax burdens on the people, but by increased income-tax levies in the higher brackets, a 100% tax on excess profits of armaments concerns, and the like. If our idle men and idle machines are put to work to a measurable degree and the national income raised by that much, there should be no real difficulty in covering necessary arms expenditures while maintaining and even raising the levels of welfare.

PRESERVATION OF DEMOCRACY

5. The true bulwark of defense is the preservation and extension of democracy, civil liberties and the rights of labor. (This, of course, implies the democratization of the armed forces, a difficult subject which I will discuss in some detail in a later article.) The keynote of Administration policy, on the other hand, seems to be to fight totalitarianism abroad by copying it here. Democracy has already fallen into great disrepute in official circles in Washington, and the totalitarian concept is permeating influential groups throughout the country. As against this trend, it is necessary to stress that in a truly popular cause, broad and genuine democracy can prove just as efficient as totalitarianism and can defeat it on its own ground. Nor would a genuinely defensive war against foreign invasion or attack contain that compulsion to rigid military totalitarianism that would inevitably arise in waging a foreign war in Europe or Asia. No ground must be given to the spirit of intolerance, repression, and regimentation born out of the war panic and hysteria sweeping the country.

6. Social and labor legislation, as well as the standards of labor, must be maintained and safeguarded.

NO ARMAMENT ECONOMY

7. Efforts to overcome the crisis must be based in a planned attack on unemployment, poverty and low living standards, not on the hope of building up an arms economy in the United States. Experience has shown that an arms economy—that is, an economic system that depends for its continuous functioning on ever greater armament expenditures—is absolutely fatal to the economic soundness, to the peace and welfare of the country. It is today more timely than ever to recall the warning issued by President Roosevelt in Buenos Aires on December 1, 1936:

"We know too that vast armaments are arising on every side and that the work of creating them employs men and women by the millions. It is natural, however, for us to conclude that such employment is false employment; that it builds no permanent structures and creates no consumers goods for the maintenance of a lasting prosperity. We know that nations guilty of these follies inevitably face the day when either their weapons of destruction must be used against their neighbors, or when an unsound economy, like a house of cards, will fall apart."

At bottom, vigorous, effective national defense is impossible without a deepening and vitalization of democracy in terms of the basic needs and aspirations of the people. A defense that is simply defense of the status-quo is futile and self-defeating; it can never acquire that spirit and drive that alone can meet the challenge of totalitarianism. A dynamic democracy, implemented with a program of social reform looking towards socialism, is the only sound foundation of genuine national defense.

At the present time, this program is at variance, in practically every respect, with the line followed by the Administration. It therefore implies systematic political opposition to the Administration, its aims, policies and programs.

3. See George Fielding Eliot's article, "The Defense of America," in Harpers Magazine, December 1938.

(This is the third in a series of discussion articles by Will Herberg. The other two articles, published in recent issues of this paper, were entitled "IT DOES Make A Difference Who Wins" and "American Can and Must Stay Out of War."—Editor.)

I. W. F. Appeals to the German Working Masses

(Continued from page 3)

Workers! Do not forget the lesson of 1918: the workers of the Allied countries also tasted the bitter fruits of their "victory."

Who profited from the ten million corpses? Only a few small groups of financiers. What will result from your victory? More wealth and power for your masters—more poverty and slavery for you!

Did the Allied victory of 1918 put an end to "Prussian militarism"? No! It gave birth to your Hitler and a Germany more militaristic than ever. Will not the same thing happen to the other side?

German soldiers! How long will you serve passively as instruments of this monstrous military machine which crushes the weak? Opposite you are workers and peasants just like you, who also have wives and mothers, who also love their children, who also love their villages, their homes and their country like you.

The invasions of Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium and France are raising a wave of hatred against you, which will break over the heads of your children.

But if you really want to, you can transform this hatred into universal admiration and love which will bring you greater prestige than any military victory. Stop the massacre!

Rid yourselves of your masters and oppressors! Stretch out a fraternal hand to the workers and peasants of other lands!

With such an end to the war imposed by such means, the workers of all countries will follow your example, and in their turn will destroy the system of exploitation that gives rise to war, and will build a Socialist Europe.

German workers! Even if you reached the peak of military "glory" by following Hitler, you would after all be alone, surrounded by a world of enemies whom you would never be able to conquer. You would have against you the universal consciousness of the workers who would never make peace with the triumph of injustice and brutality.

But if you listen to our voice, if you are touched by our appeal as men, then you will immediately take the first place in the building of a new world—freed from exploiters, from dictators and from war.

FOR THE SOCIALIST UNITED STATES OF EUROPE!

German workers, comrades!

Are you for your dictatorship, sharing responsibility for its crimes, trampling on your brothers in the vile hope of reducing them to slavery?

Or are you with us, with the revolutionary workers who are fighting for socialism and for liberty?

IT IS FOR YOU TO CHOOSE!

INTERNATIONAL WORKERS FRONT AGAINST WAR

White Group Seen as Agency for War Entry

Press Appeal Drops "Short of War" Cover

WHEN the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies was first announced by William Allen White, anti-war spokesmen pointed out that it was really only a transition stage towards demanding outright intervention. Such was its inmost logic.

This logic has operated with indecent haste, and some of the more vocal members of the committee have not acted unwittingly. Robert E. Sherwood, author and financial guarantor of the committee's full-page advertisement, has announced that he favors immediate entry into the war on the side of the Allies—for the "moral effect." Herbert Agar, Henry Breckinridge, Calvin B. Hoover and Lewis Mumford, all members of the White Committee, also urge an immediate declaration of war. These are the frontiersmen of the White Committee.

To the advocates of the "all-aid-short-of-war" position, the most maddening question is: "What aid?" Calm analysis of each step "short of war" reveals that they are walking on air.

The Allies have more than \$8,500,000,000 purchasing power in America. If their resources outside the U.S.A. are included, the total becomes more than \$19,500,000,000. Repeal of the Johnson Act would be futile. The Allies do not need money. Since they could buy anything they need and their orders have been given preference, the precise meaning of "aiding with our supplies and wealth" is difficult to grasp. Fact is, the entire U.S. industrial machine has been at the disposal of the Allies for eight months.

The formula of the White Committee involves at least the danger of the U.S. becoming an active belligerent. Under such circumstances, our own defenses become immediately necessary. Yet General George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, declared only a month ago that the U.S. could not possibly be ready for war before December 1941. Yet the White Committee, which wants arms sent to the Allies, also insists on national defense: "We can and should and will devote ourselves to a vast program of defense."

The most ingenious evasion of this question comes this week from William Allen White's son, William L. Discussing that "our army hasn't enough planes and tanks to fight a successful war even against Sweden," he thinks they might be enough to stop the Nazi drive and therefore proposes that all of it be sent over. "Because," he continues, "if we did this and the Allies were nonetheless overwhelmed, the British, out of a mixture of gratitude and self-interest, would send their fleet to us as the Germans were overrunning their island. With this new fleet, plus our own which is now in the Pacific, we could keep the Japanese, Germans and Italians out of this hemisphere while our factories had a chance to build up a decent new armament of planes and tanks. But if we don't send the Allies any equipment in the next few weeks and they are crushed, I don't see why the British would will us their fleet, and I don't see then what could keep the totalitarian powers out of the Americas." William L. White, who is both homespun and sophisticated, is usually less homespun in his interpretations of world affairs. It is the dilemma facing the advocates of "measures short of war."

Unemotional Washington military

observers maintain that there are no further "steps short of war" that can save the Allies. The likeliest result of such steps is war itself which in turn, would save neither the Allies nor democracy.

In the light of these practical considerations, the cry for further aid to the Allies becomes a cry in the wilderness; it cannot answer the question, "how?" assuming that it has an answer to "why?" Yet the cry is stirring wild emotions throughout the country. These emotions, seeking satisfaction, are finding it in the astronomical figures of an unplanned defense program and in the hysterical pounding on "Fifth Columns" which is threatening civil liberties in hundreds of American communities. The White Committee has given direct encouragement to this hysteria. Under the heading, "The Fifth Column," its advertisement states: "All Americans should beware of the prevailing Nazi-cum-must propaganda which attempts to capitalize our desire for peace by opposing all our moves toward national defense—sabotaging all aid to the Allies—preaching that Hitler has already won and we must meekly appease him." On national defense, the ad says: "It will take years for us to build the necessary machines and to train the men who will run them. Will the Nazis considerately wait until we are ready to fight them? Anyone who argues that they will wait is either an imbecile or a traitor." Members of the White Committee, which includes men and women who have fought for tolerance in the past, presumably support these incitements.

The formula of the White Committee involves at least the danger of the U.S. becoming an active belligerent. Under such circumstances, our own defenses become immediately necessary. Yet General George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, declared only a month ago that the U.S. could not possibly be ready for war before December 1941. Yet the White Committee, which wants arms sent to the Allies, also insists on national defense: "We can and should and will devote ourselves to a vast program of defense."

The most ingenious evasion of this question comes this week from William Allen White's son, William L. Discussing that "our army hasn't enough planes and tanks to fight a successful war even against Sweden," he thinks they might be enough to stop the Nazi drive and therefore proposes that all of it be sent over. "Because," he continues, "if we did this and the Allies were nonetheless overwhelmed, the British, out of a mixture of gratitude and self-interest, would send their fleet to us as the Germans were overrunning their island. With this new fleet, plus our own which is now in the Pacific, we could keep the Japanese, Germans and Italians out of this hemisphere while our factories had a chance to build up a decent new armament of planes and tanks. But if we don't send the Allies any equipment in the next few weeks and they are crushed, I don't see why the British would will us their fleet, and I don't see then what could keep the totalitarian powers out of the Americas." William L. White, who is both homespun and sophisticated, is usually less homespun in his interpretations of world affairs. It is the dilemma facing the advocates of "measures short of war."

Unemotional Washington military

tor bottle-neck. (The same is true in the U.S. today.) The two large privately-owned motor factories were frequently attacked for their conservatism and their failure to keep pace with the rest of the industry.

2. There is no evidence that strikes or the 40-hour week slowed down production of planes. Because of lack of tools and raw materials (both of which came from private industry abroad), workers could not have put in more time.

3. While it is true that production of planes fell to about 30 a month at the time of Munich, this record was no worse than the one made by private industry under the General Denain Plan of 1934, which in three years turned out only 1,000 planes.

4. Meanwhile, decentralization of the industry and tooling up proceeded under the semi-nationalized set-up. Experts in Paris have stated that this process could not have been accomplished by uncontrolled private industry because bankers opposed granting funds and private managements obstructed decentralization.

5. The tooling up and reorganization of the industry under government semi-nationalization did accomplish results. Production jumped from 30 to 250 a month within ten months. The latest figures on French monthly production in the New York Times were 400 a month. In view of the relatively low industrial potential of France compared with Germany and England, this is considered a very good showing.

French Airplane Failure Not Due To Reforms

(Continued from Page 3)

tor bottle-neck. (The same is true in the U.S. today.) The two large privately-owned motor factories were frequently attacked for their conservatism and their failure to keep pace with the rest of the industry.

2. There is no evidence that strikes or the 40-hour week slowed down production of planes. Because of lack of tools and raw materials (both of which came from private industry abroad), workers could not have put in more time.

3. While it is true that production of planes fell to about 30 a month at the time of Munich, this record was no worse than the one made by private industry under the General Denain Plan of 1934, which in three years turned out only 1,000 planes.

4. Meanwhile, decentralization of the industry and tooling up proceeded under the semi-nationalized set-up. Experts in Paris have stated that this process could not have been accomplished by uncontrolled private industry because bankers opposed granting funds and private managements obstructed decentralization.

5. The tooling up and reorganization of the industry under government semi-nationalization did accomplish results. Production jumped from 30 to 250 a month within ten months. The latest figures on French monthly production in the New York Times were 400 a month. In view of the relatively low industrial potential of France compared with Germany and England, this is considered a very good showing.