

Another Moscow Trial!

a statement

A GAIN the world is being treated to the horrible spectacle of another Moscow trial. Among the victims this time are N. Bukharin, whom Lenin, in his last political testament, characterized as "not only the most valuable and best theoretician of the party but also legitimately to be considered the favorite of the party"; A. Rykov, Lenin's successor as head of the Soviet state; C. Rakovsky, veteran leader of the revolutionary movement in a number of countries of Eastern Europe and one of Trotsky's closest collaborators; together with a whole group of Stalin's own loyal followers and devoted henchmen of yesterday, including Yagoda, Grinko, Krestinsky, Ivanov and others. The only reason Mikhail Tomsky is not to be found in this list is that he managed to escape his bloody persecutors by committing suicide before they could get to him.

A Staggering Mass Of Unreason

And the "charges" against these men? A staggering mass of unreason, even more grotesque and nightmarish than at previous "trials"! In addition to the old story of "treason, espionage, wrecking, terror, provocation of military attack and restoration of capitalism," there is the murder of three men, including Maxim Gorki, heretofore certified as having died natural deaths! Trotsky is accused of being "linked as a spy to a certain foreign secret service as early as 1921"! Bukharin is prosecuted on the basis of a fantastic misrepresentation of the inner-party struggles of twenty years ago! Both Trotsky and Bukharin are charged with responsibility for the attempt on Lenin's life in 1918! There are no words with which to characterize this obscene and bloody burlesque masquerading as a "trial"!

If these "charges" are to be taken seriously, they are an indictment of the revolution and of Lenin himself. For the prime movers of the former and the closest associates of the latter have now been "revealed" as "spies, traitors and fascist agents"! Was the whole Russian revolution a fraud, made by such creatures as these are alleged to be? Was Lenin their "accomplice" or was he a stupid dolt, easily imposed upon by his colleagues in the leadership, raising traitors and spies to the highest posts of the republic! Indeed, it would not be at all surprising to find Lenin himself included in the next list of "traitors" as the source and fountain-head of all evil!

Without doubt, this "trial" will proceed in the same old way. There will be abject "confessions" consisting of a jumble of political and factual impossibilities concocted by the G.P.U., crude discrepancies and glaring self-contradictions. And there will be the same verdicts of guilty decided upon in advance and the same series of executions to follow. Another great "triumph" will be chalked up for the Stalin-Yezhov regime of blood and destruction!

A Disastrous "Triumph"

But, in the long run, such a "triumph" will be a shattering blow to the very system it is designed to bolster up. Desperately set on perpetuating at all costs an oppressive regime long obsolete, long deprived of whatever progressive function it may once have had, confronted with a mass discontent

(Continued on Page 2)

Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. 7, No. 11.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, MARCH 12, 1938

5c a Copy

FDR Halts All Reforms

Moratorium On New Deal Is Called By President For Rest Of Year

President Roosevelt has declared a quiet moratorium on new reform legislation for the next period of time, it was learned last week at Washington. From now on until after the Congressional elections in November, at the very least, it will be a matter of marking time.

Even the outlook for the wage-hour bill, hitherto looked upon as a Presidential "must" measure, is regarded as pretty dim at the present time. On the program for enactment at this session, however, there are the government-reorganization bill, modification of the undistributed-profits tax and the naval-building bill.

Among the factors making for this halt in the New Deal program, already foreshadowed in recent weeks, is the administration's preoccupation with rearmament and its desire to conciliate big business to the utmost. It is becoming ever clearer that the huge armaments program of the administration, as a phase of its war policy, is bringing with it a swing to reaction on all fronts.

The administration's abandonment of its own program is to be connected with a definite reorganization to the right of its main political support in Congress, the old New Deal progressives giving way to conservative anti-New Dealers who stand behind the President for the sake of his foreign policy and war preparations.

Progressives Win In Flint Elections

The progressives in the United Automobile Workers, supporters of the Martin administration, scored tremendous victory last week in the final elections in Flint Local 156, one of the biggest and most important organizations in the union. All six candidates of the progressive group were swept into office by huge majorities, leaving the "unity"-group candidates far behind.

President: Jack Little (Prog.) 7540; Roy Reuther ("Unity") 4080. First Vice-President: R. Newman (Prog.) 7262; L. Baraty ("Unity") 4276.

Second Vice-President: R. Amy (Prog.) 7154; D. McLean ("Unity") 4300.

Third Vice-President: F. Grant (Prog.) 7398; R. Webber ("Unity") 3996.

Financial Secretary: J. Austin (Prog.) 7110; G. Rose ("Unity") 4252.

James Fortier, progressive candidate, had been elected recording secretary in the primaries the week before, having received a majority of all votes cast.

"We consider this election," declared the victorious candidate for president, Jack Little, "a victory for the policies of our International union. We stand behind the International 100%."

5,000 PACK BIG WAR PROTEST MEETING

The big New York Hippodrome was jammed on Sunday, March 6, as over 5,000 people demonstrated their opposition to war and to the war-making policies of the administration under the auspices of the "Keep America Out of War" committee. Among the speakers were Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Norman Thomas, Homer Martin and Bertram D. Wolfe, Oswald Garrison Villard was chairman. Full details will be reported in the next issue of this paper.

WPA-Army Link Bared

Military Men Use Relief Setup To Drive Young Men Into Army

A concerted campaign to drive young men on W.P.A. in New York State into the United States Army, was revealed last week in this city.

On January 10, representatives of the army, navy and other branches of the armed service met in the offices of Lieut-Col. Brehon B. Somervell, local W.P.A. administrator, to discuss ways and means of "encouraging shifts of qualified personnel from W.P.A. to the vari-

(Continued on Page 5)

Court OK's NLRB Acts

Closed Shop Ban Denied And Board Upheld In Five Decisions

Five important decisions, likely to influence very materially the development of labor law in this country, were issued by the Supreme Court last week, four of them in connection with cases coming under the Wagner Act.

The court, thru a formal order, dismissed the appeal of an anti-union group among New York Rapid Transit employees against a closed-shop contract between the Transport Workers Union and the corporation with its three auxiliaries. The action came in a refusal of the high court to review a N. Y. Court of Appeals decision against granting a temporary injunction. While the Supreme Court acted largely on technical grounds and did not pass in any way on the legal merits of the closed shop, the rebuff it gave to the anti-union group may be regarded as a victory for labor.

In another important case, by a 5-2 ruling, with Justices Butler and McReynolds dissenting and Justices Reed and Cardozo not participating, the court upset an injunction granted by Federal Justice Geiger against picketing certain meat shops in Milwaukee. Judge Geiger had denied the existence of a "labor dispute" because the pickets were not actual employees of the concern but the Supreme Court disagreed and found him in error.

In two decisions, unanimous except for the absence of Justices Reed and Cardozo, the court held that the National Labor Relations Board may force an employer to withdraw collective bargaining from a company union. The court's ruling sustained the board's fight against the "Employees Association" of the Pennsylvania Greyhound Lines and the "Drivers Association" of the Pacific Greyhound Lines.

The fifth labor victory came when another order promised the N.L.R.B. a review of the Ninth Circuit Court decision refusing to compel compliance with a board order directing the Mackay Radio and Telegraph Company to reinstate, with back pay, five men dismissed for strike activity.

ference of Japanese competition. China would figure only as the loot, the spoils of this vast conflict! There is nothing American imperialism would fear more than real freedom and democracy for China, for that would mean an end to all foreign exploitation and domination whatsoever, American included.

And the Soviet Union? Who is there so blind as cannot see that, however bitter may be the rivalry between the United States and Japan, the antagonisms between the United States and the Soviet Union are infinitely deeper and sharper in the long run. The U.S.A. and Japan are both capitalistic, both imperialistic powers; they fight for profits, of course, but they can always get together to take it out on the hides of the people in the colonies and at home. They both stand on the same economic system and with them it is,

(Continued on Page 5)

Can U.S. Imperialism Defend the U.S.S.R.?

By WILL HERBERG

I NTERNATIONALISM places upon us, class-conscious workers of America, the duty of doing everything in our power to help the working masses of the Soviet Union to construct the socialist society towards which they are striving; it also places upon us the duty of doing everything in our power to come to the assistance of the Russian workers and farmers should their country be attacked by an outside imperialist power or group of powers. We feel this duty towards the Chinese people in their resistance to Japanese aggression, even the capitalism and worse prevail in China and its government, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, has an appalling record of reaction and bloody repression of the masses. How much more must this duty arise before us in the case of the Soviet Union, a country that has already succeeded in getting rid of its capitalists and landlords, a country in which great advances have already been made towards a new social order?

War To Help The Soviet Union?

Does this support and assistance mean that we should strive to have America enter any war in which the Soviet Union may be engaged in order to help it? That is what so many progressive-minded people in the United States are afraid of; they believe that support of the Soviet Union would mean plunging this country into war and from this, of course, they recoil with horror.

But the whole thing is based on a very fundamental misunderstanding. No real friend of the Soviet Union or of American labor will want us to bend our efforts to drive America into war, even tho it be on the side of the Soviet Union. Why? Not because we are opposed to war "in principle," under all conditions and circumstances. No; we believe that many wars in history were progressive and deserved the support of the progressive groups and classes of the time: for example,

the wars of the French Revolution, the American Revolutionary War, the Civil War on the Northern side. We are against American participation in a war today because we are convinced that such participation would, in the long run, prove utterly disastrous to the cause both of the Soviet Union and of the labor movement of this country. This, surely, is reason enough!

Let us take the example* commonly offered us these days: a war between Russia and Japan in the Far East, in which China, of course, would also be involved. Suppose the United States government joined this war against Japan; what would be its real aims and objectives? Let us remember that, Hoover or Roosevelt, Old Deal or New Deal, the American government remains an imperialistic government, fundamentally concerned in its foreign policy with the protection and advancement of the long-range interests of capitalism in general and of the investments and prospects of American big-business groups, in particular. If we want to understand what line the American government will follow in any situation, we must ask ourselves what would the interests of capitalistic imperialism dictate.

Aims Of American Imperialism

Of course, one of the things America would be out for would be to weaken and curb Japanese imperialism, its most formidable rival in the Far East, in order to tighten its own grip on China. In such a war, the United States would be fighting not for the freedom of China but rather for the privilege of exploiting it without the inter-

* I may as well point out that I am discussing this situation—a war with the United States lined up with the Soviet Union and China against Japan—not because there is much likelihood of its occurring but because it is the situation generally pictured as the justification for pro-war agitation under a radical banner in this country.

Bertram D WOLFE

"DEATH AGONY OF THE COMINTERN"

FRIDAY, MARCH 11
NEW WORKERS SCHOOL
131 W. 33rd St.

Viewed from the Left

By Politicus

Contributors' Innings

WHILE administration policy is being shaped primarily by its drive towards war, another political determinant is the coming elections. Already the President has announced a "temporary" moratorium on reform legislation, while his various henchmen indulge their talents for the vaguest sort of attacks on "predatory interests," in the traditional manner of American big-business political demagoguery. In the course of the coming months, this column hopes to devote much of its space to the problems confronting labor in the coming elections. Perhaps no better key could be found for such comment than the following devastating remarks of our well-known colleague, Raymond Clapper, columnist for the Scripps-Howard chain. Writing in the New York World-Telegram of February 24, he describes the real nature of the Democratic party, of which Roosevelt is the titular head, as follows:

"The Democratic party is about to lose the halo of shining idealism which Mr. Roosevelt has kept on its head in the last few years. Its soon will become apparent for what it is—a group of state political machines, grassroots Tammany Halls, which at heart have absorbed nothing from the New Deal except political jobs.

"In Missouri, there is the Pendergast machine, or such of it as has escaped the wholesale convictions for voting frauds which are being ground out in the federal court at Kansas City. In Illinois, there is chiefly the odor of the Kelly-Nash machine. In Ohio, it is the Davey organization, which spends most of its time now denying graft charges. In Pennsylvania, you have the Guffey machine, badly torn over the distribution of the loot. In New Jersey—Frank Hague in person.

"That is what you find when you turn back the rug on which Mr. Roosevelt stands. And that is the group of pivotal states which turns Presidential elections, the decisive strength of the Democratic party....

"As 1940 moves closer Mr. Roosevelt's influence is waning. More and more, as Mr. Roosevelt's influence recedes, the Democratic party organization in the balance-of-power states shows up as a collection of fat, greedy political gangs operating with mass-production technique and blowing a New Deal whistle as a decoy."

PORTENTS OF FASCISM

We turn over the rest of this column to an important addendum to the discussion of the "little" business men's conference, made in a letter to us, signed W. H.:

Your column on the "little" business men's conference, "Little Business Men Talk Big," was very interesting. But there is one aspect of the situation that seems to me to have attracted much less attention than it deserves, if, indeed, there has been any comment on it at all. No one reading the accounts of the "little" business men's get-together either in the daily press, in Time or in the New Yorker (the pre-conference caucus in New York), can escape the uncomfortable feeling that he is witnessing the antics of people who are not quite right in the head. I am not referring so much to the obviously lunatic fringe—to the gentlemen who traced the depression to an unknown germ or to the faces on the paper money of this country; altho the serious reception that these ingenious ideas received is itself of symptomatic significance. I refer to the conference as a whole, to its queer incoherence and instability, to its air of hopeless futility, to its shrill, nervous atmosphere, in which it seemed anything could happen—and did. It obviously wasn't good-humored roivysm at all; it had the authentic stamp of the psychopathic ward.

And yet, taken one by one, the "little" business men can hardly be called mad; in their private capacities, they are probably as sane as the rest of us. Whatever was screwy about the affair must have arisen out of their getting together, out of the "little" business men collectively, not individually. In other words, it is emphatically a problem for social psychopathology.

I think it all points to the fact that the small business men, collectively as a class, are actually being driven mad under the pressure of present-day social forces. Tormented by gigantic economic forces, in the dark shadow of which they stand impotent; mined by the prolonged economic crisis that is dissolving away every

What Kind of Anti-War Movement?

WE have received the following inquiry from a group of readers:

It is not clear to us what the difference is between the "Keep America Out Of War" movement that is sponsoring the March 6 meeting and the People's Front. Both are made up of labor together with petty-bourgeois and liberal elements, aren't they? Also what is the difference between this move-

ment and the Stalinist League for Peace and Democracy?

1. Let us take the last question first. The fundamental difference between the "Keep America Out Of War" movement and the Stalinist League for Peace and Democracy is that the former is a movement against war while the latter is a movement for war, in spite of its name. This is certainly difference enough!

In the December 18, 1937 issue of the Workers Age, we characterized the League as "the first big step of the Communist Party to mobilize labor for war, the first big effort to launch a mass movement in support of American imperialism's program of aggression."

Now, of course, the League denies that it is for war; in fact, it claims to be for peace from first to last. But so do all war-mongers. Let us judge by program and deeds, not by words. The League for Peace and Democracy, at its very first congress, came out strongly in favor of the Presidents "quarantine" policy and "collective security" in general. We have shown again and again in these columns that the policy of "collective security" is a fraud and a menace; that, if it means anything at all, it means a military alliance of one group of imperialisms, the "democracies," to defend their imperial-

A New Moscow Trial

(Continued from Page 1)

the armed intervention of world imperialism on twenty fronts, to overcome the legacy of backwardness and slavery left by centuries of Czarism, and to lay the foundations of a socialist society, this same heroic and class power will enable the Soviet working class to sweep out of its way the present obstacles to its advance, the Stalin regime. Stalinism and all that it implies must be wiped out and be replaced by Soviet democracy if the Russian revolution is to make any progress after its twentieth year. Again we say: the revolutionary resources of the Russian proletariat will prove equal to this new and heavy task placed upon it by history!

ALREADY it is being hinted in the kept press and by the kept correspondents of Stalinism that the Bukharin-Rykov case is going to have an "American angle." Nearly a year ago (March 24, 1937), we were "warned" in the Daily Worker of the coming trials "of the god-fathers of Lovestonism, the Right opportunists, Bukharin and Rykov." We are, of course, ready for the most preposterous frame-up and we are not very much disturbed at the prospect. The mad ravings of the Stalinist prosecutor will meet with the withering contempt they deserve from the thinking people in this country, from all sections of the labor movement that know us and our work. And it is the American labor movement that constitutes for us the final court of appeal.

Basic Roots Of Our Movement

Our group—as part of the International Communist Opposition—was born as an independent tendency precisely because we believed with the most intense conviction that no healthy revolutionary-socialist movement could be developed in this country as a reflection or an off-shoot of one or another of the political factions in the Soviet Union. We regard it as fundamental that revolutionary socialism in America must grow out of our own labor movement, must have its roots deep in the soil of American reality and must strive to draw from that soil its inspiration and guiding principles. Only a movement of such independent political character can form a worthy part of a genuine international organ-

Stalinism Must Be Swept Away

But the socialist foundations of the Russian revolution are strong—stronger by far than Stalinism. The inexhaustible heroism and vast resources of the Russian working class, that enabled it in the past to overthrow the rule of the landlords and capitalists, to beat back

imperialisms, the fascist powers. "Collective security" is today what the "concert of free nations" was in Woodrow Wilson's days—a trap to lure the masses into another world slaughter in the interest of big-business imperialism.

When the Panay incident took place and the administration started a campaign, which fortunately fell pretty flat, to arouse a mad jingoistic frenzy among the American people, what did the Stalinist League do? Together with a few similar organizations, it issued a leaflet on which was printed in big red letters: "Once is enough!" What is this if not incitement to war? And this outfit has the nerve to call itself an organization "for peace!"

The program of the "Keep America Out Of War" movement is quite different; in fact, it is diametrically the opposite. Here is its six point platform, as given in the call for the March 6 meeting: (1) immediate withdrawal of warships and Marines from Chinese territory; (2) no increase in the army or navy; (3) passage of a war-referendum a m e n d m e n t; (4) against all schemes (such as the Industrial Mobilization Plan) to enslave labor during war; (5) cooperation for international peace but no alliances for war, declared or undeclared, under any name or pretext; (6) concentration on a struggle for labor and social reform at home. To the first three of these points, the most decisive, the Stalinites are openly hostile; to the others, they are hostile without daring to say so out loud. In short, the difference between the two movements is as clear as it is fundamental and far-reaching.

2. But, our correspondents ask, is not the movement we are supporting a People's Front movement? Isn't it made up of "labor together with petty bourgeois and liberal elements"? Let us examine more closely the nature of an anti-war movement and of the People's Front.

As far back as February 1, 1936, in a criticism of the old American League Against War and Fascism, we pointed out that an effective anti-war movement must be a real "people's movement," a broad, popular movement, embracing the workers together with all other sections of the population that hate war and want to do what they can to prevent its recurrence. To speak of an anti-war movement that excludes petty-bourgeois and liberal elements is absurd on the face of it; for the danger of war is an issue on which great masses of the people outside the working class are aroused to a fever pitch and to renounce their support and assistance against the war-makers would be folly of the worst sort. But, while non-labor elements are welcome and essential in any anti-war movement, their effectiveness in this struggle depends on how well they cooperate with labor and follow its leadership. In the article above referred to, we outlined two years ago what a real anti-war movement should be like.*

"A labor movement against war... means a movement with a firm trade-union base and with a predominantly trade-union character.... Such a movement could attract large sections of the middle classes and, what is more important, could turn their activity into definitely progressive class channels.... This should be built up—rooted in the labor organizations, leading the masses of the petty bourgeoisie...."

Obviously, then, the mere presence of petty-bourgeois and liberal elements in an anti-war movement does not make it a

Path Of Revolutionary Socialism

As for ourselves, we do not hesitate to say that it is basically to our realistic and truly Marxist conception of the specific and "exceptional" character of our problems and tasks in this country—that they are necessarily specific and "exceptional" in every country of the world—that we owe the effectiveness of our efforts as an independent tendency in the general labor movement. It is to this attitude that we owe so much of our ideological independence and political strength, so much of our ability to formulate policy on the basis of actual conditions and the real relation of forces, without regard to extraneous factors and considerations. And it is to this line of independent revolutionary socialism, independent revolutionary Marxism, that we intend to adhere faithfully in the future!

As for ourselves, we do not hesitate to say that it is basically to our realistic and truly Marxist conception of the specific and "exceptional" character of our problems and tasks in this country—that they are necessarily specific and "exceptional" in every country of the world—that we owe the effectiveness of our efforts as an independent tendency in the general labor movement. It is to this attitude that we owe so much of our ideological independence and political strength, so much of our ability to formulate policy on the basis of actual conditions and the real relation of forces, without regard to extraneous factors and considerations. And it is to this line of independent revolutionary socialism, independent revolutionary Marxism, that we intend to adhere faithfully in the future!

As for ourselves, we do not hesitate to say that it is basically to our realistic and truly Marxist conception of the specific and "exceptional" character of our problems and tasks in this country—that they are necessarily specific and "exceptional" in every country of the world—that we owe the effectiveness of our efforts as an independent tendency in the general labor movement. It is to this attitude that we owe so much of our ideological independence and political strength, so much of our ability to formulate policy on the basis of actual conditions and the real relation of forces, without regard to extraneous factors and considerations. And it is to this line of independent revolutionary socialism, independent revolutionary Marxism, that we intend to adhere faithfully in the future!

As for ourselves, we do not hesitate to say that it is basically to our realistic and truly Marxist conception of the specific and "exceptional" character of our problems and tasks in this country—that they are necessarily specific and "exceptional" in every country of the world—that we owe the effectiveness of our efforts as an independent tendency in the general labor movement. It is to this attitude that we owe so much of our ideological independence and political strength, so much of our ability to formulate policy on the basis of actual conditions and the real relation of forces, without regard to extraneous factors and considerations. And it is to this line of independent revolutionary socialism, independent revolutionary Marxism, that we intend to adhere faithfully in the future!

As for ourselves, we do not hesitate to say that it is basically to our realistic and truly Marxist conception of the specific and "exceptional" character of our problems and tasks in this country—that they are necessarily specific and "exceptional" in every country of the world—that we owe the effectiveness of our efforts as an independent tendency in the general labor movement. It is to this attitude that we owe so much of our ideological independence and political strength, so much of our ability to formulate policy on the basis of actual conditions and the real relation of forces, without regard to extraneous factors and considerations. And it is to this line of independent revolutionary socialism, independent revolutionary Marxism, that we intend to adhere faithfully in the future!

As for ourselves, we do not hesitate to say that it is basically to our realistic and truly Marxist conception of the specific and "exceptional" character of our problems and tasks in this country—that they are necessarily specific and "exceptional" in every country of the world—that we owe the effectiveness of our efforts as an independent tendency in the general labor movement. It is to this attitude that we owe so much of our ideological independence and political strength, so much of our ability to formulate policy on the basis of actual conditions and the real relation of forces, without regard to extraneous factors and considerations. And it is to this line of independent revolutionary socialism, independent revolutionary Marxism, that we intend to adhere faithfully in the future!

As for ourselves, we do not hesitate to say that it is basically to our realistic and truly Marxist conception of the specific and "exceptional" character of our problems and tasks in this country—that they are necessarily specific and "exceptional" in every country of the world—that we owe the effectiveness of our efforts as an independent tendency in the general labor movement. It is to this attitude that we owe so much of our ideological independence and political strength, so much of our ability to formulate policy on the basis of actual conditions and the real relation of forces, without regard to extraneous factors and considerations. And it is to this line of independent revolutionary socialism, independent revolutionary Marxism, that we intend to adhere faithfully in the future!

Path Of Revolutionary Socialism

As for ourselves, we do not hesitate to say that it is basically to our realistic and truly Marxist conception of the specific and "exceptional" character of our problems and tasks in this country—that they are necessarily specific and "exceptional" in every country of the world—that we owe the effectiveness of our efforts as an independent tendency in the general labor movement. It is to this attitude that we owe so much of our ideological independence and political strength, so much of our ability to formulate policy on the basis of actual conditions and the real relation of forces, without regard to extraneous factors and considerations. And it is to this line of independent revolutionary socialism, independent revolutionary Marxism, that we intend to adhere faithfully in the future!

* "War, Fascism and the Middle Class," by Will Herberg, Workers Age, Feb. 1, 1936.

The Unions in the Crisis

By M. S. MAUTNER

THE BASIC transformation of our labor movement, heralded by the formation and activities of the Committee for Industrial Organization, is perhaps nowhere better signaled than in the new approach and actual work of the unions on the problem of unemployment.

The Last Crisis And This

Consider, for example, the first phase of the 1929 crisis and the activities of the craft-minded A. F. of L. Not until 1932 did that organization even approve the idea of government "unemployment relief" and, so weakly was its voice raised, that the inauguration of this reform by the New Deal appeared as an unasked favor to labor. The organization of the unemployed took place outside of the organized trade-union movement, not merely because of Stalinist dualism but because the craft-unions refused to take any action of their own on this matter or even to assume leadership of the already organized sections of the unemployed. The C.I.O., on the contrary, after some temporary hesitancy and confusion, stemming from the New Deal-Stalinist theory of the "sit-down strike of big capital," recognized the seriousness of the economic recession in the space of a month or two and directed its organizations to act promptly to assume the leadership of the unemployed workers.

For the A. F. of L., composed of highly skilled workers whose numbers ever decrease but whose high dues still provide push-linings for the union coffers, unemployment relief was a union service. For the C.I.O., composed of masses of unskilled workers, whose component unions, as in auto and steel, number their members at upwards of 400,000, it would be a financial fantasy to attempt to provide union unemployment benefits. The vast social upheaval of the industrial-union movement brings with it the necessity of political action as a vital accompaniment of the organization of the unorganized on the economic field. That this parallelism in the function of trade unionism in America extends to all fields of labor's needs and interests, is a point buttressed by the work of the unions in times of crisis and unemployment, as well as in times of employment and consequent organization.

New Functions Of Unionism

Not only is it true that a new and different attitude characterizes our trade-union movement today but, in the very process of putting that new viewpoint into practice, additional functions and experiences are acquired. The unions are not merely "presenting their case"; they act, in effect, as relief agencies, certifying need, investigating cases and handling, in conjunction with the relief agencies proper, the distribution of funds. This is most clearly worked out by the United Automobile Workers, whose own private investigation and certification is, in many localities, sufficient to establish the right of a worker to relief. In this connection, it must be pointed out that the ardent and unsparring activity of the union, whose leaders had a special conference with President Roosevelt on relief needs of the auto workers, won the allocation of more than half the recent appropriation of \$250,000,000—meager as that sum is.

It means a great deal to the development of a powerful and competent labor movement that its members should receive actual training in what is nothing else than governmental administration. In the field of unemployment, the

unions are acting as a labor government—not as a parliamentary ruling clique to be sure but assuming the functions of administration thru their own class organizations. The tremendous effect of this on the future development of socialism in this country can only be dimly glimpsed at this time.

To return to the present stage of development of our movement, however, the importance of this activity lies in that the unions now appear to the workers not merely as dues-paying groups which offer security on the job when times are good and there is apparently no much danger of losing a job, but as an organization of permanent value, which successfully fights for the needs and demands of the workers in bad times as well. For the first time in our history, there exists the possibility of really maintaining those organizational gains of labor, made in time of "prosperity," in the period of crisis and depression, which has ordinarily proved such an erosive force, undermining the whole movement and, in many instances, even wiping it out. This unbroken activity of the union during all phases of the business cycle also brings with it an objective lesson in socialist economics and politics. For now, it becomes clear to more and more sections of the workers that, despite the utmost efforts of the trade unions to fight unemployment and to secure relief, itself of seven or eight millions, is periodically increased by four or five millions more, not all of whom will be taken back into industrial production again. It is no longer a question of "if only the union would do something"—the union does its utmost and gets a great deal in the way of immediate relief—but the real solution of the question

is the extension of labor's political power to eradicate the profit system, the breeder of unemployment.

Political Independence

This new policy of the trade unions carries within it the germ of class political independence, as much as did the organization drives in steel and auto. The C.I.O., for example, estimates that at least three billion dollars are needed to take care of the unemployed. The administration, under terrific pressure thru demonstrations, conferences and political threats, "refuses to let the people down" and responds with an allowance of a quarter of a billion dollars—it is too busy building battleships. The immediate needs of the labor movement are opposed to the war-mongering administration, let alone labor's opposition to war itself, and this will certainly energize the movement for a labor party.

However much we welcome the new attitude and practice of the American trade-union movement, in championing the cause of the organized workers who are unemployed, we must recognize that this is but the first step in the right direction. In this period of the decline of capitalism and the fostering of reactionary mass movements by the ruling class, labor must pay the keenest attention to the great bulk of the disemployed who are unorganized, whose ranks are replenished by sections of the population other than the working class. To provide leadership for this group, numbering millions, to win for them their demands and needs, to demonstrate the power and progressive character of the labor movement and save them from the anti-union and fascist demagogy of reaction, that is the next great task of the trade-union movement.

Forgotten Words

IN March 1935, T. H. Wintringham, a well-known Stalinist writer on military-political questions, published his book, "The Coming World War." In it, he undertook a fairly thoro examination of the "collective-security" doctrine, then coming to the fore. The year before, the British Labor Party had changed its stand from opposition to war and rearmament to support of "collective security" and all its works. In his book, Wintringham severely criticized the new policy of the Labor Party and contrasted it with the genuine socialist attitude of the I.L.P.

Within six months, by the time of the seventh congress of the Communist International in July 1935, the official communist movement had itself made a similar shift from opposition to war to support of "collective security" and every word of criticism levelled by Wintringham against the Labor Party now applies with equal force to the Communist International.

"COLLECTIVE SECURITY" EXPOSED

The line of the Labor Party was laid down in its resolution of 1932: "That this resolution is of the opinion that the socialists and Labor parties of all nations should agree to oppose any war entered into by any government, whatever the ostensible object of the war, and ask the Labor Party delegates to bring forward this policy at the next International Socialist Congress."

In 1933, the Labor Party again "pledged itself to take no part in war and to resist it with the whole force of the labor movement." In 1934, the bubble burst. The Labor Party leaders... forced thru the Labor Party conference at Southport, a resolution pledging labor to support war against a "peace-breaker"! In this resolution, (it is declared) that the Labor Party "must unflinchingly support our government in all the risks and consequences of fulfilling its duty to take part in collective action against a peace-breaker"; this means being prepared militarily and financially to join in such "collective action"! This policy is stated as a necessary part of settlement of the world by "collective security"...

Under this "collective-peace system," the (Labor Party) memorandum states it would be possible to distinguish between a war of an aggressive character and one undertaken in defense of the collective-peace system: "Labor is emphatically opposed to any form of aggressive war but we recognize that there might be circumstances under which the government of Great Britain might have to use its military and naval forces in support of the League in restraining an aggressor nation which declined to submit to the authority of the League and which flagrantly used military measures in defiance of its pledged word." What is the League? Fifty-nine capitalist governments and one soviet government. The League's action or inaction at any given moment is the resultant of the policies of the government members of the League, especially the most influential gov-

We Must Prepare For Our 'M-Day'

By BERTRAM D. WOLFE

(This is the last of the series of articles based on Bertram D. Wolfe's report at a recent meeting of the National Council of the I.C.L.L.—The Editor.)

A few words in conclusion. It is high time that we ourselves began drawing up our own "M-Day plans." I pointed out before that the ruling class has spent a decade in preparing, down to the finest details, its plans for the day war is declared. I don't want to be an alarmist—one of the comrades here told me after my October 16th report on the war situation that he thought I was exaggerating the situation in sounding the cry of alarm—certainly, he must realize by now that that was the moment at which the moral mobilization of the American people for war was beginning—I do want to point out that the preparation of our M-Day plans, while it does not need to take a decade and a half, is something that cannot be done overnight without previous thought and planning. I know that this is not an appropriate thing for discussing in a large committee but I want to give some idea of a few things that can be considered by an organization as a whole, and that should be worked out in detail by the Executive Committee or a sub-committee.

I counted the number of women present in this plenum chiefly because I have been studying the M-Day plans of the government. I discovered that, while those plans give the war dictators important powers over women and children by setting aside child-labor laws and women's minimum-wage laws, that nevertheless only men are subject to conscription, to being drafted into either the factories or the army. That means that, at any

moment, any number of our leaders, of our spokesmen, of our trade-union functionaries of the male sex, can be effectively stilled either by being thrown into jail or by being put into military discipline and I think that we must begin now an intensive effort to train more women in our ranks to write for our press, to learn how to speak, to draft programs, to organize, to do all of the things the bulk of which have been done only with very little participation and very little leadership on the part of women. That is one thing.

A second: I notice also from the M-Day plans that workers in basic industries are, in general, going to get deferred classification. That is important to us. That means, for example, that our auto workers will not be drafted with the same rapidity that our miscellaneous workers will be. And, in any other basic industries in which we have many members, we will have some relative deferment. Therefore, we must consciously begin to develop in the ranks of the basic industries people capable of taking over the leadership and the tasks of the entire organization over every field that the organization will have to respond to. I don't mean merely on the top, people who get to plenums, like this for instance, for our top people in all fields will be marked men. But we have to prepare second and third and fourth and fifth-line reserves, with general political education, with practise in many-sided analyses on all the concrete problems in the light of our general aims.

We have to develop a great deal more of the capacity for independent leadership and initiative in every unit of the country because it is obvious that the separate regions may be cut off from the center for a while.

I am deeply impressed by what I saw happen in Spain, the example of the P.O.U.M. Its best leaders both taken—Maurin and Nin. Then its entire leadership was arrested—I mean the entire leadership not the top leadership—every well-known, active P.O.U.M.ist in the land. Scores and hundreds of leaders of the P.O.U.M. in every region are in jail. And despite that, the P.O.U.M. is getting out a regular underground press that is very effective. It is functioning as an underground party thanks to the initiative and self-leadership of militants of the lower ranks. I don't believe we have developed to that extent the capacity for self-initiative in our own ranks.

Next, I want to repeat what I said in the October 16th report, that today in a very different sense than at any other time during our organization's life, it is not any longer a question of long-time political aim, but today recruiting and mass explanation of our stand on the war question are the burning necessities of our existence. In one conception, there is a united "collective" world... bound together to resist a "peace-breaker." In the other, there is a world divided by class war in which "defense" means primarily defense of ruling-class property. These two views clash within the whole labor movement....

The importance of this change of policy (of the Labor Party) cannot be overstressed. It means that war is near... and it means that, in this war, the official machinery of the labor movement will be at the disposal of whatever government... wages that war. For it is always easy to make this war appear to be against the foreign "peace-breaker," a war for "collective security," a war for peace.

WORKERS AGE

Organ of the National Council, Independent Communist Labor League. 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Publishers...

Vol. 7. March 12, 1938 No. 11

SPY SCARES

THOSE who remember or have read about the wild spy scare of 1916 that helped put the American people into the proper frame of mind to be led to the slaughter the next year, will not fail to recognize the multiplying signs of another such hysteria being generated thru the efforts of the present "peace-loving" administration.

A few nondescript individuals are arrested, charged with espionage of a rather "amateurish" and "naive" variety, according to the press. Such things have happened repeatedly in the past and have been regarded as a mere routine affair, provoking little attention, if, indeed, they received any publicity at all.

The current spy scare is not just an exploit of the yellow press, as some people think; the most sober and respectable papers are as guilty as the rest. The current spy scare is part and parcel of a war psychology that the administration is deliberately fomenting in order to break down popular resistance to its war policy.

The spy scare, with all its trimmings, is part of this program. It is only a beginning. A short time ago, an American consul was slapped by a Japanese sentry—curious how omnipresent our diplomatic agents are in China as compared with their almost total absence from Spain.

Thus, deliberately and with malice aforethought, is the country being driven into a war madness from which there is no way out except another world slaughter.

War and Revolution

Some Lessons from History

By J. BRAUN

WHAT are the most important lessons of the great French Revolution as they apply today in Spain in the armed struggle against fascism?

In 1789, the whole of Europe was still under the yoke of feudalism or absolute monarchy. The proletariat was a tiny minority of the people. The tasks and the results of the revolution could only be the destruction of feudalism and the elimination of the hindrances to free capitalist development.

Revolution And War

There is the lesson that emerges immediately: a war against reactionary foreign invaders, supported by the reactionaries of our own country, can only be won by the most radical completion of the internal revolution so that the working class and the peasants are really fighting against the restoration of their own oppressors and exploiters when they war against the foreign invaders.

The first French Revolution had to fight against foreign invaders whose military superiority appeared to be overwhelming in comparison with the French forces. Feudal Austria and Prussia, the strongest military powers in Central Europe at that time, backed by Czarist Russia and by bourgeois Britain, tried to crush the French Revolution and to reestablish the Bourbon monarchy in France.

The Prussian and Austrian generals thought that a real war against the untrained and undisciplined troops of revolutionary France would not be necessary. The appearance of their own well-trained and disciplined mercenary troops who understood how to handle their muskets, would be sufficient to make the young recruits of revolutionary France run away from the battle-field in panic.

Last year, at Buenos Aires, Secretary of State Hull declared in his usual sanctimonious manner: "We must create on this hemisphere an area of peace and sanity in a war-mad world."

revoiting piece of jingoism to put over, there the Stalinites are to be found, right on the job!

strong army. For the same reason, Marat, the best representative of the "have-nots" of Paris, was opposed to provoking a war which would necessarily lead to the establishment of a powerful, centrally organized military machine.

The first clashes between the French and the Austrian and Prussian troops produced great dismay in Paris. Many leading officers turned out to be traitors and the old army troops, consisting mainly of professional soldiers, were easily defeated by the better disciplined and better led troops of reactionary Austria and Prussia.

The Masses Rise For Victory

The French Revolution was in the greatest danger of being defeated by the foreign invaders when the masses of the poor of Paris and other big towns wiped out the saboteurs of the revolution, the defenders of big property and of the speculators, the protectors of the reactionary army officers, those who wanted a reconciliation between the monarchy and the representatives of big capitalist property.

The short period of revolutionary terror under Robespierre began when the war against the foreign reactionary invaders was in a very bad condition and the very existence of the French Revolution was in danger. The most revolutionary wing of bourgeois France, the Jacobins, did not hesitate to violate the "rights of property" or to persecute rigorously those who enriched themselves at the expense of the hungry people.

The first French Revolution had started with a decision of the "Third Estate" at the National Assembly in 1789 to abolish feudal privileges and to insist on a democratic constitution. However, things were so arranged that the former feudal lords could transform their feudal incomes into capitalist incomes, at the expense of the peasants whose economic situation, therefore, did not improve, except for a small minority of independent landowners.

A Life Or Death Choice

When foreign armies threatened to destroy the revolution and when the king himself proved to be in conspiracy with the foreign invaders, the French Revolution was faced with a life-or-death choice: either to continue the revolution at home—that is, the complete expropriation of the feudal landlords (without compensation) and the eradication of the royalists with the king at their head—or else submit to the certainty of losing the war.

What motivated the army, big business and the Junkers in their revolt? The army was opposed to

By Lambda

WORLD TODAY

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

(We present below a brilliant analysis of the recent events in Germany. It will be noticed that Lambda's interpretation of these events is quite different from that of the American press generally. It is only necessary to add that, in his knowledge of economic, social and political life of Germany, our correspondent is without a peer and that he has unusually trustworthy connections with the underground labor movement of that country.—The Editor.)

London, February 9, 1938.

FEBRUARY 4, 1938 represents an historic date on the Nazi calendar. In order to understand its true significance, we must discard both the prejudiced view of the German press which would interpret the blow suffered by the regime as a victory for the Nazi party as well as the confusing reports of most of the international press. Let us look at the facts.

February 4, 1938 marks the beginning of the decline of the Nazi regime. Open warfare has broken out among its leading factions. The first rift is here. The conflict of the leaders and their cliques reflects deep dissension within the ruling class.

The loss of the British monopoly of the world market at the turn of the century, led to the organization of unskilled workers and, after intense inner warfare, the domination of the crafts in the Trades Union Congress was replaced by that of the miners, the railwaymen and general workers.

Both movements gained during the war and, in spite of ideological differences, the leadership of both followed the identical policy of mobilizing the labor movement behind the war. From 1915 to 1920, the British gained 3,989,000 and the American 2,465,200 workers.

What motivated the army, big business and the Junkers in their revolt? The army was opposed to

Labor Notes and Facts

Unions in England and the U. S. A.

By ANNE LAURIER

IN GREAT BRITAIN and the United States, both highly industrialized and major imperialist powers, the trade unions are the mainstream of the labor movement. Due to the absence of democratic tasks for the working class to perform, the political movement in the Labor Party has grown out of the necessity of protecting the unions against hostile legislation and courts.

Due to this similarity, there has been a parallel fluctuation in the trade-union membership of the two countries from 1898 to 1935, with Great Britain on a consistently higher level. This similarity has been accompanied by certain important differences in structure, power and ideological outlook.

3. Reversal Of Roles And The Upsurge In America—1933-1937

As the result of the deepest depression in history both movements have undergone basic changes. Due to the demoralization following the 1931 debacle of the Labor Party and the curtailment of social legislation by the Tory government, the English trade unions have not recovered their militancy and, consequently, have made few gains in membership.

1. Upswing Of The Unions—1900-1920

The loss of the British monopoly of the world market at the turn of the century, led to the organization of unskilled workers and, after intense inner warfare, the domination of the crafts in the Trades Union Congress was replaced by that of the miners, the railwaymen and general workers. Growth was at first slow but, by 1910, the conflict was solved by amalgamation and culminated in the establishment of the three great industrial unions: the National Union of Railwaymen, the Transport Workers Federation and the Miners Federation of Great Britain.

Both movements gained during the war and, in spite of ideological differences, the leadership of both followed the identical policy of mobilizing the labor movement behind the war.

2. The Decline—1921-1933

The post-war depression started a reduction in membership but the employers offensive was so strong that the loss was continued thru the following prosperity period, a new phenomenon in the history of trade unionism. By 1933, membership in the United States declined to 2,973,000, a loss of 40%, and Great Britain lost about 4,000,000 members, falling to 4,392,000.

What motivated the army, big business and the Junkers in their revolt? The army was opposed to

America and USSR

(Continued from Page 1)

port any American war in the Far East, even the sweet words about "helping the Soviet Union" or "aiding the Chinese people" are used to bait the trap.

Always Ready To Betray

That means that, even in a war in which the U.S.A. may be temporarily lined up with the Soviet Union against Japan, it would gladly take the first opportunity of getting together with Japan for a joint attack upon the U.S.S.R.—in the name of "peace" and "civilization."

How To Help The Soviet Union

No; agitating for war is not the way to help to Soviet Union. The way to help the Soviet Union is to organize labor's forces in this country and on an international scale to prevent the shipment of munitions and war materials of any sort to Japan, at the same time exerting the utmost pressure upon the government at Washington in the same direction.

American Armies A Police Force Of Reaction

But even that isn't the whole story. It is very unlikely that war in the Far East could go on for long without a social upheaval in Japan and China, both of which seem to be on the verge of revolution.

Both movements gained during the war and, in spite of ideological differences, the leadership of both followed the identical policy of mobilizing the labor movement behind the war.

Both movements gained during the war and, in spite of ideological differences, the leadership of both followed the identical policy of mobilizing the labor movement behind the war.

Both movements gained during the war and, in spite of ideological differences, the leadership of both followed the identical policy of mobilizing the labor movement behind the war.

Both movements gained during the war and, in spite of ideological differences, the leadership of both followed the identical policy of mobilizing the labor movement behind the war.

Both movements gained during the war and, in spite of ideological differences, the leadership of both followed the identical policy of mobilizing the labor movement behind the war.

Both movements gained during the war and, in spite of ideological differences, the leadership of both followed the identical policy of mobilizing the labor movement behind the war.

BOOKS

FARM POLICIES UNDER THE NEW DEAL. Public Affairs Pamphlets No. 16. Public Affairs Committee, New York, 1938.

This pamphlet on New Deal farm policies presents a pretty clear account of the plight of the farmer, the various mechanisms of the A.A.A. before and after the Supreme Court decision, the effects of the A.A.A. in terms of production, prices and farm income, and a general appraisal based on the Brookings Institution study published recently.

One of the shortcomings of this study is that it gives inadequate consideration to the differences in benefits received from the A.A.A. by various classes or income-groups of farmers; a word is said about the share-croppers but that is all.

WPA-Army Link Bared

(Continued from Page 1)

Meanwhile, the up-state W.P.A. has already been requested by the United States Army recruiting service to draw up lists of able-bodied, single young men on home and work-relief with a view to obtaining their enlistment for military service.

The war machine is evidently driving full speed ahead with its preparations for the next world slaughter.

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

Advertisement for Workers Rights In Spain Symposium: Saturday, March 12, 1 P.M. CENTER HOTEL 108 West 43rd St.

Trade Union Notes

By Observer

The Federman Case

THE decisions of the United Automobile Workers and the United Mine Workers Union restricting the destructive activities of the Stalinites in the trade unions caused loud and indignant protests from the direction of the C.P. and its stooges. Heywood Broun rushed in with his usual Stalinist apologetics, our organs of "liberal thought" insisted that this was the first step to fascism and that well-known labor leader and trade-union expert, the columnist, Jay Franklin, could contain himself no longer. Deliberately distorting the position of the United Automobile Workers, he protested against a policy which allegedly means "taking the bread and butter from the mouths of trade unionists" merely for holding certain political opinions.

Of course, the whole argument is a fraud, as we have shown more than once in these columns. But it is curious to note how silent all of these champions of "oppressed minorities" are in the case of the Toronto furriers, where it is the Stalinites who are doing the oppressing.

In the last election for manager of the furriers union in Toronto the candidate of the C.P. was defeated. Elected was the popular builder of the organization, Max Federman, affiliated with a Jewish radical organization, the Left Poale Zion. At that very moment, the C.P. leadership in the International Fur Workers Union began to plot and conspire to get Federman at the first opportunity. This opportunity was not long in coming.

A difficult strike and ensuing troubles gave the Stalinist clique the chance to raise the cry of misuse of certain funds for which they alleged Federman could not produce official receipts. The argument of the Toronto manager, that certain types of organization work are not easily accounted for in terms of official receipts, was met with a shrug of the shoulders. To make certain that their long-awaited chance did not go wrong, the General Executive Board immediately appointed a committee to place Federman on trial.

When the Toronto locals insisted upon their right to try Federman, the G.E.B. was forced to yield and confined its activity to bringing pressure to bear upon the membership. The results were rather disappointing for the Stalinists. The trial committee hearing Federman's case and acquainted with the work of the organization, found him not guilty. A general membership meeting delivered a final blow to Stalinist hopes by voting 4-to-1 to back Federman.

And here is where the C.P.-dominated International Fur Workers Union showed that it had learned much from the Moscow trials. Completely disregarding the decision of the membership, the G.E.B. expelled Federman, ordered him to turn the union office and funds over to a Stalinist appointee and, when that was refused, it went to court to enjoin Federman and the union from using the name of the International Fur Workers Union. In addition, a gang of New York hooligans were imported and the Toronto fur market became a bloody battlefield.

At this writing, the battle is still on. The supporters of Federman, consisting of two local unions, have gone over into the A. F. of L. in their search for backing in the fight. Thus does the Stalinist lust for political domination of the trade unions drive workers out of the C.I.O. and into the A. F. of L.

The activities of the Stalinists in the furriers union are unique only in the degree to which they have a stranglehold upon the leadership. That this policy of extermination of their political opponents—those who stand in the way of their domination of the trade unions—is not an isolated case confined to the

fur industry is clear from their much publicized campaign to 'drive' the Lovestoneites, Trotskyites and other political opponents, from the labor movement. In so many words, the Communist Party gives the lie to its own protestations that it is a force for unity in the labor movement. In Toronto, they have been able to carry their policy into practice and to drive an opponent out of the ranks of the C.I.O. into the A. F. of L. If they have not succeeded elsewhere, it is only because they are too weak; it is only because the membership is on guard against Stalinist disruption.

The labor movement at large has said very little about the events in Toronto and the actions of President Gold. But suppose, just suppose, that the president of the United Automobile Workers had received a report from an auditor of some local union under the leadership of a Stalinist, that finances were really and truly being mis-handled? Suppose, then, that he proceeded to take steps to investigate this matter. What do you think would have happened? How the cry of "unity and democracy" would have split the very heavens! The rest you can best picture for yourselves.

But where a Stalinist union is concerned, where the victim is merely an obstacle to the Stalinist lust for power, there is total silence. The insolence of the Stalinist trade-union leaders and their contempt for the opinion of the labor movement, is exceeded only by that of Stalin himself for the international labor movement.

G. F. MILES

World Today

(Continued from Page 4) further entanglement in Spain and the strengthening of the Rome-Berlin axis since it regards Italy as a negligible military factor and is not inclined to risk a European war because of friendship with Mussolini and Franco. The army was opposed to giving full support to the Japanese. It was in favor of a rapprochement with England and France and certain elements, particularly Fritsch and his followers, favored a rapprochement with the Soviet Union. The army is opposed to the religious warfare carried on by the Nazis as tending to destroy the morale of the soldiers. To sum it up, the Reichswehr is in favor of thoro and slow preparation for a war, a big war, and is opposed to the irresponsibility with which Hitler's demagogues are dissipating the strength of Germany and threatening to involve it in a premature war.

Big business had many points in common with the army. It looks upon credits granted to Italy as so much money wasted; it is anxious to get credits from England and possibly America; it feels that its business opportunities in China are being threatened by a Japanese alliance. In the Frankfurter Zeitung it aptly dubbed the Four-Year Plan as "organized distress." It is opposed to governmental interference in business. The army, of course, is in favor of subordinating all business and industry to war preparations.

The Junkers were opposed to cer-

What Was Behind Strike Of Phila. Hose Workers?

THE two-day insurgent strike in Philadelphia, Pa. in the Philadelphia hosiery market in protest against an arbitration award resulting in a wage-cut, focused attention last week on the American Federation of Hosiery Workers and some of the problems faced by that union.

To understand the strike we must go back to last August, when, as the result of negotiations between the union and a large group of manufacturers, a wage increase averaging between 6% and 9% was obtained for approximately 40% of the workers in the industry. Despite the organization efforts of the union, which resulted in the consolidation of strength in the largest hosiery-knitting center (Reading, Pa.), and other major gains, the union was unable to bring the wage level in the industry as a whole up to that in the shops which were signatory to the so-called national labor agreement.

Until October, 1937 was the biggest year that full-fashioned hosiery has ever had in America. However, when the general depression came, the hosiery industry was worse hit than most other consumer-goods industries. In Philadelphia, the most strongly unionized section, the situation was particularly acute and aggravated by the fact that, because of migration to the South and other reasons, there was little modern knitting machinery being installed. Philadelphia was thus a high-cost producing area and its 16,000 hosiery workers seemed doomed unless something could be done to attract new equipment. By December, but 20% of the Philadelphia hosiery workers were working.

In this situation, the president of the Philadelphia Branch, No. 1, made the proposal that the industry in Philadelphia could be saved by granting wage concessions equal to the increase gained in August. This proposal was made in the public press just prior to a mass-meeting of Branch 1, which subsequently almost unanimously turned the proposal down. The proposal was denounced by the national officers of the union, and by workers in North Jersey and the Midwest, other sections covered by the contract.

Almost simultaneously, in accordance with the provisions of the agreement, the manufacturers moved to reopen negotiations on the wage-scale, asking for reductions amounting to much more than those offered by the Branch 1 president. The union refused to consider the question and then, under the terms of the agreement, the matter was arbitrated, with Wm. Leiserson, of the National Mediation Board, as the impartial arbitrator.

Leiserson handed down a decision which took advantage of the

tain effects of the war economy introduced into agriculture.

Neither the army nor big business nor the Junkers are opposed to the continued existence of the Nazi dictatorship as such. They cannot get rid of it for fear of the consequences. They must retain the Nazis as the instrument of oppression of the working class. The present conflict, therefore, takes place within the confines of the fascist dictatorship. But the seat of power is being shifted away from the Nazi regime to the army. The so-called totalitarian war towards which Germany is heading requires, in the opinion of Ludendorff (and the army shares his opinions), that all power, political as well as military, be concentrated in the hands of the army in case of war and that the Nazis play a secondary role. February 4, 1938 is a step in this direction.

(Continued in next issue)

Philadelphia, Pa. complicated piece-rate method of payment to mask a wage-cut rising to 20%, in accordance with the type of work done. The higher-paid workers were the hardest hit.

Resentment immediately arose against the award. In Philadelphia and Northern New Jersey it took the form of strike sentiment, altho the contract specifically prohibited strikes during the life of the agreement. Altho the strike sentiment was not unanimous in Philadelphia, it was encouraged by the president of the branch. The opposition to the president, Stalinist-led, offered no real suggestions at all. The meeting at which the strike vote was taken was sparsely attended and the action was protested, particularly among some of the newly organized workers. However, a meeting later in the week came to the same conclusion, first voting to rescind the strike vote and then passing it once more. In the meanwhile, the national officers of the union, while denouncing the arbitration award, condemned the strike action also, pointing out that it was in violation of the terms of the agreement. The lead offered by Philadelphia was followed by North Jersey but turned down by the other districts affected by the award, partly because of a distrust of the Branch 1 leadership on the part of the other areas.

The newspapers have carried accounts of the partial nature and ultimate collapse of the strike under pressure from the national organization. What they have not recognized, however, was the fact that the strike was doomed to failure from the first. The leaders of the strike in Philadelphia had no program to offer to prevent the new wage schedule from going into effect. From the very start they were afraid to permit the majority of the members to vote on the question at all. The final vote in favor of the strike was about 800 to 400, out of a membership estimated between 12,000 and 16,000.

The collapse of the strike leaves the hosiery industry in the Philadelphia area and as a whole in an even more difficult situation than before. The best efforts of the entire union, leadership and membership alike, will be necessary to meet the grave crisis.

B.S.

War Lessons

(Continued from Page 4)

really be a fight for their own interests.

Robespierre and the Jacobins insisted on the destruction of all internal enemies and on radical measures against the speculators and big landowners, even during the most difficult period of the war. The leaders of the moderate bourgeoisie, who had amassed new fortunes during the revolution, did not want any measures which violated "property rights" and made impossible a reconciliation with the reactionary foreign powers. Girondist leaders attempted to save the head of the king and to preserve the monarchy. The Jacobins insisted that the death of the king would discourage the reactionaries and inspire the revolutionaries to greater activity and vigilance. The Girondists did not want to "provoke" the foreign powers by a death sentence against the king. The Jacobins urged revolutionary propaganda against feudal oppression in order to weaken the invading armies by making the French cause the cause of all peoples against all suppressors.

The pressure of the revolutionary people of Paris compelled the Girondist leaders to put the king on trial in open court. Under the influence of the Jacobins, anti-

Movements Against War

(Continued from Page 2)

People's Front by any means.

What, then, does make a movement a People's Front? Fundamentally, two things: (1) an organizational setup attempting to unite working class organizations with bourgeois (not petty-bourgeois) organizations, especially bourgeois political organizations; and (2) a program expressing the conservatism and class strivings of the bourgeois partners in the alliance. In other words, the organizational and political predominance of the bourgeoisie, since, once you enter a political partnership with definitely bourgeois organizations, it will be their program and their outlook that will predominate.

Is the anti-war movement we are supporting of such a character? Of course not! The "Keep America Out Of War" movement so far is a movement of several hundred outstanding figures in various fields of social life sponsoring meetings and other anti-war manifestations; beyond that, it has not taken any organizational form as yet. But already the labor elements in the movement are decisive in all that counts and its program is unquestionably generally sound. The fact that a good number of the sponsors of the March 6 meeting are middle-class people and liberals no more makes it a People's Front than the thousands of middle-class and liberal supporters and sponsors of the Sacco-Vanzetti movement made that a People's Front affair.

Where the anti-war movement has gone on to a further stage of development, it is almost entirely labor in character. Look at the anti-war conference called two weeks or so ago in Detroit by the U.A.W. and other C.I.O. unions. Forty delegates were there, all trade unionists, and, when they came to elect a provisional committee, they had to leave a vice-presidency open for a representative of civic and religious organizations because there was none such present. That was a distinct shortcoming of the conference but it certainly was not a failing in the direction of the People's Front.

Two different phases of the anti-war movement are beginning to develop simultaneously. On the one hand, we have activities, such as the March 6 and April 6 meetings, organized by loose committees of prominent people of all political views and all classes of society, united only by their hatred of war and burning desire to do something to prevent its recurrence. On the other hand, we have the mobilization of the labor movement against war, as expressed in the resolutions adopted by the S.W.O.C., the U.A.W., the U.M.W.A., the Chicago Labor Party, and hundreds of other labor organizations throughout the country—as expressed, above all, in such movements as that recently initiated in Detroit. In the early cooperation and fusion of these two tendencies under the leadership of labor, lies the hope of a broad and effective anti-war movement in the United States.

feudalist revolutionary propaganda became a powerful weapon against foreign invaders and assured the French armies the support of the peasants and towns-people in Belgium and in the Rhineland.

(Continued Next Week)

"PEOPLE who assume that we should always be prosperous unless some villains upset the applecart are reckoning without economic science. Crude charges against either government or business are ruled out of economic discussion."—George Soule, in the New Republic.