

COMING
Series of Articles On
Spain
By JULIAN GORKIN

Workers Age

Weekly Paper of the Independent Labor League of America

CLINICAL SPECIMEN OF TROTSKYIST
DOGMATICS . . . by Will Herberg . . .
page 3.
KNITGOODS PROGRESSIVES WIN BIG
VICTORY . . . page 2.

Vol. 9, No. 15.

NEW YORK, N. Y. SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 1940.

5 CENTS

Behind the Headlines:

Unity — Or Else . . .

By JAY LOVESTONE

JUST at the moment when a united trade-union movement is most urgently needed, do we find that the outlook for trade-union unity is dimmest. It would be folly to play the ostrich and wishfully think that somehow or other the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. will soon get together.

The entire labor situation has taken a turn for the much worse in recent months. John L. Lewis has rudely rebuffed all A. F. of L. efforts at further negotiations. The A. F. of L. Executive Council—inert, devoid of imagination and sterile in initiative—has failed to make any moves to force or dramatize the issue or, for that matter, even to acquaint adequately the rank and file with the startling facts of Lewis's guilt in this situation. To add fuel to the flames menacing labor's vital interests, the C.I.O. has increasingly and systematically been resorting to rankist dualism and disorganization, especially against the highly organized building-trades unions. The "bright boy" and evil genius of the governing coterie of the C.I.O.—a lawyer, Lee Pressman—has gone so far as to applaud publicly Thurman Arnold's sinister assault on unionism. Badly muddying all these life-streams of labor is the obnoxious Stalinist dirt, the weight of which has become much heavier in C.I.O. councils since the last convention at San Francisco.

Very small wonder, indeed, that in the face of such suicidal internecine strife Congress may enact a law prohibiting political campaign contributions by labor unions. It is the split in the labor movement which is primarily responsible for the grave dangers to all further and even already enacted social legislation. This tragic division must either be healed soon or else . . . No good can come out of the continuation of two trade-union movements tearing at each other's throat. Only the worst of evil is in store for all labor organizations if this breach is not healed very soon. Let us cite some facts.

Embittered by the loss of ground and egged on by those inveterate dualists, the Stalinists, the C.I.O. has turned to the crassest dual unionism. In the anthracite region, C.I.O. organizers have been making desperate efforts to win over some runaway women's garment shops. Of course wage scales, hours, and working conditions of runaway employers are to be accepted here by the C.I.O. in exchange for the check-off system and so-called recognition of the Lewis firm. Incidentally, this is being hailed as smart strategy in circles closest to Lewis himself—on the ground that it will teach the I.L.G.W.U. a lesson or two about the "invincible power" of the C.I.O. and may even prevent Dubinsky's reaffiliation to the A. F. of L. Obviously, this is nothing but stupidity run amok.

There is even rising talk of the C.I.O.'s tackling the printing trades. If perchance someone might think that we are exaggerating in the least, we hasten to present unchallengeable evidence typifying this disruptive spite policy as applied by the C.I.O. in its feverish campaign to disorganize the building-trades unions. A few weeks ago, the C.I.O.'s United Construction Workers Organizing Committee appeared before the New York Building Trades Employers Association and offered the latter standard contracts providing for lower wages and longer hours than those enforced by existing agreements with the A. F. of L. unions. The C.I.O. offered the bosses: a flat daily wage of \$9 for mechanics ("compared with the A.F. of L. scale of from \$11 to \$15, \$6 for helpers, and \$5 for common labor"), freedom from jurisdictional disputes and strikes ("by allowing employers to transfer workers from one skilled occupation to another"), a guarantee against all interference with the use of materials on the ground that they are non-union made, and finally an eight-hour day as against the A. F. of L.'s six-hour and seven-hour days.

The building-trades bosses told the Lewis spokesmen that they could not do business with the C.I.O. until it had more members enrolled in the industry. That this is an open bid by the employers to go out and recruit

(Continued on page 4)

Regular ALP Slate Carries in State

Alex Rose Claims 150 Majority But Stalinist Forces Make Big Inroad; State Committee to Meet Soon

New York City. The Stalinist-controlled "Progressive Committee" registered heavy inroads in the American Labor Party in the state primary elections on April 2 although all indications were that the regular State Committee leadership headed by Alex Rose, state secretary, would retain control of the state organization.

Final figures were not available last week but Alex Rose claimed that at least 450 of the 750 members of the A.L.P. State Committee elected in the primaries were supporters of the old State Committee leadership.

According to Rose's headquarters, the "regular" State Committee slate carried Bronx and Brooklyn, electing 30 committee members to the former and 62 to 53 in the latter. It lost two other boroughs, however, the line-up being 35 to 80 in Manhattan and 10 to 20 in Queens. In Richmond, there was a tie, 5 to 5.

These figures would mean that in New York City the Stalinist forces took 168 committee members as against 142 for the State Committee.

Up-state returns received at the end of last week indicated that at least 54 out of 88 Assembly districts outside of New York City had voted to support the Rose ticket. Five members of the new State Committee were elected by each Assembly district. This would give the old State Committee a clear tho as yet undetermined lead for the state as a whole.

Headquarters of the Stalinist "Progressive Committee" not only challenged these figures but also claimed that a number of uncontested delegates elect up-state as supporters of the old State Committee were really their men under cover. The exact state of affairs will not be known until the meeting of the new State Committee, which by law must take place within fifteen days after the primaries.

Commenting on the results of the elections, Mr. Rose said:

"The reports indicate that the

regular candidates of the party will have a clear majority of at least 150 at the meeting of the State Committee. We have carried 90 districts out of 150 in the state.

"In New York City, we carried the Bronx and Brooklyn, lost Manhattan and Queens and won one and lost one district in Richmond. The Bronx and Brooklyn contain 100,000 enrolled voters of our party out of a total of 135,000 in the city and we carried the largest districts in these two important boroughs. The popular vote in the city was in our favor.

"The large majority of our enrolled voters have expressed their approval of the policies of the Labor Party. It is somewhat unfortunate that a larger percentage of the enrolled voters did not participate in the primaries because the preliminary canvasses indicated overwhelming support for the party regulars. Many of our supporters never participated in a primary fight and were not sufficiently experienced to engage in this fight.

"Now that we have been given a vote of confidence by the enrolled voters we shall eliminate those elements in the party who entered it under false pretenses and who stand for a philosophy foreign to the basic principles and ideals of the American Labor Party."

New York City The Coudert-McLaughlin bill to excuse children from school to attend religious classes was attacked as un-American and "thoroughly vicious" last week by Johanna M. Lindloff, member of the New York City Board of Education.

The Teachers Guild, United Parents Association, and the Teachers Union also assailed the measure in messages asking Governor Lehman to veto it. The bill has been passed by large majorities in the Legislature.

The bill violates the principle of separation of church and state and is likely to intensify religious prejudice in the schools, the teachers and parents organizations charged.

ILLA Makes Appeal for Socialist Unity In Communication to S. P. Convention

Letter of Greetings Urges Cooperation on Many Vital Issues Facing Labor

(We publish below the communication addressed by the Independent Labor League of America to the recent convention of the Socialist Party of America at Washington, D. C. It places the position of the I.L.L.A. very clearly on the problem of socialist unity and related issues.—Editor.)

New York City. Socialist Party Convention Washington, D. C.

Dear Comrades:

BEARING in mind your comradely action in sending a representative to greet our last national convention in September 1939, we take the occasion of your own convention now in session in Washington, D. C., to send you greetings and good wishes for the fruitfulness of your deliberations.

You meet at a time when the most difficult and burning problems press upon the all too weak socialist forces of this country and of other lands. After an initial success in Russia which aroused hope everywhere and helped to bring the first World War to a close, the past quarter of a century has witnessed a series of defeats for the working-class movement in land after land—sometimes after gallant struggles, as in Austria and Spain; sometimes without even a struggle, as in Germany. The gravest blow of all has been delivered to us from within, by the betrayal of our hopes for socialism and freedom in Soviet Russia. The errors, defeats, divisions and betrayals leave our movements divided, weakened in morale, and deeply in need of honest and searching reexamination of our fundamental premises and assumptions. We know that you will agree with us that neither the errors nor the sound views that have met the test of these difficult and stormy years are the monopoly of any section of the international revolutionary movement. All of the tendencies and

parties have contributed by sins of omission and commission to the defeats and difficulties of the past quarter-century, and all healthful elements can and should take up with each other the task of fraternal discussion, reexamination and reconstruction of a sound international movement. Out of that should come a new clarity and a new unity on a national and international scale, and a new capacity to resume the interrupted forward march toward socialism. We hope and trust that your convention will make its contribution to this urgent task.

There are pressing problems facing you that will not wait until this necessary reexamination has been completed but must be met now in accordance with the urgent necessities of the time.

Cooperation Against War

First of these is the question of war. In this field, your organization and ours have been in close agreement and fighting shoulder to shoulder. We have had every occasion to welcome such collaboration in movements like the Keep America Out of War Congress where your spokesmen and ours have had common agreement on all problems and we have been able to strengthen the anti-war forces both in program and in organization as a result of that agreement. We look forward to that cooperation being continued and reinforced as a result of the decisions of your convention. We feel, and believe that you do too, that in the possible entrance of this

country into war lies the chief danger to free freedoms as we have, the chief source of potential totalitarian military dictatorship at home and of the spread of such economic and political ruin as may weaken the very foundations on which a better order can be built. Keeping America out of war is the first prerequisite for solving the economic problem confronting us, for maintaining and expanding our democracy, political and economic, and for giving impartial and comradely aid to the European masses in all warring countries. To this latter task we can both give considerable impulse by strengthening the work of the International Workers Front Against War to which you are fraternally and we directly affiliated and which includes such parties and groups as:

America: Independent Labor League of America (I.L.L.A.).

Great Britain: Independent Labor Party of Great Britain (I.L.P.).

France: Socialist Workers and Peasants Party (P.S.O.P.).

Germany: Communist Party Opposition (C.P.O.).

Greece: Communist Archio-Marxist Party.

Holland: Socialist Revolutionary Party (R.S.A.P.), N.A.S. Trade Unions.

Italy: Italian Socialist Party (Maximalists).

Spain: Workers Party of Marxist Unity (P.O.U.M.).

Sweden: Socialist Party (P.S.S.).

Groups in Norway and Czechoslovakia.

International Bureau of Revolutionary Socialist Youth

African Colonial Bureau (London). Anti-Imperialist Bureau (Paris).

Second, there is the question of the Presidential elections. It is not

our desire to try to influence your decisions, but we believe it may be of interest to you to know what we feel in this matter. We would like to see the Presidential elections utilized for a broad campaign for a socialist solution of the problems of the depression which the "New Deal" methods have been manifestly inadequate to solve. We would like to see that campaign center around armament economics, the M-Day dictatorship plans, and the efforts, open and secret, to involve this country in war. And we would like to see such a campaign waged in a spirit to further working-class unity, working-class consciousness and independent political action of labor. We hope, for your sake as much as for ours, and above all, for the sake of the needs of the mass of the American people, that your platform and action on candidates will be of such nature as to make possible such a broad campaign against war, for independent labor action, for labor unity and socialism. To a campaign waged in such a spirit we will be glad to give our fraternal support.

Third, there is the question of labor unity. We are sure that you agree with us on the urgent need for a reunification of the divided trade-union movement into a single, democratically run, powerful trade-union center.

Problem of Socialist Unity

Fourth, there is the question of socialist unity. For some time now, we have held to the belief that the pressing needs of the present difficult hour, and the experiences and lessons of recent years, make it

(Continued on page 4)

War Referendum Remains Vital Popular Issue

Washington, D. C. An issue which seems to have been forgotten by Congress, but not by the people, is the war referendum. Regardless of which party is successful in the coming elections, the people need to protect themselves from involvement in any foreign war by demanding that Congress begin legislating this protection by adopting the war-referendum resolution before it adjourns.

No opportunity affords itself like the present to do this. This is an election year. Who will be the candidates of the major political parties and who will sit in the White House, no one can predict. No one can be

(Continued on Page 2)

House Labor Group Urge NLRA Change

Norton Bill Embodies A.F.L. Proposal On Craft Representation Unit; Green Calls for Support by Federation

Washington, D. C. The House Labor Committee last week approved a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, offered by its chairman, Representative Mary T. Norton, and instructed her to use "all possible parliamen-

tary procedures" to have the measure considered.

The Norton bill contains four important modifications of the Wagner Act:

1. The Labor Board shall be enlarged to five by adding two to the present three members.

2. The Board shall continue to determine the bargaining unit, provided that in any case where a majority of a particular craft so decide, the Board shall designate the craft as a unit for bargaining purposes.

3. The employer may petition for an election when there is a dispute between contesting unions.

4. Where contracts exist between employers and a majority of their employees, such contracts shall continue for one year, even the changes of majority or affiliation may take place. This amendment states that the Board shall not have power to certify the representatives with respect to the bargaining unit covered by the contract "until after such contract has been terminated, or has been in effect for one year, whichever occurs first."

These amendments were immediately endorsed by William Green, president of the A. F. of L., who launched the Federation's campaign for the early passage of the Norton bill. Commenting on this bill, Mr. Green said that, while it would be preferable to "wipe out the existing Board entirely and have five new members," the proposal to add two members "will change the complexion of the Board and inevitably result in better and fairer administration."

"The bill provides," he added, "that in any case where the majority of employees of a particular craft so decide, the Board shall designate such craft as a unit appropriate for the purpose of collective bargaining." This amendment embodies the language of the New York State Labor Relations Act and

(Continued on Page 2)

The French Dictatorship Bares Its Teeth!

NOTHING so completely exposes the fraud and hypocrisy of the official pretense of the French government that it is fighting for "freedom and democracy" as the barbarous treatment it is meting out to dissident elements within its own borders. The report from the Temps published in the last issue of this paper on the fate of the seven members of the P.S.O.P. (Socialist Workers and Peasants Party) at the hands of the Paris military tribunal points to a situation to find a parallel for which one would have to go to the totalitarian countries themselves.

Seven P.S.O.P.ists, party leaders and militants, are taken into custody, illegally kept in prison for several months without a hearing, then finally brought before the military court for trial. After a summary investigation, the sentences are handed down: five years in prison, a thousand francs fine, five years loss of all political, civil and family rights!

And what dreadful crime against the majesty of the state did these P.S.O.P.ists commit that they received such crushing punishment? Why, they were charged with distributing, or being responsible for the distribution of, certain anti-war leaflets issued by their party BEFORE THE WAR BEGAN! That was the sole offense charged against them—and for that they were sentenced to long terms in prison, heavy fines, and the loss of their rights as citizens! And the government that can commit such an outrage against elementary human rights and political decency has the brazen audacity to proclaim itself the champion of freedom and democracy.

In the new French cabinet headed by Reynaud, there are three members of the Socialist Party of France, the party of Blum-Faure. This new cabinet is continuing the persecution of dissident opinion with the same ruthlessness and savagery that distinguished its predecessor. What do the "socialists" in the cabinet have to say about it? Are they, who justify their support of the war and the government by their profound hatred of totalitarianism, ready to take responsibility for the military despotism being consolidated right at home under their very eyes?

For us in this country, what is happening in France is both a warning and a challenge. A warning that the first victim of war, even a war "to make the world safe for democracy," is democracy and liberty at home; a challenge to come to the aid of the hard-pressed militant socialists in France. We must not rest until we have raised such a cry of protest in this country against the repressions in France that the military dictatorship in the saddle in Paris will have to give heed!

Allies Turn to Measures To Strengthen Blockade

Attempt to Block Shipments of Ore From Norway, Sweden to Germany

With military operations on the western front continuing inactive last week, the thirty-first week of the war, increasing attention was concentrated by both sides on economic measures against the enemy and on diplomatic maneuvers to promote these measures.

In an effort to strengthen the blockade of Germany, hitherto far from successful, the Allies initiated a series of drastic measures of economic warfare. Prime Minister Chamberlain announced that a renewed effort would be made, thru trade pacts limiting neutral exports to Germany as well as thru widespread buying, to keep materials from reaching the Reich. Chamberlain stressed that sea-power would be the big stick behind this program. Britain even took the unprecedented step of mining Norwegian territorial waters in order to prevent the passage of German ships.

The Allied program was directed against the Scandinavian countries in the first place and against the Balkans and southeastern Europe in the second. Considerable alarm was expressed in Norway and Sweden at the consequences of the intensified economic warfare on the part of Britain. It was understood that the Allies had protested to the governments at Oslo and Stockholm against allowing German ships to use Scandinavian territorial waters for carrying raw materials, such as Swedish ore, to Germany. It was believed that Britain was contemplating drastic measures to assure ore deliveries to itself while blocking those to the Reich.

Thru communications to Norway and Sweden, London also warned Moscow that it would not brook a

Russian repetition in Finland of Nazi tactics in swallowing Czechoslovakia. Russian economic aid to Germany loomed larger in Allied calculations last week than perhaps ever before since the war started.

In Oslo, Foreign Minister Koht stressed that Norway would not permit interference with "free shipping in territorial waters" by any of the belligerent powers. He said his country was ready to stop ore and other shipments to all belligerents but could not allow any "one-sided" arrangement. "If such hindrance of shipping should be one-sided against one party and therefore in open conflict with the neutrality which we have pledged ourselves to maintain," he concluded, "Norway will then at once be at war." This sharp declaration was an indication of the increasingly anti-Allied sentiment, in some cases definitely pro-German and pro-Russian, prevalent in government circles in Norway and Sweden.

Stiffening of the blockade in the Southeast was also considered last week in London by the British and French ministers in charge of economic warfare. Here Rumania was recognized as of central importance because of the supplies of grain and oil that Germany was drawing from that country. This economic assistance to the Reich seemed about to be considerably increased as nearly 4,000,000 Rumanian youths were drafted to work on farms in order to provide a bigger grain supply for export to the Reich.

The intensified interest of the Allies in the Balkans aroused growing concern in Italy, particularly over the possibility of naval action in the Adriatic. In some quarters, it was

(Continued on Page 4)

British Labor Revolt Against "Truce" Grows

Local Labor Parties Oppose Official Policy, Prepare to Fight at Coming Congress

London, England. No fewer than fifty Labor Parties have resolutions on the agenda for the Labor Party Conference, to meet at Bournemouth from May 13-16, demanding an end to the electoral truce.

In the thirty-nine years of the Labor Party's existence, there have never been so many resolutions introduced in opposition to the official policy of the party. The resolutions extend over eight pages and occupy more than one-fifth of the total space on the agenda.

There is little doubt that these resolutions represent the overwhelming view of the Labor Party rank and file, but it cannot be accepted that this view will therefore necessarily carry in the conference.

The decision at the conference will be determined by the block vote of the large trade unions, which means in many cases the vote of the Executives. These can be counted on generally to support the official attitude.

On the other hand, it is not certain that all the large trade unions will support the truce. The South Wales miners, for example, have voted against it, and the National Union of Railwaymen and the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen are likely to oppose.

It is known that there is a minority in the Labour Party's Executive, led by Harold Laski, who are against the truce. Laski prophesied at the end of last year that the truce would not last another six months.

This strong expression of opinion inside the Labor Party condemning the policy of the leadership will be welcomed by those who want to see the political stage cleared for an uncompromising struggle for socialism and peace.

SPRING FROLIC AND DANCE Saturday Evening, April 13

LABOR STAGE STUDIO — 106 West 106 Street — A Swell Time — See Ad. on Page 4

Progressives Win Knitgood Elections By Huge Majority

Brooklyn, N. Y. PROGRESSIVE forces in Knitgood Union Local 155, I.L.G.W.U., scored a smashing triumph in the local elections on Thursday, April 4, carrying to victory by huge majorities every one of the six candidates for delegates to the I.L.G.W.U. convention on their slate.

Over 2,700 members took part in the elections. The highest vote among the progressives was obtained by Louis Nelson, manager of the union, who polled 2,159. The other progressive candidates received votes somewhere between this high point and 1,896, which was the lowest obtained by anyone running on the progressive slate.

The highest opposition candidate, L. Rappaport, received only 520 votes, while the low man on the opposition ticket got no more than 580.

In percentages, these figures mean that Louis Nelson, the leading progressive, received over 80% of the valid votes cast, a magnificent vote of confidence of the membership in the progressive administration of Local 155. Between the lowest progressive and highest opposition candidate there was a gap of over 1,300 votes, the former receiving



LOUIS NELSON

over three times as many votes as the latter, 1,896 to 529.

The delegates elected were: Louis Nelson, William Schaffer, Louis Levinson, Daniel Ielardi, Paul Tauber, Helen Taublieb.

The opposition in Local 155 was a Stalinist group, generally known as the "Rank and File Group." It was never very popular with the membership but the April 4 elections

dealt it a virtual death-blow, showing how utterly discredited it was among the knitgoods workers.

The progressives forces in Local 155 carried on a vigorous, constructive campaign, stressing the issues that the delegates to the I.L.G.W.U. convention, which is to take place in May, would have to face. Great stress was laid by the progressives on the issue of labor unity. The progressive program (published in full in the last issue of this paper—Editor) called for the reaffiliation of the I.L.G.W.U. to the A. F. of L. upon adjournment of the convention should all efforts at labor peace have proved unavailing in the meantime. The Stalinists proposed the reaffiliation of the I.L.G.W.U. to the C.I.O. The overwhelming vote received by the progressives is therefore to be regarded as strengthening the hand of President Dubinsky of the I.L.G.W.U. in the policy he has pursued on the question of labor unity.

Louis Nelson, as progressive spokesman, made the following statement on the elections: "This tremendous vote of our membership is a recognition of the constructive role of the progressive administration. The knitgoods workers, members of Local 155, expressed their full confidence in the lead-

Stalinists Wiped Out in I.L.G.W.U.

New York City. THE recent elections in the locals of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union resulted in an annihilating defeat for the Stalinists, David Dubinsky, president of the I.L.G.W.U., reported in a statement issued last week. Out of 1,147 posts filled thru the votes of over 100,000 members of the I.L.G.W.U. in this city, Mr. Dubinsky announced, Stalinists or their "camp-followers" won only 8.

ership of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, headed by President David Dubinsky, and in the leadership of their own local union. Our members have clearly repudiated the attempts of the Stalinists to dominate the Knitgoods Workers Union. The election further demonstrates that the workers want labor unity now, and that they want it in the quickest way possible—through reaffiliation with the American Federation of Labor."

Administration's Navy Bills Menace Seamen's Conditions

Government Schools Would Aggravate Unemployment

San Francisco, Cal. CERTAIN bills are now pending in Congress which vitally affect the welfare of American seamen. These bills will affect the economic status of seamen and increase the militarization of civilian life.

These bills are being vigorously opposed by the Sailors Union of the Pacific, an organization of seamen shipping from West Coast ports. They deserve attention and action on the part of the anti-war movement and of all those who are concerned with the problems of labor and war.

The bills in question are H.R. 7094, H.R. 7870, H.R. 8612, H.R. 6136. They are now before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The general purpose of all of them is construction or acquisition of vessels by the United States Maritime Commission to be placed at the disposal of state nautical schools in New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and California. An outlay of at least \$10,000,000 is to be provided for the construction of these ships. In addition, the bills call for an appropriation of \$50,000 for the upkeep of each school and the maintenance of each ship.

However, H.R. 7870 provides that the navy shall furnish suitable vessels for state nautical school training and other purposes in the seaports of Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Seattle, San Francisco, Baltimore, Norfolk, Corpus Christi, and Astoria and at Detroit and Saginaw, Michigan. H.R. 6125 provides for a \$50,000 subsidy for each of these schools.

H.R. 8612 stipulates that: "The navy shall own these ships, keep them up and they shall be restored to the U. S. navy on demand."

The bills finally provide as a condition for receiving such appropriations as are contemplated "that each school or branch thereof shall agree to conform to such standards regarding courses of and vessels for training and the admission of students resident in other states, as the Maritime Commission and the Navy Department shall prescribe or regulate." In other words, the navy shall take over the training of civilians for civilian jobs.

The reasons for the opposition of the Sailors Union of the Pacific to these bills are chiefly the following: There are thousands of well-trained, able-bodied American seamen ready and willing to man every vessel in the American merchant marine. All have years of experience. All are certified by the United States government and thousands are today unemployed. There is sufficient supply of trained seamen in every port in the U. S. A. to fill the needs of the American merchant marine as it is situated today and for years to come.

"These seamen," a S.U.P. resolution reads, "are today facing the question of not knowing whether they will ever again be able to get a job aboard a vessel of the Ameri-

can merchant marine—thru no fault of their own—and find themselves beached in American ports, with no chance of being able to follow their chosen profession. . . .

"An outlay of government money" the resolution continues, "at this time to subsidize schools for further training of green seamen, in the face of the unemployed thousands of well-trained American seamen, is a travesty of justice. . . and is an outright waste of the taxpayers money."

"These school-ships cater to a privileged class; in other words, to the sons of persons of financial affluence, and not to the American youths of modest means, or boys who . . . must work their way from the bottom up. . . .

"It is against the American concept of democracy to establish training ships or schools for civilians supervised by and regulated by military bureaus, such as the navy. The army and navy are established, under our democracy, as a branch of the government for military purposes only, and they have their own methods of training soldiers and sailors, but it is certainly not the intent of the American people to use the military branches of the government to lay down rules and regulations affecting the civilian population.

"The American merchant marine

is distinctly manned by civilians and any attempt to inject supervision over them from the navy or Maritime Commission in a supervisory capacity thru establishment of training ships, etc., is an infringement on civil rights, and will foster dictatorship methods such as are now prevalent in Germany, Russia and Italy."

To the excellent case of the Sailors Union of the Pacific can be added another comment on these bills. A vast number of young men would be trained under military supervision for a profession in which they cannot get jobs. They will exist, then, as a potential body of scab labor trained with the approval of the government and with federal funds.

The labor and anti-war movements should be concerned both with the economic effect of such legislation on American workers and with the last two conclusions of the Sailors Union. The anti-militarist sentiments of American labor are expressed in these last two paragraphs.

To-date, the Sailors Union has carried on the opposition to these bills almost single-handed. The Keep America Out of War Congress has pledged its support. The support of all labor and anti-war forces in the country should be readily forthcoming to the S.U.P. in opposing these dangerous bills.

Living Standards Are Below 1929, Green Says

Rise in U.S. Population Outstrips Income

Washington, D. C.

THE United States is now producing an income in goods and services about equal to that of 1929, but since its population is some 10,000,000 greater, its standard of living has been lowered 7 1/2%, William Green declared in an article in the April issue of the American Federationist. This decrease in national living standards is a new thing for the United States, the A. F. of L. president stressed.

"Commerce Department figures show that in 1939 we produced in this country an income in goods and services about equal to that of 1929," Mr. Green stated. "In other words, our 1939 production equaled the previous all-time peak, if we count only in terms of goods and services produced. We must remember, however, that our population has increased from 121,526,000 in 1929 to about 131,180,000 in 1939. In other words, our 1939 income had to feed, clothe, house and serve nearly 10,000,000 more people. Be-

cause of this population increase, the income we produced in 1939 provided 7.5% less for each person than the same income had provided ten years ago in 1929. That means that our national living standard is lower by just this amount.

"Another important point: This decrease in our national living standard is a new departure in the United States. In the past, we have increased our living standards by leaps and bounds. In the ten years from 1919 to 1929, we increased our per-capita 'real' income—that is our living standard—by 32%.

"Confusion also exists on the question of employment. Our population has changed greatly in the last ten years, because of changing birth rates. We have in 1940 fewer children under 15 than in 1930, but we have 12,000,000 more people who are over 15 years old. Out of this 12,000,000, after making a generous allowance for increased school attendance and earlier retirement, we estimate that 5,300,000 want work. We cannot escape the fact that there are 5,300,000 more people in the United States today who want to earn an independent living than there were in 1930, and this figure does not include any mothers, sons or daughters who are seeking work only because heads of families are unemployed.

"We have not increased production above the 1929 level and consequently we have no jobs for these new workers. The American Federation of Labor was among the first to acclaim the production gains of last Fall. We cannot, however, permit recent newspaper statements to cloud the real issue, namely that, with 23,000,000 families—nearly four fifths of all American families—living at income levels below \$2,000 a year, which is minimum for health and efficiency, we cannot accept a production level too low to lift these millions out of their poverty."

House Group Urges Change In Wagner Act

(Continued from Page 1)

the substance of the Federal Railway Labor Act. Both of these laws have operated successfully.

"The amendment will not bar industrial unions. It merely gives the workers the right to decide whether they want a craft, plant or industry-wide unit. This is in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the act. The present Board has ignored the wishes of the workers in many cases and trampled roughshod on their rights.

"The amendment permits the workers to choose their own collective-bargaining representatives, instead of having such representatives imposed upon them by a federal board. That is why this amendment is vitally necessary.

"The American Federation of Labor firmly believes these amendments incorporated in the Norton bill will provide a cure for the maladministration of the act from which the entire nation has suffered. In no way do they weaken or impair the fundamental principles of the act. We, therefore, call upon all of our affiliated organizations throughout the country to register their support of this measure."

The C.I.O., on the other hand, denounced the Norton bill, which, it claimed, would permit the "carving up" of industrial unions and otherwise work to its disadvantage. In a joint statement, the C.I.O. and Labor's Non-Partisan League declared: "Under the proposed amendment every established industrial union would be in constant danger of division and destruction thru the slicing off of craft splinter groups, even in the face of existing industrial-union contracts.

"Under this amendment no discretion even would be left to the Board and it would be compelled to split up industrial unions whenever a handful of craftsmen could be persuaded to disrupt the industrial unity desired by most of the workers.

"No existing industrial union, no matter how long established as the workers' representative, would be safe from this form of invasion, leading to serious disturbance of existing peaceful labor relations in many industries.

"The other amendments are also objectionable to the C.I.O. They are designed to pack the Labor Board so that it may become an instrument of partisan or anti-labor policy, and they are further designed to weaken the Wagner Act in its enforcement of labor's collective bargaining rights."

While Mrs. Norton prepared to seek quick action by asking for suspension of the rules, the majority of the Smith Committee, which is investigating the Labor Board, made plans to forward consideration of their amendments by the petition method. The Smith amendments would virtually nullify the effectiveness of the Wagner Act.

House consideration of either measure, or both, will await the outcome of the parliamentary maneuvers of the next fortnight.

Is There No One Who Will Call a Halt?

THE reckless, unscrupulous efforts of the C.I.O. to break into the building-trades field with its dual union, the United Construction Workers Organizing Committee, are fast developing into one of the worst scandals in recent labor history. There seems to be nothing, absolutely nothing, no matter how low or despicable, now matter how flagrantly in violation of the basic standards and traditions of organized labor, to which the Lewis outfit will not resort in its mad attempt to invade a field already organized, a field that John L. Lewis himself more than once explicitly recognized as lying altogether outside the scope of the C.I.O. as an industrial-union movement.

We have had occasion more than once in past weeks to call attention to the indecent proposals made by the C.I.O. dualist outfit to the employers in the building and construction field in order to gain their favor. Anything to win the employers and their support against the A. F. of L.—offer them lower wages, longer hours, worsened working conditions, anything! Such snags to be the accepted C.I.O. tactics.

Recently, A. D. Lewis, John L.'s brother, appeared with a committee before the New York Building Trades Employers Association and tried to sell his dualist outfit to the organized building-trades employers of this city. What did he offer? The New York Times reports:

"It was learned from the employers that among the inducements offered by Mr. Lewis was a standing \$9 wage for mechanics, compared with the [A. F. of L.] scale ranging from \$11 to \$14; freedom from strikes and jurisdictional disputes; wider latitude to the continued mechanization of the industry; arbitration of disputes; and no interference with the use of materials, regardless of whether they were union made."

We call our readers particular attention to the first and last items in this list: open and unshamed undercutting in wages and a blanket pledge to disregard long-recognized obligations of solidarity by permitting the use of scab materials! We have to look far and wide to match such despicable conduct on the part of a "progressive" labor organization.

Fortunately, the C.I.O. dualist organization has not succeeded and apparently will not succeed in making any impression on the workers. Indeed, it seems to realize this for it makes no real appeal to the workers; it stakes everything on selling itself to the employers. Certainly, no decent, self-respecting worker would want to have anything to do with such an ill-smelling outfit.

But while the C.I.O. dual-union group in the building-trades field is incapable of doing itself any good, it may prove capable of doing a lot of damage to others, C.I.O. as well as A. F. of L. Unquestionably, its unsavory tactics have tended to discredit in the eyes of organized labor and the public at large many perfectly legitimate and responsible C.I.O. affiliates merely because they happen to be associated with the same parent body. Even more serious is the demoralizing effect that the constant sapping and undermining activities of the Lewis building-trades outfit is bound to have on union standards in the construction field. Scores of thousands of building-trades workers may ultimately have to pay dearly in wage-cuts and longer hours for Lewis's insane venture in dual unionism.

Is there no one in the C.I.O. to call a halt before it is too late?

Leiserson Backs NLRB Research Division

Stresses Need and Efficiency of Bureau

(We publish below a letter from Dr. William M. Leiserson, member of the National Labor Relations Board, to Representative Murdock giving his reasons for opposing the abolition of the Research Division of the N.L.R.B. and stressing the valuable work done by this agency, of which David J. Saposs is head.—Editor.)

Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Murdock:

In response to your request for my opinion on the proposal to abolish the Division of Economic Research, I submit the following:

1. The work of the Board would be very seriously handicapped if it were deprived of the services of the Division. The notion that no need exists for a Division of Economic Research seems to me quite erroneous and can only be based on inadequate information of the functions which that Division performs in connection with the work of the Labor Relations Board. Shortly after I was appointed to the Board, I made a special study of the operations of the Division, and I was convinced that the Division and the research it carries on are essential to proper functioning of the Board and to efficient performance of the duties imposed on the Board by Congress. I came to this conclusion after questioning practically every member of the staff of the Division, inquiring into the work they were doing, and reading reports they submitted.

2. If I may say so, I think that those who are attempting to kill off the research division are shooting in the wrong direction. There is need for reorganization of the Administrative Division of the Board, and a staff less heavily weighted with lawyers would be desirable. To provide a better balanced personnel, the proportion of men trained or experienced in administration, economics and labor relations needs to be increased and the proportion of lawyers decreased. The proposal to eliminate that part of the staff which is trained in economics and labor research, therefore, seems to me particularly unwise at this time.

3. The work of the economics division is not decreasing. Altho the number of complaint cases is slowly falling off, the problems involved in the complaints are becoming increasingly complex. Representation cases at the same time are becoming more numerous. Moreover, I do not find any other branch of the government equipped to supply the Board with the particular type of economic information which the administration of the act requires.

4. The notion that the Board is primarily a prosecuting agency may be responsible for the proposal to eliminate the research division. This is an erroneous notion. The National Labor Relations Act is a remedial and not a penal statute; it empowers the Board only to find facts and to order appropriate remedies. For investigating and fact-finding, a research division is, of course, essential. For prosecuting, it may not be needed. The effect of eliminating the Division would be to make the Board more of a prosecuting agency and less an investigating

body. This, I think, would be very unfortunate.

5. The proposed drastic cut in the appropriation for trial examiners is likely to have the same effect of emphasizing prosecution rather than careful investigation and fact-finding. The need is for better trained trial examiners and for more thorough and careful preparation of intermediate reports by the trial examiners. Much improvement in this direction has been made during the last year. The proposed cut for the Trial Examiners Division will hamper this development and will be a backward step in the direction of less careful investigation and fact-finding.

WM. M. LEISERSON

War Referendum Remains Vital Popular Issue

(Continued from Page 1)

sure whether the next four years will bring peace or war for the United States. Therefore, whatever the outcome of the elections the people of the United States, determined as they are to keep out of foreign wars, should insist that this session of Congress consider the proposed constitutional amendment to give the people the right to vote on foreign wars and at the same time press for inclusion of the war referendum as an important plank in all party platforms.

Public opinion polls have indicated not once, but many times, that a substantial majority of the American

Labor Fears FBI Used as Spy Agency

Washington, D. C. LABOR organizations all over the country are showing increasing concern over the new activities assumed by the revised General Intelligence Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation providing for "protection" of industrial plants which have army and navy orders.

J. Edgar Hoover, F.B.I. chief, told the House Appropriations Committee in January that there were then 540 such plants and that "in a time of greater emergency there will be approximately 12,000."

While this supervision, according to Mr. Hoover, is ostensibly designed to protect plants from sabotage and theft of documents, labor organizations fear that F.B.I. agents who notoriously use an anti-labor bias would use their positions and their close contact with the management to persecute union members and hamper union organization.

Already, according to reports from Detroit, employees who can't establish that they are Americans have been dropped in automobile factories which have war orders.

The F.B.I. supervision presumably envisages a rather intimate knowledge of the plant personnel and in the mind of labor this is connected with the broad "interpretation" familiar in the past as to what constitutes "radicals" or "radical tendencies."

Veteran labor leaders recall how, as an aftermath of the "Red raids" of 1919-20, when 5,000 persons were arrested in sudden forays, the F.B.I. was used in the 1919 steel strike, the subsequent coal strikes and the railway shopmen's strike of 1922—which Attorney General Daugherty broke by getting a sweeping injunction that hamstrung labor. In this strike, the F.B.I., under William J. Burns, "investigated" 2,000 individuals. The old General Intelligence Division, significantly enough under the supervision of Mr. Hoover, then a special assistant to the Attorney General, played a notorious role in these events, especially in the 1919-20 raids.

It was under Mr. Burns that the F.B.I. also investigated Senators and FBI their offices during the investigation of the Justice Department by a special committee, including Senator Wheeler.

When Harlan Fiske Stone, now a Supreme Court Justice, was appointed Attorney General in 1924 by President Coolidge he stopped such activities and drastically reduced the bureau's functions.

people want the war referendum. A very recent poll by the American Institute of Public Opinion gives conclusive evidence of the determination of the American people to stay right here at home. Despite the sentiment in this country for England and France, 77% of those polled recently say they would not go to the aid of the Allies should it even appear that they were being defeated.

The bloodshed and suffering now going on thruout Europe and Asia have opened America's eyes to the futility and senselessness of war. America wants no part in the degradation of civilization now going on but welcomes, instead, all moves by governments for peace.

In view of these facts, is it unreasonable for the people to ask their legislators, Congressmen and Senators alike, to show their sincerity and give credence to their cries that America will not become involved in war, and to let the people protect themselves by giving them the privilege of voting against participation in foreign wars?

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

Books You Want to Read: "NATIVE SON," by Richard Wright \$2.50 "FLOWERING OF NEW ENGLAND," by Van Wyck Brooks (formerly \$4.00) 1.49 "LETTERS OF LINCOLN STEFFENS," 2 vols. (formerly \$10.00) 2.75 "DRY GUILLOTINE," by Rene Belbenoit 0.98 Order Now From WORKERS AGE BOOKSHOP 131 West 33rd Street New York City

\$1 A YEAR SUB TO WORKERS AGE 6mos. 60¢ subscribe now!

There's A Difference.... (These very significant comments on the type of campaign waged in Local 22 and in certain other locals of the I.L.G.W.U. are from an article by S. Weiss in the March 29, 1940 issue of the Freie Arbeiter Stimme, a well-known Jewish labor paper.—Editor.) AS a matter of fact, there are plenty of economic problems in the cloak and dress trades, and they are very urgent problems too. But with one single exception, the old administrations (of the I.L.G.W.U. locals) were not much interested in discussing these problems. This single exception was Dressmakers Local 22. The administration of this local published a fine factual pamphlet dealing with the most important organizational and industrial problems and indicating the manner in which the administration had handled them. The basic approach of the campaign literature of the Local 22 administration was: Elect us for what we have accomplished and give us the opportunity to continue our work in order to achieve bigger and better results. In most locals, however, the administrations turned their heavy artillery on the communists. Industrial problems were hardly touched on. The cry was: Elect us so that the communists may be driven out of the union leadership. That was an entirely negative campaign. Either these administrations didn't have very much to boast about or they really believed that to drive out the communists was at the present moment the one and only most important issue in the elections.

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

Vol. 9. SATURDAY, April 13, 1940. No. 15.

A SHAMEFUL BETRAYAL

THE abrupt "closing" of the Russell case by Mayor LaGuardia's elimination of the salary for the position from the city budget, following hard upon the rumor that the Board of Higher Education will not appeal Justice McGeehan's decision, is one of the most shameful betrayals of intellectual decency and cultural freedom on record in recent times in this city.

Let us review the course of events. Despite a savage hue and cry against Bertrand Russell whipped up by certain entrenched reactionary elements, led by the Catholic hierarchy, the Board of Higher Education confirmed his appointment. Then Justice McGeehan, by virtue of that mystical omnipotence that judges seem to possess under our system, simply voided the appointment, because, in his consummate wisdom, he did not approve of Russell or his views. The only recourse is an appeal to the higher courts to overrule Justice McGeehan. By refusing to make this appeal, by tamely acquiescing in LaGuardia's subterfuge and evasion of the issue, the Board of Higher Education would not only repudiate itself and by implication endorse the filthy slander on which Justice McGeehan's ruling is based; it would deal a virtual death-blow to academic freedom in New York City. For, by silence and inaction, it would concede the vicious principle that a man's views on religious and social questions may properly disqualify him as a teacher of mathematics; even more, by silence and inaction, it would acknowledge that any State Supreme Court justice, if he so desires, may arbitrarily arrogate to himself the powers and functions of a super-Board of Higher Education and thus set himself up as the supreme censor of qualifications and appointments. What that would mean for education in this city, it is hardly necessary to specify.

Mayor LaGuardia says the case is "closed"; the Board of Higher Education refuses to speak up. If there are any responsible, liberty-loving men and women left in New York City, on the Board of Higher Education or outside of it, they will not rest until the case is "reopened" again and an appeal against Justice McGeehan's verdict is brought before the higher courts. Too much depends upon the issue to let it go by default.

OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS

TO those who still believe the fairy-tale that the Allies are fighting to destroy Hitlerism and "make the world safe for democracy" we recommend a careful reading of Sir Neville Henderson's memoirs, "Failure of a Mission," now running serially in Life magazine.

These memoirs are so self-revealing that we are embarrassed for words of commentary. Sir Neville, our readers will remember, was British ambassador at Berlin in the period before the outbreak of war last September. It was Sir Neville who conducted the negotiations with Hitler, von Ribbentrop and Goering looking towards a "settlement" of the European crisis. When these negotiations failed, the war came. If anyone should know the issues at stake, it is Sir Neville, and what he says about these issues, both directly and indirectly, is a liberal education in the realities of international politics.

England fighting to lift the yoke of dictatorship from the neck of fascist-ridden Europe? Read these words of Sir Neville's:

"Nor are all dictatorships, even if prolonged, reprehensible. Ataturk built up a new Turkey on the ruins of the old; and his expulsion of the Greeks, which perhaps suggested to Hitler that he should do the same in Germany with the Jews, has already been forgiven and forgotten."

"One cannot, just because he is a dictator, refuse to admit the great services which Signor Mussolini has rendered to Italy."

England fighting to destroy Hitlerism and free the German people from oppression? England fighting to bring relief to the Jews? Read these words:

"NOR WOULD THE WORLD HAVE FAILED TO ACCLAIM HITLER AS A GREAT GERMAN, IF HE HAD KNOWN WHERE TO STOP; EVEN, FOR INSTANCE, AFTER MUNICH AND THE NUREMBERG DECREES AGAINST THE JEWS."

After all of Hitler's dreadful atrocities, after the destruction of German democracy and the establishment of a fascist dictatorship, after the suppression of the trade unions and the labor movement, after the outlawing of every free and independent thought, after terror and murder without limit, after the concentration camps and their incredible horrors, after the pogroms against the Jews, "after Munich and the Nuremberg decrees"—Hitler might still have been acclaimed a "great German," according to the British ambassador, had he "known where to stop," had he not gone "too far"! What was the point beyond which Britain could no longer bless Hitler's noble efforts? Why, the point at which he began to challenge the hegemony of Anglo-French imperialism on the European continent and to endanger the British and French empires! Then of course, the bland tolerance of Sir Neville and his colleagues in London suddenly ran out, and war came.

Sir Neville Henderson's memoirs are recognized as a semi-official presentation of Britain's case; else they would never have been published so soon after the event and in war time. Apparently official Britain wants to have its role in the war and its war aims judged by them. Nothing could suit us better. We are willing, nay, eager, to have every American read this statement of the British case and make up his mind accordingly. Sir Neville's memoirs are easily the best anti-war propaganda to receive wide circulation among the American people so far. More power to them!

UNITY—OR ELSE . . .

(Continued from page 1)
[By disrupting the A. F. of L. unions] is clearly confirmed by the following significant comment about this whole sordid business by an important employing-class sheet: "But they [the employers] left the door wide open for business later by indicating that as soon as the C.I.O. is strong enough, they'll listen with an eye to agreements." [Business Week, March 30, 1940.]

We are at a loss to find words with which to express adequate condemnation of such anti-union activities. Such tactics deserve only the most vehement denunciation and can arouse only the most painful abhorrence no matter by whom they are applied. Some years ago, we branded precisely such ventures by the Communist Party and its Trade Union Unity League as devastating dual unionism. When such moves are made by Lewis today, they are infinitely more harmful to labor's effectiveness and its very existence.

It is this self-created chaos that plays right into the hands of all reaction. Had there been a united trade-union movement to stop him, Roosevelt would not have dared to appoint at least fifteen military men to key social-service posts and to boost skyward the armament expenditures at the expense of the jobless and needy. Encouraged by this pernicious division, Thurman Arnold is seeking to "coordinate" labor unions by proceeding recklessly with his campaign to uproot unionism thru invoking the anti-trust laws against the strongest trade unions. Here we have the gravest menace to trade unionism in fifty years—a menace growing directly out of the fatal labor feud. And when the various state legislatures reconvene after the Presidential elections, we may expect them to follow in these footsteps.

It is for these reasons—especially in the light of the flames of the world conflagration—that we again say to the workers of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L.: "Force the reopening of the unity negotiations interrupted a year ago at the request of Lewis and upon his promise that he would reconvene the negotiating committees. There lies the road to labor's greatest gain—stop fighting, resume negotiations, make concessions, all in order to close ranks and preserve and effectively defend them against the intensifying onslaughts of labor's outright enemies and the maneuvers of its false friends. More need not and cannot be said. Either we move towards a unified trade-union movement, or else. . ."

Socialist Fundamentals Reexamined:

What Is Socialism?

By C. A. SMITH

(C. A. Smith is chairman of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain. We publish this article as part of our discussion, "Socialist Fundamentals Reexamined."—Editor.)

London, England.
SOME people profess to regard many of our war-time economic measures—rationing, for instance—as "socialistic." Others declare that the socialist elements in National-Socialism are asserting themselves, and that Germany is moving leftward. Others, again, regard Russia as a socialist country.

Many of us, however, who have all our lives striven for socialism, recognize this long-sought blessing neither in 4 ozs. of butter per head, nor in Hitlerism, nor in Stalinism. Clearly, it is high time for socialists to get down to the job of definition, and make quite clear to themselves what they mean by the term.

Now socialism cannot be defined in purely economic terms. It is useless to speak merely of the socialization of the means of production. Desirable though this be, it is a means, not an end in itself. It is a necessary but not a sufficient condition of socialism. Socialism could not exist without it, but it could certainly exist without socialism.

Socialist society must be not only a cooperative commonwealth, but one based on the willing cooperation of free men, not on that of galley-slaves chained to the bench. It must be a society organized as a friendship or alliance of all its members.

THE GREAT TRINITY

Friendship, freedom, equality—where have we met this trinity? Why, in the great slogan of the French revolutionaries—"Liberty—Equality—Fraternity!" And it is time to get back to this imperishable ideal, for we can never go beyond it.

True, we may read into it economic implications which most Jacobins would have resisted. Experience in the last hundred and fifty years has taught us some things about the institutional forms of its realization hidden from them. Our ideas of the political basis of freedom and equality have gained from the teaching of the anarchists and syndicalists, from the spectacle of the rise and destruction of the French Commune and the Russian Soviets. But "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" remains an unsurpassable ideal—our task is to realize it.

First, liberty. Liberty of the individual both from coercion by other individuals and also, as far as possible, from control by the state.

The exigencies of economic planning and of other forms of social life make some state control inevitable. Socialism requires that this be determined by majority decision after full and free discussion. But democracy is not a substitute for freedom—nor even a guarantee of it; democracy is a less obnoxious form of unfreedom, and not always even that—for the rule of the majority may be as withering a tyranny as the rule of a minority. Liberty,

Allies Turn to Measures For Strong Blockade

(Continued from page 1)
felt that this turn of events might tend to facilitate the rapprochement between Berlin, Moscow and Rome, which Germany was understood to be greatly interested in bringing about.

The long-expected reshuffling of the British cabinet took place last week in a shift of posts that brought Winston Churchill to the top as virtual director of all the armed services. In Paris, the Reynaud cabinet continued to maintain its existence but there were reports of wide dissension within it that was expected to lead to its fall or reconstruction in the near future.

There was considerable talk last week of a possible intensification of military operations in the coming weeks. In Germany, Marshall Goering again "forecast" what the press called a "decisive blow in the West." The same tone was adopted in the controlled press thruout the Reich which also stressed the "firm bonds uniting the three great totalitarian powers, Germany, Italy and Russia."

In Allied military circles, it was believed that these "forecasts" in the German press might take the form of a massed attack from the air. Heavy fighting along the Maginot-Seigfried Lines was not expected.

then, includes the maximum of individual freedom plus political democracy.

It includes also the freedom of groups which have a sense of special unity. Those ethnic groups which we call nations must enjoy freedom by means of autonomy within a free federation of socialist republics. Imperialism of every species is anathema to freedom, and Stalin's role of "liberator" of the Finnish people has not been recognized by the Finns.

Second, equality. Not that men will be equal, nor that they must be treated as tho they were. "To each according to his needs, from each according to his ability" is the true formula of equalitarianism. The assertion of Stalin that socialism means "to each according to his work" is a lie—socialism has never meant that.

Piece-rates and Stakhanovism, the enormous disparity between the incomes of skilled and unskilled, between the incomes of the masses and of the burocracy, is not socialism whether encountered in Britain or in Russia.

But political equality is also necessary, however difficult even to imagine; and no war-time rationing could ever bring socialism to the workers of a capitalist country—not even if Goering and Winston Churchill, the Earl of Derby and the Archbishop of Canterbury, never had an ounce of butter in excess of their

Again the Question Of Civil Liberties

Readers Present Various Views on Issue

(Continued from Page 3)
the class, should produce a profound change in attitude and line of action. For, on the basis of the foregoing, we might define, within the limits of our historical background, civil liberties as the rights of a class, which class is other than the ruling class. Under such circumstances the rights of the individual become subordinate to, and dependent upon, the rights of the class; and to speak of "denying rights" to the fascists is utterly without meaning. Who is to deny the rights, and what rights, to the fascists? Is it not the same as saying that we shall deny civil liberties to the ruling class, upon which class we depend for our own civil liberties? Denial of rights is not within our province.

This is, furthermore, a negative interpretation, which, when inverted to its proper position, should mean the maintenance and extension of the rights of a class—which can be achieved only thru a ceaseless struggle against the ruling class, which would wrest from the workers the last vestige of freedom. Thus, the ruling class expresses itself negatively while the working class should express itself positively.

Our task becomes one of exposing the fascists all along the line, while at the same time a fight is carried forward to maintain the rights of the proletariat, which task will become increasingly difficult as time goes on. On the other hand, programs of liberal groups invariably display a point of view which is based on the individual rather than the class. Civil liberties is one of the many instances where inconsistencies arise in the ranks of the liberals.

ration. Finally, fraternity. There are no institutional forms which can of themselves ensure fraternity—even the orders of monks in the Middle Ages failed as guarantors of brotherliness—even the family sometimes fails, not all blood-brothers being brotherly.

Fraternity is essentially spontaneous and non-compulsory. This truth was recognized by the satirist who depicted the French exponent of "fraternity" as saying: "Let us be brothers, or I'll cut your throat!" But there are certain institutions which are organized in denial of fraternity, and render it impossible—slavery and capitalism, for instance. And there are others which are sure proofs that a society is not able to rely on fraternity for its internal security. Such are vast concentration camps, a powerful secret police, a muzzled press, frequent sanguinary "purges" and judicial murders following farcical "trials."

THREE ESSENTIAL QUALITIES

Socialism, then, demands of any society all three of these qualities. And if any one of them is absent—if there is unfreedom, inequality or fratricide—then that society is not socialist, no matter what the form of its land-ownership, the extent of its state-owned industry, or the magnitude of its totalitarian policy or collectivized economy.

Profests Slur on Rosa Luxemburg

New York City.
Editor, Workers Age:
I should like to call your attention to the enclosed article (Dimitri Horbaychuk's letter to the editor and the editor's reply), which greatly surprised me. Whatever Rosa Luxemburg may have said on the Ukrainian problem and whatever the disagreement of the editor of

Write today for your copy of
INDEPENDENT NEWS
a press service dealing with international political news
Send 5c
in coin or postage to
WORKERS AGE
131 W. 33rd St., New York

SUBSCRIBE NOW!
WORKERS AGE
131 West 33rd St., New York City
I enclose \$1.00 for a year's subscription
\$1.00 per year \$.85 for six months
Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____

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

They're Mighty Poor Props, Mr. Lewis!

JOHAN L. Lewis says he's going to form a "third party" when and if . . . If the candidates and the platform of the Democratic party are not going to be "satisfactory," he will call a convention of labor, youth, Negro, old-age and farmers groups "to meet in some central city" (the true Lewis touch; it's a wonder he didn't specify the hall) "to formulate a program that each and every American can support."

And among the organizations that are to form the backbone of his new departure the C.I.O. leader proudly names the American Youth Congress and the National Negro Congress!

It's hard to tell whether Mr. Lewis is kidding himself or merely kidding the public. Does he really think he's going to form an independent party of labor with a couple of communist stooge organizations, mere paper instruments of Stalinist "capture-control" tactics? Or is Mr. Lewis the one and only literate person in the United States—aside from Mrs. Roosevelt, of course—who still does not know what the American Youth Congress and National Negro Congress really are?

In any case, we would not advise our readers to stake very much on Mr. Lewis's threats or promises. There is still at least an equal chance that he will end up supporting Mr. Roosevelt, or his nominee, and the Democratic party.

I.L.L.A. Appeals for Socialist Unity

Letter Urges Cooperation on Vital Issues

(Continued from page 1)
possible to undertake to heal the breach in socialist ranks resulting from the division on war in 1914, on the Russian Revolution in 1917, and on a number of other matters in the succeeding years of bitter and unfruitful internecine strife. We have learned much, and know you have, from the past quarter-century.

We do not feel that such need would be well served by considering either the best or strongest of the existing organizations as adequate to enter in a body, or dissolve and enter as individuals. Adding such relatively small forces together would accomplish little to attract the unaffiliated radicals, to remoralize the demoralized, to sound a powerful note of unity, and to serve as a ringing call to the great mass of American workers. What is needed in our opinion is a public coming together of all forces that agree on a simple common program. That would serve as encouragement and inspiration to tens and hundreds of thousands who have

at one time or another supported or taken part in the socialist and communist movements, and have dropped out because of errors, defeats, divisions, factional warfare, and internecine quarrels. They would take fresh hope if they saw that the long process of division and confusion was coming to an end, and that the forces of socialism were attaining to a new clarity and a new unity preparatory to a new forward march toward socialism. We ourselves are in contact with thousands of such people who are unwilling to join either your organization or ours, or any other organization as at present constituted, but would find fresh hope and courage in any dramatic and public step towards socialist unity, and could then be recruited and inspired to work for our common cause.

In our opinion, the common program of such a unification would include the following:

1. Socialism is inseparable from freedom and democracy.
2. Opposition to involvement of America in war and support to the anti-war movements of the warring countries.
3. Work for a united and democratically organized labor movement and independent political action of labor.

To give our further opinions on these matters, we are enclosing for your information the resolutions of our last convention "On Socialist Unity" and on "Socialism and Democracy." We then set up a standing committee for negotiation with all other forces in the direction indicated, and a committee of yours has had several meetings with our committee, on which it can inform you closely.

Joint Socialist Action

The conditions for radical reconstruction are really not many or complicated. The chief obstacles are old prejudices, organizational conservatism, factional narrowness and cliquism. We recognize that the scars are many and the suspicions deep, and are prepared to do our part to overcome them by comradely discussion and cooperation on all fields of agreement, as a preliminary process to complete unification. Our cooperation with your representatives in the anti-war work is an indication of the possibilities short of unity. We would appreciate it if your convention publicly set up a committee to explore the possibilities of further joint socialist action, or authorized such activity by your incoming executive committee. Such public action would sound a much needed note of hope, and would aid as well in preparing a broad Presidential election campaign.

In closing this letter of greetings and statement of our position on the matters which we think might be of some interest to you, permit us to express our satisfaction with the fact that there has been a measure of cooperation between us to further the interest of the labor movement, of peace and socialism. We hope for an ever more ample extension of that cooperation and we wish you success in your labors on behalf of a cause which is common to us both.

INDEPENDENT LABOR LEAGUE OF AMERICA
JAY LOVESTONE, Secretary

The calendar says
Spring Is Here!
We take calendars seriously.
SPRING IS SPRING
We're only human and Spring's got us!
You're only human and Spring's got you too!
Only WE are doing something about it and Invite YOU to join us when we run our
Spring Frolic and Dance
Saturday Evening, April 13, 1940, 8:30 P. M.
Labor Stage Studio
106 W. 39th St., N. Y. C.
Do you rhumba?
Do you Suzy-Q?
Do you hop any number of ways?
Of course, you waltz!
Just name your dance and you shall have it!
How's that?
That's the kind of band we're having.
It's the DANCINGEST DANCE BAND and knows just everything!
You're coming? That's swell!
Only 49 cents for half a dance couple; 49 cents for the other half; less than \$1.00 for a whole couple!
Get your tickets at the
INDEPENDENT LABOR INSTITUTE
131 W. 33rd St., 7th floor, New York City LAcKawanna 4-5282