

Next Week:
THE REAL POLAND
By Kalman

Workers Age

Weekly Paper of the Independent Labor League of America

DEMOCRACY THRU EDUCATION . . .
by George S. Counts . . . page 3.
APPEAL TO MEMBERS OF THE S. W. P.
. . . page 4.

VOL. 8, NO. 42.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1939.

5 CENTS

AT FIRST GLANCE

by Jay Lovestone

A STALINIST POISON-GAS ATTACK ON LOCAL 22

ON October 10, the Daily Worker, English-language mouthpiece of the Stalin-Hitler war block in this country, printed a declaration of the 10th Assembly District of the Communist Party denouncing Local 22 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. This denunciation deserves a careful examination because of its extraordinary insolence, total falsity, and reckless unprincipledness.

It is not our aim at this moment to enter into a debate with the Hitler-Stalin block agents in this country about Local 22. The latter needs no defense at our hands. Every honest working man and working woman knows that this local has for years, under the leadership of Chas. S. Zimmerman, been an outstanding fortress of progressive unionism. When the Stalinites were still dedicated to outright dual unionism, when the Daily Worker and the Freiheit (Jewish-language organ of the Hitler-Stalin block) were calling upon the dressmakers to smash this local as a "company union," this organization served as a beacon light of militant unionism throughout the land. More than that, the progressive forces leading this local were able to have it continue this role despite the entrance of the Stalinites into the union—upon orders from "over there."

Particularly does the writer recall the desperate but futile efforts to line up Local 22 for a May Day parade dedicated to dragging America into the world war by lining it up with Chamberlain and Daladier because at that time Stalin was trying to make a deal with them. Those were the days (only last May and as late as August 20) when, because it suited Stalin's foreign policy, the Communist Party and all its tools in all the unions were peddling "collective security," a war to make the world "safe for democracy," a fight to the finish against that "bestial aggressor, Hitler." Those were the days when particularly the members of the Independent Labor League of America were being subjected to the slickest attacks as "isolationists" (a curse-word in the Stalinist press), as advocates of a pact with Hitler, as opponents of the "great French and British democracies."

And now, lo and behold, the streamlined Munichmen of East 13th Street, with the insolence of police officers administering the third degree, brazenly denounce Local 22 in general and Comrade Zimmerman in particular as "war mongers," as promoters of "war hysteria to evade union problems." These are weird days indeed! But a super-Pulitzer Prize for weirdness will have to be set up in order to award it to the Communist Party for the following saffron fantasy and yellow fairy tale. Denouncing Local 22, the Stalin-Hitler branch in the 10th Assembly District speaks of the union leadership as "pro-fascist . . . trying to confuse the masses in order to weaken the solidarity of American labor" and as guilty of "shamelessly and openly trying to stampede the workers into support of the present imperialist war." Furthermore, the 10th Assembly District defenders of the Stalin-Hitler rape of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, etc., etc., go on to shout from the housetops: "This is done at a time when the bosses are taking advantage of the situation to worsen our conditions. Now more than ever must all constructive forces in the union unite to protect the dress trade in New York and maintain union conditions. Zimmerman is spreading confusion in order to evade the serious economic problems of dressmakers."

Well, let's take a look at some facts. In Local 22, the Stalinites have, for the last few years, had extensive, the underserved, opportunity to share in the administration and leadership of the organization. Yet, time and again the Stalinites have attempted to stick a poisoned dagger into the administration of the union—an administration for which they are supposed to be responsible by mandate of the union membership. Trampling, in true Stalin-Hitler fashion, on this most elementary concept of trade-union honesty and responsibility, the Communist Party's so-called "Left Group" in Local 22 railed in the Daily Worker of January 30 "that the administration has not done all it could to reduce the plight of the unemployed" and that "there can be no excuse for neglecting to enforce the minimum provision in the agreement. . . ." This move by the Communist Party agents was not at all tied up with any genuine

(Continued on page 2)

Fight On Arms Embargo May Shift to the House

Frank Howard's Weekly Washington Letter

By FRANK HOWARD

Washington, D. C. ALTHOUGH almost everyone here, including the isolationists, agree that the battle against the arms embargo repeal is lost in the Senate, there is considerable fear (by the Administration) that there may be real trouble in the House. Some persons even predict that there is a chance to beat the Administration's repeal proposal in the House. I seriously doubt if this is the case but I urge all readers of the Age to continue their bombardment of Congressmen. It cannot be repeated too often that the size of the vote against repeal in both the Senate and the House will have a great deal to do with putting us into the war or keeping us out of the war—eventually.

In the meanwhile, preparations for war go forward apace. The latest news is that even departments most remote from making war on the battlefield are being asked to prepare memoranda on the manner in which they will be able to function if we enter. One administrator in the cultural field has been reported to have written the following accurate and brief memo: "Under such circumstances, favor complete abolition of this department."

W. G. Krivitsky has caused more interest among press correspondents than any other Dies witness. It was the general conviction that he was speaking with authority. Word went out that he has been sponsored here by Ambassador Bullitt and Leon Blum.

Relations with South America are being widely discussed in Washington this week because of the presence of a number of Latin American women delegates representing the People's Mandate to End War. These ladies are being entertained royally. The official delegates are accompanied by a number of other South American women, such as Senorita

Pollitt, British C.P. Head, Out in "Change of Line"

London, England. As a result of the sudden right-about-face of the Communist Party of Great Britain on the war question, executed under direction of Moscow as a reflection of the recent change of Soviet foreign policy, Harry Pollitt was removed as party secretary last week and a sweeping "purge" instituted throughout the party. Mr. Pollitt, one of the best known British communist leaders, suffered primarily for having written a pamphlet some weeks ago on "How to Win the War." This pamphlet was written upon instructions and with the approval of the authorities in Moscow, and it was then the "party line." The same "line" was also expressed when, at the outbreak of the war, the C.P.G.B. issued a manifesto signed by Harry Pollitt, calling upon the people "to secure a military victory over the fascist system, whose victory would lead to the forcible destruction of every democratic right and liberty."

Then came the sudden "change of line." Pollitt's pamphlet, widely advertised, was withdrawn and the

(Continued on page 2)

Powers Continue Warfare of Diplomacy

A.F.L. Takes Strong Anti-War Stand

Convention Refuses To Back Embargo Repeal; Hits War Dictatorship

Cincinnati, Ohio

Strong opposition to American involvement in the European war was expressed by the A. F. of L. convention in session here in a resolution adopted last week. American armed forces should be used only to repel invasion, the resolution stressed. An attempt by Max Federman, furworkers delegate from Toronto, to amend the resolution to indicate that the United States should help England and France, was rejected.

The resolution refused to back the Administration in its efforts to kill the arms embargo, although, on the opening day of the convention, President Green had urged such action. The resolutions committee, of which Matthew Wall was chairman and John P. Frey secretary, declined to follow Mr. Green in this respect. Instead, it included in the resolution a warning that policies were already being advocated which might be the "first steps" towards forcing this nation into war. In the closing hours of the convention, the delegates voted in favor of a strict neutrality stand barring the extension of credit to belligerents or the use of American ships in carrying goods to warring countries.

The resolutions committee also did not follow Mr. Green in his advocacy of American mediation in the European war "at the earliest possible moment." Such a move, the committee said, "might not only involve us in an embarrassing situation but in addition might prove without successful results."

Another resolution sponsored by the committee directed the Federation to seek legislation to protect labor from "the menace of war dictatorship as contained in the Industrial Mobilization Plan." "Labor would be regimented and perhaps deprived of an adequate voice in the nation's councils," the report warned. "After the war, labor in our country would struggle under heavier burdens than ever before and find itself the victim of crushing taxation."

Another recommendation was to continue the labor boycott of German and Japanese goods and to extend the boycott to Russian goods. The entire report and all recommendations of the resolutions committee on war and foreign policy were approved by the convention.

Earlier in the week, the convention followed the resolutions committee's recommendation and rejected a resolution from the Connecticut State Federation of Labor pledging "full support" to the President and the New Deal. While the committee acknowledged that many New Deal measures had proven

(Continued on page 2)

LaFollette, Clark Defend Embargo

Washington, D. C. Senators Robert M. LaFollette and Bennett Champ Clark scored heavily in defense of the arms embargo and American neutrality in the course of the great debate on foreign policy in the Senate last week. Despite an Administration victory in defeating, by a vote of 65 to 26, Senator Tolley's proposal to split up the Pittman bill into two parts—the controversial arms-embargo question and the rest of the bill, on which there was considerable agreement—the peace block strengthened its position in the course of the week. A number of Senators, formerly thought to be in the Administration camp or doubtful, shifted their stand in the direction of keeping and strengthening neutrality. Chief among these was Senator Chavez of New Mexico, hitherto believed safely lined up for repeal. His statement that he would vote against the repeal of the arms embargo caused a sensation.

Dr. Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion announced last week that its survey showed a slight but definite rise in pro-embargo sentiment, from 38% to 40%, after the first week's debate.

Senator LaFollette's address made a profound impression on the Senate. He smashed the Administration position at every point and showed that it was directed towards "teaming up" the United States with Great Britain and France in the European war. With considerable emotion, he reached back and recalled the great fight his father had put up in 1916 and 1917 against the war drive of the Wilson Administration. He based his opposition to re-

War Breeds Dictatorship

"A standing military force, with an overgrown executive, will not long be safe companions for liberty. The means of defense against foreign danger have been always the instruments of tyranny at home. Among the Romans it was a standing maxim to excite war whenever a revolt was apprehended. Throughout all Europe, the armies kept up under the pretext of defending have enslaved the people. It is perhaps questionable whether the best concerted system of absolute power in Europe could maintain itself in a situation where no alarms of external danger could tame the people to the domestic yoke."—James Madison.

"PRACTISE under the Wilson Administration makes it as certain as death and taxes that civil liberty would perish in the United States as soon as war is declared."—Charles A. Beard.

Lewis Bars Labor Unity At CIO Meet

No Step Toward Peace Taken; Convention Raps Labor Board For 'Bias'

San Francisco, Cal. The regular convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, in session here last week, virtually turned its back on peace in the labor movement in the speeches and declarations of its leaders, although it left the door a trifle ajar in the official resolution finally adopted.

The question was raised both in the report of the C.I.O. negotiating committee and in the message sent by President Roosevelt to the convention, in which unity in the labor movement was urged in the interests of "national unity." From Mr. Lewis' opening address and the

(Continued on page 2)

pealing the arms embargo—he favored substantially the "cash-and-carry" commerce provisions—on these three major premises, he said: "Repeal of the embargo, in the present circumstances, and the sale of arms, ammunition and implements of war is a significant step toward participation in the European war."

"The several discretionary loopholes in the pending bill are sufficient to allow for incidents which may lead us into war."

"It is not in the best interest of American democracy to gamble everything of value which we possess in return for some temporary profit together with a permanent participation in a post-war chaos." Senator Clark, in his address, denounced Assistant Secretary Louis Johnson for misleading and war-mongering speeches. He, too, stressed the point that, despite all talk of keeping the country out of war, the Administration policy was directed straight at involving the United States in the European conflict as the ally of England and France. Such was the meaning of the Administration drive to repeal the arms embargo and undermine our neutrality, he pointed out. He demanded the enactment of a neutrality law with fool-proof and hole-proof provisions for embargo on arms, munitions and implements of war and strict "cash-and-carry" trade on all other commodities.

Charles A. Lindbergh reentered the neutrality debate last week with another radio speech in which he urged that the arms embargo be kept except for "defensive" weapons such as anti-aircraft guns.

It became known last week that the Administration leaders in the Senate were doing everything in their power to close the debate and come to a vote as quickly as possible. "This attitude was said to be motivated first by the fear that some 'new event' abroad might alter the situation here but particularly by reports that the margin for repeal in the House, counted as small even in the beginning of the special session, was in danger of narrowing down still more."

Efforts to undermine even the inadequate safeguards against war involvement contained in the Pittman bill were foreshadowed in a statement made by Senator Bailey of the Senate Commerce Committee that he would seek to exempt commerce in the Pacific from any wartime restrictions. The Administration is understood to be behind these efforts.

"WAR TO THE BITTER END!"



—from New York Daily News

Shall It Be Peace—And On What Basis?

WE want peace, immediate peace. Nothing that one or the other side is out for in this war can justify its continuation by another day, the sacrifice of another human life.

This war is an imperialistic war. All the fine phrases about "democracy" and "self-determination" are just so much camouflage to hide the naked, greedy aims of predatory power-politics. For imperialistic Britain and imperialistic France, which hold hundreds of millions of subject peoples in slavery in their colonies, and which fed and nurtured fascism to its present savage fury, to pose as "emancipators" in Europe is as grotesque a swindle as for Hitler, with his heel on the prostrate forms of Austria and Czechoslovakia, to pose as the champion of the "self-determination of peoples," even though today Stalin gives his blessing to the degrading farce. Victory for the Allies would mean not freedom for Europe but another and even more ruthless Versailles; victory for Hitler would mean a Versailles dictated from Berlin and the yoke of fascist slavery fixed more tightly on the neck of Europe. In either case, the "victory" would be a disaster for mankind, the prelude to another and even more fearful war. To spill another drop of human blood for such a "victory" would be an historical crime of monstrous proportions.

We therefore urge the immediate cessation of hostilities and the convocation of a conference of European states to establish peace. But how can peace be really established?

If the peace is to be anything more than a momentary interlude between two slaughters, if it is to be anything more than a spur to another outbreak of predatory imperialism, it cannot be a peace on terms laid down by either London and Paris or Berlin and Moscow. The Hitler-Stalin terms are obviously designed to preserve and legitimize the Russo-German depredations in Poland, the Baltic states and the Balkans. The Chamberlain-Daladier terms, for all their glittering phrases, are just as obviously designed to reassert Anglo-French hegemony in Europe and protect the plunder of past aggressions. In either case, it would be a hollow mockery to speak of them as terms of peace.

The only kind of peace that can conceivably be anything more than a jumping-off place for another imperialist war is

A DEMOCRATIC PEACE ON THE BASIS OF THE SELF-DETERMINATION OF PEOPLES!

Yes, a democratic peace on the basis of the self-determination of peoples! Let the people of Poland themselves decide—in an internationally controlled plebiscite conducted under conditions guaranteeing the fullest freedom of speech, press and association—what their own fate should be. In Czechoslovakia, too, let the people be given the right and opportunity freely to determine their own destiny. But let it not stop with Poland, Austria and Czechoslovakia. Let the principle of self-determination extend to India, Syria, Ireland, Africa, in short to the colonial empires of England and France and other imperial powers as well. For here, too, millions are groaning in abominable slavery; here, too, are stocked up heaps of dry tinder waiting but for a spark to set off another world slaughter for the redivision of imperialism. Any sort of real peace in our time, if it is to be more than an anxious breathing spell to get over the exhaustion of the last war, must be based on a real new deal in world relations, a new deal rooted in genuine democracy and self-determination all around.

On such a basis, many other festering problems could be approached with a measure of success, the problems of disarmament, of international trade relations, and the like.

Let it not be said that such a basis for peace is impracticable. Of course, it is—within the rigid framework of the existing imperialist system. But within this framework, no sort of peace at all is possible, and all talk of peace on the basis of imperialism, no matter what rearrangement of power relations is momentarily effected, is nothing but a snare and a delusion.

Such a peace—a democratic peace on the basis of self-determination—can come only as a result of irresistible pressure on the

(Continued on page 4)

Allies Reject Hitler 'Peace'; Kaunas Bows

Diplomatic activities on many fronts, chief among them being the German-Soviet "peace" offensive, were again the main form of hostilities last week, the sixth week of the war, with actual military operations limited to some light, desultory fighting on the western front and the naval duel between the English blockade and German submarine raiding. In this latter field, the Reich scored a remarkable triumph when one of its U-boats sank the 29,000-ton British battleship, the Royal Oak.

The Nazi "peace" offensive, officially launched by Chancellor Hitler in his Reichstag address and reiterated a few days later in his speech opening the "Winter Relief" drive, was rebuffed by both Chamberlain and Daladier. Both of the Allied leaders made addresses in which they rejected Hitler's advances but by no means formulated their own war aims in concrete form. Their main stress was laid on the condition that "Hitlerism must go," but by "Hitlerism" they apparently meant not the oppression and dictatorship ruling Germany but the personal regime of Adolf Hitler. Strong hints were thrown out from London and Paris of willingness to deal with a regime of German Junkers, industrialists, the army chiefs, and "moderate" Nazis, provided they would "get rid" of Hitler. Such a regime, it was felt, could give "satisfactory guarantees" that Anglo-French imperialist hegemony would be left unchallenged.

In this situation, Berlin last week made contact with Russia and Italy for consultations on "common defensive measures" as prescribed in the pacts uniting Germany with the two countries. The Stalin government had already given its blessings to Hitler's "peace" drive in a sensational editorial in the Izvestia of October 10 in which the choice between fascist and anti-fascist "ideologies" was declared to be a "matter of taste" and not worth a bloody war. Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov and Italian Foreign Minister Count Ciano were expected in Berlin very soon. All signs pointed to a continuation of the "peace" offensive, at least for another period.

Meanwhile, Germany continued its efforts to bring about mediation thru President Roosevelt or some other "neutral of equal standing." In Berlin, the warning was issued with great emphasis several times last week that should no such mediation occur and Hitler's "peace" offer go unheeded, it would be the "last of its kind" and war would break out "in real earnest." President Roosevelt, however, refused to take any action, officially because he had received no formal bid, actually because it would not fit in with the plans of Britain and France.

What "war in real earnest" might mean was not clear last week when practically no war at all was under way. Experts were convinced that it would be primarily a war in the air, waged against both land and sea objectives, and that a break-thru on land in the west was all but impossible, or, even if possible, utterly impracticable in terms of losses in blood and treasure.

Stalinist Russia continued its drive to fix its grip on the Baltic states and gain a real foothold in the Balkans. Lithuania submitted last week to the Soviet "mutual-assistance" pact which established Russian control over it, after such control had already been extended over Estonia and Latvia. In return, Lithuania received thecession of Vilna and the surrounding district, which had been taken by Moscow in the partition of Poland.

A much more difficult situation developed in connection with Finland. Here the Russian demands, which were said to include control of the strategically located Aland Islands, met with stiff resistance in Helsinki. For a while, it looked as if a Russian attack were imminent. Norway, Sweden and Denmark, the Scandinavian powers directly interested, made representations to Moscow, expressing their "anxiety" and hoping that Russian terms would be "moderate." A similar step was taken by President Roosevelt in a "personal message" to Soviet President Kalinin. As the week ended, there came the report from Moscow that an "agreement in principle" had been reached with Finland and that no "difficulties" were anticipated. But the crisis was far from relieved.

In the Soviet capital, it was also reliably but unofficially reported that Turkey had finally signed an agreement with Moscow "protecting Russia's rights in the Black Sea and its outlet, the Dardanelles." The accord defined Russo-Turkish relations with respect to their roles in the European war; in particular, the Dar-

(Continued on page 2)

Red Caps In Fine Union Progress

By ERNEST CALLOWAY

Chicago, Ill. APPROXIMATELY one year after the Interstate Commerce Commission's decision granting "employee status" to red-caps, station porters and ushers, the International Brotherhood of Red Caps has translated this momentous legal decision into terms of concrete organizational results.

Today, with nearly 16,000 miles of Class A railroads under contract, the Brotherhood has entered into the spirit of developing the strength of the organization with full steam ahead. Aside from the contracts already under the belt of the union, the Brotherhood is in the midst of a series of negotiations with the railway managements which in the near future will push its contract mileage into the neighborhood of 85,000 miles of Class A railroads. This figure, when compared with the best mileage of any of the old railroad unions, is a great feather in the cap of the two-year old Brotherhood.

Resulting from a series of elections conducted among red-caps by the National Mediation Board, in which the International Brotherhood of Red Caps was selected as the bargaining agency on numerous systems and terminals, dates have been set for a number of preliminary conferences between railroad officials and representatives of the International Brotherhood of Red Caps.

On October 5, Brotherhood representatives opened negotiations with the Memphis Union Station Company, and on October 9, with the Pennsylvania Railroad. Union officials and the Illinois Central officials will meet October 21. The Union Pacific Brotherhood meeting is scheduled for October 18. The Missouri Kansas and Texas will meet with the union heads on October 20, Southern Pacific (T. & N.O. Division) on October 23, and the Houston Belt and Terminal Company has set October 25 as the date for the meeting with the Brotherhood.

Compared with the nature of the union's work a year ago, which was 75% legal, over 75% of the work today is in the nature of complaints, adjustments, agreements and conferences with railway managements. This calls for a day-to-day office routine of filing complaints, submitting memoranda to railway managements, invoking the services of the National Mediation Board, selecting Brotherhood representatives for elections, meeting with grievance and negotiation committees, settling complaints, inspecting contract proposals, holding weekly staff conferences and numerous other detail activities which go into the process of building a trade union.

Also going into the process of growth, the Brotherhood has extended its organization into the ranks of wives, mothers and friends in the form of the Women's Auxiliary which today is becoming a bulwark of strength in the union. This and the development of its union educational work gives added testimony to the continued growth of the organized red-caps in the American labor movement.

AFL in Anti-War Stand

(Continued from page 1) "most beneficial to labor," it felt that a blanket endorsement of the character desired in the Connecticut resolution was altogether out of place. "The hearty support which the trade-union movement has given to a large number of New Deal measures," the report pointed out, "should not lead this convention to give its blanket endorsement of all legislation which has been proposed or enacted by the so-called New Deal; neither should our opposition to certain New Deal legislative and administrative acts permit us to voice condemnation of the New Deal as a whole."

The convention adopted unanimously a resolution on peace in the labor movement proposed by Mr. Wolf's committee. It retraced the steps taken by the Federation in furtherance of labor peace and recalled the obstacles thrown in the way by the C.I.O. It declared that the responsibility now lay with the C.I.O., from whom the next move was to be expected. It directed that the A. F. of L.'s peace committee be continued and that "it hold itself in readiness to meet with representatives of the C.I.O. whenever that organization will indicate a willingness to resume conferences."

Against the protests of the brewery-workers union, the long-standing jurisdictional feud of this organization with the teamsters union, now seriously aggravated by the intervention of the federal courts, was again referred to the Executive Council.

The convention saw the retirement of Secretary-Treasurer Frank Morrison, 79, for forty-three years the Federation's second in command. Elected to succeed him was George Meany, president of the New York State Federation of Labor. The one change in the Executive Council was the withdrawal of Frank Duffy of the carpenters union, replaced by William Hutcheson of the same organization. Mr. Green was reelected president.

Labor Action Needed to Halt Prices

By CECIL OWEN

Washington, D. C. IF there is to be any really effective check on profiteering as a consequence of the other fellows war, it is up to labor, farmers and consumers over the nation to get busy.

This is the conclusion that stands out clearly after a check-up here of what Washington proposes to do to prevent high-jacking of the public by profit-hungry business.

Real wages were slashed by one-third in the last war due to unjustified price increases. The government then did not plan ahead on this subject and consumers were the first victims of war.

Today, the situation differs somewhat in that there are men here who realize the importance of this problem. But when it comes to doing something about it, opinions vary widely.

Attacks on the profiteer are on two fronts here: legislative and administrative. Here's what's going on.

A block of liberal Democrats got together under the leadership of Rep. John M. Coffee, of Washington, and decided to press for an amendment in the neutrality act to tax war profits at a high rate. Their first concern is with munitions, airplanes and other war industries.

This effort seems doomed to failure because of the parliamentary situation at the Capitol. Briefly, since the House passed the neutrality bill at the last session without such a proviso, its hands are tied now. All the House can do is accept or reject the bill as it comes back from the Senate. And tax legislation cannot originate in the Senate.

Furthermore, the Administration is cool to the idea for fear of complicating the already tangled neutrality issue. A steep surtax on war profits might cost some votes now counted for the bill.

This seems to rule out any immediate legislative remedy against profiteering. Action on the administrative front appears a little more hopeful.

Under the anti-trust laws, the Department of Justice can move against any price rises that appear to be the result of collusion among business men. If prices on similar articles rise all at once and in stores generally, there are grounds for an anti-trust law inquiry. The public is warned, however, that anti-trust laws cannot reach all kinds of profiteering.

The two other government agencies concerned with this problem (Departments of Labor and Agriculture) are limited to reporting the facts and warning the public against profiteering. There is no law under which they can prosecute and Washington opinion is doubtful whether an effective anti-profiteering law can be written.

Right here is where the people outside of Washington enter the picture. Action by them is imperative if consumers are not to be gouged and labor forced to take a wage-cut because of skyrocketing prices of what the workers must buy. Action by labor and consumers throughout the country is the thing needed.

British CP Head Is Removed

(Continued from page 1) first manifesto repudiated and replaced by another to exactly the opposite effect. Pollitt is reported to have voted against this change in the Central Committee. At any rate, he was quickly removed.

The new party policy is said to be widely opposed in party ranks, especially by many former members of the Spanish International Brigade. Support of the war was voted a few days ago by the South Wales Miners Federation, of which Arthur Horner, well-known Stalinist, is leader.

The British government seems little concerned about the Communist Party or its views since the influence and standing of this party have rapidly declined because of its ludicrous right-about face at the command of Moscow.

N.Y. Teachers Union Leaves Stalinist "Peace" League

Action is Manouever of C.P.-Controlled Leadership

By D. BENJAMIN

New York City ON Friday, October 6, the Teachers Union of New York at its Delegate Assembly meeting voted unanimously to disaffiliate from the American League for Peace and Democracy, with which it has cooperated practically since the latter's inception. After rejecting similar proposals made by the Independent Group and progressive elements year after year for the past six years, the administration of the union, what with the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact and the end of the Stalinist policy of "democratic front against the fascist aggressors," made a shameful and dishonest turn to bring its policy into line with the new foreign policy of the Soviet Union. Not demands from union members, not the interests of the Teachers Union itself, not conditions in this country, effected the change of policy, but rather the manipulation of the union in accordance with the changing line of the Stalinists, aping the Russian Foreign Office in Moscow. (In fact, the question may well be asked whether the Stalinists don't plan to dump the League overboard altogether.)

Last May, when election issues were discussed, the Independents in the union were booed and hissed for proposing disaffiliation. The proposal was considered a betrayal of the interests of the teachers and the people, because it opposed the lining up of the Teachers Union and the American government with the "democratic" imperialist powers in the developing war situation. The need of the hour then was "defense of democracy," and when anyone argued against the pro-war policy of the American League for Peace and Democracy as being no solution to the problem of defeating fascism, he was dubbed a traitor to the union, to the people and to the holy cause of "democracy." Even militarism and militarization were justified by the union administration, for was not a strong "national defense" needed for "defending democracy"?

"First things first," they said—even then it was pointed out that war preparations and armament economy business men. If prices on similar articles rise all at once and in stores generally, there are grounds for an anti-trust law inquiry. The public is warned, however, that anti-trust laws cannot reach all kinds of profiteering.

But came the "revolution" in Russia's foreign policy—alliance with

Nazi Germany rather than a "concerted front against fascism"; for Hitler's invasion of Poland as an "act of peace" rather than another example of brutal aggression. Immediately, the Stalin-Ribbentrop agreement in Moscow brought a change in Local 5, Teachers Union, New York. Obviously, the good ship "American League for Peace and Democracy," very useful in the period of "defense of democracy," had to be deserted and scuttled. Of course, it had to be done tactfully so that the real reason would not be evident, as that would expose the political character of the union leadership. So reasons had to be invented: "We must release the union members from controversial discussion of the war question in order to unite them on teacher issues." "We must allow every union member to decide for himself as how best to fight war," etc. But these reasons could have been presented and considered just as well one, two, three, or five years ago. However, the administration, with cynical contempt for the memory and intelligence of the union members and the teaching staff, offered these lame pretexts in order to hide the real cause of the change of policy—the Stalin-Hitler alliance. Not a word was said by the administration about that pact—for them, it had no bearing on the question of the American League. This attitude of essential dishonesty was most effectively answered by a representative sent to the meeting by the union group in P.S. 33, Bronx, who showed the tie-up between the Soviet Union, the Stalinists and the American League. Suffice it to say that the union administration has not, nor will it, introduce a resolution condemning the infamous pact that furnished the spark for the war now raging in Europe.

The administration hastened its move because it was aware that the Independent Group was circulating petitions demanding disaffiliation. In addition, the union "leadership" feared that hundreds of union members would drop out of the organization because of the notorious coloration of the American League. So it felt it could kill two birds with the one stone of disaffiliation. It felt it could turn the growing hostility to its policy of political domination into a source of support: it could talk "no politics in the union" and thus disarm the opposition forces, in fact, prevent them from discussing other false political policies introduced by the administration itself.

We are, of course, glad the disaffiliation has taken place. The value

of disaffiliation will not be fully realized, however, until and unless:

- 1. The membership understands the real cause of original affiliation as well as of the recent disaffiliation. Otherwise, there will be a repetition of similar mistakes.
2. The membership puts an end to political domination of the union. This situation exists now after disaffiliation and the talk of "no politics" really reflect the desire of the political bosses to avoid answering for many of their policies as well as to maintain their interests until they learn what the next steps are to be.
3. The membership changes the methods of work prevailing in the union. A situation where a sound proposal made by an Independent Group follower is for that reason only not considered on its merits and is rejected, while the administration can make all kinds of turns and twists for political reasons, is an unhealthy one.
4. The membership realizes that it itself bears a responsibility to be more critical of the administration as well as of its former attitude of giving cart-blanche and blind support to the administration.
5. The membership sees to it that the struggle against war is not shelved on the spurious ground of "no politics." (This cry coming from those who understand conducting a union only in terms of political domination!) The administration has already taken steps to liquidate the anti-war and anti-fascist committee into the Academic Freedom Committee and speaks of the necessity of keeping out discussions not bearing directly on teacher questions. As the war is not the biggest and most immediate question facing us and the world, as the war does not have direct effects and consequences for education!

In other words, an overhauling in the Teachers Union is necessary. It has long been overdue.

The election of Professor Counts as president of the American Federation of Teachers, after he had been maligned in a most irresponsible manner by the Local 5 administration, followed by the beginning of more critical thinking in the ranks of the membership as the result of the Stalin-Hitler alliance, afford a better basis for the solution of these problems. The administration will not yield easily nor will it be exactly scrupulous, but it is a fight that has to be made for the good of the Teachers Union.

Stalinists Launch Poison Attacks on Local 22

Denounce Zimmerman as 'War-Monger'

(Continued from page 1) interest in the economic conditions of the dressmakers. It was just another case of having a "political" axe to grind at the expense of the workers and at the express instructions and orders from outside, from the Communist Party. This party has, in various ways, always sought to turn all unions and labor organizations into subservient agencies, into mere auxiliaries. Communist Party members in all unions, in all labor organizations, never approach the vital economic questions confronting the workers on the basis of the merits of these questions. Communist Party members in all unions are not responsible for the positions they take and owe no responsibility to the membership of these unions. The Communist Party people are responsible strictly to those controlling their party—the Stalin bureaucracy in Moscow. The latter determines the domestic policies of all Communist Parties solely on the basis of Soviet foreign policy.

Today, these moral defenders of the Stalin-Hitler bed-fellowship have the unmitigated gall to brand those who refuse to bless the crimes of this pair of "blood-brothers" as "pro-fascists trying to confuse the masses." This takes the cake. But by now it is a very stale cake. A "blood-brother" of the 10th A. D. kamerads is Stalin's War Commissar Voroshilov. Day in and day out, the Daily Worker heils him as a "tireless fighter against fascism." But, and the "but" is a big and brutal one this time, Hitler's Air Marshal, Hermann Wilhelm Goering of Reichstag Fire fame, has just sent Voroshilov a swastika-adorned, specially designed Fieseler "Storch" monoplane as a token of Nazi appreciation, as a personal gift.

We are prepared to bet good Stalin gold rubels by the carload against Third Five-Year Plan doughnuts that the Daily Worker will soon tell its readers that this was a gift by Goering to Voroshilov for his consistent and courageous fight against German fascism. Yet let no one condemn too harshly the Daily Worker, the 10th A. D. of the C.P., or the Stalinists in Local 22 for what they say. They say what they are told, ordered or paid to say. Charitably speaking, this is at best a modern version of the tale in the Old Testament about "the voice of Jacob and the hand of Esau." Here we humbly apologize

to Esau for putting him alongside of Stalin.

The progressives in Local 22 are "openly trying to stampede the workers into support of the present imperialist war," raves Browder's 10th A. D. Kameraderie. At the same time, I have before me the London Daily Worker of September 16 lauding to the heavens a pamphlet by Harry Pollitt, until 10 o'clock last night Eastern Standard Time general secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain. This pamphlet by the Browder of England is called "How to Win the War." Remember, in London, Pollitt tells us "how to win the war," talks of the "liberty for which we are fighting," and about the need "to make it our war and to fight for our cause." But in New York, Browder brands it as the "present imperialist war." Is this duplicity, confusion, or too speedy orders from Moscow? No one will go wrong if he says it's a combination of all of them. Or perhaps the Daily Worker of London and New York will once again mechanically echo the Izvestia of October 10 and tell us that since Stalin has entered into a partnership with Hitler, with German fascism, the whole thing is only "a matter of taste."

Let no one make the mistake of believing that Browder is all of a sudden genuinely opposed to America's participation in an imperialist war. Only a few weeks ago he was dying (on paper) to have the United States join the same war which he now denounces. The only reason he is against America's getting into the war today is because that would mean fighting Nazi Germany, warring against the Germany of Hitler with whom Browder's boss and paymaster, Stalin, has a rather all-inclusive pact. In England, Pollitt didn't respond quickly enough in his contentions so out of the secretaryship he went. In Great Britain, the Communist Party publication, The Week, openly declares in its issue of October 4 that "the possibility of a Russo-German military collaboration, in one form or another, against the French and British empires is not 'ideologically excluded.'"

Once again, we must hasten to confess that with "leaders" whose minds are deened by the pernicious poison of Stalinism, nothing is impossible—except independent, constructive, responsible thinking and action. However, here we must deal not only with confessions but also

Frey Makes Powerful Anti-War Plea to Unionists

Cincinnati, Ohio

A powerful plea to help keep America out of war was made last week by John P. Frey, head of the A. F. of L. Metal Trades Department, at the opening day of its convention here, just preceding the Federation convention.

Frey demanded "absolute, unqualified neutrality, in practise," and he gave his reasons in language which could not be misunderstood. "We entered the World War to make the world safe for democracy," he said, "but since 1918 we have been disillusioned. Instead of making the world safe for democracy, it was made safe for dictators."

After describing recent events in Europe and Asia, Frey pointed out that "we are now informed thru propaganda that the frightful conflict taking place in Europe is a contest between democratically governed countries and the totalitarian states. We are again being urged to enter the present conflict so that democratic institutions may be preserved."

"Democratic institutions are involved, but there is much more. There is the domination over many subject peoples, whose lands contain wealth which the controlling nations have exploited, and which others, in turn, desire to take from them, so they may be exploiters. There are questions of commerce and finance, and also questions of personal and national ambitions."

"The democratic countries abroad had a golden opportunity to make Europe safer for democracy, but instead of lending a hand to the German republic, they permitted such conditions to develop as made possible the rise of Hitler."

"From the medieval period, Europe has been filled with ambitions, seething hatreds and fears. These have been the school in which most European diplomats have learned their lessons."

"It is into this inferno of duplicity that Europeans seek to drag us. 'Are we to permit our sympathies to lead us to forget the lessons of the past and favor any policy which can possibly lead us to again take part in the bloody quarrels of Europe?'"

"Millions of splendid young men have died upon European battle fields because their leaders have so willed. Are we to permit young men, natives of our country, to follow in their footsteps?"

"It seems to me that the position of our country must be one of absolute, unqualified neutrality in practise. It must not be expressed in catch-phrases. We must maintain a neutrality which is neutral in purpose, in action and in policy."

Lewis Bars Labor Unity At C.I.O. Convention

Meet Attacks Labor Board for "Bias"

(Continued from page 1) statements of other leaders, it was clear that those who directed the destinies of the C.I.O. were determined to bar the way to any negotiated peace no matter what the consequences. Lewis even spoke of "coming back five years from now" to San Francisco to a convention of the C.I.O., evidently taking it for granted that the labor movement would remain split for at least that long.

Contrary to expectations, no fight for unity was put up in the public councils of the convention by Sidney Hillman, who sharp disputes are reported to have taken place behind the scenes. In the end, the convention dismissed this vital matter with a terse resolution recommending that the existing negotiations committee "be continued and authorized to exercise its discretion in any future negotiations" with the A. F. of L.

The second most important issue to come before the convention was the Wagner Act and the N.L.R.B. Speakers violently attacked the Labor Board, particularly Dr. Wm. M. Leiserson, for alleged bias against the C.I.O., and a resolution to the same effect was adopted. In his opening address, John L. Lewis had assailed the Board and had even suggested that, in the present situation, the "dangers" of the Wagner Act might outweigh its "benefits." In line with this, a resolution was adopted recommending to all C.I.O. affiliates "most sparing and considerate use of the Wagner Act in the future."

The convention adopted a resolution on political policy in 1940 without any reference to a third term for President Roosevelt. The resolution simply endorsed Labor's Non-Partisan League and urged that action be taken to coordinate the political and legislative activities of C.I.O. affiliates. Joseph Curran, Stalinist head of the National Maritime Union, took occasion to denounce the American Labor Party for withdrawing its endorsement from Michael Quill and said that Labor's Non-Partisan League would back Mr. Quill against the A.L.P. In his opening address, John L. Lewis made a strong plea for keeping America out of war but he endorsed the Administration proposal to kill the arms embargo and undermine neutrality. No definite figures were given as to C.I.O. membership and finances. Mr. Lewis spoke of "four million members," altho all available evidence points to a C.I.O. membership of two million at the outside. Mr. Lewis was reelected president of the C.I.O.

Democracy in Wartime "PARADOX of democratic countries is that as soon as one of them begins defending democracy, it ceases to be a democracy. Last week... France became a full-fledged totalitarian state." — Time, Sept. 25, 1939.

Special Performance — Age Benefit "Salvation" A Magnificent Play by Sholom Asch Friday Evening, October 20, 1939 at the YIDDISH ART THEATRE Tickets available at Workers Age office, 131 West 33rd Street

Announcing Two Special Courses: 1. AMERICAN LABOR FACES THE WAR: Background and Problems A series of lectures on the fundamental economic, political and labor problems raised by the war in Europe. Among the lecturers will be: Jay Lovestone, Bertram D. Wolfe, Lewis Corey, Jim Cork and Will Herberg. TUESDAY—8 P. M. (BEGINNING OCTOBER 24) 10 Sessions—Course \$2—25c Single Admission 2. CURRENT EVENTS: The World In Crisis JAY LOVESTONE A critical examination of the most important national and international events of the day. FRIDAY—8:15 P. M. (BEGINNING OCTOBER 27) Course Fee \$2—25c Single Admission INDEPENDENT LABOR INSTITUTE 131 West 33rd Street, New York City October 12, 1939.

Towards A Better America:

Democracy Thru Education

By GEORGE S. COUNTS

(We publish below in full the paper presented by Dr. George S. Counts at the symposium, "Towards A Better America," held on October 6 under the auspices of the Independent Labor Institute. Dr. Counts is professor at Teachers College, Columbia University, and president of the American Federation of Teachers.

Dr. Counts' paper was read by Professor Goodwin Watson owing to his own presence at the A. F. of L. convention. The other contributions to the symposium—by Luigi Antonini, Norman Thomas, Louis Waldman, Abram L. Harris, Lewis Corey, Scott Nearing and Bertram D. Wolfe—will appear in early issues of this paper.—Editor.)

THRU the long centuries, mankind has painfully and hopefully built a great heritage of popular justice, freedom and enlightenment. In the present bitter and tragic epoch, this heritage, product of the efforts of countless men and women of diverse creed, race and nationality, seems to be in process of dissolution through a large part of the world. Even America, fabled land of democracy, has felt the resurgence of the spirit of tyranny and oppression. In meeting this threat to our central tradition, we must develop a comprehensive program of defense and offense. In such a program, the school, and particularly the public school, must hold an important place.



GEORGE S. COUNTS

In considering the task of the school in this situation, we suffer from a certain handicap: neither as a profession nor as a people have we ever faced squarely the problem of educating for democracy. To be sure, immediately after the Revolution, under the auspices and encouragement of the American Philosophical Society, a number of gifted minds outlined educational philosophies and programs in terms of democratic purposes. But this effort was essentially an intellectual exercise, bearing little tangible fruit. Even in Massachusetts, in the days of Horace Mann and the struggle for free schools, the problem was never fully grasped. This fact was observed and commented upon again and again by George Combe, the Scotch phrenologist, scholar and traveler, who lectured in all parts of the United States during the years 1838-40. Writing from Boston, he noted with deep concern that "the power of the people exceeds their educational attainments." He remarked further that no one seemed to be aware of this profound incongruity. "I have seen men of sense and understanding here," he observed, "regard my views as obviously Utopian and absurd when I ventured to express the opinion that both the quantity and quality of instruction communicated in the common schools of the United States, and even in Boston, is fitted much more for a government like that of Austria than for that of the United States! The Austrian government does not object to its subjects being taught reading, writing, arithmetic and geography because these are only the elements of knowledge and do not necessarily imply any practical results in action." Since this was written, the quantity of public education has been greatly increased and the quality much improved. Yet, in view of the vast complication of the social problem arising from the development of science and technology, the fact remains that, relative to the task, the teaching of democracy has advanced but little in the intervening century.

Our failure is traceable at bottom to a widespread assumption that education is a self-determined process, that it is indifferent to social values and systems, that it moves forward in accordance with its own timeless and universal laws, and that when so conceived, it inevitably and automatically serves the cause of democracy. As a matter of fact, the historical record shows that, while certain common elements are discernible in all educational programs, to every order of society there is an appropriate educational pattern and content. The recognition of this fundamental truth by the dictators has given them a great advantage in the contemporary struggle. It is therefore proposed that we frankly reject the conception of social and moral neutrality and direct the energies of organized education without reservation to the defense and strengthening of the democratic tradition and way of life.

Democratic Habits And Loyalties

The problem of achieving a democratic program of education is, of course, a most complicated one. Here attention will be confined to the crucial issue of the habits, dispositions and loyalties to be developed in the young.

The successful operation of any social system rests upon and tends to cultivate a certain mentality in its people. That a democratic society requires certain habits, dispositions and loyalties in its citizens is clearly revealed in the strategy and tactics of totalitarianism of every form. Wherever totalitarianism appears, it proceeds at once to the systematic destruction of those mental traits on which democracy relies. It is argued here that the American public school, thru the organization of its life, should proceed deliberately to foster and strengthen these traits—to incorporate into the behavior of the rising generation the great pattern of democratic living. As a very minimum, it should strive with all the resources at its disposal to develop in the individual a feeling of competence and adequacy; an allegiance to the central democratic principle of human equality, brotherhood, dignity and worth; a loyalty to the democratic process of free discussion, criticism and group decision; a mentality marked by fair-mindedness, integrity and scientific spirit; a respect for and an appreciation of talent, training and character; a sense of the fundamental social obligation of labor; and an enlightened devotion to the common good.

Feeling of Competence And Adequacy

The development in the individual of a feeling of competence and adequacy is the first obligation of democratic education. This is due to the fact that democracy, because of its very nature, must gauge its success in terms of human personality, in terms of the free men and women it produces. The school has a double responsibility here. On the one hand, it would wage a relentless warfare on the social conditions which to day dwarf the souls and bodies of millions of children and rob them of their democratic birthright. On the other, it would proceed positively to order its life so that it may assist every child to grow to his full physical, intellectual and moral stature. It would reject all systems of measurement, classification or instruction that submerge the individual or pretend to place him in a fixed quantitative relation to another. It would treat every pupil, regardless of his talents, as a unique and precious personality, a rightful heir of the great human legacy, meriting the most unqualified attention—"as an end in itself," to use the words of Immanuel Kant, "never as a means merely." It would seek to explore fully his abilities, develop his creative powers, and encourage him to feel that he can do something of value, that he belongs, that he is wanted, that he possesses worth. While it would give rich opportunity to the gifted, it would nip in the bud every tendency toward megalomania, every manifestation of the Hitler or Mussolini complex. As the weak would not be debased because of their weakness, so the strong would not be elevated to a superior moral order by reason of their strength.

Allegiance to Human Worth

A second obligation of democratic education is to develop in the individual a profound allegiance to the principle of human equality, brotherhood, dignity and worth. This means that a fraternal spirit would be applied as fully as possible to the organization and conduct of the life of the school and that a condition of social equality, sympathy and kindness would pervade everywhere. No individual would be permitted to exploit his fellow, nor would discrimination based upon family, race, nationality, politics or religion be tolerated. Cultural differences derived from diverse ancestry, life conditions or personal aptitude or conviction would be employed, not to found rival and hostile groups but rather to enrich the common life. Every effort would be made to fashion a mentality that would be uncomfortable and even outraged in the presence of poverty, injustice, ruthlessness, special privilege, denial of opportunity, persecution of minorities, exploitation of the weak, master-servant relationships. At the same time, the great ideals of a free society would be raised to the level of consciousness, and a sense of responsibility for correcting all violation of the democratic principle would be instilled into the mind of the pupil.

(Concluded in the next issue)

Saving Our Own Skins

By RAYMOND CLAPPER

(In her syndicated column on September 19, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, who has gone in for war-mongering in a big way, wrote: "Hundreds of thousands of men, women and children are dying. Are we going to think only of our own skins and our own pockets?" To this, the following article by Raymond Clapper in the New York World-Telegram of September 20 is a good and sufficient answer, whether it was intended as such or not.—Editor.)

Washington, D. C. THOSE who think, as I do, that no issue has arisen to warrant us sending several million American youths to Europe again are being taunted with the question: "Are we going to think only of our skins and our own pockets?" Says another: "This is not a backroom brawl. This is Armageddon."

I think it is very much to the point to be thinking of our skins—at least to be thinking of those American families whose sons would have to risk their skins. Certainly, it is not for us armchair kibitzers, safe behind our trusty typewriters, to be lecturing our friends into sending sons to fight in Europe.

Neither does it come with good grace from highly placed New Dealers who have been so solicitous about the skins of the unemployed and the economic underprivileged, to be so horrified now by the thought of anyone wishing to save his own skin.

SAVE AMERICA FIRST!

I hope sincerely that this time the American people will think about their own skins—about the great skin that is America, providentially blessed by a degree of natural isolation from this crazy carnage in Europe, the America which shelters us within a potential paradise rich enough in natural resources to enable those so fortunate as to be Americans to live in the peace and comfort to which human beings are entitled.

But they tell us this war in Europe is not a backroom brawl. This is Armageddon. Yes. That's what they said before.

You can find it now in Walter Millie's book, "The Road to War." How Walter Hines Page, our ambassador to Britain in the World War, wrote to Woodrow Wilson about the first World War.

Barnes Warns Against FDR War Policy

New York City. DECLARING that the combination of Anglo-French propaganda and the activities of U. S. bankers and industrialists is already threatening the neutrality of America, Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, historian and author, writing in the current Modern Quarterly, charges that President Roosevelt is already thinking and acting intervention in the European war.

President Roosevelt's foreign and armament policies are especially dangerous, says Dr. Barnes, because the President, in his October 1937 speech calling for "quarantining the aggressors," moved over to the camp of unneutrality even before the outbreak of the second world war.

"The forces, factors, and personalities making for involving us in a second world war are more threatening and ominous than they were in 1914," says Dr. Barnes. He continues: "Today we are threatened with a well-developed propaganda aiming to line us up once more with Britain and France in the effort to pull the French and British, chestnuts out of the fire, and to make up the losses growing out of the stupid and treacherous diplomacy during the last twenty years, especially the last five years."

In President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull, the United States is less fortunate in world affairs than it was in 1914 with Woodrow Wilson and William Jennings Bryan, asserts Dr. Barnes. "Roosevelt is an ardent naval enthusiast who would be specially susceptible to propaganda inciting us to enter a naval war, and Secretary Hull is a loyal disciple of Woodrow Wilson's philosophy of making the world good, if necessary by force."

Propaganda favoring American entry into the war is likely to be more effective than it was in 1914, Dr. Barnes predicts, saying that the propagandists have become far more proficient liars and that they will have all the skill learned in 1914-18, in addition to the lessons of commercial and political propaganda taught since 1918.

Urging American neutrality, Dr. Barnes states that American entry into the war would mean the end of the New Deal, the suppression of civil liberties, and a regimentation worse than that of 1914-18. "There is every probability that this regimentation would carry over into peace time and would transform the United States into a fascist society, whatever mollifying name we might give the new system," he says.

In addition to Dr. Barnes' leading article, the current Modern Quarterly contains an essay on "The Withering State" by James Marshall, president of the New York City Board of Education; and a chapter taken from V. F. Calverton's forthcoming history, "The Awakening of America." Mr. Calverton is editor of the Modern Quarterly.

"It's a death grapple," he said. "All preceding mere 'wars' are not in the same class of events. It means extermination, not of the people of either nation, but the utter extermination of the system of either one or the other—English free institutions or German military autocracy."

And Elihu Root in a rousing speech: "There is no nation on earth, not England, nor France, nor Belgium, nor Italy, nor Russia, with a stake greater in the success of the Allies in this (1917) war against German militarism than the U. S. A. . . . If we enter this war, we shall be fighting over again the battle of American democracy, along with the democracy of England, the democracy of France, the democracy of Italy, and now, God be praised, the great democracy of Russia; fighting for the principle of free self-government against the principle of old-time autocracy and military power."

WAR OF "IDEOLOGIES"

Still they insist now that this present war is different. It isn't an ordinary war. It's a war of ideologies.

Well, six weeks ago Hitler was fighting to crush Bolshevism. Now Hitler and Bolshevism are allies. For years, the ideological war raged. But the minute it was to Hitler's advantage to make a deal with Bolshevism, he made it. And what of Bolshevism's war against fascism? Stalin has made a deal with Hitler because he gets something out of it. They both carve up Poland and ideologies be damned.

All wars are fought under crusading banners which are supposed to take the curse off the loot that the powers are after.

If there is one thing that is completely cynical, it is war. It is part of the game to disguise interests under high-sounding slogans, but that is the propaganda to lash up the morale. We are inclined to mistake the propaganda for the real thing, the selfish interest which hides beneath it.

Chairman John Hamilton, of the Republican National Committee, just back from France, says: "It is my opinion that the Republican party should dedicate itself to the task—not of hoping this country will stay out of war—but of seeing that it does stay out of war."

The Republicans should not be allowed to occupy that platform all alone.

Man Will Conquer The Forces of Death

Already Human Factor is Uppermost in War

By MARCEAU PIVERT

(Marceau Pivert is secretary of the French Socialist Workers and Peasants Party and a leading spokesman of the International Workers Front Against War.—Editor.)

ON the imperialist war front, the relations of forces between the belligerents seem to be determined, in the first place, by their respective military strength. But equally important is the capacity for industrial production of the belligerent groups, their financial reserves, their world connections, the balance between agriculture and industry, their oil, electrical energy and means of transportation. Finally must be considered such matters as cadres, engineers and technicians, research laboratories and the like.

Except in the matter of financial reserves, in which Anglo-French capitalism obviously has the advantage, the disproportion of forces in other fields is not such that a crushing victory in a short time of one or the other imperialist block can be envisaged.

However, the military front or even the economic front is only a part of the full reality of the situation. The decisive factor is elsewhere. As always, it is the human material to which one should finally refer. More exactly, it is with the intelligence and will of men that the final decision rests. It is precisely this that constitutes the political factor which has the last word.

Governments know this and that is why they everywhere stifle free thought and the free exchange of ideas. In the whole of Europe at war, to indulge in the luxury of political curiosity is to risk the penalty of death. But it is also for this reason that we feel that we are uttering a deep reality when we say: "The international class front will dominate the military and economic fronts of this imperialist war. In the last resort, the political factor will be the decisive one."

It will decide because the imperialist powers are about to reenact, whether they wish to or not, the eternal legend of the devil's apprentice. The forces of destruction, which they control, are today such that at the very point of throwing them into play, the governments, on the one side as on the other, stop in hesitation—in fear of incalculable psychological reactions to which they might give rise.

It is probable that here lies the explanation of the absence of large-scale air fighting on the western front. Considering what is possible, the absence of major air-raid offensives on the vital centers of England, France and Germany, proves in our eyes that the General Staffs fear to provoke thru their up-to-date military techniques serious, uncontrollable repercussions among the masses of the people.

PROGRESS IN DESTRUCTIVENESS

Progress in aviation during the past five years has been tremendous. Given the stimulus of a state of war, one might therefore expect even more rapid advances now in techniques of destructiveness. (That made between 1914 and 1918 gives only a feeble idea.) A veritable word of Damocles thus hangs over the heads of all the big cities of Europe—Warsaw is an example, at least in part.

But who will take the initiative? To this very day, not a single government has dared—doubtless because they all know that it would

mean an enormous risk to the morale of their own populations. Can this paradoxical situation continue? We do not believe so. It is a total war which has begun—a war to the death between two imperialist blocks. As in the last world war, every means possible will be brought into use. For this reason, in spite of all the precautions taken by the propaganda machines, the political actor will, as the weeks go by, emerge as predominant.

THE TASK OF THE MOMENT

It is the task of all enlightened and progressive elements to prepare for the great collective refusal which will turn against the imperialist regimes the means of destruction they have themselves put into the hands of the masses of the people.

It is our task, pacifists and internationalists grouped in the International Workers Front Against War, to raise before the working masses the hope of peace and socialism.

Already, spontaneously, hardly four weeks after the outbreak of the tragedy, resistance has begun to show itself in all countries. German women dare to cry out their anger. French writers refuse to capitulate. English sailors join American sailors in a successful strike. Polish sailors occupy their ships and refuse to transport munitions. French soldiers and German soldiers exchange the first gestures of fraternization in the Haute-Rhine region. British workers of the I.L.P. and German revolutionary socialists establish connections of solidarity with each other.

Yes, despite the monstrous Stalinist betrayal, despite the crushing dictatorship of steel and iron, there lies salvation! And more particularly in the fraternization of the workers of France and Germany, for such fraternization would destroy at one blow all the imperialist schemes which exploit the natural anti-fascism of the masses of western peoples for the profit of the London bankers and financiers.

That is why wherever militants and groups of pacifists and internationalists are found, unity of action will take place spontaneously to organize active mass protests against the terrible sufferings imposed on the civil population as well as on those in the armed forces.

MAN WILL CONQUER

And should the days of the great distress come, as in total warfare they ultimately must, when thousands of airplanes bombard the capitals and give rise to the biggest panics in history, the political factor, hitherto suppressed, will surge forward and the great decision will be at hand. Even now, in spite of everything, the militants of the International Workers Front Against War are everywhere preparing. Nothing can stop the torrent. The political factor will assert itself. Man will conquer!

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

Federal Utility Policy Uncertain as FDR Veers

Washington, D. C. OF the many questions left unfinished by the last regular session of Congress, not the least important were several problems of legislation touching relations of government and public utilities. Even more important questions, involving basic utility policy, lurk in the background, to be considered at the special session or the regular session next year or postponed farther into the future.

CONGRESS SKIRTS THE ISSUE

Congress, several times, in the last session, skirted around the broad subject of major policy of the Federal government toward the electric utilities in private ownership. For the first time since March 4, 1933, the public-ownership group in Congress was forced to give ground. In one of these instances the issue was localized. In the other case, action was not completed. Thus, the main question still remains unanswered.

The first victory of opponents of extension of public ownership of

ambassador Kennedy's statement blaming Germany for the Athenia disaster and Ambassador Biddle's statement on German plane atrocities.

9. Sailing of Germany's big liner Bremen was deliberately delayed by federal officials in order to give the British a chance to get at it.

Every one of these measures, of course, not only indicates the unneutral direction of Administration policy but is also a factor in making for involvement in the war.

electric utilities in the last session of Congress lay in their success in limiting the power of the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue bonds for acquisition of private properties. The original T.V.A. act authorized bonds totaling \$100,000,000, emphasizing expenditure for "construction." When T.V.A. and the Commonwealth and Southern Corporation reached agreement for acquisition by the former and local agencies, of the latter's Tennessee Electric Power Company properties, it was necessary to broaden this bond-issuing authority.

In brief, the final form of the bill definitely bound T.V.A. within the territory of its present and immediately prospective operations so far as concerns purchasing, or financing the purchase of other privately-owned electric utilities.

It was in connection with Senate consideration of the Administration's lending bill that the closest approach by either branch of Congress was made in the last session to determining a government policy toward the private electric-utility industry. That bill did not become law. The House voted down a rule for consideration of the lending measure proposed by its Banking and Currency Committee, and the bill remains on the House calendar. The House bill does not contain the utilities amendment adopted by the Senate.

CURBS ON COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE CONCERNS

By a vote of 45 to 24, the Senate on July 29 adopted an amendment to the lending bill offered by Senator

(Continued on page 4)

Two Timely Books:

"The Devil Theory Of War"

By Charles A. Beard How America got into the last war and what to do to stay out now.

"Secret Armies"

By John L. Spivack An expose of Nazi secret organizations and activities in the Americas.

60c each including postage

Order Now—The Supply Is Limited

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

Everything Looks Mighty "Phoney" in Washington

By FLORENCE B. BOECKEL

Washington, D. C. WHEN Senator Borah said there was something phoney about this war he voiced the baffled feeling of practically everyone else in America. There is something phoney about the war and there is something phoney about everything growing out of it. For instance, take the Administration's foreign policy. For exactly two years now, beginning with the President's quarantine speech in Chicago, the highest officials of this government have been urgently declaring to the American people that we must "help the democracies." They have based their opposition to the neutrality law on the fact that it interferes with our helping the "democracies." Yet, when the President personally addressed Congress demanding that the neutrality law be changed not "if" but "when," he never men-

tioned the "democracies" nor our obligation to help them. There were other points in that message also about which it can be said, now you see them, now you don't. For instance, the President said with considerable feeling that the good faith of his opponents would not be questioned. Within two days, the State Department was explaining the anti-embargo repeal letters flooding Congress by saying privately to visitors that they had "intercepted cablegrams" from the Nazi and Stalin governments urging their agents and supporters in this country to get messages to Congress opposing repeal!

In his message, the President talked of a strict cash policy on all sales but by the time the Administration bill was reported to the Senate cash had been changed to 90-days credit. And so far as the Administration authors of this bill are concerned, one lot of goods could (Continued on page 4)

Workers Age

Organ of the National Council, Independent Labor League of America, 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Pub. Ass'n. Subscription Rates: \$1.50 per year; \$3.50 for six months; 5c a copy. Foreign Rates: \$2.50; Canada \$1.75 per year.

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

WILL HERBERG, Editor

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

VOL. 8. SATURDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1939. NO. 42.

ONLY A "MATTER OF TASTE"

EVERY one is entitled to express his attitude towards one or another ideology, defend it or reject it," writes the Moscow Izvestia, the mouthpiece of the Stalin dictatorship, in an editorial that is bound to go down in history as an example of infamy unparalleled. "One may respect or hate Hitlerism, just as any other system of political views. This is a matter of taste."

"This is a matter of taste. . . ." Hear and ponder this sage pronouncement, you hundreds and thousands of German communists who have gone down to death or the torture of the concentration camp for resisting fascism. At that time, Moscow encouraged and applauded you; at that time, the Hitlerites were denounced in Moscow as "fascists pogromists and cannibals". Now, it's all a "matter of taste".

Hear and ponder this sage pronouncement, you scores of thousands of Spanish anti-fascists who fought with such heroic determination and courage to save your country from the fascist yoke. At that time, you thought Moscow was supporting you, even though you may have had your doubts as to its methods. Now, you may learn that fascism or anti-fascism, it's all a "matter of taste."

Hear and ponder this sage pronouncement, you scores of thousands of Russian revolutionists, assassinated in the "purges" or groaning in the dungeons of the G.P.U., on framed-up charges of serving as "agents of fascism". Now it has all become a "matter of taste."

Hear and ponder this sage pronouncement, you American liberals and progressives who have believed, hoping against hope, that in the Stalinists you might find an ally in the struggle against the menace of fascist and fascist-like movements at home. Learn, then, that whether you "respect" or "hate" Coughlinism or the Silver Shirts, it's all a "matter of taste"!

"This is a matter of taste. . . ." Under this formula, Stalin turns his back in derision upon the rivers of blood and mountains of heroic sacrifice that the world-wide struggle against fascism has already cost, turns his back in contempt upon the devoted ranks of anti-fascist militants, and eagerly takes up the cause of his new-found friend and ally, Adolf Hitler, the "barbarian" and "cannibal" of yesterday!

THE A.L.P. RESOLUTION

IT is unfortunate, indeed, that the leadership of the American Labor Party found it necessary to combine in their resolution that has now become the instrument for "purging" the party ranks of Stalinists, two totally unrelated matters: the question of the arms embargo and the question of the Russo-German pact and its implications for America. For the two questions have really nothing to do with each other and their artificial combination in one resolution has only succeeded in making things easier for the foes of the A.L.P. and more difficult for its friends.

The Stalinists, who have now revealed themselves as bitter enemies of the A.L.P. and intent on its destruction, are enabled to divert attention from the Hitler-Stalin pact and their own nefarious intrigues by pretending that they are being persecuted for their devotion to peace by A.L.P. leaders who are "war-mongers". There is not very much to this "argument," of course, but why give them any argument at all, why make it easier for them in any way?

On the other hand, many loyal and proved friends of the A.L.P. cannot agree with the attitude of the resolution on the arms embargo, although they emphatically agree with the condemnation of the Stalin-Hitler pact and the determination to cleanse the ranks of the A.L.P. of Stalinists and their agents. Here, too, the illogical way in which the resolution combines two unrelated matters is a source of difficulty.

Our position is quite clear. We have always given loyal support to the A.L.P. We are wholeheartedly at one with it in denouncing the Russo-German alliance and in the efforts that are being made to rid the party of Stalinist influence. We are as definitely against the repeal of the arms embargo and we deplore the fact that the whole matter was injected into the resolution, instead of being made the subject of a separate statement which could then be discussed on its merits. However, it appears obvious to us that, in the resolution as it stands, the arms-embargo section is no more than a "rider," of entirely secondary importance, while the anti-Stalinist angle is of paramount significance. Therefore, where the resolution cannot be divided—and we are gratified to learn that it is being divided in a number of A.L.P. branches—we urge all members of the A.L.P. to vote in favor of it, taking the opportunity to make clear their position on the question of neutrality and the arms embargo.

The A.L.P. is faced with a hard job in restoring unity and health within its own ranks and in making an effective showing in the elections in November. Every class-conscious worker and friend of labor will rally to its support in this difficult hour.

SHALL IT BE PEACE?

(Continued from page 1)

part of the masses of the people of the European states. Despite all official propaganda, the people don't want war, neither in Germany, nor in Russia, nor in England, nor in France. Their eager hope for peace, their will to peace, is manifested everywhere. To the degree that popular will can be speedily converted into a conscious force determined upon a lasting peace on a democratic, anti-imperialistic basis, to that degree is there still hope for Europe and the world.

A good many people who are morally outraged at the behavior of Soviet Russia," writes the New Republic editorially in its October 11 issue, "are so because they have been naive enough to take communist propaganda at its face value. Because of the constant iteration from official party sources, the unwary assumed that the leaders in the Kremlin really believed in democracy, that they regarded Hitler and Nazism as the greatest menace to the world. . . . It should have been remembered all the time that if the communists joined democratic and popular fronts, it was because it served their strategic purposes, not because they cherished democratic ideals. . . . Those who held these considerations steadily in their minds had less reason to be shocked by the turn of events."

Such belated wisdom certainly comes with ill grace from the New Republic! The New Republic, which together with its partner, the Nation, never missed an opportunity to whitewash the Stalinists and revile their opponents as "Red-baiters"; the New Republic, which featured apologies for the atrocious Moscow "trials" in its columns; the New Republic, which defended and vouched for every Stalinist "innocent" organization and fake "front"; the New Republic, whose readiness to do scavenger service for the Stalinists became an open scandal in all decent liberal circles!

MOST of the anti-New Dealers, particularly from the South, are backing Roosevelt (on the arms-repeal question)—to the private, amused embarrassment of both factions. They have called each other so many names in the past that they are a little nervous at the idea of playing ball together.—Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, in their "Washington Merry-Go-Round" column, September 27, 1939.

An Appeal to Members and Followers Of the Socialist Workers Party:

Is Your Party Really a Party of Anti-War Struggle

THE paramount task facing every class-conscious worker in this country, every genuine socialist, every internationalist, at the present critical moment is to fight to keep America out of war, to rally the American people against being dragged into the imperialist slaughter raging in Europe. Involvement in war would be an incalculable disaster for the masses of the American people. It would force them to pour out their blood, to sacrifice life and limb, for a cause that is not their own. It would wipe out the gains made by the labor movement in years past; it would bring a wave of unbridled reaction that would engulf the working masses on all sides; it would speed the establishment of a military dictatorship in this country which would ride roughshod over the civil and political rights that the workers still have today. It would be a terrific blow to all our socialist hopes and aspirations, a blow that no adventurist speculations as to "revolutionary consequences" could possibly counterbalance.

In view of this heavy responsibility placed upon the shoulders of every revolutionary socialist, the big question for you to ask yourselves at this critical moment—and answer honestly—is:

Do you really believe that the Socialist Workers Party, of which you are a member or follower, is an effective instrument in the struggle against war? Do you really think that by remaining a member of and active in this party, you are contributing the best that is in you to the struggle against the imperialist war-mongers, headed by President Roosevelt and his Administration, who are working day and night to drive America into the war? Is your party really the anti-war party that it claims to be?

Just Look the Facts Frankly in the Face:

Isn't it true that, from the very beginning, your party has shown marked resistance to every practical step in the struggle against war? Only a few months ago, your leaders denounced agitation for a war-referendum amendment in the most abusive terms. Then they finally came around to it and it suddenly ceased to be "reformist," "centrist," etc. But they have not abandoned their sectarian tactics of standing aside from the growing, ever more powerful united-front anti-war mass movement embodied in the Keep America Out of War Congress; they sneer at it and ridicule it on every occasion; they take every opportunity to throw obstacles in its way. In short, they think their duty is done by staying out and scoffing instead of joining the movement and helping to strengthen, clarify and improve it. That is why, despite its revolutionary formulas, your party has been very largely ineffective as an anti-war force.

But even that is not the worst of it. Under the distant but powerful influence of Leon Trotsky your party seems to be fast maneuvering itself into an absolutely impossible position, into the position where the very fight against American involvement in war is given up as utterly hopeless. Just see what Trotsky has to say on this point in his article in the October 4 issue of the New York Times:

"By itself, this intervention [of the United States in the European war] is absolutely inevitable. . . . Some people on the American continent expect to conceal themselves behind a paper screen of isolation from purely 'European' insanity. Their hopes are in vain. It is a question of the struggle for world domination, and America will not be able to stand aside. . . . To make the Kremlin change its policy, there remains only one way but a sure one. It is necessary to give Herr Hitler such a decisive blow that Mr. Stalin will cease to fear him. In this sense, it is possible to say that the most important key to the Kremlin's policy is now in Washington."

This "theory" of the inevitability of American involvement in war is false in fact and is deadly poison to any real anti-war struggle!

It is false in fact because no great historical event which depends for its consummation on the fierce struggle of economic, social and political forces, is ever "absolutely inevitable" in the sense that nothing that we can do can change the outcome. Otherwise, conscious social action would be futile, a mere delusion. Especially is it false to say that American involvement in war is

"absolutely inevitable" at a time when the great masses of the American people are so aroused in their determination to escape another world slaughter. If a vast, nation-wide sentiment such as this cannot be organized into a collective force powerful enough to stop the war-makers, what chance is there of success on any front of the struggle against capitalism and imperialism? Whether it will actually prove possible to mobilize and organize this great force of popular determination in time to defeat the war-makers, we can tell only by trying, by throwing in every ounce of our energy into the fight against war, into building up a Keep America Out of War movement capable of driving the war-makers to cover. But Trotsky forbids us even to try; he tells us in advance that it is all useless, futile, "in vain"! American involvement in war is "absolutely inevitable" so why waste any energy in trying to prevent it?

Such fatalism, such defeatism, is deliberate self-paralysis in the name of "revolutionary theory". What would you think of a leader who, at the outset of a great strike or labor struggle, tells the workers that their defeat is "absolutely inevitable"? Wouldn't you say that, despite the best of intentions, such a leader was discouraging and demoralizing the workers, that he was really contributing to the loss of the strike? And what good would it be, after the strike was lost, for him to say: "See, I told you so; defeat was 'absolutely inevitable'!"

With such a defeatist, fatalistic attitude that American involvement in war is "absolutely inevitable," your party cannot possibly carry on a real anti-war struggle. All of its theses and resolutions, all of its revolutionary phrases, mean nothing. When it comes to action, real anti-war action, it stands paralyzed! No, the Socialist Workers Party is not the party thru which you can carry on a serious, effective struggle against war!

How, furthermore, are we to interpret Trotsky's strange remark that American intervention in the war is the "sure way" of giving Hitler a "decisive blow" and making Stalin "change his policy"? Is this not virtually agitation for speedy American entry into the war?

Add to this pseudo-revolutionary defeatism and indirect invitation to war, the confusion worse confounded that is being spread by your official spokesmen on any number of vital issues. Thus, the Socialist Appeal of October 6 attacks Norman Thomas and likens him to Earl Browder for calling upon President Roosevelt to "extend the arms embargo against belligerent powers in Europe to include Stalin's government", because mind you, such a demand means calling "upon the American imperialist government to do the job of 'stopping' Stalinism." By that kind of logic, you ought also to be against the idea of a legal arms embargo altogether because that also means calling upon the American imperialist government to "do the job". Isn't there some connection between this peculiar attitude and the astonishing statements made by so prominent a spokesman of your party as Felix Morrow at a recent public discussion to the effect that the Russian Red Army was "bringing liberation and socialism" to the Poles, that anyone who condemned the Russian invasion of Poland was an "enemy of the Soviet Union"? Why don't your party leaders have the courage to speak out clearly in your press on these questions? Are you too subject to a "party line" forced on you from the outside whether you agree with it or not?

If you really want to do your share in the fight against war and imperialism, if you want to have your efforts really count in advancing the cause of labor and socialism, we call upon you to join the Independent Labor League of America. In the I.L.L.A. you will find an organization firm in its devotion to the tested principles of militant socialism but realistic and flexible in its tactics. There you will find an organization whose words are not divorced from its acts by paralyzing dogmas that sound "revolutionary" but are really apologies for inaction and retreat. There you will find an organization that works out its own policies, independently and democratically, to meet the needs and interests of the workers and not to follow a "party line" laid down by the "leader" in Moscow or in Mexico City. If you want to be of real constructive service to the cause of international labor and to do your bit for the victory of socialism, your place is in the I.L.L.A.

JOIN THE I.L.L.A.!

Everything Looks Mighty "Phoney" in Washington

(Continued from Page 3)

whether or not payment was made, another bill of goods could be bought on another 90-days credit.

The neutrality block succeeded in modifying the bill in committee so that, as it stands, if the first credit is not met, no other can be advanced. But, as some of these gentlemen point out, a tremendous order of goods could be given within the first 90 days, no payment made and after that purchases made with the cash now available. In addition, a citizen of any foreign country can make all the purchases he wants with no limit whatever to his credit. It is pretty clear that there is something phoney about this kind of "cash" policy. It is no great wonder that Senator Johnson announces that such a "cash" policy amounts

to a repeal of the Johnson Act which prohibits new credits to our World War debtors.

And about those war debts. If you wouldn't call it phoney, what would you call it when England, for example, has built up a tremendous credit in this country but made no payments?

And, finally, if you don't call them phoney, how do you explain these inconsistencies? The Administration says that it is going to leave all the talking on the neutrality issue to the opposition and that it will bring no pressure. It promptly follows this statement with the announcement that no appointments will be sent to the present session. If that does not mean patronage pressure, there is no such thing as politics. And the "national emergency," limited or otherwise, was that phoney?

If to be phoney is to be based on nothing real, then the implication of the Administration's argument that the neutrality block has never paid any attention to trade in goods other than arms, ammunition and implements of war, and has therefore left this country exposed to the danger of having its goods and ships destroyed, is certainly phoney. The neutrality block has always stood for restrictions on all war trade and would have included a cash-and-carry on goods other than embargoed munitions in the present law except for Administration opposition, which resulted in a compromise. The compromise gave the President discretion in this matter, and therefore the neutrality block, which wanted a stronger law, limited it to two years and it has now expired. There need be no doubt in anyone's mind that if the program of the neutrality block is adopted at this session, our ships will be kept out of war zones and all war trade restricted.

Poland, the Jews and the European War

(We reprint below a very interesting article on "The Next War" by Zev Yarkoni from the October 1939 issue of Hashomer Hatzair, a Zionist youth monthly published in New York in the English and Hebrew languages. We are gratified at the opportunity of publishing this article not only because of the soundness of its views but also because of the fact that it comes from a Jewish and Zionist source and thus helps to refute the dangerous notion spreading in many parts of the country, assisted by the diatribes of near-fascist demagogues and the irresponsible outbursts of certain so-called Jewish "leaders," that the Jews in America are war mongers, trying to drive the country into the war to "get even with Hitler."—Editor.)

By ZEV YARKONI

WHAT is the nature of the war now transpiring? Are we dealing with an ideological struggle which must needs have bloodshed, a war represented on the one side by the "democracies," France and Great Britain, who promised to protect semi-fascist Poland from the onslaughts of a vicious and brutal fascist German state? Or, have we in actuality a war very similar to the one conducted in 1914-1918? This question is not of a theoretical or speculative nature but very vital. It will not only determine a socialist position in relation to it but also one for the Zionist forces.

IMPERIALIST WAR IN OLD GUISE

Let me declare here that this conflict is not an ideological one. Not only has this been proven by previous history but even by that of today. What did the past prove? It proved the discrepancies in British relations with republican Germany and then with Hitler; it was revealed by the attitude of Britain and France to republican Spain during the civil war; it gave birth to a Munich Pact.

We can further unmask the "democracies". How easy it was for Danialier to decide to smash the French workers, to change his category of politics in the Near East in respect to Turkey. How simple it was for Chamberlain to introduce the White Paper, to drive back into the open sea the wandering boats full of Jewish refugees. . . . Why should we expect more of the conservative (mildly speaking) colonial policies conducted by France and Britain? In reality, have the French and British ever desired more than to come to terms with Der Fuehrer? Is it necessary to enumerate the many attempts Britain made, diplomatically or financially, to help Hitler and Mussolini?

This bundle of facts, plus the understanding of the character and essence of the present social order, makes it very evident that today we are not dealing with an ideological struggle between democracies and fascist states. Rather we have to deal with the rivalry and competition of antagonistic camps which, at this historical moment, cannot be solved across a discussion table but on a battlefield, with the blood shed by millions of workers, peasants and middle-class citizens, with the background of destruction in lives of innocent women and children, with the waste of much wealth and goods created by man.

That Poland has become bankrupt before the eyes of the world, should be a surprise to no one. There are many causes which were deeply rooted in the Polish reality as well as in the broad composition of world events.

Poland was a semi-fascist country with neglected rich resources which the government always left undeveloped. The Polish army and police had one consuming destiny—to fight the internal enemy. This internal enemy was the socialist movement, which only demanded a democratic order. The semi-fascist junta fought against the Jews, who demanded a place in the sun. It fought against the peasants, who demanded agrar-

ian reform and aid in periods of agricultural crises. It fought against the national minorities which demanded freer conditions for the development of their culture. The Polish policy was directed towards one end—the preservation of the semi-fascist set-up in the geo-political conditions of Poland between the Reich and the Soviet, having on its own borders the various national minorities which in many large areas are actually the dominant nation.

POLISH RULERS WERE FASCIST

To achieve this end the Polish government maintained the reaction within the country and tended to veer more towards the Reich than towards Russia. Changes followed, however, in Polish policy when Stalin decided to disband the Polish Communist Party (because it was a workers party, it was still able to create a certain sentiment against the Polish rulers), and the Reich displayed a willingness to revise its eastern borders at the expense of Poland.

Meanwhile, the Polish government developed along lines similar to all fascist countries—when it became impossible for it to show important economic gains within the country itself, it prepared to acquire external gains and victories by helping Germany invade Czechoslovakia and itself occupying small strips of valuable Czech territory. Also, Poland itself helped to increase Hitler's power, just like so many others.

Poland could not fight Germany not only because of the latter's superiority in war machines but also because a struggle of a small country against a stronger opponent can be carried out only on the basis of an ideological conflict. Such a conflict cannot come as a product of propaganda and education alone but must in addition hinge on the well-meant government changes in the national and economic spheres. The Polish government, until the last moment, hesitated to introduce the necessary reforms. The western "democracies", including their labor elements (among them the communists), forgot all about this "little thing"; and today Poland has crumbled beneath the burden of the unresolved economic and national problems.

Against this point someone may raise his voice in objection and tell us: "What assurance do we have that Poland, even after altering her economic conditions and national policies, could be able to resist the Nazi onslaught?" Our answer is this: No such assurance could be given. But let us keep this in mind, that in all struggles where there is possibility of defeat, we must strive as much as possible to preserve the character of this (revolutionary) struggle and implant in it the seeds of a future victory. Even in defeat, the factors of ferment and revolt must be the residue from the chaos, for under certain historical conditions, they can furnish the basis for new and greater uprisings and conquests. In the creation of such necessary factors, there is a definite connection and relation to the aims of the previous struggle, and the latter—as was mentioned—are decided by national and economic factors.

(Concluded in the next issue)

Utility Policy Now Uncertain, FDR Veers

(Continued from Page 3)

O'Mahoney designed to restrict public-works loans for purposes which would compete with private industry. Senator O'Mahoney only a few weeks previously had fought successfully as a member of a conference committee, to obtain inclusion in a Department of the Interior bill of provisions which would permit power installations at reclamation projects where electric-power development would be a natural incident to the primary purpose.

Senator Norris opposed the amendment vigorously. Long the outstanding proponent in Congress of electric utilities, the veteran Senator said, at one point when he interrupted Senator O'Mahoney: "I do not want to take up the Senator's time. I am not questioning his motives in any way. However, in my own time, I wish to show—and I think I can—that if this amendment is adopted, so far as municipal light plants are concerned, they are out of the picture, and that for practical purposes, it would be impossible for municipalities ever to go thru the modus operandi provided in the amendment and obtain a municipal plant thru any assistance which the municipality might seek under this particular provision."

But Senator O'Mahoney insisted that the amendment was in accord with expressed views of President Roosevelt and that Congress should make plain that the government

does not intend to "crush private business."

Senator O'Mahoney said that he sympathized with the fights which Senator Norris and Senator Bone of Washington, had made against "abuses" by private utilities.

"I am in no sense defending such abuses," Senator O'Mahoney asserted. "I am here, however, to say that the constant attrition of the forces which have been supporting Administration policies in this Chamber and in the House has been the result of a growing belief in the country that the principle so clearly enunciated by the President of not competing with private enterprise is being undermined by others who do not speak his philosophy but who speak, or attempt to speak, in his name."

The amendment won, 45 to 24. Thus, this issue of the policy of the federal government toward private business, with emphasis upon the policy toward electric utilities, was raised and passed upon by the Senate, but without conclusive Congressional action because of House delay in considering the lending bill.

It seems clear, however, since no protest or denial came from White House circles of Senator O'Mahoney's interpretation of the President's views, that the official Administration position is one of increasing hostility to the doctrine of public ownership and operation of power utilities in this country.