

**Next Week:**  
**"THE NEW STALIN  
IMPERIALISM"**  
By Will Herberg

# Workers Age

Weekly Paper of the Independent Labor League of America

LABOR CAN STILL STOP WAR  
By John McNair . . . . . page 3  
THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION  
By Rosa Luxemburg . . . . . page 4

Vol. 8, No. 51.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1939.

5 CENTS

## The New Stalinist "Line" Hits the Unions

THE new Stalinist "line," following in the wake of the Russo-German pact, and the purge that invariably accompanies a new "line," have hit the trade unions in this country with a bang. In the Dressmakers Union, which the Communist Party has always regarded as a sort of guinea-pig on which to try out its new trade-union tactics, two leading C.P. members have been expelled from the party for refusing to carry the new "line" into Local 22, and five others have resigned in solidarity with them.

The notice of expulsion, published in the Daily Worker of December 13, is a significant document. It is, of course, cast in the style to which we have become accustomed thru the past decade. Ben Gerjoy and Sol Lipniak, the two expelled trade unionists, only yesterday recognized leaders of the Stalinist faction in the Dressmakers Union, now become "weaklings, cowards and opportunists, fearing for their personal well-being. . . . it is suddenly discovered that they have always been "unreliable" elements, that they "deserted the struggle" on many occasions in the past, and so on and so on to the point of nausea.

Yet, despite this routine, stereotyped vilification, the statement is noteworthy in several respects. It is the first public announcement of the purge that is under way in the Communist Party and its auxiliaries to root out and destroy—to the limited degree, fortunately, that the Stalinists have the power to destroy in this country—every one who disagrees in the slightest with the new "party line" in the unions. The declaration itself asserts that the differences of Gerjoy and Lipniak with the party were merely "tactical," but out they go anyway, heaped with foul abuse and accused of every crime under the sun.

Even more significantly, the Communist Party statement reveals the new Stalinist trade-union "line" in its full implications. Gerjoy and Lipniak are charged with "deserting the class struggle" and "taking shelter in the camp of the enemy." But who precisely is the "enemy" in this case, the "enemy" in whose "camp" they are "taking shelter"? Why, the Dressmakers Union, the entire trade-union movement! Gerjoy and Lipniak were ordered by the Stalinist bureaucrats at the top to start a fight in their union, to whip up dissension in the ranks of the workers, in accordance with the new "line." They refused. For that, they were expelled as "traitors."

"Does the new communist 'party line' mean that serving a trade union and the workers it represents is equivalent to being in the camp of the enemy?" very pertinently asks Charles S. Zimmerman, manager of Local 22, in a public statement on the expulsions. "The policy of our union," he adds, "has always been to place the interests of the workers above party politics."

But that emphatically is not the policy of the Communist Party. The Communist Party has no real interest in and owes no responsibility to the masses of workers in this country or the labor movement. Its responsibilities are entirely to the Stalinist dictatorship in the Kremlin. What the Kremlin says goes, and what the Kremlin says has come to depend more and more exclusively upon the shifting demands of Russian power-politics and upon very little else.

In accordance with the new "party line" emerging from the Stalin-Hitler alliance, the labor movement is coming to be regarded in official Stalinist tactics as the "camp of the enemy," and the "class struggle" has been made equivalent to a struggle against the unions. In short, the new "party line" is essentially a revival, in a form appropriate to the new situation, of the old union-smashing policies of 1929-1934.

For the present, the new Stalinist "line" is still in an early, formative stage. So far, the orders emanating from the Kremlin branch office on 13th Street are: "Start a fight in every union not under party control! No hesitation, no vacillation, no regard for union interests or discipline! Such a course has an inescapable logic of its own, today as it did in 1930, and that logic is the logic of dual unionism!"

## Leiserson Upholds Wagner Labor Act

### But Conflict in Board, Spying on New York Regional Office Bared in Probe

Washington, D. C. The special House committee investigating the National Labor Relations Board opened its hearings last week with a series of startling revelations of frictions, conflict and spying within the Board and its regional machinery, as well as of "irregularities" in administration. At the same time, the Wagner Act itself was stoutly upheld by the witnesses as a necessary and beneficial piece of legislation, not requiring any drastic changes.

Many of the conflicts, it appeared, turned around the repeated demands of William M. Leiserson, newest member of the three-man Board, for the discharge of the Board's secretary, Nathan Witt, and other "amateur detectives" in the secretary's office. Mr. Leiserson charged that Witt was not qualified for his position, was interfering in matters to which his authority did not extend, and was engaging in procedural irregularities that "smelled." The two other Board members, however, J. Warren Madden, chairman, and Edwin S. Smith, blocked Mr. Leiserson's formal motion to oust Mr. Witt.

Witt is well and unfavorably known in Washington, and his political connections are regarded with great suspicion. An example of his methods, which incidentally also cropped up during the first day's hearings, is the way he handled some remarks made to him over the telephone by David Dubinsky, president of the I.L.G.W.U. Mr. Dubinsky, according to his own account given to the press, complained to Witt of a certain sudden change in procedure by the Board, pointing out that his union had already spent large sums for legal fees and other expenses under the old procedure. He then asked Witt: "Is this what we had to spend money for?" Witt reported this remark in a memorandum to Chairman Madden in a thoroughly distorted and misleading form, creating the impression that the I.L.G.W.U. was paying money for favorable decisions! Insiders say that this is but one example of Mr. Witt's peculiar ethics.

A further source of conflict in the Board was the refusal of Mr. Leiserson to participate in a number of

pending cases because they were in advanced stages when he took office and because he considered them to have been mishandled before his appointment to the Board. Edwin S. Smith even suggested court action to force Mr. Leiserson to participate, but this suggestion was quashed. Another proposal was to pass a record motion of condemnation of Mr. Leiserson, but this also was not carried out.

Another aspect of the unhealthy situation in the Board and its agencies was revealed in a telegram, dated February 21, 1939, to Chairman Madden from Elinore M. Herick, New York regional director, in which she protested bitterly against "indecent, destructive and un-American" methods of the Board in a secret investigation of her office and charged that the procedure of the two agents from Mr. Witt's office assigned to the inquiry was what "one might expect from the OGPU but not from fellow administrators or an agency of the American government." Again it was Witt who was the center of the trouble.

Mr. Leiserson's difficulties with the other Board members and with the secretary of the Board did not prevent him, however, from making a powerful and well-reasoned statement in defense of the Wagner Act and the general operations of the N.L.R.B. In a memorandum submitted to the House committee, he stressed that any drastic amendment of the act "would involve turning back the pages of our history, re-tracing the progressive steps we have taken, and going back to the days when labor law was class legislation in favor of the employers only." Dr. Leiserson gave it as his opinion that most of the difficulties experienced by the Board revolve around the question of appropriate bargaining unit. He attributed the bitterness of the difficulties to the bitterness of feeling that has come since the split between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O.

Further hearings last week were taken up with charges by Joe Ozanic, president of the A. F. of L.'s Progressive Miners of America, that it was the "bias" of the N.L.R.B. that helped the C.I.O.'s United Mine Workers get control of the mine fields in certain parts of the country.

Further, he is it not strange that Mr. Chamberlain denounces the wrongdoings of Hitler but remains silent about Mussolini's "brute force,"

the colored races for centuries, is the long standing conflict between bandit nations for colonies as markets, sources of raw material and cheap labor, spheres for the investment of finance capital, and naval, military and air bases. It is for the possession of these things that the war is being fought.

Further, he is it not strange that Mr. Chamberlain denounces the wrongdoings of Hitler but remains silent about Mussolini's "brute force,"

## Arnold Opposes Anti-Profiteer Legislation

Washington, D. C. Vigorous opposition to any attempted control of prices thru "anti-profiteering" legislation was voiced last week by Assistant Attorney-General Thurman Arnold, chief of the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Arnold expressed this opinion at a hearing of the Monopoly Committee. Such legislation, he said, was of doubtful constitutionality. In that view, the Assistant Attorney-General found himself in general agreement with the day's principal witness, Donald M. Nelson, vice-president of Sears, Roebuck and Co.

This is the same Assistant Attorney-General Arnold who some weeks ago proclaimed it his intention to use the anti-trust laws against trade unions in order to suppress practices that he regards as "improper." When it comes to rising prices and profiteering, of course, it is different!

## Russia is Ousted by League; Finns Hold Off Invading Army

### Conquest of Finland Likely to Prove Costly and Draw-Out Process; Russo-Japanese Partition of China Rumored

Soviet Russia was unanimously expelled from the League of Nations last week, thus putting an official end to its brief venture at diplomatic collaboration with the Anglo-French "democratic" front that began in 1934 when Moscow first gained admittance to the League. Convened suddenly after a long period of dormancy to act on the Finnish invasion, the League called upon Russia to cease hostilities and negotiate with Finland. The Moscow Foreign Office curtly declined, reiterating the official fiction that it was not at war with that country but was simply aiding the "recognized" government of Finland, the puppet regime at Terijoki. Thereupon a League committee condemned Russia as an aggressor and called upon members and non-members to give all possible aid to the Finns. The next day the League Council and Assembly ratified this action and decided further that Russia was "no longer a member of the League." The vote was unanimous, with Greece, Mexico, Yugoslavia, China and Russia's immediate neighbors abstaining on the expulsion. The initiative in the condemnation and expulsion proceedings against Moscow was taken by the

Latin American states, acting under inspiration from Washington. In Russia, the action of the League was greeted with ridicule and denunciation in the controlled press and over the controlled radio. The old phrases branding the League as the tool of Anglo-French imperialism, shelved during the few years of "democratic" foreign policy, were dusted off and pressed into service again.

In Finland, the invading armies, even according to Moscow communiques, were making very little progress. At the end of third week, the Russian forces had not penetrated very far, held but little Finnish territory, and were constantly harried by Finnish counter-attacks. Informed observers stressed that the Russian conquest of Finland, while ultimately probable because of the immense superiority of the invader in numbers, materials, equipment and resources, would be a costly and long-drawn-out process.

The invasion of Finland shared the attention of the world last week with an exciting running battle off the coast of Uruguay between the German pocket battleship Admiral Graf Spee and three British cruisers. Considerably injured, the Graf Spee put in at Montevideo for repairs. The Uruguayan government ordered the battleship either to leave within a few hours and confront the British cruisers on a death watch, or else be interned for the duration of the war. Under orders from Berlin, the Graf Spee was blown and destroyed by her own crew.

The sea duel off Uruguay bid fair to become an important diplomatic "incident" in that it took place within the so-called "safety zone" fixed by the United States at a recent Pan-American conference. Secretary Hull indicated in Washington that the various American nations might consult on the question. All belligerent activities were supposed to be barred from the "safety zone."

Another chapter in the sea warfare between Britain and Germany was written by the liner Bremen. Having once eluded the British navy to sail to Murmansk, she again gave the British the slip last week and steamed into her home port in Germany.

There was still very little doing on the western front last week, the fifteenth week of the war. (Continued on Page 2)

the other things that desperate animals do. More ambassadors, clerks, bell-boys and labor leaders will be demanned another term for the President. The country is up in arms for it, we will be told. He will then be nominated, whether it is June or September. I am getting out on a limb, making this definite prediction, with the fullest recognition that the whole world is raving mad and cockeyed and anything may happen. But, there is overwhelming evidence here that the drift is all in this direction. My job is to reveal this drift to you.

## Out of His Own Mouth...

WARNING sounded by President Roosevelt at the Pan-American Conference at Buenos Aires in 1936:

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

Expenditures for the U. S. army and navy during the years of the New Deal:

	Army	Navy	Total
1933	\$ 318,331,000	\$ 349,562,000	\$ 667,893,000
1934	205,306,000	274,388,000	479,694,000
1935	212,187,000	321,411,000	533,598,000
1936	373,015,000	391,422,000	764,437,000
1937	359,028,000	497,084,000	856,112,000
1938	431,564,000	596,278,000	1,027,842,000
1939	489,607,000	672,968,000	1,162,575,000
1940	1,000,000,000	760,000,000	1,760,000,000
1941	1,700,000,000	1,300,000,000	3,000,000,000

By his own words, President Roosevelt stands condemned!

## Arnold Attack on Labor Hit by Left New Dealers

### Frank Howard's Weekly Washington Letter

By FRANK HOWARD

Washington, D. C. MANY left New Dealers are criticizing Thurman Arnold's drive to apply the anti-trust laws to the labor movement. It is reported Mordcaik Ezekiel and Jerome Frank have spoken sharply against

Some are quoting the letter to the New York Times of November 26 signed by Henry Epstein, Solicitor General of the State of New York. Mr. Epstein declared: "One must read and reread Mr. Arnold's letter several times before its terrific impact on the development of a bill of rights for American trade unions can be fully appreciated. Sugar-coat it how you may, it remains a throwback to the Danbury Hatters and other similar cases."

The A. F. of L. has made clear its position on Arnold's activities in no uncertain terms but the C.I.O. tends to encourage him because of the desire to set up a dual union in the building-trades field. Denny Lewis's staff has been strengthened and newspaper men conferring with him find that he has difficulty in disguising his glee at the way Arnold is causing A. F. of L. fur to fly. In the short run, this may be called clever; a better name for it would be irresponsible and highly dangerous opportunism. The C.I.O. may yet regret encouraging this anti-labor tendency in government.

The development has profound significance for the effort to unite the labor movement. Instead of removing obstacles to unity, the C.I.O. leadership seems determined to locate new ones. Already, the A. F. of L. is planning a major campaign against this New Deal-C.I.O. collaboration which they charge is directed by Lee Pressman, with his wide personal contacts among government officials.

AN ATTEMPT TO FRAME DUBINSKY?

Over the coffee cups at the National Press Club, it is rumored that Nat Witt of the Labor Board

may have tried to "frame" David Dubinsky with malice aforethought, when he reported that the I.L.G.W.U. president opposed Leiserson's appointment. The way the anti-labor editors have quoted Dubinsky's purported statement about campaign funds—with severe condemnation—adds considerable weight to this rumor.

It is too early to declare that the hearings of the Smith Committee will be consciously directed against the labor movement but this fear is widespread among all progressives in Washington. Toland's (legal adviser of the committee) connections have been exclusively with the employers in the past. The unfortunate aspect of this investigation is that the records of the N.L.R.B. provide such a wealth of material in which an anti-labor committee can fish and find red herrings.

WILL F. D. R. RUN AGAIN?

I have been asked if I still am convinced that F.D.R. will be the Democratic nominee. I made this prediction last Spring. My answer is that he will be according to all indications here. For a time, there seemed some tendency for the New Dealers—even the left New Dealers—to play up to McNutt. They did this with the greatest reluctance, because they understood the Great White Father had so willed it and planned it. Ickes's blast at McNutt was engineered by Corcoran and was the signal for some of the nearest sniping at and undercutting of the boom of P. V. McN. That has been seen for many days. Again, I say, F.D.R. is ready and anxious to run; the New Dealers are for a third term—to a man. The deciding factor will be the answer to the question: Can we win with F.D.R.? According to present plans, the announcement from the New Deal on the third term question will not be made on Jackson Day. It will be held off until Republicans and other Democratic candidates will be camping at the bit, tearing their trousers and doing all

## The Negro Faces the War

By GEORGE PADMORE

(George Padmore is head of the International African Service Bureau, an organization of colonial groups, closely associated with the International Workers Front Against War—Editor)

THE second World War has begun. Already Africans, Indians, West Indians, and other colored races are being appealed to, and in the French colonies conscripted, as cannon fodder for the bloody holocaust which threatens to drown the world in blood and bring misery, ruin and devastation on a scale before undreamed of.

The maharajahs, sultans, emirs, sheiks, paramount chiefs and other native potentates are vying with one another in offering up the lives of their peoples as human sacrifice to Mars. However, we need not be deceived by these manifestations of "loyalty." These minions are merely doing what they have been ordered to do by their white masters. They are stooges of imperialism.

WHAT IS THE WAR ABOUT?

But what is this war about? This question is on the lips of every colonial encounter in London today. While most Negroes, like the common people of England, are bewildered over the issues involved, about one thing they seem clear. And that is that the war, notwithstanding the professions of statesmen, is certainly not one for democracy.

When we consider the autocratic manner in which colonies are administered, be they under so-called "democratic" or totalitarian regimes, it should cause no surprise that the colonial peoples have not been consulted as to whether they want to

fight or not. All that they have been told is that this war is the noblest that has ever been embarked upon, for it is to save Poland, a fascist state, from the big, bad fascist wolf, Adolf Hitler. But this is sheer humbug.

The British and French imperialists are no more concerned about the Poles than they were about the Czechs. What they are concerned about is the preservation of their colonial empires and the monopoly of cheap colored labor. They most certainly have not gone to war to defend democracy, which they themselves deny to hundreds of millions of colored peoples in Africa, India, the West Indies, Indo-China, Morocco, Tunis, Algeria, and other territories too numerous to mention. Nor are they at war to uphold international law and order, or even to rid the world of those "evil things"—brute force, bad faith, injustice and persecution," which Mr. Chamberlain, in his speech of self-righteous indignation denounced over the radio as war was declared.

What Britain in particular is worried about is the menace which German imperialism represents to her commercial interests. The politicians at Downing Street, who represent the Federation of British Industries and the financiers of the city—the real rulers of the Empire—are afraid that if Hitler is not checked now, he might, after consolidating his position on the continent, demand the return of the former German colonies, and call for a redivision of the colonial territories, which can be achieved only at the expense of Britain and France. This, then, is the essence of the quarrel between Nazi Germany and the so-called "democracies."

Behind all the shibboleths of "brute force and oppression," which the British and other imperialist powers have been practicing upon

the colored races for centuries, is the long standing conflict between bandit nations for colonies as markets, sources of raw material and cheap labor, spheres for the investment of finance capital, and naval, military and air bases. It is for the possession of these things that the war is being fought.

POLAND THE PAWN

Poland in 1939 is merely being used as a pawn in the game of power-politics, in just the same way Belgium was used in 1914. The cry of "poor little Poland" is being exploited by the financiers and warmongers to win the sympathy of the common peoples of all lands. While the Polish workers and peasants are entitled to our sympathy in their tragic hour of national disaster, we can have nothing but contempt for the gang of feudal landlords and the corrupt generals who lost no time in bolting into safety, leaving the tolling masses to the mercy of Hitler and Stalin.

But let us take the words of the British Prime Minister at their face value. Is it not strange that he should be so passionately concerned about Poland (whose Foreign Minister, Colonel Beck, was one of those who helped tie the noose around the neck of Haile Selassie at Geneva) while at the same time he condones the rape of Ethiopia? Let us not forget that it was Mr. Chamberlain who declared that sanctions were a midsummer night's dream and who recognized the Italian "conquest" of Abyssinia by his "gentleman's agreement" with Mussolini. Mr. Chamberlain might forget these little "indiscretions" but Africans have long memories.

Furthermore, is it not strange that Mr. Chamberlain denounces the wrongdoings of Hitler but remains silent about Mussolini's "brute force,"

bad faith, injustice and oppression" toward Abyssinians and Albanians? Surely justice, like freedom, is indivisible. If Britain wants to win the respect of her subject peoples then her statements must be consistent in their advocacy of justice and fair play, even at the risk of offending Mussolini. This kind of duplicity only serves to emphasize the moral bankruptcy of those who talk about riding the world of "evil things." We, too, want to rid the world of evil things, but this will never be until we have got rid of the system of imperialism, the most evil thing of all.

DEMOCRACY FOR COLONIALS?

Today, as twenty-five years ago, we are hearing a lot about democracy. Poor democracy! What crimes are committed in her name.

What do black folks know about democracy? There is as much democracy for Negroes in Mississippi as in Africa, especially in such places as Kenya, the Congo, Rhodesia and South Africa. The natives have as much liberty and freedom in their own countries as the Jews enjoy in Hitler's Germany. Nevertheless, there are some white folk who have the impudence to ask Africans to forget all about their misery and their sufferings and to line up with their slave masters as they did in 1914-18. Then it was "defense of democracy against the Kaiser and Prussian militarism." Now it is "defense of democracy against Hitler and Prussian Nazism." Only the villain has changed!

Sometimes, one despairs of the stupidity of the common people. When will they learn? But if the future is to be judged from the past, those Negroes who allow themselves to be taken in by the kind of demagoguery which is being peddled around

Thursday Night  
DECEMBER 22, 1939  
8:15 P. M.

◀ "RUSSIA AND THE WORLD CRISIS" ▶  
Speakers: Will Herberg — Minnie Lurye

Manhattan Center  
34th Street & 8th Ave.  
25 Cents

# The "Line" Marches On— Now It's the Amalgamated

THE "line" marches on! When Stalin made his pact with Hitler and thus put a brutal end to the fraud of Popular Frontism, we forecast that sooner or later—and sooner rather than later—the Stalinists in this country would throw overboard their false front of "good behavior" in the unions and start out on the war-path in good earnest, hearking back to the "good old days" of 1929-1934. Our readers are aware that this is already happening in various locals of the I.L.G.W.U. But not there alone; the "line" is definitely spreading.

In the Daily Worker of December 11, there is an editorial that should make the initiated reader stop, look and listen. This editorial, headed "A Disservice to the Labor Movement", is actually a criticism of the Hillman administration of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Now, on the face of it and in any other paper, that might not be a world-shaking event, for, Heaven knows, there is enough to criticize in the Amalgamated. But in the Daily Worker, where not the least breath of critical comment against the Amalgamated or Sidney Hillman has been permitted to find its way in the past four years, it is indeed an event of historical significance; it marks the end of one era and the beginning of another in the history of the "line".

The Daily Worker editorial may prove interesting from another angle as well. For some months, there have been growing rumors of a rift between John L. Lewis and Sidney Hillman, largely on the question of labor unity. Indeed, there has even been talk that Lewis is prepared to "write off" Hillman and the Amalgamated as once, under somewhat similar circumstances, he "wrote off" Dubinsky and the I.L.G.W.U. Can the Daily Worker editorial be interpreted as the shadow of coming events? We're just asking!

# Stalinites Cleaned Out In the S.U.P.

By J. S.  
THE nominations for officials for the year 1940 in the Sailors Union of the Pacific are in. With the exception of a few very minor positions, the Stalinists are conspicuously by their absence. For secretary-treasurer, Lundeborg is running unopposed; Harry Prevost is running unopposed for assistant-secretary. Here is one union the Stalinists seem to steer clear of. With all their denunciations during the year, when the time comes for election, they cannot even muster a nomination. Three years ago, Lundeborg beat his Stalinist opponent by something like five to one. The same ratio was the rule thru the branches for the minor positions at that time. Since then, they haven't tried again. All of which is a good thing for the union.



For a HAPPY NEW YEAR (See Ad on page 2)

# A Dangerous Court Decision Imperilling the Wagner Act

ONE aspect of last week's two-to-one decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the National Casket Co. case strikes us as full of dangerous implications. We are not here referring to the question, which was the main issue of the case, of whether the Wagner Act protects employees discharged before the enactment of the act; this issue may be of legal interest but practically it is not likely to prove of first-rate importance. We refer to that section of the majority opinion, read by Judge Swan, which, in the apt words of the New York Herald-Tribune of December 12, "strongly reaffirmed the right of an employer to select employees of his own liking, even if in so doing he discriminates against workers enrolled in unions."

This opinion does not, as some over-enthusiastic employing-class interpreters have been ready to declare, "outlaw" the union shop or the closed shop. If a union succeeds in bringing an employer around to signing a closed-shop agreement, this agreement has the same validity and legal standing it has always had. But Judge Swan's majority opinion does declare that it is not an unfair labor practice under the Wagner Act for an employer to refuse employment to a worker simply and solely because the latter is a member of a trade union. "The act," says Judge Swan very sagely, "confers rights on employees and not upon applicants for employment."

But is it not obvious that discrimination in hiring based simply and solely on union affiliation is in fact a direct form of coercion on workers already employed, discouraging them from becoming members of unions or remaining so if they have already joined? If the employer is free openly to discriminate against union members simply and solely because they are union members, no employee who ever expects to have to apply for a job at the same or another plant, will feel safe in joining a union or being prominent in its activities. If the employer has such powers, how long will it be before, by careful selection of new applicants, he fills his plant with non-union members and thus escapes union control and collective-bargaining responsibility altogether? And these are only some of the more obvious aspects of the decision.

In addition, Judge Swan's opinion is directly contrary to the plain meaning of the Wagner Act, Section 8(3), which defines as an "unfair labor practice" the following: "Discrimination in regard to HIRE or tenure of employment . . . to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization."

It is to be hoped that the Supreme Court will ultimately overturn this opinion. If it does not, the effectiveness of the Wagner Act will be seriously undermined.

# Labor and the Law

by Joseph Elwood

## BEHIND THE APEX DECISION

THE latest decision of the U. S. Court of Appeals, Third Circuit, holding that a union does not violate the anti-trust laws by an extended sit-down strike, constitutes a substantial victory for the organized labor movement. We refer, of course, to the Apex Hosiery Co. case. The successive steps by which the dispute led to this interpretation of the anti-trust statutes are as follows:

In May 1937, the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, after unsuccessful attempts to negotiate a closed-shop contract with the Apex Hosiery Co., began a 47 day sit-down strike to compel the company to accede to its demand. The company applied for an injunction on the grounds that the strike constituted a conspiracy in restraint of trade within the meaning of the anti-trust law. The federal district court at Philadelphia dismissed the petition, but on appeal the circuit court held that the injunction might issue.

The union then appealed to the U. S. Supreme Court, which dissolved the injunction as moot, since the strike was over by that time, but made no ruling on the anti-trust question involved in that case. Meanwhile, the union and the company signed a collective-bargaining agreement.

Subsequently, the company started a civil action for triple damages under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. Last April, a jury in the federal district court awarded a total of \$712,000 in damages to the employer. The C.I.O. immediately appealed from this verdict, arguing that labor was exempt from such prosecution under the anti-trust laws, and cited the legislative history of those statutes as proof that they were not intended by their framers to apply to labor organizations.

And now comes the opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals, composed of three Roosevelt appointees. In determining whether a labor union is liable under the anti-trust laws for acts committed by it, the test, according to the court, "is not whether unlawful acts were committed . . . but whether a combination or conspiracy was formed . . . with the intent to restrain commerce." In addition, according to the court, interstate commerce was not restrained to an "unreasonable degree" by the union's "action local in motive and

local in effect"—that is, its effort to unionize the company's plant.

A distinction was quite properly drawn by the court between the exercise by Congress of its commerce power in enacting the anti-trust statutes and Congress's exercise of the same power in enacting the Wagner Act. "Commerce," says the court, has a broad meaning under the Wagner Act but a narrow meaning under the anti-trust laws. In explanation of that difference, the court points to the wording of the laws. The word "affect," in regard to interstate commerce, in the Wagner Act has a broader meaning from that of "restraint" in the Sherman Act.

When this case comes to the Supreme Court, as is expected, that court will have to determine as to whether "commerce" has the same meaning in both the Wagner Act and the Sherman Act, or whether it has a particular and different meaning in each law.

Should the Supreme Court decide to uphold the Circuit Court in the latter's interpretation of the word "commerce," a reactionary demand will most probably arise in Congress and in the employing-class press for an equalizing of the two statutes either thru the narrowing of the Wagner Act or thru the expansion of the Sherman anti-trust Act.

It should also be remembered that the above court opinion specifically rejected the contention that organized labor is totally exempt from the anti-trust laws. All the court did was to limit the extent to which the anti-trust laws apply. The basic danger to labor's rights inherent in the present anti-trust laws remains unaffected. In order to overcome that danger, labor will have to unite and fight hard.

# Government Drive Against Labor Branded Reactionary

N. Y. State Solicitor General Criticizes Thurman Arnold

By HENRY EPSTEIN

(Henry Epstein is Solicitor-General of the State of New York. His sharp criticism of Assistant Attorney-General Arnold's attempt to use the anti-trust laws against labor organizations appeared in the correspondence columns of the New York Times of November 26, 1939—Editor)

demands "This is the function of the Legislatures which, while limiting individual group rights to aggression and defense, may substitute processes of justice for the more primitive method of trial by combat."

Congress had in Sections 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act (as we had hoped they would now be construed) freed labor unions from the effective application of the anti-monopoly statutes, which never were intended to strike at them. It is well known that the calamity of the collection of the judgment in the Danbury Hatters case by sale on execution of working men's homes found answer in this promise (the amendments in the Clayton Act) of no possible recurrence. Analysis of some of Mr. Arnold's "restraints" may well cause doubt as to the fulfillment of that promise. We may disregard his specific examples, because others may choose other examples and apply his principles. It is the principle that matters, not Mr. Arnold's example.

The most flagrant instance is the record of "types of unreasonable restraint" chosen by the Assistant Attorney-General:

"2. Unreasonable restraints designed to compel the hiring of useless and unnecessary labor."  
Who is to determine the uselessness or lack of necessity? The employer, the workers, the courts, or perhaps Mr. Arnold or his successor prosecutor? The teamster example is one. Is not that a struggle between labor and capital to supply greater spread of employment, which, barring "violence, deceit or misrepresentation," the courts must leave to the field of economic conflict?

But let us take a more striking possibility: Suppose the employees of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company had been well organized in the period of 1929-35, when about 185,000 workers were dismissed by that corporation. In those years, despite a five-million increase in shares, despite maintenance of the famous \$9 dividends, of \$52,000,000 increased dividend payments, 185,000 workers were discharged. Efficiency, mechanical improvements, etc., all contributed.

By Mr. Arnold's test, a strike to compel the retention of some of these "unnecessary" or "useless" workers, even at the expense of shorter hours for all, or at the expense of less dividends, would constitute, or might constitute, a violation of law. Is this the province of the courts under the law today?

Take the first of Mr. Arnold's types: "1. Unreasonable restraints designed to prevent the use of cheaper material, improved equipment, or more efficient methods."  
Mr. Arnold's example is "factory-painted kitchen cabinets." Is it the purpose of the law or the courts to determine from what method best results will accrue to society? Is this not the very field of economic combat into which, with the absence of violence, deceit or misrepresentation, the courts should not tread without

legislative or constitutional mandate?

Take, in the instance of the A. T. & T. Company herein cited, the relative social deficit in the destitution of 185,000 families as against the social value of improved gadgets and the cash dividends to a few. Is this the province of the Attorney-General or the court to decide? Rather is this not the economic battle into which we trust our government will not rush, without developing an institution of industrial evolution?

So, too, we could go on with regard to Mr. Arnold's Type 5 (jurisdictional strikes), where he implicitly threatens both A. F. of L. and C.I.O. for invasion of one another's chosen fields. Types 3 ("graft and corruption") and 4 (price-fixing) are adequately met by the criminal statutes dealing with extortion and criminal conspiracy. It would seem—with capital exulting at the wedge being driven deeper and deeper between labor's two great units, with the Wagner Act and its Labor Relations Board assailed before their true worth can be appraised, with war hysteria and witch-hunts again on the threshold—that the government has now assailed the organized trade-union movement on both flanks.

The warning to labor should not be lost. It is earnestly hoped that Mr. Arnold's blast does not represent Administration policy. It is the very negation of the Roosevelt New Deal and its great contributions to the forward progress of the American trade-union movement.

One final word. This warning of Mr. Arnold's gives evidence of some careful planning. Scarcely hidden, however, is its actual threat to labor unions and their only effective weapons. The danger lies in the fact that labor cannot know when its acts say nothing of civil damage suits.

The warning is equally applicable to A. F. of L. and C.I.O. Here is an issue on which they can unite, to combine forces and prevent the nullification of labor's gains thru distortion and misapplication of anti-trust laws. They have not long to wait.

## LEGION OF DEATH



—from Justice

# Business Lobby Prepares Against Wage-Hour Act

Manufacturers Drive for Amendments

Washington, D. C.

WHEN the last regular session of Congress adjourned in July, a four-month drive on the part of certain powerful business interests to break down the Fair Labor Standards Act by amendment wound up with only a minor change in the law, an exemption for telephone operators in small exchanges. All other amendments, some endorsed by the Wage and Hour Administration as allegedly necessary to ef-

ficient enforcement, were laid over until 1940.

Now that the new session of Congress is approaching, the business interests hostile to the main aims and purposes of the act are beginning in an effort to exert the maximum pressure on Congress as soon as it opens. The National Association of Manufacturers, thru its Employment Relations Committee, has just prepared for submission to Congress a list of nine "outstanding objections" which have become evident during the first year of practical operation under the law. It is important for the labor movement to become thoroughly acquainted with the objectives of this drive of the employers to break down existing wage-hour legislation. Here are some of the outstanding "objections" listed by the N.A.M.

"Narrow definition of exempted classes." This indicates an effort to multiply exemptions to such an extent as to make the whole law virtually meaningless.

"Prohibition of the averaging of working hours from week to week." It is obvious that were working hours thus averaged, the maximum work-week provision would be deprived of all effect in many industries for excessively long hours in the busy season would be "averaged up" by part-time work in the slow season.

"Restriction of educational opportunities made available by employers for the training and advancement of employees." Behind this fine phrase lies the ugly practice of many employers, named by the Wages and Hours Administration, of forcing their employees to work below scale or extra hours as "education" or "training."

"Interference with the training of skilled employees by limiting exemptions for learners and apprentices." Here, too, what is meant is that the law as administered prevents employers from classifying ordinary workers as learners or apprentices and thus paying them below scale. Cases have been reported where factory operatives who had been on the job for over a decade were suddenly rebaptized as "learners" in order to keep their wages below the prescribed minimum.

The other "objections" are of the same type, even more flimsy. This is the platform on which the organized business interests of the country are going to make their assault on the wage-hour law when Congress opens.

The labor movement must protect the law against these attacks of reaction. That does not mean that either the law or its enforcement are by any means thoroughly satisfactory to labor, but the present attack of the employing class is against the very principle of wage-hour legislation and this principle labor must defend with every resource at its command.

As to labor's views on how the wage-hour act may be strengthened and its administration improved, this we will deal with in another article.

## In the Next Issue:

Beginning a series of articles

# "The New Stalin Imperialism"

By Will Herberg

The nature of the new Stalinist policy of aggression and conquest. The Soviet state in the light of the new imperialism. The question of the "defense of the Soviet Union." What should the Finnish masses do in this crisis? The attitude of international socialism. The New Stalin imperialism and Stalinism outside of Russia.

# N. Y. C.I.O. Convention Shows Deep Inner Crisis

Only Drastic Steps Can Avert Disaster

By DONALD

(Concluded from Last Issue)

AT least 75% of the convention delegates were Stalinist-controlled. The only non-Stalinist representation there was as follows: (1) Amalgamated Clothing Workers (not counting the Cleaners and Dyers); (2) the Playthings and Novelty Union; (3) the S.W.O.C., which is very small in this state; (4) the majority of the Textile delegation; (5) a minority of the United Retail and Wholesale Workers International. Otherwise, all the other delegations were Stalinist: Transport, Shoe, Maritime, United Radio and Electrical, Office & Professional Workers, State County and Municipal Employees, Federation of Architects and Technicians, etc. This proportion could be easily judged,

usually meaningless.

"Prohibition of the averaging of working hours from week to week." It is obvious that were working hours thus averaged, the maximum work-week provision would be deprived of all effect in many industries for excessively long hours in the busy season would be "averaged up" by part-time work in the slow season.

"Restriction of educational opportunities made available by employers for the training and advancement of employees." Behind this fine phrase lies the ugly practice of many employers, named by the Wages and Hours Administration, of forcing their employees to work below scale or extra hours as "education" or "training."

"Interference with the training of skilled employees by limiting exemptions for learners and apprentices." Here, too, what is meant is that the law as administered prevents employers from classifying ordinary workers as learners or apprentices and thus paying them below scale. Cases have been reported where factory operatives who had been on the job for over a decade were suddenly rebaptized as "learners" in order to keep their wages below the prescribed minimum.

The other "objections" are of the same type, even more flimsy. This is the platform on which the organized business interests of the country are going to make their assault on the wage-hour law when Congress opens.

The labor movement must protect the law against these attacks of reaction. That does not mean that either the law or its enforcement are by any means thoroughly satisfactory to labor, but the present attack of the employing class is against the very principle of wage-hour legislation and this principle labor must defend with every resource at its command.

As to labor's views on how the wage-hour act may be strengthened and its administration improved, this we will deal with in another article.

by the way they rose for Stalinist speakers or for Amalgamated speakers, but not by any actual vote on the floor, since everything was "unanimous."

In the selection of officers and Executive Committee, the fight between Hillman and the Stalinists was again revealed in committee. The Stalinists wanted Hogan of the Transport Workers Union as secretary-treasurer of the New York State Industrial Union Council. Hillman was called in from his home to stem the tide. Quill pounded on the table and shouted: "We have a majority in this convention." (Which was perfectly true.) Quill threatened to put Hogan over in spite of the nominations committee. Hillman then threatened that if Hogan were put over, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers would withdraw. In other words, only by a threat of split was Hogan withdrawn.

August Stroebel, of the A.C.W., was elected president to succeed Haywood. The nominations committee was hard put to find a non-Stalinist candidate from any important union outside of the A.C.W. for the post of secretary-treasurer. They finally hit upon Hugh Thompson of the U.A.W.A. in Buffalo, who was elected with the following back-stage arrangement: Thompson is to remain in Buffalo and the A.C.W. is to provide one of its staff to do the actual work of the secretary-treasurer of the Board is about 50-50 Stalinist and non-Stalinist, with a slight edge for the A.C.W.

The convention voted without a murmur an increase in the per-capita tax from a half cent to one cent per member monthly.

## BANQUET TO HAYWOOD

After the conclusion of the convention, a testimonial dinner to Allan Haywood was held. Emil Rieve of the Textile Workers Union was chairman. The majority of the banquetters were again Stalinists. A huge uproar from the floor demanded that Quill be called to speak to he was not at the speakers table. Rieve gave Quill the floor. Quill then delivered a tirade against the "main enemies" of today: (1) the Dies Committee, (2) Dubinsky, Dubinsky was thoroughly booted, even more energetically than the Dies Committee. Quill then lauded that "great labor statesman," Sidney Hillman.

Thomas J. Kennedy of the United Mine Workers spoke and attacked the "plotters against the C.I.O.," including Mayor LaGuardia, presumably because of the latter's speeches for labor unity.

Dalrymple, president of the Rubber Workers, spoke and said that unity would come after "seven or eight funerals" had taken place in Washington. He apparently meant that the hope of unity lay in either the death or execution ("purging")

(Continued on Page 3)

# Labor Can Still Stop War Before It Is Too Late

Workers Unity Only Spark of Sanity in Mad World

By JOHN McNAIR

(John McNair is general secretary of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain—Editor)

London, England.  
WE are now entering the ninth week of the war and we are told that the black-out has caused more casualties in Britain than the war itself.

There appears to be some occult and vital force which is holding the nations back from the abyss, and the sands are running out, it may still be possible to set into motion the forces of sanity which will prevent the wreckage of civilization.

Let us make no mistake about it. If the war really breaks out in western Europe, it will be inconceivable in its horror.

It has been estimated that the war of 1914-1918, and the epidemics which followed it, caused the death of 25,000,000 human beings, mostly young men. It left in its train an atmosphere of violence and brutality which has poisoned all the relations between men ever since.

Let us grimly realize that the laws of the jungle, inherent in capitalism and imperialism, will come to the surface and stalk unchallenged over the earth. Our towns and cities will become smoking ruins. The homes of the people, already disturbed and uprooted, will be smashed. The wives and children, whom the men have gone out to defend, will be the innocent victims of universal slaughter. And this not only in Britain, but in all warring countries.

## AND ANOTHER WAR AFTER THAT!

The only real and adequate defense which will be urged by our militarists will be to wreak vengeance on the enemy. As the spectacle of universal war can make individual loss more bearable!

Then, as the months pass, one country after another will become embroiled, precisely as in the last war. The tide of hatred and fear will rise to ungovernable proportions, and at the end, no problems will have been solved. The victors, whoever they may be, will be left to enforce peace treaties attempting to give permanence to their temporary victories.

The end of it all may be another robot dark age, maintained for centuries by brute mechanical oppression.

This is not an imaginary picture. Who, before the last war, visualized the four years of death-emerald—the water-logged trenches? There are alive to-day gas victims, who are human only in mind, and whose bodies are simply kept alive by immersion in oil!

Is it too late to prevent a monstrous recurrence of all this. It may not be. Where are the forces of sanity?

During the past nine weeks, I have been up and down the country and listened to men and women in all walks of life. I have spoken with Frenchmen and Central Europeans, and the basic fact which emerges is that, with the exception of a few crazy chauvinists and profiteers, no one wants this war.

We have had weeks, aye, months, of war propaganda. The carefully cultivated propaganda of all the national wireless stations, the more blatant propaganda of the capitalist press, and since the war started, the pulpit, with a few praiseworthy and notable exceptions, has unceasingly entered the grisly arena. The fat prelates, here and on the other side of the Rhine, have recommenced their age-old job of dividing up God among themselves—praying that he shall bless their respective arms; that each of them is fighting in the cause of righteousness. But their stuff isn't getting across as it used to. No one wants this war.

The general public reminds one of the bull one sometimes sees in the

Spanish arenas. Goaded by the public, and by the picadors, he still does not want to fight. Amid yelling crowds of blood-lusters, he stands with a forlorn dignity, not desiring to kill or be killed. The peoples of the world do not want to murder each other.

The only positive sentiment which the people of this country have is to "smash Hitler." In case the preceding phrases be garbled by the Nazis, let me make this point quite clear. The people of this country hate Hitler and all he stands for. They consider him and his works as a putrid pollutant to human dignity and human freedom. But their wish to "smash Hitler" is their unexpressed desire to smash all tyranny—whether it be Hitlerism here or in Germany. We think we know how Hitlerism can be smashed. Let us look for a moment at the so-called smashers!

## THE WAR AIMS OF THE POWERS

Here we come to the crux of the matter. The present government has no war aims. All the best minds in the country have been endeavoring to get a statement of them. Their war aims! The truth is that this is simply a struggle for supremacy between rival capitalisms and imperialisms.

This is the real war aim. It dare not tell us so. They talk about a war for democracy. Brailsford said the other day that the torch of their sincerity would be short attitude towards India. I hope he is satisfied now!

The recent Viceroyal pronouncement was in the best traditions of aristocratic imperialism. It has been deservedly spurned by the people in India. Quite baldly he stated that "after the war some measure of dominion status would be considered!" Now the

are engaged in the delectable pastime of attempting to "smash Hitler." And India lies prostrate in her age-old trance of misery and inertia. A war for democracy? Somebody said the other day that he would rather be a Jew in Berlin than a Kaffir in Johannesburg.

"Smash Hitler." Yes. But this will be done by his real enemies, not by his pals. We have not forgotten where he got his fleet from and the raw materials for German rearmament.

Some of the bolder spirits talk about another conference. A conference of the Hitlers, the Dalai-lamas, the Mussolinis and the Chamberlains. A conference of the governing classes to divide the spoils and perpetuate their domination. At the best, this will simply be an armed truce before another Armageddon. Let them clearly understand that the workers will have none of it, neither their wars nor their armed truces which they call capitalist peace.

The moment is fraught with great and terrible possibilities. Neither the goods nor time will save us. We must save ourselves. The lamps have gone out almost everywhere. There remains one faint spark of sanity and if that goes—all goes. The spark of workers' fraternity and solidarity is still alive, and we, the workers, must fan it to be a beacon of hope for humanity.

There comes to my mind the mighty words of Daniel O'Connell, speaking of the slave-trade a hundred years ago: "I shall send my voice careering across the seas, telling the slave-holder that God's thunderbolts are hot and telling the slave that the dawn of his redemption is already breaking."

These words have a message for us. Let the workers say:—"Stop now!"

# Negro Masses Face The Crisis of War

Can No Longer Trust "Democratic" Promises

(Continued from Page 1)

today may expect as little reward for their services as they received after the last slaughter.

And what did the Negroes get out of the last war which should make them enthusiastic about the present? Nothing. Today, they enjoy less democracy in their own countries than they did in 1914. And as for self-determination? Abyssinia, the last of free Africa, is sufficient answer.

One would think that the least the Allies could have done to show their appreciation to the blacks was to set aside one of the African colonies annexed from Germany as a national home for black folk. But nothing of the sort happened. Even this small act of mercy was considered too much for Negroes. Instead, Britain and France, who were supposed to have been fighting for democracy and to free the world from the menace of Prussian barbarism, grabbed all the colonies of the defeated powers (Germany and Turkey), and shared them among themselves. Then, to add insult to injury, they defended their action on the grounds that the natives who inhabited these territories were unfit to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world. Those who have any doubt about this, may read Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Is it not strange that the Africans were fit enough to help the Allies pull their chestnuts out of the fire, but not fit to share in the victory? In the quarter of a century which

has elapsed, Britain has had every opportunity to express her appreciation for the supreme sacrifice paid by hundreds of thousands of Africans and peoples of African descent on the battlefields of Flanders, Egypt, Palestine and Africa. Yet having failed to do so, Mr. Chamberlain today has the effrontery to talk about "bad faith" on the part of others.

They have broken faith not only with the living but with the dead. But let us not say any more about the past.

What of the present? It is not too late for our British masters to make good their lofty pretensions.

If the British and the French imperialists, and all those who are taken in by their diplomacy, really want to convince the colored races—and for that matter, the white working classes—that they are really concerned about ridding the world of "evil things," now is an excellent opportunity for them to start by putting their own empires in order. Let them extend democracy to their colonies. Let Mr. Chamberlain get up at Westminster, and Mr. Daladier in the French Chamber of Deputies, and issue a declaration to the world granting their colonies self-government. Such a revolution in international relations would not only be a moral victory for the democracies, but a bloodless one. Such a gesture, coming at this time, would rally reinforcement to the democratic front by giving hundreds of millions of subject peoples something tangible to defend. It would cut the ground from under Hitler's feet and inspire the workers of Germany to strike a blow for freedom against their Nazi oppressors.

But will Messrs. Chamberlain and Daladier accept this challenge? Or shall our suspicious be confirmed—that their democratic statements are just a facade for their real imperialist aims?

I hate Nazism as much as anyone. I was fighting the Brown menace at a time when many who are today denouncing Hitler were singing his praises.

The fact that I spent three months in a Nazi prison does not blind me to the fact that in a capitalist world, as long as Britain and France reserve the right to rule over 500 million colored peoples and exploit their labor in the interests of plutocracy, they cannot expect Germany to be satisfied. Empire and peace are incompatible. And it is precisely for this reason we say that if peace is to be achieved, imperialism must be abolished.



# War Profits Control Looms As Big Problem

Bone Bill Aims to "Take Profits" Out of War

By FLORENCE B. BOECKEL  
Washington, D. C.

AMERICAN men fought in a World War trenches in France for a dollar a day. When they came back, they found 21,000 new American millionaires enriched by war profits.

Profits in the World War ran into the following figures:

Over \$50,000,000 for the new dye industries.

U. S. Steel, \$1,100,000 during 1915 and 1916.

Over \$47,000,000 for General Motors.

Utah Copper Co., 200%.

Bethlehem Loading Co., 362%.

Calumet and Hecker, 800%.

Munition companies piled up profits ranging from 22% to 943%.

The New York Shipbuilding Company paid the government \$500,000 for a plant which cost the taxpayers \$14,000,000.

The Newport News Company entered a claim against the government on the basis of anticipated profits for a warship order which was canceled. It received \$6,644,000, although no costs had been incurred.

Revelation of the extent of war profits promptly led to a demand for action from all quarters. As soon as it was organized, the American Legion began a demand for "conscription of dollars as well as men." In 1930, Congress created the War Policies Commission "to study and investigate ways and means to promote peace and to economize the burdens and to minimize the profits of war." In 1934, President Roosevelt said, "the time had come to take the profits out of war." Revelations of the Senate Munitions investigating Committee increased the demand for abolition of war profits.

In 1935, the War Department saw an opportunity to win support for its mobilization plan to legalize conscription and provide for war-time control by the government of industry, commerce, labor, agriculture, transportation and the press, combined with a provision supposed to control war profits. It was called a bill "to take the profits out of war," and, introduced in the House by the late Representative McSwain, it was also known as the McSwain bill.

This bill contained no specific provisions for eliminating war profits but provided merely that Congress, after the outbreak of war, should "consider" heavily taxing all incomes above the average of the three pre-war years. It allowed adjustments for capital expenditures, and left the way open for such evasions as were practiced during the World War, when manufacturers were permitted to count taxes as part of the cost of production. The report made by the War Policies Commission was to all intents and purposes in agreement with the War Department's mobilization bill and provided that no amendment which would permit private property to be taken without full compensation in time of war, should be considered by Congress.

In 1936, the chairman of the Munitions Investigation Committee, Senator Nye, introduced a genuine

war-profits tax bill. Omitting all mobilization provisions of the McSwain bill, it set up a detailed tax schedule on war profits difficult to evade. The Veterans of Foreign Wars have supported this and later bills providing for strict taxation of war profits.

In 1938 a similar measure, known as the Bone bill, was introduced in the Senate by fifty Senators, and is now pending. The purpose of the bill is to tax the profits out of war by steeply graduated income and other taxes, in order "to provide for effective national defense, to promote peace, to encourage actual neutrality, to discourage war profiteering, to distribute the burdens of war, to keep democracy alive, and for other purposes." Under this bill, corporations would be taxed 15% on net incomes not in excess of 2% of the declared value of corporations; 25% on net incomes not in excess of 6% of such value; and 100% of net incomes in excess thereof. In other words, all income over 6% of the value of a corporation would be taken by the government in taxes.

As to individuals, there would be a normal tax of 6% on all incomes above a personal exemption of \$500, plus \$500 for a spouse, plus \$100 for each dependent, together with a graded surtax rates ranging from 10% up to 93% on net incomes in excess of \$20,000. The following figures indicate the steeply graded surtax:

Tax	Income above \$1,000
6%	\$4,000 to \$ 5,000
10%	5,000 to 6 500
30%	6,500 to 8 000
50%	8,000 to 20,000
71%	20,000 to 200,000
93%	Above 200,000

According to its sponsor—the Bone bill, which would go into effect as soon as Congress declared a state of war to exist, would make it possible to "pay for the war as we go." Congress adjourned after action on the neutrality law at the special session, leaving no legislation on the books to control war profits.

The problem of eliminating or controlling war profits still remains one of the big problems facing the American people.

# C.I.O. Meet Shows Deep Inner Crisis

(Continued from page 2)

ing") of a majority of the A. F. of L. Executive Council.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

1. The New York State Council, constituting one-fourth of the C.I.O., is today overwhelmingly dominated by the Stalinists. Only the threat of split by the A.C.W. prevented the Stalinists from taking all the officers and complete control of the Board.

2. The presence of Brophy, Len De Caux, etc., showed the free hand John L. Lewis has given the Stalinists since the San Francisco convention, where he was supposed to have begun the campaign against them.

3. The appointment of Germer as Lewis's representative and regional director in New York, and Germer's statements attacking Dubinsky and defending the Communist Party show that there is no intention on Lewis's part to wage any campaign against the Stalinists.

4. Alan Haywood's praise of Quill as one of the great leaders of American labor, his adulation of Archie Wright, Len De Caux, etc., indicates that his promotion to Washington is not as much an anti-Stalinist move as the press has suggested.

5. The convention indicated the seeds of split in the C.I.O. The fight between Hillman and the Stalinists on the Roosevelt question must grow

# Books

by Jim Cork

PROGRESS OF LABOR IN THE UNITED STATES, by Sigmund Umanski. House of Field, Inc., New York, 1939. \$2.50.

A CHRONOLOGY of developments in the labor movement since 1933 which, like other chronologies on this subject, suffers seriously from the fact that developments outstrip the published accounts. A good deal of the material descriptive of organization drives and strikes is therefore dated. In addition, the chapters on the organization of the South and Ford, though warmly optimistic, are unfortunately hardly a realistic picture of the accomplishments recorded.

There is little if any interpretation of or comment on the developments in trade unionism since 1933. What little there is, is distinctly harmful to labor. As, for instance, the conclusion that if labor is "wise," it "should voluntarily ask for laws defining what it can and cannot do" and "take the initiative in asking for curbs upon its own extremists."

Labor has wisely resisted any such attempt on the part of government to establish some form of state control of unionism, insisting that such "curbs" may well become the first steps to totalitarian state control of labor. A case in point is the strong opposition of the A. F. of L. to the recent activities of Thurman Arnold against the building and electrical unions.

Better written, and incidentally better edited, histories of recent

# Rebel Sailor In Danger of Deportation

By JACK SODERBERG

TWO years ago, Eric Rix, a German seaman, arrived in this country after having succeeded in escaping from a concentration camp in Hitler's Germany. Rix was a member of the German Seamen's Union prior to Hitler's decree dissolving the unions. Upon arrival in this country, he transferred to the Sailors Union of the Pacific. After certain technicalities required by the immigration authorities, Rix was finally admitted legally into this country and began to work among the German seamen arriving here on German ships. He was extremely successful in his organization work on these ships.

Recently, when Rix filed his first papers, he failed to mention the fact that he was once convicted of a "crime" in Germany. The "crime" consisted in smuggling five pounds of flour to his mother while home on a German ship—a "crime" which you and I could be guilty of a million times under similar circumstances. Some one put the finger on Rix and as a result he was arrested by Department of Labor agents and held for deportation back to Hitler's Germany. When you consider that he escaped from one of the many concentration camps in Germany in the first place, and has successfully organized German seamen into an illegal union since, there can be no question in your mind what will happen to this brother if he is returned. At present, Eric Rix, is free on bail supplied by his union awaiting a hearing and a decision from Washington.

So happens that it is not only the case of Rix. Since his arrival here, he has married and his wife and baby naturally will be destitute should he be deported, and there is little likelihood they will ever see him again.

Certainly the labor movement as a whole has a stake in this case. Every organization of workers, be it political or trade union in character, should be concerned in saving this worker from the Hitler axe-men. Every support possible should be extended to Rix. As the call of the S.U.P. states: "We ask you to use your good offices to see that this brother has a just hearing and that investigation be made into a situation where agents of foreign powers and dictators can reach over here as finger-men and use the U.S. government's bureaus to do their dirty work for them."

Protests should be sent to the Department of Labor in Washington and resolutions of support should be sent to Sailors Union of the Pacific, 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Cal.

labor events have appeared. With due apologies to Edgar Lee Masters, I'd therefore like to say:

"At an early page, it was already done for,"  
"I wonder why it was ever begun for?"

Reviewed by G.

# Religion and Revolution

New York City

Editor, Workers Age:

The unqualified, ready acceptance that some have given to the dictum that religion is the opiate of the people, may probably be traced to the spurious effects that services in church or temple have had upon them.

But the effect that the teachings of Isaiah or Christ have on one are far from spurious. These teachings may be irritating to those who have bought house upon house, field upon field, to the detriment of the poor, or to those whose only concern has been laying up treasure on earth; but they are certainly not spurious.

And there have been those upon whom the effect of these teachings was stimulating. They rose from hearing or reading them feeling positive that they could be not other than revolutionists without denying their God.

In view of this, should we not qualify that sweeping indictment? Organized religion has often been an opiate of the people. The organized religion, for example, that existed in old Russia was beyond doubt an opiate to the people. But may not that organized religion have been a

sharper as the orders from Stalin for a more pro-Nazi policy and a sharper anti-Roosevelt policy become more pronounced. In this connection, one should note that in the New Jersey convention of the C.I.O., which was held at the same time, the Stalinists voted against the third term and were defeated by only a narrow margin on this particular question. At the same New Jersey convention, however, a S.W.O.C. delegate who attempted to present a resolution against the Hitler-Stalin pact was literally thrown out of the hall.

6. The present basis for collaboration between the Stalinists and Hillman is largely their common enmity to Dubinsky. Hillman needs allies (Lewis and the Stalinists) to wage his war against the I.L.G.W.U.

7. The regime in the C.I.O., as evidenced at this convention, puts very strict limits to the growth of the organization, and forebodes eventual decline, crisis and split

perversion of the religion it organized? Indeed, may it not have been the religious nature of the revolutionists that first caused them to rebel against such a perversion and against the injustices it represented?

Reason discovered the causes of the injustice, but it was not reason that first sensed the injustice. In fact, reason has been used far oftener to cover up than to discover the causes of injustice. It is a religious sense, a sense of right and wrong, that awakens man to injustice. Reason may be used either as an opiate to put him back to sleep or as a stimulant to keep him awake and active. Of the use of reason as an opiate, glib liberal-labor and communist contortionists have given no end of demonstrations in recent years.

The organized religion that revolutionists denounce differs very little from the organized religion Christ denounced; the same formalism and hypocrisy marks both. But whereas Christ distinguished between the Jewish religion and organized Judaism ("I come not to destroy but to fulfill the law and the prophets"), revolutionists too often have not distinguished between the Christian religion and organized Christianity. And yet of them it can be said that they come not to destroy but to fulfill the social promise of the prophets and of Christ. True religion has not been an opiate to them but the first incentive to their struggle against injustices. The vision in which they worked was a religious one, a vision of a society to which each gives according to his ability and from which each receives according to his needs.

Theologians and dialecticians can without doubt expose my ignorance from one viewpoint or the other. But as one who pretends to be neither, I do not offer this argument as a solution of anything but as a problem, which neither theologian nor dialectician to my little knowledge has solved.

FRANK D. SLOCUM

SPREAD THE WORKERS AGE

# Russia Ousted from League

(Continued from page 1)

England, there was revival of peace talk in the House of Lords, where some Conservative and Labor peers made addresses which Lord Halifax, Foreign Secretary, characterized as "unfortunate."

Conflicting rumors relating to Russia were current. Well-informed quarters in Washington were increasingly of the opinion that Russia might soon join Japan in the partition of China. Russia's share, according to these reports, would include Outer Mongolia and Sinkiang or Chinese Turkestan, comprising about two million square miles of territory. Both of these regions are under virtual Soviet control today. A comparable area in eastern China would be left to Japan. Such a division would leave only about one-fifth of the country in any way independent. This "free China" would be completely landlocked, with Tibet on the West and the foreign-dominated territory on the other three sides, hardly more than a puppet state dominated by Tokyo and Moscow.

On the other hand, there were rumors in Copenhagen that informal negotiations were under way be-

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

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

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

# 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, \$5 for six months, 5c a copy. Foreign Rates: \$2.50, Canada \$1.75 per year.

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

WILL HERBERG, Editor

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

VOL. 8. SATURDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1939. No. 51.

## LET'S KEEP OUR HEADS

THE whole country is naturally aroused over the Russian invasion of Finland for even in a world of violence and savagery it is a shocking example of unprovoked assault on a small nation for purposes that cannot be otherwise described than as predatory and imperialistic. The sympathy felt for the Finnish people and the good wishes extended to them in their efforts to maintain and, if necessary, to recover their independence, are feelings quite natural under the circumstances and we share them fully.

But it is precisely in such a situation that we must not let our feelings run away with us or we are likely to come up against the most unexpected consequences. A case in point is the widespread demand, raised by the Republicans for partisan reasons but finding an echo among large masses of the people, for breaking diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia. We regard this proposal as dangerous and false—not out of tenderness for the regime in the Kremlin but out of consideration for the safety and welfare of the American people. The United States, we believe, ought to maintain formal and correct diplomatic relations with all established governments throughout the world without regard to their "ideology," their domestic regime or their reprehensible doings. Otherwise, if we were to make our diplomatic relations dependent upon our approval or disapproval of what the various powers are saying or doing, the United States would be forced to function as a sort of international moral policeman, intervening everywhere in order to arrange the affairs of the world in accordance with our beliefs and standards. Such a procedure would, of course, embroil us in every foreign quarrel that would arise and would mean perpetual war or the danger of war for this country. No one in his right mind and with any sense of responsibility to the American people would seriously propose such a policy.

Besides, if we break diplomatic relations with Russia for its wanton assault on Finland, how can we maintain relations with Germany after Czechoslovakia and Poland, with Italy after Ethiopia and Albania, with Japan after China? And should Britain repeat the horrors of the Amritsar massacre in India in 1919, in which British airplanes bombed unprotected native villages, or France repeat its atrocities in Algeria and Syria, would we be obliged to recall our ambassadors from London and Paris as well? This would be "splendid isolation" indeed! Let us remember that the world is not now run on the basis of decency and moral principles and is not likely to be so run as long as the system of imperialism prevails. Moreover, wouldn't it be rather embarrassing if we ourselves went in for another spurge of Dollar Diplomacy with the aid of the Marines, as Wilson did in Haiti and Coolidge in Nicaragua? With whom would we break relations then?

No, breaking relations with Russia is no way for us to act from the point of view of our own interests, the safety and welfare of the American people.

For the United States, the great danger in the present crisis is that the thoroughly justified indignation of the masses of the people at the bloody deeds of Hitler and Stalin may make them easy victims of British propaganda and intrigue. The great danger lies in the tendency to have American foreign policy determined by the British Foreign Office. This, of course, is the true meaning of the doctrine of Anglo-American "parallel action" on the basis of which President Roosevelt has conducted his war policy during the past few years. What the ulterior aims of the British Foreign Office are we do not pretend to know in detail but we are quite certain that they are not directed primarily towards saving democracy or protecting the rights of small nations. We have a notion that the security and aggrandizement of the British Empire, the greatest engine of oppression and exploitation known to man, have something to do with it. The repeated bids that Chamberlain has made to Stalin in recent weeks offering to let him keep his share of the Polish spoils if only he will break with Hitler, should give us some inkling of the kind of principles that are dominant in Downing Street. Who knows but that the British Foreign Office is now making Stalin the same kind of offer with regard to Finland? At any rate, British imperial interests are hardly a safe guide for American foreign policy even though these interests may happen at the present time to fall in with the strivings of our own Wall Street big-business imperialism.

It is time that the hidden wires connecting Downing Street and the State Department were brought out into the open and exposed to the public view. It is time that the peace forces throughout the country raised the demand that the foreign affairs of the United States be conducted so as to serve the interests neither of Wall Street nor of the Bank of London but of the great masses of the American people, for whom involvement in war would be the greatest conceivable disaster at the present time.

Yes, we deeply sympathize with the oppressed peoples of the world, with the peoples in the dictator-ridden countries, with the peoples whose independence and national existence have been extinguished and who are groaning under foreign domination, whether it be of a Stalin or a Hitler or of a French governor-general or a British viceroy. For them salvation can come only thru the overthrow of the entire system of imperialist domination and the thoroughgoing application of the principles of democracy and national self-determination. There is no other way. And the best service we can give to their cause is to keep out of war and dictatorship ourselves, for one brings the other; to fight our own big-business imperialists at home; and to aid the labor, socialist and anti-war forces that are waging the battle of freedom abroad.

IT'S a sort of anti-climax, but it's worth recording anyway. The Communist Party has at last officially ended its consumers boycott of Nazi German goods. William Z. Foster proclaims the new law in his question-and-answer column in the Daily Worker of December 12. The anti-Nazi boycott is off, Foster tells the faithful, because . . . but you know the reason at least as well as Foster.

"With the Japanese boycott, however, the situation is fundamentally different," Foster continues. "The struggle of the Chinese people against the Japanese invaders is not an imperialistic fight; it is a just resistance . . ." Which, of course, means that Stalin hasn't made his pact with the Mikado yet and still needs the Chinese to annoy Japan. But for how long? How long will it be before the Broadway "Reds," the penthouse "pinks" and the college girl devotees of the A.S.U. start wearing silk stockings again?

THE Nobel Peace Prize will not be awarded this year, we are officially informed from Oslo. Why not? What's the matter with Joseph Stalin, exponent of that famous "Soviet Peace Policy" which he is just now engaged in protecting from Finnish imperialist aggression?

HUMOROUS HIGHLIGHT OF THE WEEK: The editorial in the December 16 issue of the Socialist Appeal explaining why it was wicked for Ben Gitlow or Joseph Zack to appear as a witness before the Dies Committee but why it is very noble for Leon Trotsky to do the same thing. Don't miss it!

By Rosa Luxemburg:

# The Russian Revolution

(Rosa Luxemburg's celebrated work, "The Russian Revolution," was written in prison in 1918 and published some years later. The English translation is by Bertram D. Wolfe, who will contribute a critical introduction—Editor)

(Continued from last issue)

THUS, on the very day after the first victories of the revolution, there began an inner struggle within it over the two burning questions—peace and land. The liberal bourgeoisie entered upon the tactics of dragging out things and evading them. The laboring masses, the army, the peasantry, pressed forward ever more impetuously. There can be no doubt that with the questions of peace and land, the fate of the political democracy of the republic was linked up. The bourgeois classes, carried away by the first stormy wave of the revolution, had permitted themselves to be dragged along to the point of republican government. Now they began to seek a base of support in the rear and silently to organize a counter-revolution. The Kaledin Cossack campaign against Petersburg was a clear expression of this tendency. Had the attack been successful, then not only the fate of the peace and land questions would have been sealed, but the fate of the republic as well. Military dictatorship, a reign of terror against the proletariat, and then return to monarchy, would have been the inevitable results.

From this we can judge the utopian and fundamentally reactionary character of the tactics by which the Russian "Kautskyans" or Mensheviks permitted themselves to be guided. Hardened in their addiction to the myth of the bourgeois character of the Russian Revolution—for the time being, you see, Russia is not supposed to be ripe for the social revolution!—they clung desperately to a coalition with the bourgeois liberals. But this means a union of elements which had been split by the natural internal development of the revolution and had come into the sharpest conflict with each other. The Axelrods and Dans wanted to collaborate at all costs with those classes and parties from which came the greatest threat of danger to the revolution and to its first conquest, democracy.

It is especially astonishing to observe how this industrious man (Kautsky), by his tireless labor of peaceful and methodical writing during the four years of the World War, has torn one hole after another in the fabric of socialism. It is a labor from which socialism emerges riddled like a sieve, without a whole spot left in it. The uncritical indifference with which his followers regard this industrious labor of their official theoretician and swallow each of his new discoveries without so much as batting an eyelash, finds its only counterpart in the indifference with which the followers of Scheidemann and Co. look on while the latter punch socialism full of holes in practice. Indeed, the two labors completely supplement each other. Since the outbreak of the war, Kautsky, the official guardian of the temple of Marxism, has really only been doing in theory the same things which the Scheidemanns have been doing in practice, namely: (1) the International an instrument of peace; (2) disarmament, the League of Nations and nationalism; and finally (3) democracy not socialism.<sup>3</sup>

3 Here, as at various points in the manuscript, the passage is still in the form of rough notations which Rosa Luxemburg intended to expand and complete later. Her murder by military agents of the Social-Democratic coalition government prevented her from completing and revising the work. The expression, "the International an instrument of peace" refers to the excuses Kautsky gave for its bankruptcy during the war ("an instrument of peace is not suited to times of war"). It probably refers also to the theory that the International, being peaceful, is not an instrument for revolutionary struggle. Kautsky substituted utopian talk of disarmament (without the removal of the causes and roots of war) for a revolutionary struggle against war. He provided apologetics for the League of Nations which was supposed to have banished war from the world. And he justified the socialists of each country when they abandoned internationalism, supported their own governments and ruling classes, and became in theory and practice nationalists instead of internationalists. When the struggle for socialism began in earnest, the Scheidemanns defended capitalism against socialism in practice, while Kautsky did so in theory by pretending that capitalist "democracy" was democracy in the abstract, and that they were defending "democracy." Hence the third point means the advocacy of democracy as against socialism.

In this situation, the Bolshevik tendency performs the historic service of having proclaimed from the very beginning, and having followed with iron consistency, those tactics which alone could save democracy and drive the revolution ahead. All power exclusively in the hands of the worker and peasant masses, in the hands of the soviets—this was indeed the only way out of the difficulty into which the revolution had gotten, this was the sword stroke with which they cut the Gordian knot, freed the revolution from a narrow blind-alley and opened up for it an untrammelled path into the free and open fields.

The party of Lenin was thus the only one in Russia which grasped the true interest of the revolution in that first period. It was the element that drove the revolution forward, and, thus it was the only party which really carried on a socialist policy.

It is this which makes clear, too, why it was that the Bolsheviks, though they were at the beginning of the revolution a persecuted, slandered and hunted minority attacked on all sides, arrived within the shortest time to the head of the revolution and were able to bring under their banner all the genuine masses of the people: the urban proletariat, the army, the peasants, as well as the revolutionary elements of democracy, the left wing of the Socialist-Revolutionaries.<sup>4</sup>

The real situation in which the Russian Revolution found itself, narrowed down in a few months to the alternative, victory of the counter-revolution or dictatorship of the proletariat—Kaledin or Lenin. Such was the objective situation, just as it quickly presents itself in every revolution after the first intoxication is over, and as it presented itself in Russia as a result of the concrete, burning questions of peace and land, for which there was no solution within the framework of bourgeois revolution.

In this, the Russian Revolution has but confirmed the basic lesson of every great revolution, the law of its being, which decrees: either the revolution must advance at a rapid, stormy and resolute tempo, break down all barriers with an iron hand and place its goals ever farther ahead, or it is quite soon thrown backward behind its feeble point of departure and suppressed by counter-revolution. To stand still, to mark time on one spot, to be contented with the first goal it happens to reach, is never possible in revolution. And he who tries to apply the home-made wisdom derived from parliamentary battles between frogs and mice to the field of revolutionary tactics only shows thereby that the very psychology and laws of existence of revolution are alien to him and that all historical experience is to him a book sealed with seven seals.

(Continued in the next issue)

4 The Socialist-Revolutionaries were a party made up largely of petty bourgeois and declassed intellectuals and peasants. It was not a Marxist party. Its program included the advocacy of a democratic revolution in Russia. When Rosa Luxemburg speaks here of the "revolutionary elements of democracy," she is referring to the left wing of the Socialist-Revolutionary party which joined with the Bolsheviks in the struggle for peace, the seizure of the land, and the transfer of power to the soviets. They later broke with the Bolsheviks, principally on the issue of the signing of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty.

## Anti-War Youth Issue Call For National Convention

(We publish below the call to the National Anti-War Youth Congress to be held on December 27-30, 1939 at Chicago—Editor)

THE United States must not follow Europe into the tragedies of totalitarian war! Too clearly we see the brutal sacrifice of human life, the immeasurable destruction of wealth, the inevitable compromise of British and French democracy with dictatorship-at-home to win the war.

Why is Europe fighting? Will victory of either side bring freedom and peace? Will war-time profits imperil America's peace? What program of action can bring peace and security to the peoples of the world?

The American people must not be deceived again—this is not our war! American youth must resist those forces which would deceive us into fighting! Nor does our will to peace stand alone in a war-torn world. In warring and non-warring countries, courageous forces everywhere resist the war plague.

Mobilize against war while there is still time! The Youth Committee Against War opens its 1939 national convention to all American youth who will join to support a program of action: Against war trade to aid either side! For aid to anti-war forces and to refugees throughout the world! Against the militarization and conscription of youth! For constructive jobs and education! Against totalitarianism in all its forms—the fascism of Germany, the war dictatorships of Britain and France, the despotism of a new imperial Russia, the steady encroachment on American liberties.

Add your strength to this convention and this work. Organize, educate, fight NOW, against this war. Make the United States a country where free men work out a destiny of peace and security and justice.

**MOBILIZE AGAINST WAR WHILE THERE IS STILL TIME!**  
**ELECT DELEGATES TO THE NATIONAL YOUTH ANTI-WAR CONGRESS!**

## Distress of Youth Depicted In Report

Commission Also Frames Action Program

Washington, D. C.

THE plight of youth in the United States today is vividly depicted in a report made public recently by the American Youth Commission. A "program of action for American youth" is included in this report, the main point of which is that the government must provide employment for young people who cannot get jobs in private industry because "the continued pressure of unemployment on youth in the midst of a war boom will add to the danger of drifting into active participation in the war."

The Commission is a branch of the American Council on Education, a non-governmental organization. Owen D. Young has been its acting chairman since the death of Newton D. Baker, former Secretary of War. Among the other members are government officials, editors and writers, educators and a number of business and labor leaders.

The Commission recommends not only a continuance of federal work programs involving "conservation activities and the construction of useful public buildings," but a greatly expanded program of "producing the goods and services which are needed by the young people themselves and by others who are unemployed and in need."

Pointing out that the rate of unemployment is much higher among youths between 20 and 24 than in any other age group and is highest of all for young people between 15 and 20 who are out of school and seeking work, the Commission says:

"In the present critical situation it is imperative that none of the human resources of the nation be wasted thru haphazard and inefficient methods of vocational selection, preparation and employment.

"Society in each generation has an obligation to provide for youth full opportunities for vocational exploration, training and public service. The existence of a world crisis, by making clear to the nation the need for internal as well as external strength, serves only to emphasize the present obligation.

"Much time has been lost and too many young people already have a history of frustration and wasted years. There is all the more reason for strengthening this weak point in the national fabric as soon as possible, now that its dangerous nature is evident."

A discussion of "what can be done" to meet this problem comprises the bulk of its report. Among the proposals are the following:

That, although all young people should be required to attend school until they are 16, it is undesirable to compel full-time attendance after that age upon those who prefer to go to work "because above the age of 16 many young people who would benefit from the training of a job would be wasting their time in school."

That plans for combining part-time schooling and part-time work to bridge the gap between school and full employment should be extended as rapidly as possible.

That public work for young people should be planned with special regard to its educational quality, supervised by persons competent to train them in good work habits as well as in specific skills, and should be "carried on in a spirit that

will give the young worker a sense of being valued and being valuable to his country."

That any such program "should provide an opportunity to try various kinds of work, so that the young person may find his aptitudes and abilities and may be given some guidance in preparing for private employment in a field where he can be most useful and successful."

"No good purpose can be served by blaming the young person who has not found a job for himself," the report stresses. "The facts of arithmetic cannot be wished away. In the entire country, a few thousand jobs probably are vacant because no competent applicant has appeared.

"Another few thousand chances probably exist for unusual young people to make their own jobs by starting new enterprises. But there are several million more young men and women who want to work than there are jobs available for them.

"The totals do not balance. The bright or the lucky get the jobs, but some will have to be left out until their elders, who control the economic conditions of the country, find some way to open the gates.

"The fact that the elder people own the property and control practically all the jobs lays upon them the major responsibility for making the opportunities match the number of youth they have brought into the world.

"The Commission has no desire to minimize the fact that it is frankly advocating a program which will add to the federal budget, and at a time when there is great need for economy and balance of income and expenditures.

"The actual cost will not, however, be as great as might be thought. The public employment which is provided for young persons need not be full time nor highly paid. The expenditures per individual young worker need not exceed \$400 per year, from which there will be various deductible assets.

"The contributions of these young people to the aid of their families will undoubtedly lessen the need for public assistance. The work on which they are placed should be designed to provide constructive work experience in such a manner that the work done is a true service to the community. Work which meets these standards will certainly add to the wealth of the nation."

Just Published!

"In Stalin's Secret Service"

By W. G. Krivitsky \$3.00 (including postage)

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

## WE RADICALS HAVE A BAD REPUTATION . . . .

for lateness. Even those friends of ours who might be prompt are so skeptical about others being on time that they too come late and help maintain that bad reputation. Tsk, tsk, tsk, that's not right!

Let's reform!

Let's start the New Year right!

Come on time to our

## NEW YEAR'S EVE Dance and Floor Show

SUNDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 31, 1939  
MANHATTAN CENTER, 34th St. and 8th Ave.

WE GUARANTEE UNRESERVEDLY (and we are not given to overstatement) the best time of your life.

WHY? BECAUSE THE TALENT WE HAVE BEEN FORTUNATE TO OBTAIN IS REAL TALENT—nothing pseudo about them. They've made their mark in this world and are doing their best to maintain it. We are benefiting by it, which means you will find genuine enjoyment and pleasure when you come. It will be swell if you would make your reservation in advance to help relieve the last minute congestion at the door. You see, the Jimmy Higginsses would like so much to have a chance to participate in the gaiety of the evening. So won't you have a heart and write in at once for your tickets? They are \$1.00 per person (no discount for cash, check, or money order). Use the blank below if it's too much trouble to write a letter, and mail it in today to the

INDEPENDENT LABOR LEAGUE OF AMERICA

131 West 33rd Street, New York City

Enclosed please find \$\_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_ tickets to the New Year's Eve Dance.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Please make checks payable to Workers Age

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

## WORKERS AGE

\$1.00 per year \$ .65 for six months

I enclose \$1.00 for a year's subscription

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_