

Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. 7. No. 10.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 1938

5 Cents a Copy

Big Anti-War Meet in N. Y.

LaFollette, Martin Speak At "Keep America Out Of War" Mass Rally

Senator Robert M. LaFollette and Homer Martin, president of the United Automobile Workers, will be the leading speakers at the big anti-war meeting at the Hippodrome, 6th Avenue and 43rd Street, the coming Sunday, March 6. Among the others to address the meeting will be: Norman Thomas, Bertram D. Wolfe, John T. Flynn, Oswald Garrison Villard and Maj. Gen. Wm. C. Rivers.

The meeting is sponsored by a "Keep America Out Of War" committee, consisting of several hundred outstanding figures in labor, political, civic, religious and literary fields. General admission is free but there are reserved sections at \$1, 50c and 25c.

The growing "Keep America Out Of War" movement is attracting the support of men and women in labor and liberal circles of differing political views but agreeing that a common stand ought to be taken against the war-mongers who are trying to stampede America into another world slaughter.

Senate Scuttles Anti-Lynch Bill

After a thirty-day filibuster, the Senate voted last week to lay aside the Wagner-Van Nuys anti-lynching bill in order to take up the emergency-relief resolution on which a final vote is pending. The vote on laying aside was 58 to 22.

The anti-lynching bill, which makes possible the federal prosecution of a state official who wilfully fails to prevent a lynching and also permits the kin of a lynching victim to recover damages from the county in which the crime occurs, was passed by the House last April by a vote of 277 to 120. When it came to the Senate the bill met with the approval of about 70 Senators and would undoubtedly have passed could the upper house have gotten to vote on it. But the Southern Senators started an endless filibuster deliberately calculated to prevent the measure from reaching a vote. Several attempts at invoking cloture, which would have limited debate, failed since a two-thirds vote is required. And so, after thirty days of sabotage, the Southern Senators won out, for the present at least.

It was noted on several occasions that, altho the anti-lynching bill was officially an administration measure, the White House made not the slightest effort to exert pressure to end the filibuster and get action on it. President Roosevelt, who found it quite possible to send a personal message to the House against the Ludlow Amendment, did not move a finger on the Wagner-Van Nuys bill. The Republicans in the Senate used this as a pretext for helping the reactionary Senators kill the measure by refusing to vote for cloture.

The fate of the anti-lynching casts a lurid light not only on the desperate plight of the Negro in the South but also on the workings

Labor Against War

UAW and CIO Initiate Movement in Detroit

Detroit, Mich. Homer Martin, president of the United Automobile Workers, told a provisional anti-war committee of over forty representatives of the U.A.W. and other C.I.O. unions which convened last week upon his invitation, that the only basis of a real anti-war movement was the labor unions. Martin suggested the calling of an international anti-war convention of trade unions of all nations to fight the war-mongers.

A provisional committee of nine was elected with Homer Martin as chairman. The meeting agreed on a program and decided to enlist the support of all labor, religious and civic groups ready to support the adopted program.

The program, tentatively phrased, included the following: Popular pressure on governments against imperialist intrigues; opposition to increases in armaments and demand for the utilization of war funds for low-cost housing and for betterment of the social order; opposition to all legislation of the type embodied in the Sheppard-Hill and Tydings-McCormick bills designed to set up a war-time dictatorship; withdrawal of American

troops and warships from China; boycott of Japanese goods; and the principle of popular referendum before declaration of war as embodied in the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment.

In his short but impressive address, Martin emphasized the necessity of fighting the big-business plot to foist a "fascist regime on American labor when war is declared." He warned that big business is attempting to escape responsibility for economic chaos by embarking on war.

"The militant, class-conscious labor unionists must tell the cock-eyed world," he said, "what labor thinks about war before it is too late. I will give you all I have to promote the anti-war movement."

The meeting issued this statement: "We are determined to keep America out of war in Europe or Asia. We are deeply concerned over the current war talk and preparations for war and deplore the tendencies in some quarters to prepare the public mind for war. We warn the American people against 'holy wars.' In our time, war between great nations has always

(Continued on Page 5)

Nazi Deal Spurs War Foes in U.S.

British Connivance With Fascist Powers Smashes "Collective-Security" Myth; But Secret Pact With England Held Despite Protests

The sudden shift in British diplomacy, involving a more vigorous and publicly avowed effort to "conciliate" the fascist powers at all costs, is having a marked effect upon the course of American foreign policy, according to reports from Washington. The administration idea of a "united front of the democracies" to "quarantine the aggressor nations," as enunciated by President Roosevelt in his Chicago address, has undoubtedly suffered a bad blow, while nation-wide sentiment for peace has been greatly strengthened, tho with a turn towards isolationism.

Under the circumstances, with England openly playing the game of the fascist powers, it is hardly possible any longer to keep up the talk about "collective security." The administration is expected, therefore, to soft-pedal this aspect of its propaganda in the immediate future and to try to achieve the same ends thru some apparent concessions to isolationist sentiment.

The line will now be that, just because the United States can not rely on the other "democracies," it needs a super-strong navy; previously, rearmament was justified as a means of implementing "collective security."

Whatever may be the line of propaganda taken by the administration, its war-like course in the Far East will not be modified. American policy is based not upon concern for democracy but upon the imperialistic interests of our big-business groups. Nor will the alliance or understanding that obviously exists between the U.S.A. and Great Britain, despite all official denials, be basically affected by Chamberlain's pro-fascist policy. The rapprochement between the two powers in the Far East is the result of their common hostility to Japan and not of their common attachment to democratic ideals. Indeed, Britain's "reconciliation" with Germany and Italy is regarded as an asset since it will tend to release British power for action in the Far East by freeing it, to some extent, of European pre-occupations. However, the English alliance will have to be even more vigorously denied and carefully hidden by the administration in view of the growing hostility to Tory Britain among the masses. But the old policy, orientated on joint Anglo-American action against Japan, will be followed nevertheless.

The greatest obstacle to the administration's course in foreign affairs is the unmistakable strengthening of peace sentiment at home as a result of Great Britain's recent "run-out." "It was admitted today," Bertram D. Hulén reported quite revealingly in the New York Times of February 23, "that the sensational turn of events in Europe might make the conduct of American diplomacy more difficult thru the stimulus that appears to have been given to peace sentiment in this country." What must the real character of American diplomacy be if it feels itself hampered by widespread peace sentiment among the people!

C.I.O. CONDEMNS THE SHEPPARD-HILL BILL

Labor would be placed under rigid military control in time of war by the terms of the Sheppard-Hill bill now pending before the House Military Affairs Committee, the C.I.O. warned last week in a letter sent to all affiliates.

Declaring that the bill "is the most recent of many attempts that have been made to subject the free American labor movement to a fascist regime in the event of war," the C.I.O. office charges that its real purpose is hidden under the pretense that it aims "merely to regulate production and prevent war profiteering."

Only Socialism Can Bring Peace

an editorial statement

WITH increasing force, as the days go by, this country is being driven into a new war, this time in the Far East. And an armed conflict breaking out in the Far East, with this country involved, will hardly remain localized for long; it will almost certainly become the prelude to another world war even more barbarous, disastrous and ruinously destructive than the last.

A virtual alliance, probably including a naval agreement, already exists between the United States and Great Britain, for joint action to protect the "interests" of both against Japanese aggression.

What are these "interests" in China to defend which we are called upon to go to war? They are the investments, commercial privileges and financial prospects of banking and big-business groups in this country, the "right" of these groups to coin profits out of the toil of the Chinese people undisturbed by Japanese competition. They are imperialistic interests of exploitation and oppression. They are the selfish interests of no more than a tiny handful of Americans,

of our much-vaunted "democracy" in this country. Fine "democracy," indeed, where a measure, passed by the House and avowedly supported by a big majority of Senators, can be blocked by a handful of reactionaries thru a piece of shameless sabotage!

for what interests have the great masses of this country in China or anywhere else that require defense by armed force? Such is the American stake in the Far East.

Slogans Of War

Of course, we are not going to be asked to go out and get killed for the profits of big business, not even for the "open door" in China, which is the slogan under which American imperialism operates in the Far East. We will be asked to fight to "uphold our national honor" and to "make the world safe for democracy" again; to "help the Chinese people" against the Japanese; by some, even to "defend the Soviet Union." They will seek to harness our idealism and hatred of fascism to the war machine, even more brazenly than President Wilson exploited similar sentiments in 1917.

But it will be the same bloody fraud, the same unscrupulous deception of the people. For the last thing American imperialism wants is freedom and democracy in China; that would mean an end to all foreign domination and exploitation, American included. The last thing American imperialism wants is to do anything to "defend the Soviet Union" which it hates and fears far more, as a socialist republic and a standing threat to capitalism, than it hates and fears Japan, which is merely an imperialist rival. Imagine, "making the world safe for democracy," hand

in hand with Tory England, the attorney for Hitler and Mussolini!

Whatever may be the fine "democratic" phrases in which they are enveloped, the real aims of the American government in such a war will be: first, to protect and extend its own imperialistic interests against Japan; and, secondly, to ensure "order" and "security" in the Far East by suppressing any outbreaks of popular revolt that may occur and by undermining Soviet influence, perhaps even helping to organize and finance the forces of counter-revolution. American troops sent to the Far East in the name of "democracy," would become the police force of reaction against the peoples of China, Japan and the Soviet Union. In such a crusade of reactionary repression, British and American imperialism could very easily find a common basis for accommodation with Japanese militarism, after the decisive test of war had readjusted the relation of imperialist forces in the Far East. Against the common foe—socialism and democracy—the victorious and the vanquished powers would readily unite to their mutual advantage.

The "war for democracy" would not only bring reaction and increased imperialist oppression to the Far East; it would also bring military dictatorship very like fascism at home. The Industrial Mobilization Plan and the Sheppard-Hill

(Continued on Page 2)

Lewis Corey

speaks on

"C.I.O. and A.F.L."

(Labor Faces Its Future)

Friday, March 4

NEW WORKERS SCHOOL

131 W. 33rd St.

Trade Union Notes

By Observer

THE national agreement obtained from the General Electric Company by the United Electrical and Radio Workers of America, is a great achievement for the C.I.O. and for the whole labor movement. It follows in line after the U.A.W.'s contracts with General Motors and Chrysler and the S.W.O.C.'s agreement with "big steel." It is another big advance on the road towards organizing the millions of workers in the great mass-production industries of the country.

The G. E. agreement, the first ever signed by the company on a national scale, grants the union sole-bargaining rights in those plants where it is designated majority representative. For five plants, with 27,000 workers, this will take place immediately; for the rest of the company's 60,000 employees, the agreement is to become operative as soon as the union convinces G. E., thru N.L.R. B. elections or otherwise, that it has majority support in the company's remaining 15 plants. The contract is to run for one year.

The achievement of the C.I.O. electrical-workers union is big enough but it can hardly be regarded—as James Matles, the union's organization director, seems to do—as "superior" to the S.W. O.C. contract with "big steel." It is true that the G. E. agreement is to run for a year, while the steel contract is subject to sudden revision and even termination; this is undoubtedly a big point in favor of the former. The General Electric contract also provides for sole-bargaining power, while the "big steel" pact does not; but, under the circumstances, this is largely only a formal advantage. On the other, hand, however, there is a big weakness in the G. E. agreement to which it is necessary to call attention in order to have a clear picture of the situation. That is the provision with regard to wages. From the newspaper reports, it appears that wages "are left on a flexible basis, subject to reduction in the event of a sharp drop in the industrial pay scales in the communities in which the General Electric plants are located." It appears, furthermore, that adjustments in pay are to be connected with changes in the cost of living, as gauged by the Labor Department's quarterly index.

We don't want to pass judgment without any detailed knowledge of the circumstances but we can't help feeling that this way of gearing wages with prevailing rates in the community and with cost-of-living figures, is very dangerous. In the communities in which G. E. plants are found, it is generally these plants that set the higher wage standards, the other wage levels of the community being pretty low as a usual thing. To tie G. E. wages to community wage levels is inevitably going to act as a drag on them. The same is true about tying wages to cost-of-living figures. We still remember the devastating attack made by John L. Lewis on this idea over a year ago when it was proposed by the steel companies to their company unions. He pointed out, quite effectively, that it was a scheme of binding the workers for ever to one standard-of-living level, without much chance of substantial improvement. Of course, the cases are not altogether comparable and the effects are not likely to be either. But the principle of the thing remains: to make wages depend in any important way on such external and uncontrollable factors as community pay scales or cost of living is very dangerous from a trade-union standpoint.

Quite apart from all this, we wonder why Mr. Matles found it necessary to single out the S.W. O.C. agreement for such invidious comparisons. Why was it necessary for him to gloat about the "superiority" of his agreement over the S.W.O.C. contract with "big steel"?

THE A.F.L. AT WORK

Let no one say that the A. F. of L. is not reacting to the vital needs of American labor in the present critical situation! We have just come across a striking picture of the great intellects of the A. F. of L. at work, grappling with the big problems of the day. It is from the New York Times's report of the recent session of the Executive Council:

"The Executive Council spent part of its session hearing a jurisdictional dispute between the teamsters and the hoisting engineers. The engineers union has been demanding that its member pull the lever on a truck carrying and unloading concrete, rather than the driver who does the job as part of his duties.

"After protracted hearings and exchanges of briefs before Dr. John Lapp, referee for the building-trades unions, the work was ruled as being within the province of the teamsters, and the engineers spokesman, John Possehl, appealed to the Executive Council."

With bated breath, we are still awaiting news of the outcome of this great controversy!

Boycott and Embargo in The Anti-War Struggle

(Continued from Page 3)

of real and fundamental importance, and the struggle for it one which may greatly strengthen the struggle against war, including the struggle against one's own government's war plans. There are two phases to the embargo. The first is demands on the government. We must demand of the government that it end the credits and war munitions shipments to Japan. With all this talk about enmity to Japan, Morgan has sent money to Japan, Ford has sent munitions and the United States government has sent scrap-iron, gun-cotton and other war materials! Instead of shouting "Support the President," we can and must attack the President and his policies on that. We must demand the end of these shipments and credits and the end of the embargo on Spain. The United States is supplying Italy with oil and munitions and credits for its war on Spain. It denies the Spanish government, in the name of a fake neutrality, the right even to purchase munitions from the United States.

So we must make the demand upon the government to stop credits to Japan and to extend credits to China, to stop helping Italy and Germany and to supply (sell) munitions to the legal government of Spain.

But the second phase of the embargo is the independent action of the masses. Its purpose: to stop the shipment of munitions and supplies to the other side and to give active aid to China and to Spain and support to the revolutionary forces that develop in those countries.

The Revolutionary Position on War

Now, a few words on our general work on the question. First, it is necessary for us to make clear to ourselves that our complete revolutionary position on war cannot

be carried in a day into any mass organization. I do not mean that we are deceptively to hide it; but we must recognize that it can only be a general agitational and educational propaganda campaign at present. This is so because our complete position on war involves our complete position on the capitalist system. It is, however, a very effective point today to attack capitalism—the two main points of attack are capitalism's twin evils, depression and war—that is why the Communist Party has given up both! Because the attitude toward war involves the attitude toward the social order, it is our job to teach and make clear the inseparable connection between capitalism and war and to expose all the shibboleths used and the camouflage used in preparing the war in the name of "peace, democracy and civilization."

Secondly, in the mass organizations, while we cannot at any one moment carry this entire educational campaign into living realization, we can carry on a concrete campaign on slogans which tie up inseparably with this position. In the course of the fight for them, we can clarify their relation to the entire struggle. And it is our business to evolve concrete slogans that will make our position clear and then to mobilize labor to fight, thru its own organizations under its own leadership and control.

The Peace Movement

Third, there is the problem of our attitude towards the peace movement. I think it is our duty to develop, to support and to help to clarify every sincere peace movement. But first develop it and then you will have something to clarify. The main stress is on a broad movement that will learn by its own experience.

Our task is also to expose and destroy all movements masquerad-

Two Letters to the Editor

New York City

As I was reading the papers today about Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia, I recalled what I had read in the Workers Age a few weeks ago, in the January 1 issue, on the first page:

"4. On Austria: It was decided (by England and France) to allow Germany a free hand in Austria, even to the point of Anschluss. The hope was expressed that this would create a rift between Germany and Italy.

"5. On Czechoslovakia: It was decided to exert pressure on the Czechoslovakian government with the purpose of effecting certain changes as a concession to the Nazi elements."

That's just the way the things are working out and you told it in advance by more than a month.

I am a member of the Communist Party but not a Stalinite as you call it. I read the Workers Age pretty regularly. I don't agree with everything you say by any means, especially about Spain, but I find a lot of good ideas and information in your paper and interesting articles.

I remember this item particularly because I had an argument with somebody about what England would do and I used your information. I said England could never be depended upon to help the Soviet Union. Now I think that even that fellow will have to admit I was right.

L.H.

Hartford, Conn., Feb. 1, 1938

Enclosed please find my contribution to the \$10,000 drive. I am a former supporter of the Communist Party. At one time, I was sincerely convinced that the line of the C.P. was correct. This was during the period of ultra-leftism. At that time, altho the party was unrealistic in its approach to the working class and its program was much too far to the left of the needs of the workers, it was at least a revolutionary party and called for the militant struggle against the capitalist system. For that reason, I supported it.

Since the introduction of the new line, the People's Front policy, the C.P. has lost its character as the vanguard of the working class. Its policy in America, in supporting Roosevelt's foreign policy, I am now convinced, will lead us straight into imperialist war. It has come out against the Ludlow-LaFollette resolution calling for a referendum of the American people on the question of waging a foreign war. It speaks in the name of democracy, and defends democracy, yet it denies to the people this fundamental democratic measure. It is for this reason that, a short while ago, I refused to donate to the Daily Worker which has become an organ of the war-mongers and not of the struggle against war.

Its course in Spain has weakened the revolutionary struggle of the Spanish proletariat against the fascists and, if persisted in, will lead to defeat. I denounce its persecutions of other anti-fascist bodies in Spain. Because I was in Germany when Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were murdered by the German socialists, Noske and Scheidemann, it has affected me very deeply to hear of the death of Andres Nin at the hands of the Spanish Noskes and Scheidemanns. His only crime was to raise the slogan of "All power to the working class."

I have witnessed in horror and dread the slaughter of veteran revolutionists in the Soviet Union and have wondered when they will end.

For these reasons, I welcome the opportunity to help by my contribution the Workers Age and the Independent Communist Labor League in its fight for a sound revolutionary line based upon Marxism and Leninism. This is my hope for your success.

Fraternally yours,
Louis Ertman

ing under the slogans of peace that are really movements for the preparation of war. I think, roughly speaking, we can distinguish three types of movements in this connection:

There is the movement of reactionary bourgeois isolationism, the elements that say hands off in the Chinese and Spanish situation because they support Japan in China and Italy in Spain. There are not many who support Japan but there are those who support Italy because they believe Italy is doing a good "clean-up" job in Spain. Now, with them, we have nothing but direct war.

Secondly, there is the Stalinist war propaganda, poisoning the very name of peace. The test is simple—it fights Japanese imperialism but refuses to fight American imperialism.

Third, there is the unclear, sincere peace movement that wants the American Marines and the big-business interests to get out of the war areas. This is not so much because of a conscious opposition to imperialism and capitalism as because of a hatred for war and its consequences.

We have simple touchstones for testing all peace movements. The touchstone can be found in the following: Are you opposed to America's entrance into the war and, with it, to preparedness and the

FASCISTS TOO?

ACCORDING to the Daily Worker of February 5, "the resolution adopted by the Executive Board of the United Automobile Workers is a resolution giving aid to Japan, . . . aiding fascist aggression. . . ." And, according to Clarence Hathaway, in the same issue of the Daily Worker, Homer Martin's anti-war declarations, based on this resolution, are really "pro-Japanese tactics."

We have before us the statement signed by several hundred sponsors of the "Keep America Out Of War" movement. This statement urges the following program, every point of which is included in the U.A.W. resolution and which in its entirety is exactly equivalent to the resolution:

"1. The immediate removal of American ships and Marines from Chinese territory. . . .

"2. No increase in the army and navy.

"3. The amendment of the Constitution along the lines of the original Ludlow Amendment. . . .

"5. . . . No alliance with any nation or group of nations for war, declared or undeclared, under any name or pretext."

Are the signers of this statement—which is, we repeat, practically the same as the U.A.W. resolution—"giving aid to Japan" and "aiding fascist aggression"? Specifically, are the following signers engaging in "pro-Japanese tactics" when they support the statement?

ROGER BALDWIN, of the American Civil Liberties Union.

ABRAHAM EPSTEIN, of the American Association for Social Security.

PAUL BRISSENDEN, of Columbia University.

MAX DANISH, editor of the Justice, official paper of the I.L.G. W.U.

CLINTON GOLDEN, Pittsburgh regional director of the S.W.O.C.

ABRAHAM MILLER, of the New York Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers.

ROSE M. STEIN, author of "M-Day."

N. A. ZONARICH, president of the Aluminum Workers Union of the C.I.O.

ERNEST L. MEYER, columnist of the New York Post.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, of the Nation.

HERMAN F. REISSIG, of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

One last question: How about SENATOR ROBERT M. LAFOLLETTE who is going to address the March 6th meeting at the Hippodrome arranged by the "Keep America Out Of War" committee? Is he also exerting his efforts in order to "give aid to Japan"?

diplomatic moves which lead to entrance into war?

Test Number Two: Do you reject as the chief of these diplomatic manouvers, the "collective-security" swindle? Any movement that does those two things we must support and help to develop and clarify.

I emphasize that we must work with these organizations and elements that meet these tests because, out of them, will come those who will swell the ranks of the conscious revolutionary opponents of war and of the system that breeds it; out of them will come those who will provide a mass membership for our organization if we live up to our duties in this connection.

I emphasize again that our position differs from all of these positions that I have enumerated. Here are three single tests of the revolutionary position on war: (1) Opposition to your own imperialism first; (2) opposition to capitalism as the basic cause of war; and (3) for the sharpening of the class struggle in place of its abandonment, when the war is on.