

# WORKERS AGE

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

VOL. IV, No. 48.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1935.

Five Cents

## At First GLANCE

By JAY LOVESTONE

**E**VEN so conservative a labor leader as Sir Walter Citrine, Secretary of the British Trade Union Congress, is compelled to speak favorably of the general trend of developments in the Soviet Union. Sir Citrine has spent quite a number of years inculcating British labor against communist and Soviet influence. Recently he went to the U.S.S.R. for a visit to get another glance at the workers' republic. Apparently Mr. Citrine took a good look. In substance, his conclusion as to the Soviet Union today is the following:

"... There is a definite improvement in the foundation of Russia's industrial future. In my judgment the future is soundly laid. I expect that there will be a definite improvement in the next two or three years in the standard of life, and I am optimistic enough to say that it will be maintained... Russia had been concentrating its attention mainly on the heavy industries. It had put in a most intense effort and there were many great achievements to its credit."

It would not harm some members of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor to examine Sir Citrine's findings. Then, of course, we would also suggest that some of them take a trip to the Soviet Union and see for themselves. It could only do good all around.

\*\*\*  
ON his Armistice Day Address President Roosevelt dropped this gem as a contribution to world peace:

"The United States will ever seek ways of peace, but she will protect herself." This is a very, very old song. There never yet was a capitalist diplomat or imperialist apologist who did not hum this same tune. Such talk is cheap especially when it is accompanied by feverish and fabulously expensive arming.

While Roosevelt was shedding crocodile tears for peace at the tomb of the unknown soldier, an American aerial armada of more than forty ships was engaged in extensive and extremely significant maneuvers in the Pacific. And the Department of Commerce was reporting about the heavy inroads in the domestic textile market being made by Japan. At the same time the Japanese government was proposing to put a stop to some British financial manipulations in the Chinese currency market. These manipulations were planned for months with the tacit but unquestionable support of the American government. Concurrently, the United States was arriving at an agreement with Great Britain as to the main lines of the next naval conference.

From all of this it is quite clear that "big things" are brewing in the Pacific and that may come to a head much sooner than most people expect. We venture to say that the Japanese have been hurrying up their looting of China  
(Continued on Page 4)

## SANCTIONS AND THE SOVIET UNION

By WILL HERBERG

The problem of sanctions, as it has arisen in connection with the Ethiopian situation, is one of considerable importance both from an immediate political angle and from a long-range theoretical viewpoint. The whole matter has already been discussed in many of its aspects in the Workers Age and in the radical press generally but there is one side of the question that seems to me to have received inadequate attention altho it is really of fundamental significance. I am referring to the attitude of the Soviet Union on sanctions.

For the official Communist Party there is no problem at all; it favors sanctions as such and so it naturally endorses the Soviet support of sanctions in League councils. The Trotskyites in the Workers Party, on the other hand, taking the directly opposite standpoint, are beside themselves with virtuous indignation at the Soviet government for its policy on sanctions. A number of Militant Socialists, too, seem to believe that Soviet diplomacy has made a grave error on this question, altho they, of course, do not share the anti-Soviet bias of the Trotskyites. The position of the Communist Opposition is quite distinct from any of these attitudes for, while we are uncompromisingly opposed to the policy of the Comintern, we find nothing wrong in the line followed by the Soviet Union in advocating sanctions. At first sight this may appear somewhat paradoxical, but I believe that such an impression is due to a failure to think things thru and that deeper consideration will show that our position is not only entirely logical in itself but is the only one that meets the requirements of Marxist realism in the situation.

What exactly do we take exception to in the sanction policy of the Communist International? Are we against the ef-

fects of sanctions (assuming they will be effective) in strangling Italy economically and financially and thus hindering its war plans in Africa? Certainly not! We are neither pacifists nor sentimental humanitarians and we do not shed maudlin tears over "starving the women and children of Italy." What we do object to is labor advocacy of governmental sanctions! What we do oppose is for the workers to demand the imposition of sanctions by their government or to support their government in such a course. Why? Because such action establishes an objective link of cooperation between the workers and the bourgeoisie, binding the labor movement to support the government in whatever consequences the imposition of sanctions may have. We are against the British Communists calling for the closing of the Suez Canal not because we do not want the Suez Canal closed to Italian ships but because, should the British government act upon this slogan and proceed to close the canal by despatching men of war to Suez (the only way in which the canal could possibly be closed), the British Communists would be bound, by ordinary political consistency, to support and take responsibility for the naval activities of the government initiated and carried out in response to their own demand. In other words, the British Communists would, despite the best of intentions, be converted into a support of British imperialism, into a partner of the Tories in defense of "empire interests." So it is in political logic and so it is in actual fact. What else does it mean when Harry Pollitt, outstanding C.P. spokesman, joins with the Tory candidate for Central Edinburgh, at a meeting to demand more vigorous action on the part of the British government against Italy?

The sanctions policy of the Comintern —and of the Socialist International as

well—is false because it necessarily involves class collaboration between the labor movement and the capitalist government (naturally in the pursuit of the latter's imperialistic aims), because it necessarily implies truce, or even peace, between the two. In place of the sanctions policy, we urge the independent, international class action of labor against Italian imperialism. We urge a labor boycott as an economic weapon against Mussolini; we urge strike action to disrupt transport of all necessary war materials (and not merely arms and munitions) to Italy; we urge all possible support to the anti-Fascist movement in Italy and to the Ethiopian people in their desperate efforts to escape the claws of the Fascist bird of prey. Such actions are independent; they do not bind us to any support of the government; they do not make us into unwilling cat's-paws in the service of imperialism.

### No Collaboration With Bourgeois Governments

The Marxist objection to the sanctions policy of the C.I. and the L.S.I. is, therefore, that, in its very nature and quite apart from any subjective intentions, it implies collaboration with the bourgeois governments—and this, of course, is quite fatal to any revolutionary labor policy in the capitalist world. But has this consideration any relevance as far as the Soviet Union is concerned? Practically everybody, aside from a few pseudo-revolutionary doctrinaires, recognizes that some sort of economic and political collaboration between the Soviet Union and the bourgeois powers is absolutely inevitable in the present period of peaceful coexistence between the two and that such collaboration, if properly carried out, can be of immense advantage to the U.S.S.R. Nor is there, in principle, any essential difference between economic collaboration, diplomatic al-

liances and military pacts. The objection to the sanctions policy of the C.I. is absolutely meaningless when raised against the Soviet government, for no one opposes, as a matter of principle, the collaboration of the Soviet Union and the capitalist powers on the field of international economics and politics. The distinction is fundamental and clear. It is obviously one thing for the Soviet government to enter into a treaty with Germany or even into a military alliance with France; and it is quite another thing, surely, for the German or French workers to declare a class truce with their own bourgeoisies!

Once it is seen that the main objection to the sanctions policy of the C.I. and the L.S.I. has no relevance when extended to the Soviet Union, the whole case against the latter collapses. From the point of view of principle, the only consistent argument against the Soviet sanctions policy would apply with equal force to any sort of official relations between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist world and so, by proving too much, it proves nothing. As a matter of fact, the only valid criterion in estimating Soviet policy in this field is one of expediency and practical consequence. And, judging it from this angle, does any one doubt that, on the whole, the course of Soviet diplomacy at Geneva has proven of greatest assistance to Ethiopia and to the anti-Fascist cause generally?

### Same Fight But On Different Planes

Fundamentally considered, the question at issue is not one of sanctions at all; it really concerns the relation between Soviet diplomacy and revolutionary labor policy in capitalist countries. Of course, the two must necessarily be identical in aim and purpose, for the interests of the working class are basically the same internationally. But should they also be identical in form and method? Theoretical considerations and practical experience unite in a decidedly negative answer. Nothing could be more fatal than the mechanical transference of Soviet diplomacy to the field of revolutionary labor strategy—thereby leading to opportunism in its grossest form. This is something which the official Communist Party has still to learn. But, by the same token, it would be manifestly absurd for the Soviet government to model its diplomatic course on the strategical line of the revolutionary labor movement in the capitalist countries—thereby leading to suicidal ultra-leftist adventurism in its foreign policy. This is something for the Trotskyites to learn if, indeed, they are still capable of learning anything at all where the Soviet Union is concerned!

No!—the Soviet government and the revolutionary labor movement in the lands of capitalism strive for the same fundamental aims and purposes but they carry on their fight on altogether different planes, under altogether different forms, with altogether different methods! And this is as true for the question of sanctions as it is everywhere else!

## Local 22 ILGWU Prepares For General Strike

Over 1500 dressmakers, members of Local 22, gathered at the Delano Hotel on Saturday, November 30 to hear a report from their manager Charles S. Zimmerman on preparations for the coming strike.

In dealing with the conditions in the industry, Zimmerman exposed the chaos and confusion in which the various employers associations find themselves today. The association of the contractors, the United, has been making every effort to secure the services of some "military man" to become the leader of their organization. He pointed out that these petty chiselers had negotiated first with General Johnson, then with Colonel Padock and others and now again with General Johnson in the hope of getting a strong man to take charge of their fight against the dressmakers in the coming general strike.

The association of the jobbers, the National, is split wide open. Attempts are being made to set up another asso-

ciation consisting of all jobbers in the cheaper line of dresses. The dissension and division amongst the employers is very great.

Zimmerman emphasized that all the maneuvering and attempts on the part of the employers to set up new associations, to get themselves "military" leadership in order to tear down the conditions the dressmakers had won thru years of bitter struggle and sacrifice, would do them no good whatsoever.

Our union approaches the expiration of the agreement and another general strike, stronger than ever, more consolidated, more powerful than ever. He discussed in detail the plans of the Joint Board to mobilize and prepare for a strike. A special training school will be set up to train and prepare a "general staff" to lead and take charge of our army of 100,000 dressmakers who will be involved in the strike.

Special plans have been worked out to mobilize every building chairman and

shop chairman, for their particular work in the strike. The problem of housing—getting halls—for this huge army, is being tackled now.

Zimmerman served warning on both the Italian fascist elements and the Nazis that their feeble attempts to sow dissension and race hatred in the ranks of our union, would be dealt with long before our strike takes place.

"We are preparing our answer to you," said Zimmerman, "an answer so powerful, that you will never again show your faces in the dress market or wherever our dressmakers gather."

In closing his report Zimmerman stated that this meeting represented active members of all groupings and tendencies in the union. The long struggle and efforts of the Progressive administration to secure the cooperation of all elements in the union had finally been realized.

A large number of dressmakers participated in the discussion.

## REVIEW OF THE WEEK

OIL EMBARGO PLAN CAUSING WORLD TENSION; JAPAN TIGHTENS HOLD IN NORTH CHINA; LAVAL IS FACING REAL TEST; ROOSEVELT SAYS SPENDING ABOUT OVER

### OIL BAN MAY MEAN WAR ITALIANS INSIST

**P**OURING oil on troubled waters is assuming new meaning these days. The nations of the world applying sanctions have postponed, in view of the seriousness and far-reaching implications of the step, a final decision on shutting off Italy's oil supply. The question will be finally considered on December 12.

In the meantime Italy is desperately fighting back. The army has again been placed at full fighting capacity—all leaves having been cancelled. At the same time carefully guarded troop movements are taking place and the guess is that the direction is toward Libya from which an attack against Egypt and the Suez Canal may be directed.

Mussolini's cabinet, or what there is of it, was hastily convened to lend the illusion of broad support and of course it endorsed all the measures outlined by Il Duce. The Italian press was instructed to lay it on thick and it dutifully broke out in a bristling attack against the "vivasanctionist" nations (referring to themselves as the guinea pig upon whom the League is trying out new methods of international coercion) and especially against Great Britain. European diplomatic circles took seriously rumors emanating from Italy that the Fascist Grand Council has decided to

answer an oil embargo along three lines: Withdraw its diplomats from all countries applying sanctions, withdraw from the League, immediately order the bombing and destruction of the British in the Mediterranean.

That Great Britain took the rumor seriously became evident when on its request France openly declared that any unfriendly act against Great Britain would be considered as sufficient reason for France to render Great Britain whatever aid the situation called for.

In a military sense Italy is in a bad position. The recent offensive on the Northern and Southern fronts, the latter threatening to engulf Jijiga and cutting off Ethiopia's main source of arms and munitions, have spent themselves and have been replaced by rapid and disorderly retreats on both fronts. This is based on reports from Ethiopian sources which the Italians have neither denied nor substantiated.

### JAPAN WORRIES BRITAIN BY NORTH CHINA GRAB

**I**MPERIALIST politics in the orient is not without humor. To Britain's question on her intention in North China, Japan replied: "The North China autonomy movement is a purely Chinese affair, for which Japan is not responsible."

Altho Nanking was finally forced to give up all opposition to the declaration

of autonomy, the pressure brought to bear, especially by the European imperialist powers, helped to thwart the major portion of Japan's well planned scheme. Instead of the five northern provinces with a population of 95,000,000, Japan secured only Eastern Hopei with a population of 4,000,000. However, the campaign is by no means ended and further inroads by Japan may be expected.

At the same time as the autonomy of this important rail center, negotiations between the Japanese-supported Manchukuan delegates and the representatives of the Mongolian Peoples Republic broke off. Manchukuo threatened with Japanese bayonets and Mongolia seems to be prepared to defend its borders judging by the calmness with which they faced these and preceding threats of dismemberment.

Again, dissatisfaction with the regime of Chiang Kai-Shek is becoming widespread and it is not excluded that secession may once again break out in the Canton area if Nanking continues to bend the knee to Japan.

Japan, having touched upon sections of China hitherto considered as in Britain's sphere, is being interpolated by Great Britain but no further steps are likely because of Great Britain's precarious position in the Mediterranean at the moment as a result of the Ethiopian conflict.

The United States is not officially cognizant of developments in China, Amer-

ican interests in Northern China being relatively slight. However, Washington's sudden interest in Japanese cotton cloth flooding American markets may not be totally unrelated to the present Japanese drive into China. The State Department announced that it is attempting to secure a voluntary restriction of Japanese imported cotton cloth. Whether Japanese interests will agree remains to be seen.

### LAVAL GETS SUPPORT ON FISCAL MEASURES

**P**REMIER Laval of France has received a vote of confidence in his financial policies (324 to 247) despite the combined opposition of the Communists and Socialists in the Chamber of Deputies. He did succeed, however, in splitting the Peoples' Front, the majority of the Radical Socialists voting with him to approve his financial program.

Nevertheless, Laval is not out of the woods yet. The chief issue to come before this session of parliament is the question of the suppression of the armed terror bands of the Croix de Feu and other fascist groups. Much depends upon this question. There is considerable speculation as to whether the majority of the Radicals will go along with him on a tight-rope walking excursion. The Communists and Socialists are determined to make this a last ditch fight.

The same can hardly be said of the Radicals whose demand for the suppression of the fascists is tempered by the fear of the overthrow of Laval and the subsequent task of perhaps taking over the government. With typical petty-bourgeois indecision they continue to hesitate and procrastinate thus aiding and strengthening the forces of fascism.

Leon Blum elicited from Laval a most damaging statement during the discussion of his financial program. In answer to Blum's question as to whether he would not have preferred to rule without parliament, Laval replied that he would have preferred that. Blum's underscoring of that reply made it clear that Laval was not adverse to a one-man dictatorship. The probabilities are that much more will be heard about this reply.

### HEAVY SPENDING OVER SAYS ROOSEVELT

**F**ROM many directions it is becoming apparent that big industry considers itself once again on solid ground and prefers to have "natural economic laws" take their course rather than continued tinkering in Washington. Big business and the financial over-lords of the nation are also in a rage at the continued "spending spree" of the government (\$9,900,000 per day income and \$21,100,-  
(Continued on Page 4)



### Labor Party from Outside Tried by C. P. in Detroit

By JAMES MCCARTHY

The reputation of British Police efficiency is world-wide. In Detroit the police are even trying to copy its methods literally. November 5th being the 330th anniversary of the attempt of a gent by the name of Cromwell to blow up the house of Parliament in Westminster the Detroit Police Department got jittery and raided C.P. headquarters. They were unable to locate any bombs but they claim to have found pictures of Lenin, Trotsky (?), Stalin, and Maurice Sugar! By sheer coincidence Maurice Sugar was on the ballot for councilman in the municipal elections on the following day, and was the only candidate with a labor platform. This raid, which was preceded by a violent red baiting campaign in all the capitalist papers, had the desired effect as Sugar was defeated for the last place on the City Council by 14,000 votes. The Detroit capitalists breathed a sigh of relief at being rid of this annoyance for another two years.

While the heavy vote for Sugar (55,000) indicates a growing tendency among the workers to support their own candidates, it is our painful and comradely duty to point out the completely false and dangerous strategy of the United Labor Conference for Political Action, the organization sponsoring Sugar—a strategy which if persisted in must lead to disaster. At this point a little local history is necessary.

#### Background of Conference

The United Labor Conference for Political Action was born out of the Continuation Committee's previous campaign for Sugar for Recorder Court judge in which he was officially supported by the Detroit Federation of Labor. This committee had no legal existence inside the labor movement, as the only political committee recognized by the Detroit Federation of Labor is the political Action Committee which dies automatically after each election and is reappointed before the next. At the time that the Conference was set up Sugar's large vote for Judge (63,000) was central to the organization's program. Twice, in regular and special sessions, that heretofore moribund assembly repudiated the old method of recommendation of boss candidates by a committee handpicked by the President. Instead of using this wide open situation to promote a fight for labor candidates and a labor party thru the legitimate channels of labor including its highest body, the city central body, the Conference in its revolutionary impatience decided to do the job on the outside and then offer it out and dried on a platter to the A. F. of L. for support.

On June 30th the Conference called a rump convention inviting delegates from all locals of the A. F. of L. and independent unions, clubs, etc. So eager was the credentials committee to make the meeting a success that they invited everyone including some unsuspecting visitors who had innocently signed the names of their organizations. The S.P. (present by special invitation) introduced a resolution substantially the same as the statement issued by the Progressive Trade Unionists Club demanding a Labor Party thru the regular channels of organized labor. This was supported by the Progressive delegates and in spite of all maneuvering it became the chief subject of discussion. So poor were the arguments against this resolution that W. Weinstein, District Organizer of the C.P., was forced to take the floor, thus destroying the illusion that the conference was initiated solely by trade unionists. The conference, of those that remained nominated a slate of 9 for the Council. These were finally hollered down to 3—Sugar, McKie and O'Camp. It is significant that until raised from the floor the leaders of the conference had not even mentioned the Labor Party. While the progressive resolution was defeated the conference was forced to compromise to the extent of asking the central body to call a special meeting to discuss a labor party jointly with the conference itself.

#### C.P. Strategy Meant Defeat

In preparing for the special meeting of the Central Body to discuss the question of political action the Progressives with the help of some members of the S.P., managed to get together quite a few delegates behind a resolution calling for a special conference, to consist of two specially elected delegates to discuss the question of political action. When the special meeting was finally called, the Conference delegates

immediately moved their resolution calling upon the Federation to support the idea of a Labor Party, and to get together with the Conference for the purpose of putting over their labor slate. The Progressive resolution was introduced as an amendment to the motion. The Conference supported the bureaucracy in voting down the amendment. However, the whole discussion centered on the progressive proposal, and several progressives were enabled to bring out very clearly how this would take the issue to where it belonged, that is to the locals, without whose support and understanding there could be no real labor party. The bureaucrats used every means in their power to keep the discussion off the main question and laid emphasis on the undesirable nature of some of the new unions and that this would give them the same rights as the old unions in such a meeting. Particularly was the C.P. controlled Ford local of the U.A.W.A. attacked. The delegates of the conference voted against the progressive, one delegate even going so far as to hand a bouquet to Martel as our "glorious leader." Doubtless this was to curry favor with the latter who had not yet clamped down on the Conference. As we shall see later he was playing the main question against the amendment against his real enemies—the progressives. Finally in a desperate attempt to stifle any more exposure of the tactics of the Conference, its supporters called the question, thereby cutting off discussion on their own proposal as well as on the amendment. Both were defeated, the amendment getting over 30 votes (official count 26), the motion 46 (probably a few more). The meeting was hurriedly adjourned by the officials without any definite policy being decided upon. The Conference then voted against the amendment getting their last chance to test their policy.

Matters now stood deadlocked but with time on the side of the fat boys. The final showdown came a few days before election. At the regular meeting of the central body Sugar was proposed as a candidate to be elected to the excellent record as a fighter for labor. Then the barrage began. One after another, business agents suddenly interested in the principles of the labor movement, got up and hammered away at the sore spot. Sugar might or might not be a fine fellow, but he was not a labor candidate and ask for the nomination as he had done successfully on a previous occasion? Why had he organized a conference with the reds on the outside and tried to force

### Quotation Marks

THEY (the Social-Democrats) must understand that the real defense of democracy is not he who says that he is defending the republic against the fascist dictatorship, defending democracy against fascism. Cavagnac was, subjectively speaking, the same republican general as Otto Bauer is a supporter of democracy, but both of them, by adhering to a conservative manner to the existing political forms were in reality paving the way for the victory of reaction. The Communist workers who struggle against the bourgeois republic and bourgeois democracy for proletarian dictatorship are doing more to bar the path to fascism than all the social-democratic party with its daily declamations about "democracy."

—D. Z. MANULSKY IN "SOCIAL DEMOCRACY — STEPPING STONE TO FASCISM"

his ideas down labor's throat? Why had he tried to sneak an endorsement thru the back door?

The conference had no answer for this, except personal eulogies of Sugar. One or two progressives were asked to speak against his endorsement because of his labor platform, something which no other candidates had. No one pointed out the hypocrisy of the bureaucrats in taking this line after they had voted against the amendment of the progressives at the special meeting. When the motion to nominate Sugar was defeated decisively no one tried to require a record vote.

#### Lost Opportunities

Thus a splendid opportunity for setting on foot a genuine Labor Party in this locality was lost thru wrong tactics resulting in a setback for the idea at present. The Progressive Trade Unionists Club is trying to re-introduce the idea by exposing the actions of the new council, holding the eight members responsible for the endorsement as responsible for the setback. Another bad feature of the campaign for Sugar was the altogether too indiscriminate use of issues which were not labor issues as such but which were momentarily in the public eye. Headlines against the early closing of saloons, the personal virtues of a candidate, all smacked too much of the methods and approach of old line politicians. The labor party idea has had but little chance amongst these things. It is now possible to draw very definite

### Knitgoods Union Needs Unity On Eve of Big General Strike

By LOUIS NELSON (Manager Joint Council Knitgoods Workers Union)

It is now several months since the dual "Industrial Union" in the knitgoods industry liquidated and its membership entered into the Joint Council Knitgoods Workers Union. An examination of the activities of the leadership of the defunct union since their entrance into the Joint Council will readily show that despite their repeated proclamations for unity they have given up only the dualist organization but the ideology and attitude of the dual union period still remains.

Recent issues of the Freiheit, Jewish organ of the Communist Party, have waged a campaign of slander against the leadership of the Joint Council attempting to prove that the Joint Council officers are discriminating against the former members of the "Industrial Union," that they are stifling discussion, that the Freiheit and the "Rank and File" group protest loudly against the tax which the "Industrial Union" members will have to pay and against the fact that the manager of the Joint Council is privileged to take the floor at Union membership meetings to sum up the discussion.

The One Day Tax The second question is typical of the pettiness and dog-in-the-manger attitude that these fellows resort to in seeking for differences and issues when none exist. Of course all workers know conclusions from this turmoil. First on the basis of this failure, the progressives must point out the necessity of putting forth ideas in such a way that the membership of the trade unions themselves become interested enough to make demands on their officials and higher bodies, and force them to comply with such demands.

Secondly, the progressives should be organized far more closely than at present. Only then will it be possible to defeat any attempt to set up other such dual bodies.

Lastly, and the hardest task of all, drawing into the fight all militant trade unionists outside the radical movement. This job can best be done by replacing revolutionary rhetoric with revolutionary patience.

The Sugar campaign has succeeded in putting the name of a labor representative before the voters. It has failed in what should have been its most important task—the building of a Labor Party.

that Union procedure permits the manager of a Union to sum up a discussion before a vote is taken. Would it be democratic to permit the "Rank and File" to proceed with an attack against the Union and its officers without permitting the manager of the Union to reply? The day's tax which the "Rank and File" and the Freiheit so strenuously oppose is a tax that had been leveled by the membership of the Council to cover the debts contracted by the Union as a result of the 1934 General Strike. This tax must be paid by all who joined the Union subsequently and this of course includes the former members of the "Industrial Union." When one reads the campaign of slander against the leadership of the Joint Council attempting to prove that the Joint Council officers are discriminating against the former members of the "Industrial Union," that they are stifling discussion, that the Freiheit and the "Rank and File" group protest loudly against the tax which the "Industrial Union" members will have to pay and against the fact that the manager of the Joint Council is privileged to take the floor at Union membership meetings to sum up the discussion.

However the official reason given for the opposition is that a tax had been paid to the liquidated "Industrial Union." When challenged as to right of the "Industrial Union" to collect a 1935 General Strike tax after they had gone on record for liquidation, the explanation was quickly changed and they now proclaim that the tax was collected for single strikes (Freiheit, Nov. 17th). But, the Joint Council has in its position as one of the membership books from the "Industrial Union" and they state quite plainly: DAY'S WAGE TAX FOR GENERAL STRIKE FUND OF 1935. The collection of this tax by the "Industrial Union" was an outright fraud. So concerned were these "revolutionaries" with unity of the knitgoods workers that they did not permit a single one of their shops to enter the Joint Council until this fraudulent tax was collected. It is in place to ask: what was done with the money collected?

Whom Does Fascism Serve? It would appear, also, that Fascism has no class basis in France at all. Vaillant-Couturier (Humanite, Oct. 22) speaks of the fascist movement as "agents of Mussolini and the munitions manufacturers." Precisely the opposite of what the masses should be taught—that the fascists are agents of capitalism to preserve the system against the interests of all other national bourgeoisies. This opportunist-chauvinist approach leads directly to national defense. For, why limit the fight merely to the agents of Hitler and Mussolini? Why not carry it further—against Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy? And for the Party it is indeed "why not?" There is however a section of the "General Staff," writes Vaillant-Couturier (L'Humanite, October 23), "WHICH PUTS NATIONAL DEFENSE ABOVE POLITICS, and which deplores the sight of the army being 'ruined by the agents of the colonies.' To put 'national defense above political differences,' is not that the rallying cry for imperialist war? Yet, the Communist Party, born in the struggle against imperialist war, follows the road of militant opportunism.

By completely striking out a Marxian analysis of fascism as the agent of the native imperialism, growing out of bourgeois democracy, it is a logical impossibility to reach the conclusion that the fascists represent the bourgeoisie preparing for civil war against the workers. Therefore they regard the workers and munitions makers (insofar as they represent anything), who act against the "will of the people."

Their preparations for civil war have been excellently exposed by the party. But the proletarian answer to such preparation for counter-revolution is revolutionary civil war. And this answer the Party is not prepared to give and does not give! In order to fully understand this astounding anti-Bolshevism, it is necessary to see the attitude of those who crack the whip over the workers—Herriot's Radical Socialist Party. This is a bourgeois party, which thinks in terms of and defends bourgeois liberalism. Witness: Herriot: " . . . It is indispensable that we maintain our liberties. But it is not by us'g force—which is always an abuse and an obstacle to bourgeois rule. To give up our liberties, our duty is to put an end to all displays of armed violence." (Quoted in Humanite, Oct. 16th).

Our progressive administration is today organizing and mobilizing the knitgoods workers for the General Strike that will follow the expiration of the present agreement. For a successful mobilization, unity and solidarity in our ranks is imperative. The knitgoods workers will not stand for any obstacles that will prevent the unification of our ranks, they will ruthlessly sweep aside all those who attempt to stop this process.

Strengthen the Police! And on this Humanite comments: "A brief but energetic editorial which puts forth a resolute policy against the fascist leagues!" Parliamentary government is losing its popularity when the Communist and fascist movements are growing. Both feed on the growing disillusionment of the masses with bourgeois democracy. Obviously this regime, discredited in the eyes of the masses from the left and the right, cannot undertake the major task of disarming the fascists. With the traditional form of government tottering extra-legal action becomes, more and more, the chosen channel of bourgeois rule. The masses must also take to extra-legal methods. The Radical Socialist Party is against Communism and Fascism because both are (or should be) extra-legal movements; the Radicals represent traditional legality. This is why the campaign against the Communist Party has been conducted along the lines of pure legality—a legalism in which both the masses and the big bourgeoisie are fast losing faith!

Appeal after appeal went forth to Laval to disarm the Croix de Feu, the Cagoule, the "Parti du Sein," and the "Parti de la Justice" wrote indignantly: "Is Laval going to allow the republican police force to be massacred by the fascists?" The re-

### Emphasis on Legalism Is Crux Of French C.P.'s Fight on Fascism

By M. S. MAUTNER

In the columns of the Workers Age it has already been pointed out that the basic error of the 7th Comintern Congress in its orientation on fascism, is to be found in Dimitroff's formulation: "The workers today are not forming between proletariat and bourgeoisie a bourgeois democracy, but between bourgeois democracy and fascism." It was clear that a false position on democracy would transform the entire policy and propaganda of the Communists. The French party has proven this conclusively in the short period since the Congress.

From the struggle for the ratification of the Franco-Soviet pact, the Communist Party derives its fundamental attitude towards the fascists as "the representatives of foreigners," "agents of Mussolini," "French Hitlerites," "agents of the fascist bourgeoisie," "representatives of foreign imperialism, endangering the existence of French imperialism!" Such a policy plays into the hands of French capitalism, which finds the masses already whipped up into a frenzy against "foreigners," against "the Hitlerites," so that the Communist Party has very little left to do.

It is criminally wrong to teach the masses that fascism is a foreign importation, to teach them to hate foreign imperialism, while asking them to defend "the institutions of the republic," which happen to be the institutions of foreign imperialism, with a very threadbare democratic covering.

#### Whom Does Fascism Serve?

Anyone with the slightest acquaintance with Marxism can see at a glance the anti-working class character of this resolution. Of course, no better can be expected of a bourgeois party. But by hail-storming the resolution as a victory, the Party betrays the interests of the proletariat to fight fascist aggression, to fight all forms of bourgeois attack! By offering full support to the Radicals to put this into effect ("If only they would take power and carry out their program," screams Cagoule in Humanite, October 26), the Party teaches the masses not to break with bourgeois ideology but to retain it precisely at the moment when a rupture is necessary.

#### No Defense Permissible

The first time the Party has approached this question was in the October 1934 session of the Central Committee. The resolution read: "The activity of the fascist leagues, toward whose disarmament and dissolution the Laval government has taken no steps, their threats of civil war, emanating from foreign governments in whose pay they are, oblige the people of France, devoted to liber-

ation until the leaders of the enemies of the people . . . are disarmed and by the law (emphasis in original), under mass pressure, put beyond the point where they can harm the country."

But there is a tremendous pressure "to do something," which the Party does its level best to keep within "legal" bounds, in deference to their Radical friends. For example, the following appears in bold type in Humanite (Oct. 22): "Workers! On Guard; General Mobilization! Beware of an attack. Be ready to answer the fascist mobilization WITH DISCIPLINE AND COMPOSURE!" (emphasis in original).

To the fascist terror the Party replies with composure! In the "red suburbs" around Paris, the Party instructed its mayors to use the police to break up the fascists. But this right was challenged and effectively removed. The party's answer was to publish long, legal opinions of bourgeois lawyers, "proving" the existence of such a right in bourgeois law. And on this issue the Party was completely correct (Oct. 22): "Here then, drawn from the archives of the bourgeoisie, are texts which will serve the municipal governments of the Peoples Front for the organization of LEGAL (emphasis in original) defense against armed attacks and for the raising of the militia."

In a united front with a bourgeois party you must not be illegal! To conduct a proletarian, revolutionary policy, you cannot be legal. And this is the Party's dilemma, in which it blithely and criminally chooses the first alternative.

In the final analysis, the struggle against fascism resolves itself into the struggle for power—proletarian dictatorship. Our task is to win the masses from bourgeois democracy, not to yield and to be left with the immediate needs of the struggle, is the formation of self-defense corps—the arming of the workers.

One step, dictated not by academic theory but by the immediate needs of the struggle, is the formation of self-defense corps—the arming of the workers. The first time the Party has approached this question was in the October 1934 session of the Central Committee. The resolution read: "The activity of the fascist leagues, toward whose disarmament and dissolution the Laval government has taken no steps, their threats of civil war, emanating from foreign governments in whose pay they are, oblige the people of France, devoted to liber-

ation until the leaders of the enemies of the people . . . are disarmed and by the law (emphasis in original), under mass pressure, put beyond the point where they can harm the country."

But there is a tremendous pressure "to do something," which the Party does its level best to keep within "legal" bounds, in deference to their Radical friends. For example, the following appears in bold type in Humanite (Oct. 22): "Workers! On Guard; General Mobilization! Beware of an attack. Be ready to answer the fascist mobilization WITH DISCIPLINE AND COMPOSURE!" (emphasis in original).

To the fascist terror the Party replies with composure! In the "red suburbs" around Paris, the Party instructed its mayors to use the police to break up the fascists. But this right was challenged and effectively removed. The party's answer was to publish long, legal opinions of bourgeois lawyers, "proving" the existence of such a right in bourgeois law. And on this issue the Party was completely correct (Oct. 22): "Here then, drawn from the archives of the bourgeoisie, are texts which will serve the municipal governments of the Peoples Front for the organization of LEGAL (emphasis in original) defense against armed attacks and for the raising of the militia."

In a united front with a bourgeois party you must not be illegal! To conduct a proletarian, revolutionary policy, you cannot be legal. And this is the Party's dilemma, in which it blithely and criminally chooses the first alternative.

tion until the leaders of the enemies of the people . . . are disarmed and by the law (emphasis in original), under mass pressure, put beyond the point where they can harm the country."

But there is a tremendous pressure "to do something," which the Party does its level best to keep within "legal" bounds, in deference to their Radical friends. For example, the following appears in bold type in Humanite (Oct. 22): "Workers! On Guard; General Mobilization! Beware of an attack. Be ready to answer the fascist mobilization WITH DISCIPLINE AND COMPOSURE!" (emphasis in original).

To the fascist terror the Party replies with composure! In the "red suburbs" around Paris, the Party instructed its mayors to use the police to break up the fascists. But this right was challenged and effectively removed. The party's answer was to publish long, legal opinions of bourgeois lawyers, "proving" the existence of such a right in bourgeois law. And on this issue the Party was completely correct (Oct. 22): "Here then, drawn from the archives of the bourgeoisie, are texts which will serve the municipal governments of the Peoples Front for the organization of LEGAL (emphasis in original) defense against armed attacks and for the raising of the militia."

In a united front with a bourgeois party you must not be illegal! To conduct a proletarian, revolutionary policy, you cannot be legal. And this is the Party's dilemma, in which it blithely and criminally chooses the first alternative.

In the final analysis, the struggle against fascism resolves itself into the struggle for power—proletarian dictatorship. Our task is to win the masses from bourgeois democracy, not to yield and to be left with the immediate needs of the struggle, is the formation of self-defense corps—the arming of the workers.

One step, dictated not by academic theory but by the immediate needs of the struggle, is the formation of self-defense corps—the arming of the workers. The first time the Party has approached this question was in the October 1934 session of the Central Committee. The resolution read: "The activity of the fascist leagues, toward whose disarmament and dissolution the Laval government has taken no steps, their threats of civil war, emanating from foreign governments in whose pay they are, oblige the people of France, devoted to liber-

ation until the leaders of the enemies of the people . . . are disarmed and by the law (emphasis in original), under mass pressure, put beyond the point where they can harm the country."

But there is a tremendous pressure "to do something," which the Party does its level best to keep within "legal" bounds, in deference to their Radical friends. For example, the following appears in bold type in Humanite (Oct. 22): "Workers! On Guard; General Mobilization! Beware of an attack. Be ready to answer the fascist mobilization WITH DISCIPLINE AND COMPOSURE!" (emphasis in original).

To the fascist terror the Party replies with composure! In the "red suburbs" around Paris, the Party instructed its mayors to use the police to break up the fascists. But this right was challenged and effectively removed. The party's answer was to publish long, legal opinions of bourgeois lawyers, "proving" the existence of such a right in bourgeois law. And on this issue the Party was completely correct (Oct. 22): "Here then, drawn from the archives of the bourgeoisie, are texts which will serve the municipal governments of the Peoples Front for the organization of LEGAL (emphasis in original) defense against armed attacks and for the raising of the militia."

In a united front with a bourgeois party you must not be illegal! To conduct a proletarian, revolutionary policy, you cannot be legal. And this is the Party's dilemma, in which it blithely and criminally chooses the first alternative.

In the final analysis, the struggle against fascism resolves itself into the struggle for power—proletarian dictatorship. Our task is to win the masses from bourgeois democracy, not to yield and to be left with the immediate needs of the struggle, is the formation of self-defense corps—the arming of the workers.

One step, dictated not by academic theory but by the immediate needs of the struggle, is the formation of self-defense corps—the arming of the workers. The first time the Party has approached this question was in the October 1934 session of the Central Committee. The resolution read: "The activity of the fascist leagues, toward whose disarmament and dissolution the Laval government has taken no steps, their threats of civil war, emanating from foreign governments in whose pay they are, oblige the people of France, devoted to liber-

ation until the leaders of the enemies of the people . . . are disarmed and by the law (emphasis in original), under mass pressure, put beyond the point where they can harm the country."

But there is a tremendous pressure "to do something," which the Party does its level best to keep within "legal" bounds, in deference to their Radical friends. For example, the following appears in bold type in Humanite (Oct. 22): "Workers! On Guard; General Mobilization! Beware of an attack. Be ready to answer the fascist mobilization WITH DISCIPLINE AND COMPOSURE!" (emphasis in original).

To the fascist terror the Party replies with composure! In the "red suburbs" around Paris, the Party instructed its mayors to use the police to break up the fascists. But this right was challenged and effectively removed. The party's answer was to publish long, legal opinions of bourgeois lawyers, "proving" the existence of such a right in bourgeois law. And on this issue the Party was completely correct (Oct. 22): "Here then, drawn from the archives of the bourgeoisie, are texts which will serve the municipal governments of the Peoples Front for the organization of LEGAL (emphasis in original) defense against armed attacks and for the raising of the militia."

### Notes on the Debate Between Norman Thomas - Earl Browder

By JAMES MCCARTHY

Twenty thousand socialists and communists filled the Madison Square Garden last week to listen to Norman Thomas and Earl Browder present their respective programs. The great majority of those in attendance (admittedly communist) must have left with a bitter taste in the mouth after watching the belly-crawling of Earl Browder. Just as in the past the C.P. believed that socialists can be won by means of bluster and bombast, so the C.P. now thinks that the same can be accomplished thru Christian humility and martyr-like self-negation. The C.P. will find that as the former led to hatred and resentment the latter will lead to repugnance and revulsion.

We beg to differ. The cause of the united front was not well served in this debate. On the one hand the self-effacement of Browder (with an eye to the 7th Congress) and on the other the ultra-aggressive posture of Thomas (with an eye on the Rand School) helped to confuse rather than clarify issues. Besides, the united front cannot be bought at so much per pound.

Thomas led in singing the Red Flag and Browder, not to be outdone, waved his arms and declaimed the Star Spangled Banner, in the most approved Fourth of July manner. This may not be the most conclusive proof of Thomas' revolutionary position but it is proof of some sort of the opportunism of Browder. Incidentally will someone please tip off Browder that the Star Spangled Banner was not born during the revolutionary war but during the war of 1812—a war well, if not less than just a little.

We doubt if he got applause even from his supporters on such a specious argument.

After two fair warnings on Russia's oil business with Italy, which the very astute Browder passed up, Thomas ended with a most dramatic appeal to the Ethiopian dead—whom Russian oil helped to kill. The crowd punctuated this remark by some lusty booing and Lee and O Neal must have applauded vigorously.

All in all it was a very successful affair—financially—even though it was announced that some 4,000 had gained admission on forged tickets. As a presentation of political opinions, however, it was a bizarre affair. Browder failed to present a communist position and Norman Thomas did not approach the Militant Socialist position.

ty and peace, to take up the question of their own defense. "The C.C. requests the party organizations together with the Peoples Front to proceed to the organization of a popular defense in order that, in the event of fascist provocation, the Peoples Front may be protected." No matter that even this resolution is terribly confused and replaces the arming of the workers by the arming of the Peoples' Front. The significance of the resolution lies in its positive attitude to the armed struggle against fascism. It is precisely this concept that the Communist Party now rejects. Humanite argues daily against an organization of self-defense. It is a policy of disarming the proletariat ideologically and materially in the face of the impending fascist coup.

which, by no stretch of the imagination can be called revolutionary.

The Communists are to be criticised for depending upon Herriot rather than Leon Blum, said Thomas, discussing the French situation. Correction please. Both Communists and Socialists are to be criticised for their almost complete dependence on Herriot.

The Liberty League wants to make oppression a system, said Browder. And with oppression, until now, been merely sporadic and incidental?

The Seventh Congress, continues Browder, has removed the sectarian attitude on bourgeois democracy. And again: It is true, as Dimitroff has said, the gap between the Socialist and Communist Parties is closing. And, we might add, to the extent that this is true the gap between both and communism is widening.

The system of apologetics for dual unionism continues. When challenged by Thomas on this question Browder replied: "Is Lewis a dual unionist because he stands for industrial unionism? Are you, when you support the Camden Shipyard men?" This from the great Browder! Any member of a high school debating team could have done better than that.

Thomas falls too easily into the ways of the past. There is less religious freedom in Russia than in Germany, he stated indignantly. And when the crowd dispersed by booing he amended himself: well, if not less than just a little.

All in all it was a very successful affair—financially—even though it was announced that some 4,000 had gained admission on forged tickets. As a presentation of political opinions, however, it was a bizarre affair. Browder failed to present a communist position and Norman Thomas did not approach the Militant Socialist position.

## LOSING THEIR CHAINS . . . by James Sand

### The Problem of Working Class Leadership

Under the general title "Losing Their Chains" we begin a series by James Sand, that will tell the story of the American labor movement in terms of its leadership. Such figures from the dim past—as Sylvius, Stephens, Powderly—as well as more contemporary leaders of labor on the economic and political field will be depicted and evaluated. Among the latter group we find Gompers, Debs, DeLeon, Haywood, Hillquit, Ruthenberg, Thomas and Foster.

The series, exceptionally well written, constitutes a distinct contribution in the discussion of the problems of the labor movement. The topic for next week is WILLIAM H. SYLVIVS: Unrecognized Genius.

THE labor leader has been glorified by his admirers and calumniated by his opponents, but as a problem in history he has been sadly neglected by dialectical materialists. Labor leadership has fallen foul of three approaches, all wrong: the first claiming that labor leadership is all, the labor movement secondarily, and that the study of the lives of leading individuals in the labor movement constitutes a complete analysis of the movement; the second claiming that labor leadership is naught, that leadership is not an essential force, but an accident, and that the masses and the labor movement are all that need be studied; the third holds that there is a problem and that it entails interminable research. The first is the romantic approach; the second, the infantile, ultra-left approach; the third, the factual approach. Each one has its class position, too. Romanticism is bourgeois in its idealization and isolation of personality from its inter-relationships, and in its concealment of the material roots of individual character and of history. It cannot criticize and it cannot weigh; it can only praise adoringly.

THE INFANTILE APPROACH Infantilism is the point of view of the lumpenproletariat, closely, akin to anarchism, and really opposed to Marxist science. In Left Wing Communism, Lenin ridiculed the infantilists for propounding the theory "Leadership from below." Later, in the ultra-left turn of 1925, the official international Communist movement, in its departure from Leninist tactics, outdid even the lumpenproletariat and the early anarchists in the zeal with which it upheld this false point of view.

Infantilism as the approach to labor leadership has more than theoretical arguments against it. Like all departures from scientific principle it rears its ugly head in the day-to-day class struggle. From this infantile theory of leadership there spring the insane tactics which split the German working class, made the united front impossible, and ultimately saw Hitler come to power over the greatest working class movement outside of the Soviet Union. But there is still a further consideration here. The infantile approach by considering all leadership as coming from below not only makes it impossible to employ correct Leninist tactics, but also makes it possible for a clique to keep itself in power in the various Communist parties. If leadership comes from below, then whatever the Communist leadership does (no matter how wild, no matter how stupid it is) is the voice of the Communist masses. Thus, infantilists while denying that leaders of non-communist organizations have any mass following, are permitted by the same theoretical principle, leadership "from below," to claim that Communist leaders have the allegiance of their cohorts in everything they do even though they never consult them.

THE ROMANTIC APPROACH The romantic approach considers the labor leader as the generating force in the labor movement, as the moulder of history. In seeing things, events, and particularly men in their isolation, in their separateness, it is diametrically opposite to dialectics, which views things in their relationships. The peculiar form of the individual-to-collectivity relationship assumed in the leader-masses bond does

not even pose a scientific problem for the romanticists. They think it away. The process of action and reaction, and then higher action and reaction accruing from the original action and reaction, is completely lost sight of. All that is considered is the action of the leader, oblivious to the material environment, the temper of the workers, the state of economic development, the class structure at the given historical moment.

Infantilism is lumpenproletarian; romanticism is bourgeois. But it may be asked, do the liberals, the petty-bourgeois humanitarians have no viewpoint on this matter of labor leadership? To be sure, they do; and it is just what a Marxist would expect them to have. The petty-bourgeois approach to labor leadership is the movement before coming to any judgment on him. Methodologically, the approach defends itself by holding that no judgment should be made until all the historical facts, even the most infinitesimal, are taken into account. These facts are type-situations in the lives of men are scientific indicators of their generic reactions, they are busy burrowing like field-mice for a theoretical hole in some cozy fact in the ground. Furthermore, being of the bastard middle-class, these factuaries are incapable of a rigorous class-approach, which once delineated makes unnecessary the compilation of every fact in the life of the leader no matter how minute. That Powderly went to bed at nine o'clock every night, and Gompers at eleven does not seem to have much bearing upon the great issues involved in the study of their biographies. This factual approach is found in its home environment in colleges and universities; there every dependent in these homes for bourgeois apologetics is paid not to be able to see any sociological problem clearly. The academic mind shields itself from Marxism by burying itself in meaningless facts. "Wait," it says, "until all the data is in." Not only is the factual approach academic in place; it is also academic in time. It is a leisure-class approach; it need never come to any conclusion since all its conclusions have already been arrived at for it by the bourgeoisie; it can "conspicuously consume" its mealy knowledge by pyrotechnic displays of fact-juggling and recitals of endless source-materials. It has nothing in common with Marxism except the topics it tries to deal with.

THE DIALECTIC METHOD We have dispatched all the possible approaches to labor leadership except one, the Marxist, the dialectical-materialist approach. It alone can set the lumpenproletarian right, unveil the unscientific basis and bourgeois prejudice of the romantic, and with the assurance of corroborated theory laugh the academician out of the historical court. Only a dialectical approach to labor leadership can observe without prejudice, appraise with fairness, and criticize with justice the theories, practices, and personalities of the labor leaders that America has known. Marxism is the proletarian approach, the approach that has nothing to lose by clear observation and fair appraisal (nothing but its chains, in the words of the Communist Manifesto).

In the first place, dialectics looks at labor leadership as part of an historical process. It considers any individual leader in relation to the material forces shaping the economic life of his epoch. Thus, for a Marxist, it is absurd to compare Gompers in 1920 with William H. Sylvius in 1868. But it is not absurd to compare Gompers with those leaders today who hold his trade union views in order to reveal that they are outdated and can bring only ruin to the workers. It is possible only for a Marxist to realize Gompers' contributions to trade unionism in America and, at the same time, to realize that he outlived them. In the second place, dialectics looks upon labor leadership as part of the broader philosophical problem of the relation of the individual to the group. It considers the labor leader as responding to the wants and needs of the workers of the time

(Continued on Page 4)

### MINERS' CONVENTIONS TO DRAFT AGREEMENT

The convention of District No. 1 of the UMWA was held recently, lasting five days. Only half of this time was taken up with actual work. The progressive forces were very weak at this convention, having no organization and a very small number of resolutions. Locals 1616 and 1174 sent in resolutions asking for the freedom of Tom Mooney. These were adopted by the convention. Local 1174 sent in a very good resolution demanding a Labor Party. This resolution was read on the convention floor but rejected. A few amendments were made to the constitution but none of a progressive character. A fight was put up against one Vice President and there is a possibility of his being impeached next April when the new officers will be inaugurated.

Following the close of the convention, Maloney, president of the New Union, issued a statement to the press disbanding his union and appealing to James Gorman, Empire of the Conciliation Board, to use his influence in the UMWA in taking the members of the former Maloney union back into the UMWA. The reasons Maloney gave for disbanding the union were: 1. The majority of the miners want to be represented by the Old Union in the coming agreement. 2. No funds. 3. Possibility of losing suit involving \$25,000 in dues checked from miners.

Tri-District Convention A joint convention of Districts 1, 7 and 9 will be held in Washington, D. C.



# Review of the Week

(Continued from Page 1)

000 expenses) and the sky rocketing national debt—an increase from 21 billion dollars to almost 30 billion dollars.

This attitude has expressed itself in numerous ways, the unfavorable poll of local Chambers of Commerce on New Deal policies some weeks ago; the almost certain collapse of the Washington conference called for December by Major Berry, Coordinator for Industrial Co-operation; and the Literary Digest poll, in which case the loud protests from Washington indicate a recognition of adverse results.

With these facts in mind we begin to understand the speech of President Roosevelt in Atlanta, Ga. To the gentlemen who complain of great appropriations he tells that "we have passed the peak of appropriations" and those who point with alarm at the increasing deficit and mounting national debt the President promises that "we can look forward with assurance to a decreasing deficit" and that the national debt could reach the 70 billion dollar mark without endangering the country as a whole.

That this speech was not made with only economic factors in mind becomes clear when we recall that the speech was made in Georgia where Governor Talmadge is campaigning against the re-nomination of Roosevelt.

## LABOR WINS MAJORITY IN NEW ZEALAND POLL

In the general election held in New Zealand on November 27, the National Government headed by Prime Minister G. W. Forbes was defeated and the Labor Party swept into power. The government party strength is cut down from 54 to 15 while the Labor Party more than doubled its seats taking 52 out of 80. Lest anyone mistakenly take his party to be revolutionary, Michael J. Savage, leader of the Labor Party, declared that "New Zealand has nothing to fear from a Labor Government."

## CABALLERO ACQUITTED OF REVOLT CHARGES

Largo Caballero, leader of the left wing of the Spanish Socialist Party, and one of the heads of the revolt of October 1934 has been found not guilty and released because of lack of evidence of his

direct leadership and incitement of the October revolution.

This comes as welcome news since in Catalonia seven leading autonomists who participated in the revolt were found guilty and sentenced to 30 years each.

Large numbers of workers greeted Caballero on his release from jail with "Long live the proletarian republic! Down with capitalism! Long live Soviet Russia!"

## NAZIS MURDER LEADING SOCIAL-DEMOCRAT

Rosenzweig, one of the leading Social-Democratic workers, residing in Prague, Czechoslovakia since the Nazis came to power in Germany has been assassinated by German Nazis. Police have arrested three Nazis suspected of the murder.

## ON THE LABOR FRONT

JOHN L. LEWIS has scotched a lot of speculation aroused by his resignation from the Executive Council by stating that the United Mine Workers does not intend to withdraw from the A. F. of L. and that his own resignation is not to be taken in that light.

In discussing the function of the Committee for Industrial Unionism Lewis again pointed out the failure of craft unionism, the spread of company unionism and the burning need for a center to advise, coordinate and assist in the organization of the mass production industries of the country. Lewis warned that unless labor strengthens itself it will face destruction at the hands of anti-labor groups.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT of the I.L.G.W.U. announces that according to a survey made at the end of November there are functioning 146 study classes, 39 athletic groups, 28 gym groups, 34 music groups, 14 in dramatics and 12 dance groups. (Of this number Local 22 I.L.G.W.U. runs 60 classes, 2 athletics, 1 dramatics, 6 music, 4 dance and 10 gym groups.)

Other union and labor groups are being assisted by the services of the I.L.G.W.U. dramatics groups, orchestras and choirs, and the mandolin orchestra and the central choir (150 voices) are now actively preparing for a grand public

# Books of the Age

by Bertram D. Wolfe

STALIN, by Henry Barbusse. Macmillan. 315pp. \$3.00.

It is a pity that Barbusse, who began his literary career with "Under Fire," should have ended it with such a work as this. The book is a failure as a biography, for Stalin never comes to life in it. It is a failure as a discussion of political problems, for scientific analysis of situations and determination of tactics are beyond the capacities of Barbusse whose warm heart and eager humanitarian sympathies are not a sufficient equipment for the mastery of Marxism. Worst of all it is not even truthful as a record of fact, for Barbusse has accepted unquestioningly the official version of everything and Stalin or his adulators have rather shamefully abused the trusting author with official misinformation.

Thus Barbusse was told and writes: "There was never, at any time, any difference of opinion between Lenin and Stalin." (p. 30). One has only to read Lenin's famous letter on the danger of a split, dated December 25, 1922 and postscripted January 4, 1923, to know that the above statement is inaccurate. And what shall we think of a biography of Stalin which does not even mention the letter in which Lenin calls for the removal of Stalin from the office of General Secretary, nor seek to analyze it? In his zeal to exalt Stalin (and Stalin's actual stature, if truthfully reported, is

concert in the Town Hall, New York City, on January 25, 1936.

Among the gym groups are to be found men's and women's basketball teams who are now beginning to play off the first matches for the Hochman and Dubinsky trophies.

TRUCK DRIVERS of Philadelphia struck on November 30. It appears to have resulted from a jurisdictional dispute between Local 470 of the Teamsters Union and the Brotherhood of Transportation Workers. Both are affiliated with the A. F. of L. Industrial unionism would abolish such struggles between unions.

MOTION PICTURE OPERATORS struck in Chicago on November 30. No demands were put forward. The reason for the stoppage appears to be differences with the Hollywood studios. New York has not been effected by this walkout.

gigantic enough without falsification) Barbusse feels it necessary to deny Trotsky any role at all in the November uprising, the civil war and the organization of the Red Army! Not having the political understanding to know wherein Trotsky was wrong and Stalin correct in their basic differences, Barbusse reduces it to the simple formula that the majority is always right. "When 100,000 people act together," he writes, "there must be some intelligence in what they do." (p. 119). With such reasoning we can uphold the intelligence of the Hoover and Roosevelt electorates, of the Hitler seizure of power, or any country's participation in the world war!

"All opposition," says Barbusse, "is a confession of retrogression, discouragement, incipient paralysis and sleeping-sickness." (p. 118). By this simple formula we could condemn the entire opposition of the revolutionary socialists to the action of the Second International at the outbreak of the World War! Of course, what Barbusse really means is that all opposition to anything Stalin thinks or proposes has such disastrous effects, for the book as a whole is a "contribution" of incense to the hero cult.

The glorification transcends all decent limits. Stalin "was everywhere at once," (p. 43). Unfortunately, this is the equivalent of being nowhere at any time for it prevents Barbusse from telling where Stalin really was and what he really accomplished. That is why the work is at its best in the rare moments when it leaves off these generalities which tell us nothing and treats a real achievement of Stalin's, as in the chapter on the national question. But such spots are few and far between. In the main the hero is treated literally as "the man who looks after everything and everybody, who has done what has been done and who will do what is to do." (p. 281).

Barbusse doesn't know a Brandlerite from a Siderealite but he puts his foot into it here too when he tells how Stalin helped to expel the "Brandlerians," the "Haisists," the "Lovestonians" and the "Pepperists" and helped the English and French parties in 1927-28 "to place their electoral tactics upon the rails of true revolutionary policy." (p. 191). A most unfortunate reference that, for since Barbusse's work was written the Seventh World Congress under Stalin's leadership found it necessary to take those parties off the rails on which Stalin had set them (withdrawal from the British Labor Party, abandonment of united front, "social fascism" and "class against class") and put them back on the rails which the "Brandlerians and Lovestonians" had advocated against Stalin, as those of "true revolutionary policy."

But let us draw a veil over the rest of this unfortunate work. It is neither a vivid personal picture such as Barbusse left to his own literary devices might have drawn, nor politically enlightening, nor historically accurate, nor theoretically sound. If it is useful at all, it will be only as a pathetic warning to intellectuals sympathizing with Communism not to abdicate their intellects and critical faculties, a warning as to the degenerating effects of sycophancy and the "hero cult" upon writers who, however inadequate their theoretical equipment, should at least bring to the movement their powers of observation (in which the novelist should excel), and intellectual honesty and self-respect. Let no one tell the sympathetic writer that those are but "bourgeois virtues." There will be no sound proletarian writing without them.

butchers by the Holy See. What especially tickled the Pope's palate was the Prussian premier's following remarks: "God blesses the gigantic task undertaken by the National Socialist Party." This, the Pope's mouthpiece hails, in haste, as "the wisdom of a regime which is now abandoning the ridiculous exaggerations of the cult of Wotan and Thor." The Vatican organ finally proclaims: "We are on the way to mutual understanding for paganism has been abandoned in Germany."

That Hitler and his hordes can make good use of even papal blessings, no one will question. But that the Holy See which usually plays rather shrewd politics should put faith in such Goering piffle is hard to comprehend. However, let no one take either Goering or the Pope seriously on the basis of the respective political prayers of each. Both are preparing for bigger and better battles. The Vatican will not yield an inch of temporal ground in Germany without a bitter fight; the Nazi regime cannot permit the Catholic or any other church for long to maintain any organization which potentially can be or become mobilization points of any sort of opposition to any Hitler measure.

## SHED A TEAR

For Jackie Coogan, child film-star of a past decade, who has just come of age. Despite the one and a half million dollars tucked away to his credit, he is spending a mere \$200 a week.

For Mrs. Blanche Lamelson Marquis, divorced from her broker husband. By pinching pennies, she says, she might squeeze thru on \$41,800 a year.

# TRADE UNION NOTES

By GEORGE F. MILES

Having heard no reply from the direction of the Communist Party on the alleged united front with the Zausner clique, we proceed to shed some more light on the subject.

The list of participants in the conference with Zausner, on Monday Nov. 4 at Hotel Delano, as printed in the Jewish Daily Forward, includes some inaccuracies. For instance Shnurman is mistakenly listed as one of those present. In the interest of accuracy we print the list of those who were present: Weinstein, Bogorad, Lotker and Rady for the C.P.; Pallacio, Ellstein and Laditsky for Zausner. There were also present Matzkin, Koslow and Rosenberg. The last named is a progressive who exposed the whole despicable mess both at the conference in the Delano Hotel on Wednesday at the meeting of the united front organization of his local and later in his local union.

The more we hear of this business, the more we marvel that the Communist Party could permit its members in the Painters Union to participate in such political chicanery. Must one ally oneself with the heroes of the underworld to achieve a measure of trade union "respectability"?

It was the President of the District Council (Laditsky) who talked cold turkey. We are all politicians, he said to those assembled at Hotel Delano, and we know that what we decide here we can put over. Then came the proposal that if the C.P. people support the motion for 9 business agents and an increase in dues they will see to it that Weinstein is elected a Business Agent from Local 848. This was agreed to by the C.P. people and was carried out to the letter 2 days later.

Local 261 had called a conference of locals to guarantee an honest election. The conference was to be held on November 6 and the agreement between Zausner and the C.P. was closed on November 4. It was Ellstein (Leibke Chazer, in English equivalent—Louis the Pig) who suggested that since the proposal for 9 business agents and an increase in dues had been rejected twice that therefore the same proposal should now come from people who had been in the forefront of the fight against them. The C.P. people agreed. On November 6, Weinstein rose at the conference of Local 261 and made these very proposals. These were seconded by another C.P. man Bogorad.

Now that the C. P. people have been compromised Zausner's crowd made sure that everyone knows about it. In locals 261, 1011 and 905, the latter a C.P. controlled local, it was Zausner's people who exposed the deal and compromised the C.P. crowd. They had nothing to say. What could they say? With the strength of the C.P. considerably curtailed it is not excluded that Zausner may now even double-cross Weinstein. Who's afraid of the big bad wolf now?

For Zausner the question of 9 business agents is a life-and-death question. More business agents means a stronger machine. Hence the "discovery" that the Gentile locals insist on their own business agents. Add to this the pressure of gangland whose income from the union sharply declined during the current year, from \$90,000 in 1934 and \$60,000 in 1933. Hence the cry for higher dues.

The proposed increase in dues represents a jump from 20c per member per month to 70c a member per month. Even subtracting the increased expense which 9 business agents would entail there would still remain a cool 30 grand to play with. By the way this doesn't include initiation fees from new members and fines from workers and bosses. (Some other time we'll tell you about the business of plain and fancy fines. Its an art in itself!)

Fear of a membership revolt forced the C.P. people to insist and secure a compromise. The proposals now call for an increase from \$1.50 to \$1.75 per month. The per capita to the District Council is increased, however, from 20c to 50c—constituting a cut in the income of the locals.

This increase in dues is just a beginning if the proposal for 9 business agents is carried. The expense of a bureaucracy doubled in size and the appetite of gangland makes it almost a certainty that within the next few months the District Council will place new taxes upon the membership. Those who are for these proposals now will not be in a position to fight against the new taxes to come.

To avoid increases in dues now and more taxes later two things are required: the defeat of Zausner's two proposals and the cleaning out of Zausner's machine from the painters union.

Build the Weekly  
"Workers Age"

# LOSING THEIR CHAINS AT FIRST GLANCE

(Continued from Page 3)

as well as guiding and urging the workers down a path he sets. He molds the wishes of his followers into certain channels, and leads them on to other struggles. He reacts to the workers and acts upon them. Dialectics does not make a fetish of "rank-and-file" profundity; it does not credit every organized worker with the brains of Karl Marx, and it certainly does not credit every unorganized worker with the brains of Nicolai Lenin. That is not Marxism; that is infantilism. In the third place, dialectics analyzes labor-leadership in terms of the class-structure in which it appears, on the basis of the class-relationships existing and coming into being throughout the leader's lifetime. By openly avowing the fact that it has a class-approach dialectics has already built up an impregnable defense against the charge of bias. To avow class under capitalist ascendancy is the mark of a proletarian; to disavow it is to conceal it under the cloak of bourgeois prejudices.

## INFLUENCE OF MARXISM

Despite the fact that a completely Marxist trade union stand did not appear as such until after the birth of the Communist Party in 1919, the influence of Marxism is present thruout the entire life-history of the organized labor movement in America. The labor movement did not appear on any solid foundation here until after the Civil War, and it is important to recognize why. In the first place, agriculture was the basis of American economy until then, and from an agricultural economy no trade union movement can grow. The non-collective character of the work, the distances separating the workers, the possibility of the farm-hand's becoming an owning farmer mitigate against labor organization. In the second place, one-half of American economy was under the sway of slavery, and from a slave-economy there is even less chance of trade union growth than from a wholly free agricultural economy. In the third place, the frontier beckoned all these discontented with their lot in the cities and country; free land was available. The covered-wagon days are much more than an historical impulse for cinema-romances. In the fourth place, and in sum, a trade union movement cannot come into being and grow except in proportion to the development of capitalism, and capitalism was then in its infancy. In fact, the Civil War was fought by the North to make capital free, not essentially to make the slaves free except as that was involved in the larger issue.

But with the beginnings of trade unionism in America we have the beginnings of Marxism. Even those leaders who seem to have had little in common with Marxism were affected by it. The organic philosophy of Marx only a revolutionary socialist can accept; but there are parts of the organic structure which even Samuel Gompers could accept. Sorge, the father of American Marxism, exercised deep influence on Gompers and Strasser; and Gompers' recognition of the need for a strong and firm trade unionism comes from Marx. Would that he had learned more as well! The National Labor Union, the first attempt at trade unionism on a national scale, was deeply influenced by the Marxists, and Sylvius was well on the way to Marxism when untimely death cut him off. Even anarchism has relations with Marxism, although negative. Early American anarchism is a transfer of Bakuninism to this country; Bakuninism came into a head-on collision with Marxism in the First International and was one of the factors which undermined the organization. There is nothing foreign to the history of American labor in Marxism; what is foreign is the half-hearted acceptance of Marx or the wholesale rejection of him.

Marxism leaves no doubts in the minds of its scientists that the view which dialectical materialism takes of individual labor leaders in American history and of labor leadership in general will be the view that history itself will take when the next great era has been opened through the triumph of the proletariat thruout the world. Glory will be to those who helped to achieve the emancipation of mankind from exploitation of man by man, and from those who have wallowed in the applause given by the ruling class for which they have apologized, or with whom they have compromised or collaborated, will be taken away even the empty glory that has been and still is theirs under capitalism.

Next week: William H. Sylvius, Unrecognized Genius.

(Continued from Page 1)

not merely because of the opportunity offered by the Italian onslaught on Ethiopia but as least as much because they find it necessary to grab off as much as possible before an impending showdown. From all angles, it would appear that some pact of mutual assistance in the Far East—under one name or another—is being consummated between Great Britain and the U. S. Furthermore, no one can exaggerate the tempo with which the Washington government has been preparing its "defenses" in the Far East.

**"LONG Live the Republican Army"** shouted the Communist Party and members of other sections of the Peoples Front in Paris on Armistice Day. Coming from the Socialists and Communists, it was a cry which made one shudder at the degrading depths to which the French proletarian masses are being dragged by their leaders today.

Not a word of criticism or condemnation of the French capitalists' role in the last war. Not a word in the French proletarian press against the current war plans of the so-called republican army, an army infested with Fascist agents, honeycombed in its top staff with members of the notorious Fascist Croix de Feu. Particularly painful is this conduct on the part of the French Communist Party which, until very recently, could really boast of the finest and really inspiring anti-militarist traditions. And by this time even the social patriots of the French Socialist Party might have learned a bit too!

But all such expectations are out of place on the basis of the Peoples' Front policy being pursued today with such vigor and enthusiasm by the parties of the French proletariat. We don't want to be dispensers of gloom; but if these tactics of co-operation with bourgeois parties, of forgetting the most elementary concepts of the class struggle, of relying on the bourgeois state apparatus as a means of beating Fascism are not dropped very soon, let no one be surprised to see the star of Colonel de la Rocque rising ominously in France in the not distant future. Ultra-opportunism of the French CP may play the same role as ultra-leftism did in Germany in regard to the rise of the Fascist menace.

**THE** Vatican organ "L'Osservatore Romano" appears to be afflicted with the holiday spirit of charity and forgiveness just a bit too far ahead and out of season. We are led to this conclusion by the praise it has so profusely been showering on the Nazi savages now goosestepping as the German government. Goering proved to be the saint evoking this latest blessing of Hitler