

COMING
Series of Articles On
Spain
By JULIAN GORKIN

Workers Age

Weekly Paper of the Independent Labor League of America

MARXISM AND TOTALITARIANISM . . .
by B. Herman . . . page 4.
UNION EXPERIENCE SHOWS EVILS OF
N.L.R.B. PROCEDURE . . . page 2.

Vo. 9, No. 13.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1940.

5 CENTS

Behind the Headlines:

What Is This War Economy?

By JAY LOVESTONE

In the coming months, even more than in recent days, there will be much talk about "war economy." The issues in our Presidential election campaign will be largely rooted in the preparation for and potential consequences of "war economy."

What is war economy? What does it mean? What does it spell? What are its main features? What problems does it pose for labor? for humanity as a whole?

Perhaps the most precise, tho too generous, portrayal of the spirit and substance of war economy is given us in these words: "The outbreak of the war has temporarily altered the economic aims of those engaged in it. The problem is no longer how to increase production and the standard of living, but how much of the national resources can be utilized for military purposes without depressing the standard of living below the level of subsistence" [Economist, February 17, 1940].

The destructive dislocation caused by the shift from peace-time procedure is rather mild in comparison with the grave consequences flowing from the attempt to turn back from war economy to so-called normal production. A mere enumeration of the basic characteristics of war economy confirms this beyond challenge. Manning and equipping the armed forces is the heart of what the Nazis have long ago aptly called "Wehrwirtschaft" (war economy). This automatically entails gearing and sacrificing of everything for boosting the output for war. In such a set-up, export needs assume primacy even in the economic life of lands ordinarily little involved in world economy or dependent on the world market. Here we enter the tortuous labyrinth of foreign-exchange difficulties. Likewise, we have here the soil for combinations or blocks of imperialist powers to battle other groupings for world trade. From the cry of "export or die" the bourgeois world travels to "export and die" or "die to export." The Yankee exporters are losing no time in preparing to beat back and smash the unified competition of the French and British "democracies" in the Latin American countries.

All of this inevitably leads to a cutting down of non-military production and civilian consumption. In driving to reach the peaks of war efficiency, the governments and their general staffs are faced with very complicated problems of man-power. The needs of front and factory clash. It is then that the role of women becomes pivotal. Men are transferred from "non-essential" industries to vital war industries and from industry to the trenches. Women increasingly replace them. It has been estimated that if the war lasts a few years, there will be employed about ten million women in British industry—an accretion of about four millions. A similar process is to be noted for the youth below military age. Even the much older folks and but yesterday's discarded workers are also affected.

This entire rearrangement demands concentrated government direction and dictation. It necessarily leads to a whitening away and annihilation of democratic rights. In short, the political, social and economic implications of the development of war economy—militarized capitalist production for military needs—are incalculable for the entire world, non-belligerent as well as belligerent.

But to reverse the process, after the war is over, is infinitely more difficult and inexorably brings in its train hardships untold and unforeseeable. For one thing, in the reversal of the process, practical planning (in detail) is even less possible than in the turning of the "normal" into the war economy. Furthermore, labor then begins to reassert itself and to insist on the restoration of pay scales and working conditions destroyed by the flames of war. The total efforts of every individual commandeered for the total war (now ended) are precipitately halted. Common consent for the military efforts (no longer required) begins to transform itself into common commotion—social and political. What was hailed yesterday as enlightening is now branded and hissed as misleading.

England's New Statesman and Nation sized up this problem picturesquely and dynamically when it recently stressed: "In all the belligerent countries, the return to civilian life may seem so perilous and so difficult that the dread of it may even prolong the war. Beside idle machines, demobilized men even among the victors, if victors there be, will face poverty with rifles in their hands." Secretary of State Hull told us the other day that when this war is over there are likely to be one hundred million unemployed in the world. Picture this army of jobless as the army of poverty with rifles in their hands and you will see that there is as much truth as panic in the economist C. F. Hughes's declaration that: "Real war means bankruptcy and, in the not too distant end, communism" [New York Times, March 10, 1940].

War economy! Here are words that may appear dry as dust to the surface observer. But this dust is very explosive; it's loaded with economic, social and political dynamite. In the contradictions which this stage of capitalism in decay begets are the germs of the destruction of the entire socio-economic system. Today there are no two more ominous words.

Conflict Over Hatch Bill Reflects Struggle Among Political Machines

Federal Patronage Control in Bitter Clash With State and Local Bosses

Washington, D. C.

THE Senate overwhelmingly adopted last week the Hatch bill to "control" political activities among state jobholders paid in whole or in part with federal funds. This was after amending it to a restrictive form far more severe than contemplated by the bill's sponsors when it became a center of controversy some weeks ago.

The final vote was 58 to 28. The large majority was due mostly to the steadfast support of Senator Barkley, the majority leader, by an unbroken front of twenty-two Republicans, who joined with thirty-four Democrats, one Progressive and one Independent in putting over the measure. Voting in opposition were twenty-seven Democrats and one Farmer-Laborite, marshaled by Senator Minton, the assistant majority leader.

As a result of the Senate's action, the House faces the necessity of making a decision on the bill as well as on a series of Senate amendments which would greatly alter current practice under the federal laws.

The Senate adopted last week an amendment limiting all individual contributions to political parties in any one year to \$5,000. The amendment, which was sponsored by Senator Bankhead, received support from opponents of the bill, who

looked upon it as such an unpalatable measure that it would assist in the defeat of the bill.

The original Hatch Act, to which the present bill is an amendment, was adopted last Summer. It bars federal executive officeholders, excluding only Cabinet officers and a few top-rank policy-making officials, from taking "any active part in political management or in political campaigns" in connection with elections for any branch of the national government. Even primaries preparatory to such elections are included under the ban. Other "improper" practices of a "corrupt" or "pernicious" character are also outlawed. Dismissal from office and other penalties are provided. The present bill aims to extend these prohibitions to state officeholders paid in whole or in part with federal funds, for only over such has Congress any jurisdiction.

NATIONAL PARTIES AND STATE MACHINES

It is necessary to look a little below the surface and brush aside the cloak of pious phrases and virtuous remonstrances with which the original Hatch bill and the present proposal have been covered during the months of controversy, in order to appreciate their real meaning. Traditionally, both of the old parties

HOW MANY TERMS FOR HIM?



Poll Tax System Robs Masses of Franchise

Maverick Scores Southern Practise As Undemocratic, Aid to Corruption

Washington, D. C.

"In the old Texas days, when a citizen was required to show ownership of \$60 worth of property to vote, a farmer took his mule to the polling place with him to cast his ballot. If the mule died before the next election and the farmer appeared alone to vote, he'd be sent home to get a mule. Who was voting, the mule or the farmer?"

This is the question Maury Maverick, mayor of San Antonio and former Congressman, threw into the lap of the House Judiciary subcommittee at the start of its hearings recently on the bill to legalize payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting.

Maverick drew a parallel between the former farmer and his mule and the present day southern citizen and his poll tax.

Who votes, he asked again, the dollar or dollar and one-half paid as a poll tax or the citizen?

Until the poll tax is removed, the South will remain a "piece-meal, fragmentary democracy," an "easy prey to northern capital" and to "its own home-grown corrupt politicians." "And I speak as a professional politician," the chunky, vigorous witness testified.

It is to the interest of all Americans, he said, that all Americans vote. But the South needs the poll tax repeal more than the North; the southern white man more even than the southern Negro, Maverick emphasized. For every additional Negro who would be enfranchised by the repeal of poll taxes, he said, there would be eight white men.

The witness declared that for the nation as a whole an average of 67% of the qualified voters participate in national elections. For the southern states where poll taxes prevail, only 31% vote in Florida, 27% in Texas, 16.2% in Georgia, 14.5% in Mississippi, and only 10% in South Carolina.

The poll-tax charge of \$1 or \$1.50 may be little enough for the privilege of voting, the witness said. But when it is realized that the southern poor whites and Negroes earn as little as \$36 a year and show a general average of \$186 a year, he pointed out, the poll tax is prohibitive. To these people the poll tax represents from 15 to 20 days work. These poll taxes must in many instances be paid almost a year in advance when \$1 for food is far more important than the right to vote twelve months later. In some states, he added, poll taxes are cumulative, so if a voter hasn't paid his tax for 10 or 15 years, he must pay from \$10 upward before he can cast his ballot!

Because so few citizens exercise their franchise, Maverick told the committee, machine politicians can control elections and can easily corrupt the ballot. He cited instances where local politicians buy up thousands of poll-tax receipts and then distribute them to their henchmen for voting purposes on election day. Men with these receipts have been known to have voted in fifteen different precincts in one day, he said. Gambling joints and red-light districts are made the handmaid of political corruption thru this practice, the witness declared.

Conflict Over Hatch Bill Reflects Struggle Among Political Machines

Federal Patronage Control in Bitter Clash With State and Local Bosses

Washington, D. C.

THE Senate overwhelmingly adopted last week the Hatch bill to "control" political activities among state jobholders paid in whole or in part with federal funds. This was after amending it to a restrictive form far more severe than contemplated by the bill's sponsors when it became a center of controversy some weeks ago.

The final vote was 58 to 28. The large majority was due mostly to the steadfast support of Senator Barkley, the majority leader, by an unbroken front of twenty-two Republicans, who joined with thirty-four Democrats, one Progressive and one Independent in putting over the measure. Voting in opposition were twenty-seven Democrats and one Farmer-Laborite, marshaled by Senator Minton, the assistant majority leader.

As a result of the Senate's action, the House faces the necessity of making a decision on the bill as well as on a series of Senate amendments which would greatly alter current practice under the federal laws.

The Senate adopted last week an amendment limiting all individual contributions to political parties in any one year to \$5,000. The amendment, which was sponsored by Senator Bankhead, received support from opponents of the bill, who

Germany Turns to Drive For Control of Balkans

Progressives Sweep Local 22 Elections

18500 Dressmakers Vote; Zimmerman, Entire Progressive Slate Triumphant

New York City. The entire progressive slate, headed by Charles S. Zimmerman, candidate for reelection as manager-secretary, was swept into office by huge majorities in the general elections held by Dressmakers Local 22, I.L.G.W.U., on Thursday, March 21.

About 18,500 of the 26,000 members of Local 22 voted in the elections, over 70% of the total membership, a proportion virtually without precedent in the trade-union movement of this country. The outpouring of so many thousands of members of Local 22 to exercise their franchise and elect a responsible administration was an impressive demonstration of the effective workings of trade-union democracy. Manager Zimmerman expressed great satisfaction at the lively interest shown by the masses of the dressmakers in the affairs of their organization; this deep interest and loyalty, he stressed, was a source of great strength for the union.

Despite the immense number who voted all in one day, the elections came off in the most perfect order with the utmost regularity.

The ballot presented to the dressmakers who came to vote was probably the biggest ever seen in a trade-union election. It included 184 candidates running for 90 offices! The officers to be elected were: 29 Executive Board members, 31 business agents, 25 convention delegates, and 5 members of the Sick Benefit and Relief Committee. The convention delegates were chosen to represent Local 22 at the 24th biennial convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, the parent organization, to take place in New York City towards the end of May.

Mayors Voice Opposition to W.P.A. Slashes

LaGuardia Urges Big Deficiency Appropriation to Be Voted by Congress Soon

Washington, D. C. The United States Conference of Mayors, thru its president, Mayor La Guardia of New York, raised its voice last week in protest against the threatened slashes in W.P.A. rolls because of inadequate Congressional appropriations. The New York mayor, here for a conference with the President, urged a sizable deficiency relief appropriation for next year at least as large as the \$1,500,000,000 voted at the last session of Congress.

The Conference of Mayors, Mr. La Guardia said, estimates that unemployment will be not less than 9,000,000, on the average, thruout the coming fiscal year, and may reach 10,000,000 or 11,000,000 unless the employment curve takes a sharp bend upward.

"The mayors estimates have not been wrong yet," he added, "I pray to God we are wrong. It is not a pleasant task to come down here in this role twice a year, once for the regular appropriation bill and again for the deficiency bill, but some one has to do it."

The mayors, by virtue of their offices, are in the forefront of all relief problems, Mr. La Guardia said. The first shock of W.P.A. lay-offs hits them, as they must improvise local means of meeting unexpected suffering.

Under present plans, 800,000 will be dropped from the W.P.A. rolls before July 1, and another 600,000 soon afterward, he said. This will leave 1,500,000, to judge from present figures, and only 1,350,000 can be kept, on the average, if W.P.A. is to stay within the \$1,000,000,000 appropriation now in mind.

"And we are talking about employables in all these figures," Mayor La Guardia added.

Colonel F. C. Harrington, Commissioner of the Works Projects Administration, told the Birmingham meeting of the Conference of Mayors two weeks ago that \$1,000,000,000 would not take care of the jobless employables during the next year, Mayor LaGuardia explained. The Mayors were told that the additional lay-off of 600,000 during the Summer would be necessary if funds were to be conserved for the high point of need in late Fall and Winter.

It was then the turn of the state bosses to take the offensive, especially as it seemed clear that the

tion of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, the parent organization, to take place in New York City towards the end of May. At the time of writing, the count and tally of the ballots had not yet been completed, but it was already obvious that the Zimmerman administration had been reelected by an immense majority. Zimmerman himself was uncontested for manager-secretary. Along with him, every single candidate put forward by the Dressmakers Progressive Group was elected by a big margin and not a single opposition candidate came anywhere near victory.

The fight against the progressive administration of Local 22 was waged by two opposition groups—the Stalinist Left Group and a so-called Independent Progressive Group, composed of a handful of nondescript, disgruntled elements without any following among the membership. The Stalinists and their sympathizers had always been very strong numerically in Local 22, their traditional stronghold. Never did they enter an election in so thoroughly discredited a state. For the previous three years, in their "Popular Front" days, they had supported the progressive administration, only to break this collaboration very abruptly after the change of "party line" following the Stalin-Hitler pact. A number of outstanding Stalinist spokesmen in Local 22 could not stomach this sharp "turn" so obviously against the interests of the union; they therefore broke with the Left Group and the Communist Party and joined the progressives. After some hesitation, the Stalinists launched a sharp attack on the administration and tried to develop a strong campaign, altho they found it impossible to put up a candidate against Zimmerman. Their overwhelming defeat in the election was the answer they received from the membership to their bid for power.

The sweeping victory in the March 21 elections marks the fifth time that the progressive forces, headed by Charles S. Zimmerman, have been entrusted with the leadership of the powerful Dressmakers Union by the vote of the membership. Zimmerman was first elected manager in 1933, when the union was in a desperate state, weak and disintegrating. Before the next election, in March 1934, the great general strike had taken place (August 1933) and the union had been raised to a powerful position with wages and working conditions immensely improved. The progressives carried the 1934 and 1935 elections. In 1937 (the I.L.G.W.U. constitution had now been amended so that elections were held every two years), there was a "united" ticket, the Left Group collaborating with the administration. Thruout these years, from 1933 to the present day, the great mass of the membership have remained steadfast in their support of the pro-

gressive forces and the Zimmerman administration. In the elections last week, the progressives made their appeal on the basis of the administration's record of achievement and its constructive program. They reduced to a minimum the usual polemical diatribes, despite the frequent resort of the opposition elements to such methods.

Walsh-Healy Measure Up in House Committee

War-Navy Departments Against Labor

Washington, D. C. Amendments to the Walsh-Healy Act, which have been sidetracked over a prolonged period in the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee of which Emanuel Celler of Brooklyn is chairman, are now being considered by the committee.

The amendment in which labor is especially interested in S.1022. This bill, passed by the Senate, widens the scope of the law to cover more firms dealing with the government. Members of organized labor are being urged to write to their Congressmen and to Representative Celler in strong support of the measure.

If this amendment were to pass, it would very effectively make it impossible for violators of the Wagner Act to obtain government contracts.

The most violent opposition to the Walsh-Healy Act amendments which are sought by labor to prevent anti-union employers from

Russia, Italy To Take Part In New Grab

With the northern front closed by the sudden end of the Russo-Finnish war and danger thus averted from that quarter, Nazi Germany turned its chief attention last week, the twenty-ninth week of the European war, to the Balkans. British sources reported Germany making ready to establish a sort of "economic protectorate" over Rumania in order to bring about the integration of the Rumanian economy with the Reich's war needs. In Bucharest, Dr. Clodius, Berlin's prime trade negotiator, was at work on speeding up Rumanian oil production and improving transportation facilities so that steady and adequate supplies would be forthcoming to Germany.

Rumania's attitude was uncertain, but apparently veering towards Germany, especially under the impact of the Allied fiasco in Finland. Threats emanating from London and Paris that the Anglo-French "guarantees" might have to be "revised" if the Bucharest government showed itself too compliant to Germany, were taken as a significant indication of which way things were going.

Germany's vigorous intervention in the Balkans was based, according to Berlin sources, on an agreement with Mussolini. In addition, Germany was said to be very eager to bring Italy and Russia together so as to make possible a three-power understanding on the division of the Balkans into spheres of influence dominated by Berlin, Rome and Moscow. Should Germany have to take "drastic measures" against Rumania, Berlin sources hinted, Russia could be relied upon to immobilize Turkey and keep it from action.

There were repeated reports last week that Russian Premier-Foreign Minister Molotov would visit Berlin very soon to discuss Balkan and other affairs, and, altho the reports were denied in Moscow, the visit is generally expected to take place in a short time.

Russia was busy liquidating the Finnish war last week. Reliable sources in Stockholm heard that Moscow was demanding more of the Finns than had been apparent from the original peace terms. Moscow also gave a decisive veto to the plans to constitute a block, either economic or defensive, made up of Norway, Sweden and Finland. Such an alliance, the Russian official news agency declared, would be considered "unfriendly" by the Kremlin government. Observers noted that the Scandinavian alliance plans had been regarded with much approval in Berlin, where it was believed that

(Continued on page 4)

gressive forces and the Zimmerman administration.

In the elections last week, the progressives made their appeal on the basis of the administration's record of achievement and its constructive program. They reduced to a minimum the usual polemical diatribes, despite the frequent resort of the opposition elements to such methods.

Walsh-Healy Measure Up in House Committee

War-Navy Departments Against Labor

Washington, D. C. Amendments to the Walsh-Healy Act, which have been sidetracked over a prolonged period in the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee of which Emanuel Celler of Brooklyn is chairman, are now being considered by the committee.

The amendment in which labor is especially interested in S.1022. This bill, passed by the Senate, widens the scope of the law to cover more firms dealing with the government. Members of organized labor are being urged to write to their Congressmen and to Representative Celler in strong support of the measure.

Union Experience Points to Evils in N.L.R.B. Procedure

Excessive Delays, Arbitrary Rulings Heavy Burden

By JOE ELWOOD

THE attitude that any amendment to the National Labor Relations Act or to the procedure of the Labor Board, no matter how reasonable or how favorable it may be to labor, endangers the entire act by opening the flood-gates of revision from hostile directions, was never such as we could expect. In fact, at a time when in C.I.O. circles any mention of amendments was considered as an outright betrayal of labor's cause, the Workers Age in general and the writer of this article in particular expressed the opinion that the no-amendment policy was entirely too simple a formula.

Since then, the C.I.O. has given up that attitude and has proposed certain corrective amendments. The so-called "liberal" journals have followed suit, of course.

PLAGUE OF LONG DELAYS

There are a number of evils which have become apparent to labor under the operations of the act. Take, for instance, the unreasonably long delays in securing a decision by the Board. Such delay has often demoralized and disillusioned the workers, besides causing the union involved to lose thousands of dollars in legal expenses.

A good illustration of this evil is the recent experience of the Knitgoods Workers Union, Local 155, I.L.G.W.U., with the Gloray Knitting Company, a firm which has done business in Brooklyn for approximately twenty years and had contractual relations with the union from 1935 to 1938. Months before the expiration of that agreement, in July 1938, Louis Nelson, the manager of the union, requested the firm to bargain collectively and to renew the agreement. The firm promised several times. Suddenly, on July 14, 1938, the firm distributed to its employees an announcement of the removal of the Brooklyn plant to Robesonia, Pa. During the removal, special police, hired by the company from the Burns Detective Agency, were stationed in and near the plant and even refused entry into the plant to Mr. Nelson, who wanted to see the owner about the promised renewal of the contract.

Charges were then filed by the union with Mrs. Herrick, New York regional director of the N.L.R.B. After long delays, a complaint was issued by the Board. In June 1939, eleven months after charges had been filed, Martin Raphael, trial examiner of the Board, submitted his intermediate report to Washington. In that report, Mr. Raphael found that the employer, by locking out and discharging the members of the union and by removing his operations from Brooklyn, N. Y., to Robesonia, Pa., an open-shop town, had been guilty of an unfair labor practice in violation of the Wagner Act. Mr. Raphael, therefore, recommended that the firm be ordered to re-employ the locked-out workers at the Robesonia plant, to indemnify the workers for any losses they have suffered by the lockout, to pay to each worker transportation expenses for himself and his family from Brooklyn to Robesonia, and to resume bargaining with the union.

In February of this year, nineteen months after the lockout, the N.L.R.B. suddenly reversed the recommendations of the trial examiner and dismissed the complaint, thus striking a demoralizing blow at the 167 workers who had been locked-out and had been waiting for reinstatement. It is to be remembered, Mr. Nelson stresses, that this case cost the union over \$10,000.

Is it not obvious, from a mere recital of the facts, that long delays in securing a decision are doing labor grave harm?

A.F.L. AMENDMENT OFFERS REMEDY

There must be a way to meet this problem. One of the amendments to the Wagner Act, proposed by the A. F. of L., seeks to remedy this situation. According to that amendment, "when charges have been preferred with the Board that any person has engaged or is engaging in any unfair labor practice, the Board shall issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint writ in sixty days from the filing of such charges, or shall enter an order denying issuance of a complaint within said time and giving reasons therefor."

In the Gloray Knitting Co. case, it should be remembered, it took seven months before the Board issued a complaint!

According to another section of the same A. F. of L. amendment, all unfair-labor-practice cases are to be disposed of within five to six months.

tendency is exposed and fought the better it will be for the entire labor movement.

The case of the Devon Knitwear shop, where thirty workers are out on strike for the past four months because of employers refusal to bargain collectively, is a case in point.

OUTRAGEOUS RULING

At a Labor Board hearing a few weeks ago, Mrs. Herrick, New York regional director of the N.L.R.B., made a ruling which, if allowed to become a precedent, would, according to Mr. Nelson, "make a farce of the Wagner Act and place an instrument in the hands of the employers with which to crush labor unions instead of giving workers the right to designate their representatives as was intended by the law." Mrs. Herrick's ruling states that a labor union representing a majority of the workers must approach the employer for collective bargaining before calling a strike and that if a majority is gained after a strike is called, the union cannot ask the employer to bargain collectively any more!

Mr. Nelson, in giving to this writer the union point of view, expressed it in the following way: "You are aware that in many strikes a union gains a majority only after the union is able to show its strength to some 'weak sisters' in the mill. You know, also, that many workers who would like to join a union will not do so unless the union convinces them that it is in a position to call a strike and stop production. You also realize that if a union, in certain cases, were to negotiate with an employer before calling a strike, thus informing him that it had a majority of the work-

ers in the mill, many of the active workers would find themselves discharged from their jobs. Then the union would have to apply to the Labor Board for a hearing and until a hearing was called—months later—the workers would become demoralized and disillusioned and if a vote were then taken, the union would lose its former majority."

Such a ruling is clearly destructive of labor's right to organize and clearly not within the intent of the act. Under the Wagner Act, the employer's legal duty to bargain collectively with the union is continuous and thus, if a majority is gained after a strike is called, the employer's obligation to bargain continues and is as of the time that the union obtained a majority. But Mrs. Herrick's ruling holds the opposite and says that the employer's duty to bargain collectively with a majority union terminates if the union calls a strike without having shown that it represented a majority. After a strike has been called, even before the employer hires new employees, according to Mrs. Herrick's ruling, the employer is not obligated to bargain collectively.

'BOR MUST ACT

Labor must realize the dangerous implications of this misinterpretation of the Wagner law. If the amendment method is the only way to stop such interpretations of the act by the Board, then it has to be done thru the amendment process.

The above shortcomings and difficulties are only a few of too many under the operations of the labor-relations act. There is no reason whatever why labor should not advocate strengthening amendments while opposing others which may reduce its rights under the act.

Two-Thirds U.S. Families Lived on \$69 a Month

Highest 1% Got as Much as Lowest 40%

Washington, D. C. TWO-THIRDS of all American families lived on an average of \$69 a month in 1935 and 1936, a government survey four years in the making and released last week showed.

The survey included detailed reports of income, spending and living standards of 300,000 families, representing a cross-section of 126,000,000 persons. It was the most detailed and comprehensive survey ever made.

Economists studying the results of the survey made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Bureau of Home Economics and the W.P.A. have learned new facts concerning American living habits.

There were 4,000,000 families—mostly on relief—who had an average income of only \$312 a year. That was 14% of the national population. Economists estimate that a decent living standard for a family of four costs \$1,200 a year or more.

There were another 8,000,000 families—comprising between 25,000,000 and 30,000,000 persons—who had an average income of \$750 a year. Thus, it was indicated, 42% of the nation lived on incomes averaging less than \$50 a month.

Another 7,000,000 families—23% of the total—lived on incomes averaging \$100 a month. The survey showed that about two-thirds of the nation lived on incomes of less than \$1,500 a year and averaging \$826.

The average income for the nation as a whole was \$1,622 for each family. The highest 5% in the income bracket had 27% of the national income and the highest 1% had 14% of the income.

Thus, the highest 1% had almost as much income as the 40% of the families in the lowest income group, the report said. Fewer than 4% of the families in the country had incomes of \$4,000 or more a year.

The report showed that 4,200,000 families in the lowest income group—14% of all families—bought only 6% of the food consumed in this country. The next 27.5% of the population bought 20% of the food.

Agriculture Department economists said families receiving \$312 spent an average of \$1 per person per week for food, while those receiving \$1,200 a year spent an average of \$2.18 per person.

"If every family receiving less than \$100 a month could be raised to that level expenditures for food would increase by \$1,900,000,000 a year and the national food bill would

be 14% larger." Milo Perkins, president of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corp., said.

He estimated that food expenditures by the group now receiving less than \$100 a month would be increased by 21%. Farm income would be boosted by \$1,000,000,000 a year, he said.

Washington, D. C. WHAT is labor's share in the national income today, particularly as compared with the situation before the New Deal? A research article in a recent issue of the United States News throws considerable light on this question.

Labor is getting almost precisely two-thirds of the national income today, the United States News says. Of income payments totaling \$69,700,000,000 last year, labor received \$46,000,000,000. But about 10% of this was in the form of government payments.

Employment and total income increased 4 1/2% to 5% in the course of the past year. Since the cost of living remained practically unchanged for most of the year, the purchasing power of the working population increased accordingly.

As compared with 1929, labor income last year was 13% lower. But, as the cost of living had declined still more, total buying power was about 5% higher. It is necessary to point out, however, that this was divided among considerably more workers, so that the buying power of the average person was actually about 5% below 1929.

The recent let-down in industrial activity has already had a noticeable effect on the total number of people at work, with a January decline of 1,100,000 reported in non-farm employment. At present, about 43,000,000 person are employed, not including relief workers, the more than 9,000,000 are still out of work. Total labor income is running at the annual rate of 48 to 49 billion dollars, about 4 1/2% above the 1939 rate.

Labor's share in the national income has increased to some extent during the last ten years but entirely as a result of the government's relief and benefit payments. In 1938-39, it was 66.7%, against 65.2% in 1929. If all government payments are excluded from the computation, it appears that labor's share was practically the same at the end of the decade in comparison with what it had been at the beginning.

JAY LOVESTONE

"Road to Labor and Socialist Unity"

Thursday, March 28, 6 P. M.

RIVERA MURALS HALL
131 W. 33rd St., (7th floor)

Admission Free
Auspices: Dressmakers Branch, Independent Labor League of America

Unemployed at 9,000,000 Federal Experts Estimate

Washington, D. C. AMERICA started this year with 9,000,000 to 12,000,000 unemployed, according to a memorandum recently submitted to President Roosevelt by his economic advisers. The memorandum is a compilation of estimates from labor-statistics sources.

The President was told that the best unemployment figures available until the census check-up in April were as follows:

	Estimated 1939 average	Estimated for January, 1940
National Industrial Conference Board	9,100,000	9,300,000
A.F.L.	10,100,000	10,200,000
C.I.O.	10,700,000	12,000,000
Federal economist	9,800,000	10,500,000

The federal economist, one who supplies figures for a half dozen government agencies, said the higher figures for January were due partly to the business decline in that month, but largely to seasonal factors which normally increase unemployment in that month.

This statistician figures that an average of 2,000,000 was unemployed in 1929, with the figure rocketing to 14,000,000 in March 1933, declining to 6,250,000 in September 1937, rising again to 10,300,000 in February, 1938, and touching temporary bottom again at 8,800,000 last October.

If seasonal factors operate this year, this economist calculates unemployment should be down to about 9,000,000 in April.

Letters from Our Readers:

Hits Rosa Luxemburg View on the Ukraine

Elmhurst, L. I.

IN her work on the Russian Revolution, which you are currently reprinting in English, the late Rosa Luxemburg found occasion to make a number of caustic, disparaging observations relating to the Ukrainian people and their movement for independence.

To those of your readers who are familiar with Slavonic history, it must have been only too evident that Miss Luxemburg's Ukrainian references were the sad result of a surprising ignorance surrounding her knowledge of the Ukrainian nation and people; or worse, that they had been prompted by a malicious desire, rooted in Bolshevik partisanship, to injure and discredit both before the workers of the world.

As the majority of Europe's 47,000,000 Ukrainians are impoverished peasants and workers who possess great admiration for a cooperative economy similar to that in the Scandinavian countries, whose war-time independent government, the Ukrainian Peoples Republic, was basically socialist, and who at present are avowed the repressed anti-Stalinists, it is only right that the progressive, anti-Stalinist press should contain in its pages writings about these people other than those tinged with ignorance or the desire to destroy.

Rosa Luxemburg was an exceedingly bitter foe of the "right of self-determination of nations" principle, terming it "nothing but hollow, petty-bourgeois phraseology and humbug." So acutely was she set against this principle that she took violent exception to it even when Lenin and Trotsky, out of expediency advocated it. By denying the various inhibited nations of Russia the right to abandon the empire and become independent states, she placed herself, a radical, in the difficult position of condoning Czarist Russia's earlier conquest by force of these non-Russian peoples; or, as in the case of Ukraine, justified Russia's wanton disregard of the Pereyaslav Treaty by which Ukraine, for protective purposes, had earlier federated herself with Russia on an equal to equal basis.

[Here our correspondent presents a mass of interesting historical material controverting Rosa Luxemburg's contentions and tending to confirm the genuineness and significance of the Ukrainian nationality. Because of lack of space we are unable to reproduce all this material.—Editor.]

We, Ukrainian socialists, are not "avid nationalists, but it is impossible for us to stand idly by while our people are so foully belabored—especially in a progressive periodical. The propagation by progressives of such asinine attacks on an already maltreated nationality will only serve to alienate the vast majority of this nationality from the progressive movement.

DIMITRI HORBAYCHUK

The Editor Replies:

WE would like to stress once again that we do not necessarily agree with every remark made in every article published in these columns. Especially is this true of a work such as Rosa Luxemburg's "The Russian Revolution," so largely controversial in character.

In publishing Rosa Luxemburg's views on Ukrainian nationalism we had no intention whatever of offending the Ukrainian people by denying the genuineness of their nationality. As a matter of fact, we ourselves disagree with Rosa Luxemburg on this question, as will be made clear in Bertram D. Wolfe's critical introduction to the English translation of Rosa Luxemburg's study. But our correspondent can readily understand that it would have been impossible for us simply to omit or suppress those sections of the Luxemburg pamphlet that did not appear to us to be entirely sound.

Whence Trotskyites Draw Their Wisdom

New York City.
Editor, Workers Age:
A RECENT issue of the New York Times relates the following

House Labor Group for Bigger Wagner Board

Votes to Recommend Adding Two to NLRB

Washington, D. C. THE House Labor Committee voted 14 to 3 last week to recommend to Congress that the National Labor Relations Board be increased from three to five members.

Chairman Norton announced the decision at the end of a two-hour closed committee meeting. The committee voted 9 to 8 to reject proposals to abolish the present Board and create a new one, she added.

Committee members, studying the Wagner Act section by section, decided against any changes in the declaration of policy which had been recommended by the Smith Committee investigating the act and the Board.

Washington, D. C. WAGNER Act supporters were reported working for major changes in the personnel of the National Labor Relations Board in an attempt to avoid a destructive Congressional fight over amending the law itself.

Conceding that it probably would take legislation to accomplish those changes, they were discussing these possibilities:

1. Enact a bill letting President Roosevelt appoint two new Board members to work with the present three.
 2. Induce Chairman Madden or Edwin S. Smith to resign from the Board so that the President could appoint a new member.
 3. Replace Nathan Witt, Board secretary, whose resignation William M. Leiserson, third Board member, once tried unsuccessfully to obtain.
 4. Coupled with any of these alternatives, require a house-cleaning of some Board trial examiners, regional directors and prosecutors.
- Certain Congressional supporters of the Wagner Act predicted that if these changes were made, "99% of our troubles would be over."
- Others, however, pointed out that these changes would have but little effect on the central difficulty in administering the Wagner Act, the

discretion of the Board to fix the appropriate unit of collective bargaining in a situation in which the labor movement is bitterly divided against itself.

Rochester, N. Y. WILLIAM M. Leiserson, National Labor Relations Board member, charged before the Rochester City Club last week that the Smith Committee which recommended sweeping Wagner Act changes "thoroughly misunderstood the act and lacked a fundamental conception of it."

All that was needed to put administration on a satisfactory basis, Mr. Leiserson contended, was a thorough reorganization of administrative personnel to correct an "overbalance" of lawyers, and "too much legalism" and open up the way for "laymen's administration."

Denying that the act was one-sided, Mr. Leiserson stressed that labor unions were responsible and should not be regulated any more than shippers whom the Interstate Commerce Commission protects from discriminatory rates.

Mr. Leiserson said that N.L.R.B. attorneys had contributed to "a fundamental misconception of the act" by taking the attitude that they were to exercise prosecution or judicial powers. The Board has not these powers; it can merely administer and investigate, Mr. Leiserson said.

Mr. Leiserson charged the Smith Committee's recommendations would increase "legalism," would open up more jobs for lawyers.

He warned that if the act were drastically amended this session, if "a backward step is taken, we'll get another and more drastic law later, because the working people will not stand for interference with their right to human association by employers who claim that right for themselves."

The right to organize, he said, is basic in American life, and "striking for unionism is striking for American rights, more important than hours or wages."

Hatch Bill Clash Bares Political Rivalries

Machine Bosses Strive for Control

(Continued from Page 1) President was continuing his crusade by more devious methods (such as the "political raids" of the Justice Department in Missouri and Louisiana). The original Hatch bill was the answer. To the degree that it was enforced, it would effectually undermine the White House political machine to the manifest advantage of the state Democratic organizations. For it would bar federal executive officeholders, precisely the men upon whom the Roosevelt machine entirely depends, from playing any direct part in national politics. The state bosses would be little, if at all, hampered, as it was never intended they should be.

Thruout all this bitter conflict in Democratic ranks, the Republicans stood gleefully on the sidelines throwing in their votes in favor of so-called "clean politics" as embodied in the Hatch bill in order to embarrass and weaken the grip of the Democratic machine. Indeed, it was almost with solid Republican support that the Hatch amendments passed the Senate last week.

The new Hatch bill was intended largely as a reprisal against the state machines. It would affect most seriously the state highway departments which are of key importance in state politics. The line-up on the bill reflects the breakdown of ordinary political alignments. In the Senate, majority leader and assistant majority leader are arrayed against each other, the former prevailing only with Republican votes. New Dealers and anti-New

Dealers are divided. The main determining factor seems to be the type of political machine the individual Congressman is more closely associated with and dependent upon.

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

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

"The Negro in the Present War"

Will the democracies bring freedom to the darker races?
Does Soviet Russia hold out any hope?
Should the United States take part in the war?

Hear these questions discussed in a

SYMPOSIUM

- Speakers:
DR. A. CLAYTON POWELL, JR.—Pastor, Abyssinian Baptist Church.
DR. WILLIS N. HUGGINS—Lecturer, Writer, Historian.
FRANK R. CROSSWAITH—Chairman, Negro Labor Committee.
E. WELSH—Harlem Branch, Independent Labor League.
MARY OVINGTON—Treasurer, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
JAY LOVESTONE—Secretary, Independent Labor League of America.
CLARENCE JENKINS—Chairman

Sunday Afternoon, April 7, 3 P. M.

RENAISSANCE CASINO
160 West 138th St. (7th Ave.), New York

Admission: 15 cents

Auspices: Harlem Branch, Independent Labor League of America

SPRING FROLIC AND DANCE
See Ad page 4

Socialist Fundamentals Reexamined:

Recreating Socialism

THIS article is part of the discussion now running in the columns of this paper on the fundamental conceptions of socialism in the light of the experiences of the last twenty-five years. The most complete freedom of opinion prevails in this discussion and therefore the articles are not to be taken as necessarily representing the views of anyone but the author.

Readers of the Workers Age are urged to contribute to this discussion by letter or article—the only restriction is that of space.—Editor.

By LEWIS COREY

(Continued from last issue)

VERY briefly, what are the institutional arrangements? First of all, there must be, under a socialist economic set-up, a democratic state. And by "democratic state," I don't mean an abstraction, the so-called "workers state" under which the "workers own." Such meaningless abstractions today help to cloak the hideous reality of oppression of the workers in "socialist" Russia. For the workers neither rule nor own. The effective power is wielded by a totalitarian bureaucracy which uses its unchecked political control over economic power to become a new ruling class. I mean a state operating under the most democratic conditions, its greater economic powers checked and balanced by appropriate institutional arrangements, more responsive to democratic pressures and ideas.

Part of the trouble here stems from Marx himself. Marx said that socialism must destroy the capitalist state machinery, that the new socialist state must combine the executive, judicial and legislative branches of the government into one central working body. I believe that that has within itself the tendency towards totalitarianism. Marx's proposal is one of dictatorship, not democratic socialist government. It means an overwhelming centralization of economic and political power which inevitably moves toward an oligarchical despotism under conditions of the combination of powers.

The democratic state of a socialist society must be a state where there is a separation of powers, because we don't want too much power centralized in one group. We must have a system of socialist checks and balances directed against the state which has enormous power in its hands.

We must have a system of socialist parliamentarism. We cannot have a one-party system. We must have the legality of political opposition guaranteed within such a socialist set-up. For socialism, at least in its earlier stages, does not abolish all exploitation and conflicts of interest. Hence the freest democratic expression of conflicting interests and ideas is necessary.

On the economic side, we must have economic decentralization. We must have the maximum decentralization of powers if we want to transform that economic set-up into a socialist democracy. It is not necessary to collectivize all productive property. Since collectivism drives toward totalitarianism, we should limit collectivism as much as possible. Independent small property should be allowed in industry and agriculture with an admixture of cooperatives. Planning can be limited to control of the few strategic factors necessary to insure an upward moving economic balance. Economic-administrative boards in the nationalized large-scale economic sector should possess definite rights and powers independent of the central national authority, with representation of the workers and other functional interests.

We must have independence of unionism in such a socialist state, and the right of real collective bargaining by unions within it.

I know it may be said that the workers form trade unions in order to fight against the employers, the capitalists, but in a socialist state the capitalists are gone. How can the workers have collective bargaining against themselves?

This is sheer tragic nonsense, as we can see in Russia. Facing the workers is a state manipulated by a bureaucracy, and the workers must have the right of action against that state and the bureaucracy—the right to ensure themselves of democracy in a concrete sense. Let me repeat: the workers are neither owners nor rulers. They still need independent organizations to protect their interests, especially under a socialism where collective ownership is complete and the state is the only employer—otherwise totalitarianism results. Unlike socialism, the trade unions are a creation of the proletariat itself. To abandon the independence of trade unionism means to sell the workers into totalitarian slavery. Whoever argues the contrary is, in my opinion, an enemy of the workers who wants to use them to establish a totalitarian dictatorship over them. There can be no democratic socialism without independent trade unionism.

We must have a pluralism of powers in a socialist society—a functional democracy in which the powers of the state are constantly limited thru the largest measure of functional democratic independence of economic and cultural groups.

These are some suggestions thrown out on this problem. I think it is a problem that must be seriously pondered. We cannot take it for granted that socialism equals democracy. We can get democracy under a socialist economic set-up only if we will democracy and fight for democracy by setting up the necessary institutions to achieve democracy.

The Road To Power

Another point is the question of the road to power. I want to suggest that here, too, all variants of socialism have shown serious shortcomings in facing the problem.

The old social-democratic idea of "growing into" socialism has been proven and found wanting by the pragmatic test of history. The newer communist idea of revolution by violence and the dictatorship of the

proletariat has given us the monstrous totalitarianism which is the Soviet Union today.

I suggest that both approaches or interpretations of the road to power or transition to socialism have shown serious shortcomings. A violent revolution could have been successful in Russia where there was a backward peasantry still under feudal conditions and no large new middle class, but in a highly developed capitalist country like the United States, where there is an articulate class of farmers and a strong new middle class, resort to violence would mean that those classes had not been won over to socialism, and if there were a resort to violence, those classes could dispose of much more violence than the workers so that the revolution would be crushed in blood. Even if successful, violence would mean a birth of socialism under conditions that would leave the new order scarred for years to come, because a revolution made against the opposition of the farmers and the new middle class would have to resort to dictatorship, and that would not be given up in a hurry. Moreover, that would defeat the ends of democratic socialism. It would mean a totalitarian bureaucracy ruling over the people. And who would be that new ruling class? Not the workers—they would still remain workers—but the new middle class of bureaucrats in industry and government, technicians, managers, the functionaries of dependent trade unions, professionals and intellectuals—as in Russia today.

I suggest that we ought to consider the question under American conditions of a new type of gradualism working towards socialism. I know it may be said: "But they tried gradualism in Europe and see the results." Social-democracy talked about gradualism. It was not gradualism that failed in Germany. The trouble was not that social-democracy had a program of gradualism but that it had no program of socialism whatsoever. It made no effort to introduce socialism, gradually or otherwise, wherever it had government power.

Social-democracy, especially in Germany, ended in being simply the political expression of "radical" trade unionism, trying to get more for the workers under capitalism. Since capitalism was in decline, it couldn't continue doing so indefinitely and the whole of Germany moved towards fascism.

We must work out a gradualist program of socialist reconstruction, a program capable of indicating to the American people precisely what we understand by socialism, a program that will express the interests of all useful groups in society, not only of workers, but the farmers and the middle classes as well.

Such a program must offer fundamental readjustments capable of solving the economic crisis. The program should include nationalization of investment and credit, the nationalization of large-scale industry, and planning. It should include recognition and encouragement of independent small property, with special measures to solve their peculiar problems in the new set-up. Nationalization and planning must involve encouragement of unions, cooperatives and other self-governing organizations of functional groups, and placing in their hands as much power as possible. Such a program, if introduced in a decisive manner and not spread over too long a period of time, would solve the economic crisis and, since it makes a fundamental break between the old and the new, could set in motion the transition from capitalism to socialism.

For a People's Socialism

We must get away from the conception of socialism as being simply in the interests of the workers. That marks it down simply as trade unionism. We need a people's socialism, a socialism that will appeal to all the people, to all useful groups in society. All those useful groups are needed under socialism. Socialism must be capable of rallying all these masses of the people, capable of making them see that their interests are expressed in this socialist society. To do that it is necessary to abandon the old emphasis on the proletariat as the "carrier" of socialism. The concept is unhistorical and unrealistic. Emphasis on the proletariat leads either to disastrous totalitarian dictatorship or to the futility of social-democracy. Trade unionism should emphasize the proletariat. But socialism must broaden and deepen itself to become the expression of the interests and action of all useful functional groups in society.

This is not a Popular Front program. It is a program of decisive socialist action. The Popular Front program was a program of compromise. But the people's socialism I am advocating is one that will work out a program of socialism expressing the interests of all useful groups in society, and in doing this, build upon our own experience and our own traditions and our own needs and thus set in motion a struggle that will not only give us a better America but a democratic socialist America as well.

NOTHING WILL SATISFY HIM!



— from Justice

Another Opinion on Socialist Attitude to Russo-Finn War

Questions "Jacobin Defense", Self-Determination Concept

By J. SYMONDS

(Altho the actual fighting in Finland is over, the problems raised in this article are still significant enough to warrant a discussion in these columns. In the next issue, Will Herberg will reply to the questions raised by J. Symonds.—Editor.)

THE war in Finland poses more concretely and sharply than any other event to-date certain problems which must be faced and clarified. Any group which seriously regards itself as revolutionary and socialist must examine and consider these problems from all angles with the greatest frankness and honesty and the minimum degree of self-justification and narrow factional bias. I am, therefore, going to discuss some of the problems which have been raised in my mind as a result of various articles and editorials in the Workers Age and other publications, lectures, and numerous private discussions.

WHAT IS "JACOBIN DEFENSE"?

The most important new general concept which has been utilized as a justification for revolutionary socialists putting forth the slogan of "defending Finland" is the theory of "Jacobin defense." Thus, "the only safeguard of the Finnish masses and the real strength of their desperate fight remains the independent organization and action of the Finnish labor movement" (Workers Age, Jan. 20, 1940). This is quoted from an article by Will Herberg and indicates that basic socialist policy is to work toward increasingly independent working-class action. But behind that slogan is the idea that the workers, in order to defend the Finnish masses, must take over power from the unreliable "bourgeois and government elements who are dominant in Finland today." Unfortunately, there is little indication of how that power is to be taken over and whether "the popular masses" can act "thru their own independent organizations" within the existing state forms (in Finland). This is a very fundamental question which cannot be taken for granted and the lack of a precise position defining the type of state can only lead to increasing confusion of the reader. Such a position even raises the general question of "defense of the fatherland against invasion" in contrast to the position in the "Communist Manifesto" that "the working men have no country" until they have captured political power from the ruling class. But the capture of power from the ruling class and its consolidation, even during wartime when the masses are armed, involves the strong probability of civil war which will temporarily, at least, weaken the struggle against the invader. It involves "the replacement of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat as state . . ." according to Marx, as quoted by Lenin, is "impossible without a violent revolution" ("State and Revolution"). Thus there seem to be certain important contradictions between the viewpoints of Marx, Engels and Lenin, which generally point in the direction of "revolutionary defeatism," and the "Jacobin defense" viewpoint, which could be used to strengthen "nationalist," "defensist," and "social-patriotic" tendencies. Of course, such quotations cannot prove that the latter and later theory is incorrect but they do indicate the need for fundamental discussion and analysis. Extensive clarification on the relation of "Jacobin defense" to "revolutionary defeatism" and the form and class content of the state is obviously needed. This especially so since up to now "Jacobin defense" has had historical validity only insofar as shifts of political power occurred within the ranks of the ruling classes.

CONCEPT OF "SELF-DETERMINATION"

Next we come to the concept of "self-determination." Now what does this concept mean? To me, it means the right of peoples to determine their cultural, political and economic conditions. Obviously, in a class society it is not the people but the ruling classes which, to a decisive degree, determine the fate and conditions of all. Thus, there is a good deal of justification for Rosa

Luxemburg's statement that it is "the democratic forms of political life in each land" which are important "whereas the famous 'right of self-determination of nations' is nothing but hollow petty-bourgeois phraseology and humbug" (Workers Age, Jan. 20, 1940). In fact, during a revolutionary situation, according to her, "in the midst of crude realities and when class antagonisms are sharpened to the uttermost, it is simply converted into a means of bourgeois class rule." But in Finland there are certain "democratic forms of political life" while class antagonisms "have been dulled." Yet the job of revolutionary socialists in Finland (if any) should be to sharpen these class differences and go toward the higher democratic forms inherent in a real workers state (economic democracy). In Russia, meanwhile, the role of socialists should be to work for the elimination of the bureaucratic degeneration (the Stalin regime) which stands in the way of the development of these higher democratic forms.

Thus, in both countries, the emphasis by socialists should be on the working class and the peasants taking power and altering the state forms (in the process) to make possible the democratic determination and development of that new state power to prevent either the Finnish ruling classes or the Russian bureaucrats from regaining and perverting it. In Finland, the general slogan could be: "Workers power and land for the peasants will defeat Stalin (Kuusinen) and the British and Ger-

man imperialists," while in Russia it could be: "End the war along with the Stalin bureaucracy and restore democratic socialism in order to defend the Soviet Union." Of course, a common aim of revolutionary socialists in both countries should be for the closest "unity of the workers of both the oppressed and oppressor nationalities . . ." as Lenin and Zinoviev put it ("Socialism and War"), thru fraternization, wherever possible, and consistent revolutionary propaganda adapted to the situation.

AN IMPOSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE

What is the alternative? As far as I can see, any support by revolutionary socialists of the Finnish government, irrespective of the influence of the social-democrats in it, merely helps confuse the masses further and binds them more tightly to the Finnish ruling classes. There can be no independent labor action to defend the Finnish masses except insofar as it moves toward independent military organization and the seizure of power from the ruling class irrespective of the immediate military effects of such a policy. Any other course makes the Finnish workers merely tools of their own ruling classes who in turn are, at present, the pliant pawns of British, French, and American imperialism in their anti-Soviet policy. At the same time, such a policy by the Finnish workers makes more difficult the job of Russian revolu-

(Continued on Page 4)

Flynn Hits Stalinist "Anti-War" Swindles

KAOWC Head Urges No Tie-Up With CP

By JOHN T. FLYNN

(We publish below a communication recently issued by John T. Flynn, national chairman of the Keep America Out of War Congress.—Editor.)

AS you know, the communists in this country are, at the moment, in favor of keeping America out of war. Using the slogan, "The Yanks Are Not Coming," they are pushing a national drive, with a pamphlet, buttons, and stickers. With the dissolution of the American League for Peace and Democracy, they are being instructed to set up new local organizations—Keep America Out of War Committees, Yanks Are Not Coming Committees, Civil Liberties Committees, etc.—or to work within existing organizations. In a few places, they are attempting to chisel in on existing bona-fide peace organizations.

Some of our members have asked us if they should admit communists to their organizations or if they should cooperate with communist-inspired groups. I want, therefore, to reiterate emphatically our policy that we do not, under any circumstances, cooperate with communists or communist organizations or admit them to our branches.

The communist peace program may temporarily seem superficially similar to ours. But there are a few basic differences. The Keep America Out of War Congress is unalterably opposed to dictatorship and to totalitarianism, whether black, brown or red. We consider the Soviet regime in Russia as dictatorial as the worst of them. We strongly condemn the Russian invasion of Finland. The communists do not agree with us on these matters.

Furthermore, we all remember that, only a few months ago, prior to the Nazi-Soviet pact, the communists were in the forefront of the interventionist, pro-armorment, "collective-security" movement and were making every effort to discredit our movement to keep America out of war as "isolationist" and cowardly. They have now reversed their policy completely. From past experience, we know that in a few more months they may once again reverse themselves and become pro-war, if the interests of Soviet Russia so dictate. The chief danger in their activities lies in the fact that bona-fide and

deep-rooted anti-war sentiment, in the unions and among other groups, may be rallied behind a movement that is not genuinely or permanently anti-war. "Innocent" supporters of the current policy of the communists may be induced to follow along when the next change in line occurs. There is danger also of a reaction to the effect that "if the communists are anti-war, we should be pro-war"; also that "since the communists are trying to undermine American defenses, we must oppose them by giving more vigorous support to the President's foreign policy."

The Keep America Out of War Congress and its affiliated national peace organizations have had a consistent policy and program ever since their formation in favor of keeping America out of war, building in America a stronghold of democracy, and using our influence to lay the foundations for a lasting world peace. Ours is a movement of Americans and for Americans.

We must, therefore, redouble our efforts to show conclusively to the people of this country that there is a strong and genuine anti-war movement which has no connection with either communists or Nazis, and that there is another alternative to the communist position besides the Administration position. We must push more intensely than ever our petitions, our stamps, our buttons, and our literature. New and better literature is in preparation.

But, in my opinion, some of us tend to overemphasize the importance and strength of the communists in this country. We mustn't get them too much into our thinking, so long as they don't try to muscle in on our organizations or to start internal dissensions. We must concentrate instead on fighting the naval-expansion program and the M-Day plans, preventing the undermining of democracy thru failure to solve domestic problems, pushing the war-referendum amendment, and keeping a watchful eye on steps taken by the Administration.

Read—Spread

WORKERS AGE

Gandhi Tries to Stem Indian Drift to Left

Opposition Grows to Capitulatory "Pledge"

By J. CORK

MY last article, indicating the capitulatory attitude of the right-wing leadership of the Indian National Congress on the question of independence and dominion status was written before news came of the Patra resolution of the Congress Working Committee adopted March 1, 1940. The heart of this resolution states:

"Indian freedom cannot exist within the orbit of British imperialism, and dominion status or any other status within the imperial structure is wholly inapplicable to India and not in keeping with the dignity of a great nation.

"The people of India alone can properly shape their constitution and determine their relations with the other countries of the world thru a Constituent Assembly elected on the basis of adult suffrage."

India and not in keeping with the dignity of a great nation.

GREAT ADVANCE TO LEFT

This has been the traditional viewpoint of the lefts in the Congress and represents a great forward step. However, the resolution should not be interpreted as indicating a real change of heart on the part of Gandhi and his right-wing followers. The New York Times dispatch on the Patra resolution makes clear that the right wing adapted itself to the rising militant temper inside the Congress in order to hold onto its leadership. In spite of that, the resolution is of great significance in that it reflects the influence of the left wing in the Indian national movement.

It would be decidedly over-optimistic, however, to conclude on the basis of this resolution that a clear-cut fight against British imperialism is necessarily in the offing.

There is another aspect of the resolution that most observers have overlooked—the fact that Gandhi alone is left to decide on what grounds the threatened campaign of civil disobedience will be carried out, if it will ever be carried out at all!

"Congress desires to draw the attention of Congress followers to Mohandas K. Gandhi's declaration that he can only undertake the responsibility for declaring civil disobedience when he is satisfied they are strictly observing discipline and carrying out the constructive program laid down in the Independence Day pledge."

GANDHI'S PLEDGE AND PROGRAM

Now, this Independence Day pledge is a very interesting business. It is a loyalty pledge which the right-wing leadership is attempting to exact from all Congress members. In reality, it is an attempt to establish its own political shibboleth. The pledge reads: "India has gained strength and self-reliance and marched a long way towards peaceful and legitimate methods. . . The most effective way of gaining our freedom is not thru violence. . .", and so on. The "constructive program" of the pledge referred to above contains directives for Charkha (spinning) and the revival of village handicrafts, the purpose as stated being to overcome the poverty of the masses by transforming the 700,000 villages of India into self-contained economic units, and to provide means for the inner spiritual discipline of the individual Congress members.

This so-called "constructive program" is, of course, trivial and deceptive. Self-contained village economy is a futile dream. Growth of modern industry, which will perforce disrupt any self-contained village economy, is indispensable for the economic reconstruction of the country and the economic emancipation of the masses. An obvious prerequisite for that is the shattering of British control. This so-called "constructive program" of the Independence Day pledge, therefore, rouses dangerous illusions, is a waste of energy and diverts the Congress from its basic political tasks. In addition, there is the central fallacy of the political limit set to the means of achieving independence—non-violent, peaceful methods, a restriction which, at the very outset, compromises the possibility of achieving the stated ends.

LEFT WING AGAINST PLEDGE

For these reasons, the various left-wing organizations have publicly expressed their disapproval of the Independence Day pledge. Roy's League of Radical Congressmen has proposed a united-front campaign against this pledge to other left-wing organizations, Bose's Forward Block, the Congress Socialist Party, etc.

To get back now to the original Patra resolution and the point of the whole story. According to the resolution, Gandhi will permit the fight to start against England only if he is satisfied that the Independence Day pledge is being faithfully observed. In view of the fact that a large section of Congress is fighting the pledge, it is to be feared that the resolution for complete independence will be shelved by Gandhi on this pretext and thus it will remain on paper like so many similar resolutions adopted in the past.

That Gandhi is still looking for some arrangement with England is evident from his speech at Calcutta on March 2, the day after the adoption of the Patra resolution. He said: "The question has come from London whether the Congress closed the door to negotiation or compromise. My interpretation of the resolution is that the Congress has not closed the door. . ." Nehru, speaking the same day at Patra, also said Gandhi was ready to negotiate.

The next step in the struggle is being decided at the national convention of Congress taking place at this writing and with which I will deal in my next article.

Workers Age

Organ of the National Council, Independent Labor League of America, 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Publishing Association. Subscription Rates: \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 for six months; 5c a copy. Foreign Rates: \$2.50; Canada \$1.75 per year.

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

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

Vo. 9. SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1940. No. 13.

AN OFFICIAL WAR-MONGER

THE address delivered at Toronto last week by the United States minister to Canada, James H. R. Cromwell, was not only a breach of diplomatic propriety but a gross insult to the great mass of the American people whom he is supposed to represent.

Mr. Cromwell, in his capacity as American minister, took it upon himself to uphold the Allies in the present war and to bless their war aims. "He declared," the New York Times reports, "that the Allies were fighting for the preservation of individual liberty and warned that a victory for Germany would result in the enslavement of the conquered peoples and the establishment of authoritarian governments everywhere."

Who ever gave Mr. Cromwell the license to make public pronouncements on European affairs from the point of view of one or the other of the belligerent groups? Mr. Cromwell is the accredited diplomatic representative of the United States, officially a neutral country. Where does he get the nerve to talk like a British propagandist trying to sell another "war for democracy" to the American people? The Allies fighting for "individual liberty"! Look at India, Indo-China and all of Africa, Mr. Cromwell, and see if you dare repeat that lying phrase again! As well hail Hitler as the champion of the self-determination of nations!

But Cromwell's impudence goes even further. He actually permits himself, as an American minister in a foreign country, to scold the American people for their intense determination to remain neutral and keep out of the war! "Mr. Cromwell chided American isolationists," the New York Times report continues, "for what he termed their failure to see the menace and referred to those in the United States who fail to see the difference between the cause of the Allies and the aims of the totalitarian powers as 'short-sighted and cynical-minded persons.'"

Such insolence is absolutely insufferable. But it is insolence with a method. Whatever he may be in form, Mr. Cromwell is in actuality not an American minister to Canada; he talks and acts as a British agent striving to drive the American people into the war for the sake of the British and French empires. He is a pro-Allied war-monger, open and unashamed! Yet he is an official representative of the United States and speaks in the name of the American people!

There is no reason why the American people should tolerate such an outrageous situation, why they should subsidize British war propaganda and give the propagandist a commission to speak in their name. Cromwell must be instantly recalled from Canada. The entire peace movement of this country should raise this demand immediately and exert such pressure on Washington that action will be forthcoming without delay. No mere censure will do.

But the problem goes deeper. As Senator Nye points out, Mr. Cromwell was "only echoing what his chief has repeatedly resorted to, the being at the head of a government striving for neutrality." There can be little doubt that our minister to Canada made his speech with the full knowledge and unofficial consent of the President and the State Department. Perhaps the speech was intended to be a sort of trial balloon to see how much American public opinion would stand. Now that such a loud cry of protest has been raised in the United States over the address, Mr. Cromwell has been formally disavowed by the State Department, even censured. The Administration will henceforth proceed a trifle more cautiously but will proceed nevertheless towards the same goal—American aid to the Allies to the point of involvement in war "if necessary."

It may not be difficult to get rid of the "indiscreet" Mr. Cromwell. But his promoters, the war-mongers supreme, will continue in power as long as the present Administration remains in Washington.

"AMONG those that stand is that of Col. Joseph Weydemeyer, U.S.A., the communist leader to whom Lincoln gave a commission in the Army so that he could carry out the 'party line' of the communists fighting against slavery in 1861."—Robert Minor in the Daily Worker, February 7, 1940.

This bit of history absolutely flabbergasts us. Can it be that it was really Joe Stalin who defeated Lee at Appomattox, just as it was Joe Stalin who made the Russian Revolution, won the Russian civil war, brought socialism to Russia, etc., etc.—and all with his little "party line"?

HAVE you noticed how every election or other political event that happens nowadays becomes a "setback" or "defeat" for the Roosevelt Administration in the columns of the Daily Worker? Six months ago, every thing that occurred was a "tremendous victory for the New Deal and the democratic forces." How do you account for this curious change? Can it have anything to do with Stalin's change of foreign policy?

The calendar says

Spring Is Here!

We take calendars seriously.

SPRING IS SPRING

We're only human and Spring's got us!
You're only human and Spring's got you too!
Only WE are doing something about it and
Invite YOU to join us when we run our

Spring Frolic and Dance

Saturday Evening, April 13, 1940, 8:30 P. M.

Labor Stage Studio
106 W. 39th St., N. Y. C.

Do you rhumba?
Do you Suzy-Q?
Do you hop any number of ways?
Of course, you wait!

Just name your dance and you shall have it!
How's that?
That's the kind of band we're having.

It's the DANCINGEST DANCE BAND and knows just everything!

You're coming? That's swell!

Only 49 cents for half a dance couple; 49 cents for the other half; less than \$1.00 for a whole couple!

Get your tickets at the

INDEPENDENT LABOR INSTITUTE
131 W. 33rd St., 7th floor, New York City LACKAWANNA 4-5282

Socialist Fundamentals Reexamined:

Is Marxism Totalitarian?

THIS article is part of the discussion now running in the columns of this paper on the fundamental conceptions of socialism in the light of the experiences of the last twenty-five years. The most complete freedom of opinion prevails in this discussion and therefore the articles are not to be taken as necessarily representing the views of anyone but the author.

Readers of the Workers Age are urged to contribute to this discussion by letter or article—the only restriction is that of space.—Editor.

By B. HERMAN

STALINIST totalitarianism, dripping with the blood of countless thousands of revolutionaries in Russia and Spain, attempting to prolong its rule through the most brutal terror, and now, faced with crisis at home, embarked on imperialist ventures abroad, has inspired in the people of all countries and the revolutionary workers of the world the most intense revulsion. Who cannot but be indignant at the monstrous crimes of a "Leader" who slaughters his entire general staff in secret on the pretext that they favor an alliance with Hitler, and then shortly thereafter enters such an alliance himself? Who can forget the role of the "Great Leader of the world proletariat" in Spain in order to win the favor of the "great democracies," France and England, and who now prates about the war-mongering imperialisms, France and England, in order to win Hitler's congratulations? Who cannot but see, or be appalled by, the oppressive treatment of the Russian masses, the extinction of every democratic right and privilege, the denial of any freedom of thought, expression or organization? The Russian Revolution, the greatest thus far in world history, whose effect and whose lessons, both positive and negative, will influence profoundly the minds of men through countless generations, has entered a period of barbarous degeneration. The Marxian dialectic has played a grim joke indeed. The Russian Revolution has turned into what appears to be its opposite.

It is therefore not surprising to see this general revulsion against Stalinism rise to such proportions as to threaten to engulf even the Russian Revolution itself, destroy understanding and enthusiasm for socialism as that higher stage thru which mankind can achieve freedom for further development, and heap resentment upon the brilliant contributions of Marxism to human thought. The best example of this trend of thought is to be found in Max Eastman's recent "Socialism Revalued." Due credit should be given to Max Eastman. We take him only as the most able, most consistent, most erudite exponent of this school of Marx-devaluators, who are suffering from Stalinist shell-shock.

BRAINS, HONESTY WITHOUT A PROGRAM

The sub-title of Eastman's article is, "Hitler and Stalin Came Together Because Marxism Failed." This is as remarkable an explanation of the Hitler-Stalin pact as we have yet seen. To blame Marx for the Hitler-Stalin pact has as little common-sense as to accuse Marx of collectivization of the peasantry, the purges or the Stalinist, Leader cult. But Eastman doesn't hesitate to throw into the Stalinist pot together with Marx, both Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg! For Stalin had no immaculate conception. Before Stalin, there was Lenin. Before Lenin was Marx. I might add that before Marx there were others, unless in his unique manner, Marx was immaculately conceived. At any rate, back to Marx we go, for in Marxism, we are informed, lies the root of the present evil. For Stalinism is a result of the application of Marxist principles! Eastman writes: "The chief trouble on the left is that radicals who have both brains and honesty have no program. They realize that the Marxian theoretical system is not scientific; they realize that the application of Marxian practical principles in Russia has been a significant failure." In a footnote, Eastman then quotes Sidney Hook and John Dewey as two examples of radicals with brains, honesty but no program. This is a clever association of ideas—brains and honesty are combined with a negation of Marxism.

FROM MARXIAN RELIGION TO STALINIST RUFFIANISM

The essential principles referred to above as responsible for the Stalinist degeneration are: the Marxian dialectic, the principle of the class struggle, and the Marxian theory of the state. Eastman identifies Stalinism with the principles of Marxism, and actually traces the roots of Stalin's ruffianism and totalitarianism back to Marxian philosophy, to that "religious belief in a benignly evolving universe." For, says Eastman, "like other religions, Marxism convinced the believer that the external forces were on his side." Having identified Stalin with these Marxian principles, Eastman then has an easy job identifying Marx, Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg with Stalin. In case some critical minds, possessing "honesty and brains," might protest, for example, against poor Rosa, an uncompromising critic of undemocratic tendencies in Bolshevism, being dragged in by her hair, Eastman proceeds to show how Luxemburg, as "a true believer in the Marxian religion," would have

acted no differently than Marx, Lenin or Stalin. "The proletariat—if the revolution is a real one—is bound to and must, and what binds it is the mystic threat of the Hegelian dialectic." And if the proletariat must wage the class struggle, it must, that's all there is to it, whether it wants to or not.

THE AMALGAM OF OPPOSITES

By proving too much, Eastman has proven nothing at all. The beginning of wisdom is differentiation. But this elementary intellectual duty necessary for honesty or understanding, Eastman ignores. The argument has been carried to the point of absurdity by identifying Stalin with Marxism, when in theory and in practice, and in the very principles which Eastman refers to as the essentials of Marxism, Stalinism is the exact opposite. In constructing the amalgam of revolutionary and counter-revolutionary, in attempting to gloss over the all-essential differences, Eastman does Stalinism a great service, for this is just what Stalin would like to prove. It is difficult to determine whether Max Eastman, in linking Stalin with Marx, errs more in defaming Marx or in flattering Stalin.

Stalin has learned sufficiently the art of ruling to know that terror alone is not sufficient to retain power. The feeding of propaganda is frequently a good substitute for more substantial food—and much cheaper. It is with this purpose in mind, therefore, that the Stalin propaganda machine works night and day disseminating the myth of Stalin as the great inheritor of Marx, "Lenin's best disciple," the "Lenin of today." An amalgam is created in true Stalinist fashion of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin. The printing presses run off millions of pictures of various combinations of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin, Marx-Lenin-Stalin, or Lenin-Stalin. Motion pictures are fabricated showing Lenin earnestly seeking out Stalin for his advice at every step. What is carefully concealed is Lenin's firm conviction, expressed in his famous letter to the Russian Communist Party Central Committee, that Stalin's leadership was disastrous.

Stalin has cultivated this amalgam with Marx, Engels and Lenin deliberately as he did the amalgam of Bukharin and Trotsky with Hitler, or the P.O.U.M. with Franco. It is an essential part of the Stalinist technique of deception. The counter-revolutionary Stalin clique knows the value of trying to cash in on the immense moral and political capital of the theoretical founders and champions of modern socialism. But let any Russian dare to "agitator" about the Marxian theory of the "withering away of the state" under the dictatorship of the proletariat and he will soon find himself in a concentration camp, providing he isn't shot. For the Stalinist theory of the "strengthening of the state" has now the force of law in Russia, and the Stalinist practice will soon show the recalcitrant how effectively laws can be enforced by the powerful argument of a shot in the head. Let anyone speak up about Lenin's view that "Stalin has concentrated too much power into his hands" (mind you—in 1922!), and that brave individual can kiss his family farewell! Stalin is by official ukase the Marx and Lenin of today, but let no one take Marx or Lenin too seriously, or dire consequences will befall anyone so naive. In no other country except Stalinist Russia is the death penalty for holding Marxian principles so effectively enforced.

Germany Turns To Drive Against Balkan States

(Continued from Page 1) such a northern block would be chiefly under German influence.

Repercussions of the Russo-German victory in Finland were felt last week in both Paris and London. In the French Chamber of Deputies, accumulating dissatisfaction with the government's policies broke thru and forced the resignation of the Daladier cabinet after nearly 300 deputies had abstained on a vote of confidence. Paul Reynaud, Finance Minister in the old cabinet, immediately undertook to form a new government. The Reynaud cabinet, containing Daladier as Defense Minister and extending representation to include three socialists, managed to survive its first test vote in the Chamber by a majority of one, receiving 268 votes as against 156 opposed and 111 abstaining. The opposition and abstentions came mostly from the Radical-Socialists and groups further right. The general opinion was that the Reynaud cabinet was in a very precarious position and would not last more than a few days. What would follow it was by no means clear.

In England, too, the government faced a barrage of criticism of its war policies in the House of Commons. Some sort of governmental reorganization was expected soon after the Easter holidays.

Washington, D. C. A NEW angle on the European war is being discussed in informed American circles here. Army intelligence doubts that the much-talked-of and feared bombings will start in the Spring. Their reasoning is that Germany now has superiority in the air and can keep it providing she doesn't lose too many airplanes—large-scale bombings might mean heavy losses. Germany also has limited supplies of high-octane gasoline and is not anxious to deplete these stores; England bombing of France and German bombing bring retaliation and Germany is no more willing to have her cities and people bombed than are the Allies. The Nazis are confident that the Allies will not initiate any bombing.

These sources believe also that the war may be rapidly reaching a stalemate. They do not see any chance of a collapse in Germany for several years. It is the German tactic, they say, to keep as short a military front as possible. For this reason, they do not expect any German attack on Scandinavia, Belgium or Holland as this would extend the front and give the Allies a battleground which they do not now have. The western front is not, in their opinion, impregnable but to get thru either the Maginot or Siegfried Lines would be so costly in man-power that neither army is willing to test the vulnerability of the other's fortifications. Should Russia attack either Norway or Sweden, it is expected that Germany would give Stalin a free hand but would insist that Russia continue to supply the Reich with Swedish iron ore. If Russia and the Allies want to fight it out on the Scandinavian

peninsula, Hitler will stay on the sidelines for both may be so weakened by such a struggle that Germany will be, for all practical purposes, the victor.

Another View on the Russo-Finnish War

Concept of "Jacobin" Defense Questioned

(Continued from Page 3) imperialist struggle and the policies of their governments were simply screens to camouflage the policies of the great powers supporting them. Also present in the situation was a certain amount of mass pressure which forced the ruling class to follow a slightly more independent policy in relation to the large powers.

Now where does Finland fit in? I would say closer to the latter group than to the former for the following reasons. The Finnish government, in spite of its former German orientation and its present social-democratic "control," is today a pawn in the hands of British, French, and American imperialism against the Soviet Union. This is clear from the extent of support it is getting and the type of propaganda in the newspapers and dispatches of these respective nations. Italian imperialism, also, has some influence and is rendering aid on a purely anti-Soviet basis—profitably, I imagine. The propaganda from Britain and France indicates that to a certain extent aid to Finland is also sent as part of the struggle against the Russo-German block, the so aspect that it is still a secondary aspect of the situation. Finally, the Finnish masses are able to influence the government to some degree and are given certain concessions (land and factory reforms) because of the desperate straits of the ruling classes. But the most basic aspect of the situation is the extent to which the ruling classes on a world scale are playing on the sympathy of the masses for "poor little Finland" and utilizing the slogan "defense of Finland" to prepare them for an "anti-communist" crusade, to restore a capitalist dictatorship in Russia, wipe out in blood even the memory of the Russian revolution, and postpone the impending collapse of the profit system by a decade or two more. The job of revolutionary socialists, therefore, is to combat and expose this drive and its slogans and thus prepare the masses for future struggle. This, naturally, involves not support but the utmost criticism and clarification of all these ruling-class slogans including "defense of Finland." Of course, there must, at the same time, be unreserved condemnation of Stalinist aggression and the role of the Stalin regime in weakening the Soviet Union and the international working class to pave the way for capitalist restoration in Russia.

Lovestone Talks On Russia at Boston Meeting

ON Friday, March 15, the Boston Branch of the Independent Labor League of America conducted a lecture at the Hotel Bradford with Jay Lovestone as speaker on the subject of "What Has Happened to the Russian Revolution?" The meeting was very successful. There were many new people in the audience which filled the hall.

Lovestone was at his best, especially in the question period when answering the great number of questions from his hearers. Another public meeting will be held by the I.L.L.A. here in the near future. Time and place will be announced.

Washington, D. C. Industrial production took another drop during February, falling 10% below January, which in turn, was 9% below December. Output of steel and other basic materials, according to the Federal Reserve Board figures, decreased contrary to usual seasonal trends. Housing would help immensely to buttress these slumping figures but thus far Congress refuses to act in authorizing the necessary loans for an expanding housing program.

A Symposium

"What Socialism Means to Me"

Beginning in the current issue of

THE CALL

official weekly publication of the Socialist Party of the United States

Contributors:
Norman Thomas - Lillian Symes - James D. Graham - Joseph Goldwell - Upton Sinclair - Prof. Oskar Lange - Prof. Maynard Krueger - Tucker P. Smith - Travers Clement - Albert Sprague Coolidge - Alfred Bahr Lewis - Frank Trager - Marcel Pivart - Bertram D. Wolfe - John M. Work - Henry Haskell - Mary Donovan Hapgood - Reginald Singh - Paul Porter - Richard Rovere - V. F. Calverton and many others.

Write for free sample copy
Subscription—\$1 a Year (52 issues)
The Call, 549 W. Randolph St., Chicago, Ill.

A New Angle on the European War Crisis

Washington, D. C. A NEW angle on the European war is being discussed in informed American circles here. Army intelligence doubts that the much-talked-of and feared bombings will start in the Spring. Their reasoning is that Germany now has superiority in the air and can keep it providing she doesn't lose too many airplanes—large-scale bombings might mean heavy losses. Germany also has limited supplies of high-octane gasoline and is not anxious to deplete these stores; England bombing of France and German bombing bring retaliation and Germany is no more willing to have her cities and people bombed than are the Allies. The Nazis are confident that the Allies will not initiate any bombing.

Germany Turns To Drive Against Balkan States

(Continued from Page 1) such a northern block would be chiefly under German influence.

Repercussions of the Russo-German victory in Finland were felt last week in both Paris and London. In the French Chamber of Deputies, accumulating dissatisfaction with the government's policies broke thru and forced the resignation of the Daladier cabinet after nearly 300 deputies had abstained on a vote of confidence. Paul Reynaud, Finance Minister in the old cabinet, immediately undertook to form a new government. The Reynaud cabinet, containing Daladier as Defense Minister and extending representation to include three socialists, managed to survive its first test vote in the Chamber by a majority of one, receiving 268 votes as against 156 opposed and 111 abstaining. The opposition and abstentions came mostly from the Radical-Socialists and groups further right. The general opinion was that the Reynaud cabinet was in a very precarious position and would not last more than a few days. What would follow it was by no means clear.

Lovestone Talks On Russia at Boston Meeting

ON Friday, March 15, the Boston Branch of the Independent Labor League of America conducted a lecture at the Hotel Bradford with Jay Lovestone as speaker on the subject of "What Has Happened to the Russian Revolution?" The meeting was very successful. There were many new people in the audience which filled the hall.

Lovestone was at his best, especially in the question period when answering the great number of questions from his hearers. Another public meeting will be held by the I.L.L.A. here in the near future. Time and place will be announced.

Washington, D. C. Industrial production took another drop during February, falling 10% below January, which in turn, was 9% below December. Output of steel and other basic materials, according to the Federal Reserve Board figures, decreased contrary to usual seasonal trends. Housing would help immensely to buttress these slumping figures but thus far Congress refuses to act in authorizing the necessary loans for an expanding housing program.

SPRING is here! Let's hear your GOAT SONG!

CELEBRATE with MIDTOWN
KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR CONGRESS!

ENJOY DOUGLAS MANDELL'S dramatic monologue presentation
of the GRAPES OF WRATH!

WONDER at that master of the metaphysical, in his presentation
of a new game, or

DR. DAVID SINCLAIR presenting 15 exciting rounds of
EXTRA ENCLAIROUR PERCEPTION!
PARTAKE of Refreshment and Enjoyment.

TIME: SATURDAY NIGHT, MARCH 30 - 8:30 P. M.
PLACE: 370 Central Park West (97th St.) - Apt. 311 N

Donation 35c