

SOCIALIST REVIEW •

Vol. 6 - - No. 7

July - August, 1938

HERBERT ZAM: Editor

NORMAN THOMAS The Menace of Hagueism

* *

Problems of the C. I. O.

by ARTHUR G. McDOWELL

Social Planning and Democracy

by HARRY W. LAIDLER

Popular Front—Middle Class Weapon

by HENRY HASKELL

Youth, Religion and Peace

by JEFFREY W. CAMPBELL

What Labor Gained From Congress

by SAM LAWRENCE

CURRENT NOTES

BOOK REVIEWS

SOCIALIST REVIEW: Official theoretical organ of the Socialist Party of the United States.
Published Bi-Monthly at 301 West 29th Street, New York, N. Y., by the Socialist Party of the United States.
Subscription: One Dollar and Fifty Cents for 12 Issues. Fifteen Cents a single copy.
Reentered as second class matter January 21, 1938 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE SOCIAL FRONTIER

A journal of educational criticism and reconstruction
A medium of expression of the John Dewey Society
for the study of Education and Culture

1. What have teachers to offer in the present national crisis?
2. Is it true that the problems of war, poverty, crime, and unemployment are too great for human intelligence to solve?
3. Can the school be made the center of American community life just as the cathedral was the focus of mediaeval activity?
4. Are there educative and miseducative influences in current business, political, religious, and other institutional practices?
5. How can our people, young and old, be guided in new and better directions of personal and social growth?
6. Will the teaching profession be able to harmonize social ends and educational means?
7. Does not the school exist to foster new values at the same time that it cherishes established goods?

These items are a sample of the topics discussed in the pages of THE SOCIAL FRONTIER by some of the ablest minds of our generation, for educators who love new and "advanced" ideas and the intellectual stimulation they bring with them.

\$3.00 Per Year

BUSINESS OFFICE:

Room 108, 2960 Broadway, New York City

BOUND VOLUMES

AMERICAN SOCIALIST QUARTERLY
AMERICAN SOCIALIST MONTHLY

Still Available

An invaluable reference for serious socialists
Order at once from

SOCIALIST REVIEW

301 West 29th Street

New York, N. Y.

MAY DAY GREETINGS

(Arrived too late for May Day Issue)

DETROIT, MICHIGAN

Emmanuel Seidler

Louis Busker

Jean Seidel

Belle Goodman

Francis King

Maurice Goldsmith

"For the Revolution—A Civil Service Employee"
Omaha, Nebraska

Mary C. Johnstone, Philadelphia, Pa.

Sam Fingerett, Uniontown, Pa.

THE SOCIALIST CALL

Official Organ, Socialist Party, U.S.A.

— features —

A weekly review of national and
world events by

NORMAN THOMAS

Articles by

McAlister Coleman

Harry W. Laidler

Gus Tyler

Lillian Symes

Travers Clement

Devere Allen

and others

"Squibs," a satirical column,
by Gene Loman

"World Notes," a review of inter-
national Socialist activities,
by John Mill

THE SOCIALIST CALL IS A
WORKERS' AND FARMERS' NEWSPAPER
SUBSCRIBE TODAY!

\$1.00 a year

Special "Depression" sub — 10 weeks 25¢

SOCIALIST CALL

549 RANDOLPH STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

SOCIALIST REVIEW

Official theoretical organ of the Socialist Party of the United States.

HERBERT ZAM, Editor

EDITORIAL BOARD: Jack Altman, Robert Delson, Harry W. Laidler, James Loeb, David Paul, Frank Trager.

VOLUME SIX

JULY-AUGUST, 1938

NUMBER SEVEN

The Menace of Hagueism

by Norman Thomas

AMONG the curious sidelights which the struggle against Frank Hague has shed upon the American scene is its new evidence of the law's delays. The crisis in the C.I.O. fight for its ordinary rights was reached last November; the application for an omnibus injunction against Hague and the Jersey City authorities was not heard until June before Federal Judge Clark, and that gentleman coolly postponed his decision until September on the ground that whatever he decided there would be an appeal to higher courts not now in session. Meanwhile, the C.I.O. and other organizations are deprived of rights which are theirs.

As one part of the various legal proceedings which, with the help of the Workers Defense League, I instituted in behalf of myself and the Socialist Party, my lawyer, Arthur T. Vanderbilt, filed an application for a writ of mandamus to compel Director Casey of Jersey City to grant a permit for a meeting the date of which was set for June 7th. The Chief Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court did not throw out the application altogether, but ruled that the first practicable date for hearing it would be in October. As I write, investigations of the Newark riot still drag on!

Nevertheless, it is progress of some value that in any way Hague and his machine have been brought before the courts as defendants. The Jersey courts which they so largely control are, however, still successfully used by them to persecute political opponents like Burkitt and Longo.

Publicity on facts like these and the basic situation has been good. On the whole we have had what is called a "good press" in our fight against Hague. Landon and Roosevelt have both spoken out for civil liberties in Jersey, the former much more specifically than the latter. The Newark riot, instigated by the Hague machine, proved to be a boomerang. The general reaction of all sorts of Newark organizations, including even some veterans organizations, was very

critical of the shameful spectacle in Military Park, Newark, on June 4th. Two weeks later a large mass-meeting in Washington Park with competent police protection was held under circumstances which suggested that the trouble makers were in a small minority.

Nevertheless, I think there is a tendency for Socialists, labor unionists and others to be too optimistic about prospective victory over Hagueism. If Hagueism is definitely an incipient American Fascism—and certainly it is—it is important that it should be met with something more than a slap on the wrist. As things now stand, I am inclined to think that Hagueism, if not Hague himself, has definitely been boosted in the opinion of those sections of our population from which a Fascist movement under some other name will likely be recruited. I have already referred to the law's delay. There are even worse features of the situation, which I shall enumerate briefly:

1. Hague's tactics and especially his utilization of violence by his police and by his mob are proving contagious. The Newark riot was followed by egg throwing in localities long free from that sort of thing. Woonsocket, Rhode Island, was encouraged to go in for restricting Communist meetings. New Orleans broke out into an epidemic of official violence against C.I.O. unions more brutal and more serious than anything that happened in Jersey City. To be sure, New Orleans needed no particular encouragement, but it is reasonable to suppose that Hague's widely publicized defense of himself as the champion of Americanism was not lost upon New Orleans officials. I have evidence in the shape of letters, conversations, etc., to prove that Hague's court room display, which to the thoughtful was an amazing revelation of the mind of a small time dictator, aroused much admiration and support from those elements in the community which like to wrap up bigotry and ignorance in the flag.

2. In spite of President Roosevelt's good words

about civil liberties in general, he has not yet acted, either as President or leader of his own party, to depose Frank Hague as Vice-chairman of that party, to take away Hague's federal patronage, including WPA which is so important a part of his power, or to see to it that the Department of Justice makes a real investigation of Hagueism in New Jersey. It is possible that the Federal Grand Jury's request, made at my insistence, for a federal investigation of the deportations may get some action, but if so neither Roosevelt nor any of his appointees will deserve much credit in view of the long delay.

3. One of the most serious features of Hagueism is its tie-up with the Roman Catholic church which in the province of Quebec is openly responsible for the development of Canadian clerical Fascism. I have heard from Catholic sources which cannot openly be quoted that the Catholic authorities in North Jersey very definitely support Hague if they did not actually inspire his Fascist policies. One of his lawyers, John A. Matthews of Newark, is an Advisory Master in Chancery, that is a judicial officer. He is also Papal Chamberlain and Knight of Malta. At a dinner in Newark to a certain Father Toohey, this good American declared that Norman Thomas had come to Jersey, "to deChristianize Christianity", and that "the Catholic masses" were and would be justified in riding me out "whether by ferry, subway, or other means". Father Toohey, himself called for "an association of the Godly" to fight against Hitler, but for Hitler's ally, Franco, and for Hague! Such a speech helped to prepare the way for the Newark riot. Fortunately, many Catholics, including the editors of important Catholic publications, have denounced this sort of thing. The Workers Defense League, which has reprinted my speech, "Hagueism is Fascism" in an attractive 2¢ pamphlet, included the forthright editorial of the Pittsburgh Catholic of June 9th, criticising this tie-up between Hague and the Church. But none of the responsible Catholic authorities in North Jersey have spoken out. Apparently, they are willing to take the risk that the Catholic equivalent of Ku Klux Klanism will not awaken and suggest counter-attacks by Protestant bigots and other enemies of the church against it. That is a real danger as some of the "nut" letters I get make clear.

4. Worst of all, as an omen for the future is the fact that most of the A.F. of L. unions, not only in Hudson County but in Essex County, have more or less openly supported Hague. The Hudson County unions had representatives in Hague's triumphal procession. The Essex County central labor body, under the leadership of a man generally regarded as a labor racketeer, defeated a resolution condemning the Newark riot. Fortunately this action does not represent the mass opinion of labor, as has been proved by the resolutions of many unions including many A.F. of L. locals. Nevertheless, it is clear that the dominant section of

A.F. of L. officialdom prefers Hague to the C.I.O. These labor leaders are moved probably by more than hate of the C.I.O. In years gone by they have tasted Hague's whip and Hague's sugar-plums. The fact remains that already there has happened in America—not only in New Jersey, but in New Orleans and other places—a thing which never happened in Europe. In no country before the Fascist dictators came to the power, did any section of the organized labor movement give them support. Yet the A.F. of L. has openly approved of Hague's policy against the C.I.O. in spite of the fact that that policy is fascist and if carried out will crush the whole American labor movement. Twice I have called this matter to the attention of William Green, and twice all that I could get out of him was a disclaimer of personal responsibility and a refusal to interfere with local bodies. Labor has rarely had blinder leadership. Rarely has it in any country shown so early and so clearly the evil consequence of civil war in its own ranks.

These facts speak for themselves and prove how far we are from winning our battle. I do not think that Hague himself is the coming American Hitler. He is too old; he lacks a popular slogan like Huey Long's "share the wealth"; his power, for all its seeming strength, is menaced by the near approach of his city to bankruptcy. Above all, the time is not yet ripe in America for a Fascist synthesis for the protection of what can be salvaged out of capitalism. Nevertheless, Hagueism shows the way.

From one point of view he is only a political boss of a familiar type. He has been mayor of Jersey City longer than the mayor of any comparable city, except Dan Hoan of Milwaukee—and the contrast between Hague and Hoan is a contrast between Fascism and Socialism, false and true Americanism. But he is more and worse than a local boss.

I thus described Hague and Hagueism in one of my radio speeches:

He rules his city by a combination of fear and favor. He has grown rich in public office, but his city is poor, worse taxed by far than any comparable American city, and with less to show for it except an overgrown police force and a medical center which Hague treats as if it were his gift to the taxpayers. He has made Jersey City's motto "everything for industry" and according to court testimony at least some 40 to 45 establishments have taken advantage of that motto by wage scales of \$6 to \$8 a week. He plays up to the A.F. of L. especially since his attack on the C.I.O. but its members have not always loved him. He has fought them and defeated labor's anti-injunction bill in New Jersey in 1936. It has repeatedly been charged in public print that he was for years the friend and supporter of the notorious labor racketeer, Brandle, whom he finally broke after a personal quarrel about a loan by establishing open shop structural work on the skyway. He boasts of the order and decency of Jersey City but the Federal Government does not accept his police records and Jersey City nationally is the

(Continued on Page 16)

PROBLEMS OF THE C. I. O.

by Arthur G. McDowell

IN an earlier article the first encounter of the C.I.O. labor movement with a renewal of depression conditions was described and the plain fact recorded that in spite of all the fears of friends and the hopeful predictions of its enemies the C.I.O. neither fell apart nor was it compelled to retreat from any major position which it had organized anyway solidly during the expansion years of '36 and early '37. The fearful strain of another six months of decline at the terrific rate of the first year of the Roosevelt recession would be costly indeed but so far the C.I.O. has blocked any real wage cutting drive by its influence on the bell wether of employing interests, the U. S. Steel. The C.I.O. has made the transition to a depression basis and under the stress of economic difficulties has weaned some of its bigger outfits and started the reverse flow of cash to instead of from the C.I.O. in terms of per capita.

The tests of the first skirmish with depression left the advantage of the field in the hands of the C.I.O. and its high command. Not so happy were the prospects inside the movement where the internal character and leadership and the long term stability and effectiveness of the C.I.O. are being determined. A new movement such as the C.I.O. particularly with the vast numbers involved eventually stands or falls in terms of the human capacity for leadership which it can develop in the given historical period of its rise. That leadership must not only be technically equipped but must be also a natural enough outgrowth of the workers own experience to be not only trustworthy but trusted and recognized as their own by the mass of rank and file. There is neither the time nor the conditions in mass production industry which permit the establishment and functioning of a time encrusted leadership merely because that leadership fought its way to the top at the first and stayed there by machine power and the inertia of the membership and the limited nature of their demands, as in the case of the craft unions. The mass character of the industrial unions multiplied the number of first line posts to be filled and called for a line of secondary non-professional leadership far exceeding in importance and numbers anything the older movement ever required or secured.

The C.I.O. was exposed on two flanks in this regard. The leadership of the original C.I.O. unions was with few exceptions as autocratic, bureaucratic and tightly held as in the old Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor from whence they came.

There was a distinct lack of trained first or second line leadership because the trade union movement in the main for years had been in the process of crustification and systematic discouragement of aspirations to

leadership by younger elements. The C.I.O. leadership solved this in two ways. First it "borrowed" official elements from all the more stable international unions such as the miners, clothing workers and others and placed them in the leading positions and recalled to labor movement service many a veteran "benched" for offending the labor powers-that-be in past trials of strength or drawn off to more comfortable employments, private or governmental, in the years preceding.

Youngsters anxious to work and not demanding exorbitant salaries but rather a chance to prove their prowess and the power of their ideals in a real mass movement were recruited from not only the Socialist and Communist parties but from smaller opposition groups and sects. The Socialist elements in general proved individually more capable and competent as well as more trust inspiring but due to a long period of dual unionism which superficially spread over some sections of the basic mass production industries the Communists had a greater spread of experienced people and due to the consolidation of their influence among immigrant groups (a majority of which they took over in 1919 from the Socialist Party) through such an organization as the International Workers Order they could claim to offer considerable contact in such an unknown territory as steel. The extreme opportunistic swing of the Communist Party to support of Roosevelt in 1936 enabled the Communists to operate in the C.I.O. with greater freedom than Socialists who stubbornly adhered to their principles of independent labor political action in the face of the labor stampede to Roosevelt and repudiated with some scorn the concealment of their views.

This favorable position for Communist penetration of the C.I.O. might not have been fraught with such actual danger to the future life and progressive character of the C.I.O. were it not for the historical developments within the international Communist movement which at the same time made easier their penetration and gave a reactionary significance to their drive for power. The Communist policy being internationally pro-war and chauvinistic, and domestically reformist in the most conservative sense, allowed the Communists to seek the most conservative and reactionary alliances and to make the crudest deals for jobs and advantage in the labor movement and government.

The Communist movement, minus the heavy baggage of communism, began to get the masses for the first time into its ranks, on the basis of its reformist program, support of Roosevelt, promises of voting and other support to individual opportunists in the trade unions, etc.

The Communist Party can then today not be evaluated nationally except as an increasingly reactionary

influence in the labor movement. It continues but with greater power to pursue a dictatorial rule or ruin tactic wherever they develop any considerable strength, they carry over from their political background the fierce intolerance, deliberate falsification and totalitarian state tactics which under existing conditions do not even mean a strong labor movement under Communist domination (it being impossible to "liquidate" opponents with prison and firing squad as yet) but result in narrowing of the mass base as well as the leadership of the unions down to their supporters or their willing tools as soon as they get full control. Large sections of workers are either, at the best under such circumstances, driven back to the A.F. of L. breaking the solidarity of new industrial unions or at the worst, are embittered, turned anti-union and downright reactionary, excellent grist for a fascist anti-union mill.

All the dangers to the future success of the C.I.O. from within while not contained in the Communist Party forces in the labor movement are nevertheless epitomized by the Communist movement and will increasingly rally round them as Frankenstein and his reactionary cronies have done in the auto union, which they are out to split if they cannot rule. To the Socialist and all genuinely progressive elements in the C.I.O. in their fight for internal democracy, independent political action and trade union unity will fall the task in the course of their work of combating what can now be called the communist menace to the C.I.O.

Nor must we forget the dangers from without the labor movement. Militant industrial unionism in the mass production industries is vastly expensive to the industrial interests and impossible for them to tolerate when the level of production again begins to drop sharply and the question of the class division of the output becomes an ugly one requiring sharp sacrifices on one side or the other. Then the question of who shall bear the burden finds the workers in industrial unions entrenched in the great industries and, with memory of past serfdom and recent hard won gains fresh in mind, in no mood to willingly sacrifice as they once did of crude necessity because they lacked the organized power to resist. In resisting the workers will of necessity become less and less respectful of property claims, as in the sit down strikes, occupational holidays, slow down demonstrations, etc., alarming the middle classes with their property consciousness and fear of disorder. These same middle classes will be pinched by the depression, irritated by increasing taxes attributed to the workers' demands for government assistance, regulation and social legislation and embittered over the decreasing opportunity for their children in middle class pursuits to which they cling desperately as to life and self-respect itself. The fact that workers by organization protect standards of living actually equaling or bettering the declining lot of thousands of middle class individuals with their "talents", training,

good minds and good tastes, will breed class hatred against the workers as an organized expression. Financial interests will be impatient of mounting taxation for social purposes and stiffening regulation and together with its industrial managers, easily persuaded as the least of the evils to subsidize a domestic fascist anti-union movement based on mass forces recruited by the middle classes. A workers movement not engaged in an aggressive drive towards Socialism and the undermining of the sources of power of its enemies and the creating of a vigorous promising forward current which will drag important sections of the middle classes along in its train will, however brave its battle, succumb to its enemies as in Germany or France because the time will have passed for a merely defensive battle and any necessary retreat become a rout. These fundamental historical political lessons the organized workers must learn, and most of those who must learn are in the C.I.O.

Workers have tasted power and the value of their strength, as in the auto industry, only yesterday, a citadel of the open shop and as in the hundred "closed company towns" which the Steel Workers Organizing Committee has broken open in the valleys of the Monongahela, the Allegheny and the Ohio. It will be fortunate indeed if an inflation program in terms of peaceful construction can enable the C.I.O. to resume its extensive advance as a result of temporary lifting of depression conditions of employment and production. It will be necessary to prevent the intervening of war developments thru military and diplomatic adventures to which Roosevelt and many of his associates lean. There is reason to believe that mobilization of anti-war sentiment in which the Socialist Party led has at least slowed down Roosevelt's war drift and at the worst forced him to divert his adventure in the direction of the south and central Americas. It is essential that Socialists who are almost alone equipped to do so, should resolutely work and fight to mobilize sufficient forces in the Labor Anti-War Council set up as part of Keep America Out of War Congress to curb Roosevelt still further and accentuate the drive for mobilizing resources for a huge construction work which will give both the C.I.O. and the Socialist Party the breathing spell for essential work which they can so advantageously use.

Socialists insist on the necessity and the possibility of sound peace between the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. as the best method of combating both of these dangers. It is a progressive step at this time, both for the C.I.O., the A.F. of L. and the working class as whole. This is based however on a clear recognition that it is almost certain that the present Executive Council in 1935 was incapable of permitting, let alone leading in the organization of the millions which the C.I.O. swept into the ranks of organized labor. It is even more true that even once organized, the American Federation of Labor under its present leadership would have been largely

incapable of holding the new millions of organized workers in the mass production industries together in the circumstances of a return of depression such as the present. Any unity must be such as to leave the channels open for a fairly rapid shifting of the leadership of the A.F. of L. not only in the Executive Council but in the state federations, city central bodies and important locals. Needless to say an equivalent process although on a different basis would take place in the C.I.O. The highly artificial, bureaucratic and very often incompetent leadership of the Communist Party machine would have to give way at important points where it is now entrenched in the split labor situation. It will be necessary to welcome and work for steps to put the C.I.O. set up on a more permanent and consistent and above all more democratic basis. The tightening up of the machinery of the C.I.O. as evidenced in the beginnings of the establishment of their own press recently to replace such free lance, essentially irresponsible and undemocratic arrangements as that carried on by "Peoples Press" for many new C.I.O. unions, and the decision to call a national constitutional convention and to set up city central bodies in the big centers all seem to be progressive and necessary. Socialists should resist the withdrawal of such an important body as the International Ladies Garment Workers from the C.I.O. line up at the very moment they are most important in the process of constructing a progressive line up in this largest section of the body of organized workers.

The American Federation of Labor united with the main body of the C.I.O. spells real labor unity and progress. There is no hope of making it again or ever the real leader of American working class forces by itself or by piece-meal addition of isolated progressive parts even as large as the I.L.G.W.U. Neither the forces nor the leadership for a dynamic labor movement exist today with the American Federation of Labor. Gompers left his lasting mark upon it and its history; set its limits when as the wiseacres say a labor movement led by a man without a philosophy was after his death ruled without even the man. The American Federation of Labor as at present constituted ran its course not in 1933 or in 1935 but in the post war and prosperity years, when far from growing in membership it actually declined.

The C.I.O. for all its weaknesses from within and dangers from without has in less than three years occupied and holds the main part of the industrial field. It has started out in heavy industry and new material production with only coal organized and today is entrenched in auto, steel, rubber, aluminum, glass, oil, metal mining, lumber and wood workers, shipbuilding, electrical and radio goods, chemicals, maritime transportation on the east coast and longshore and warehousemen on the west coast. Against this the A.F. of L. stands four square with the building trades, skilled metal and machine trades, teamsters, west coast seamen,

and east coast longshoremen, the directly or fraternally affiliated powerful railroad organizations, and fragments of coal, metal mining, and metal production.

In the field of lighter consumers goods production the C.I.O. overshadows the A.F. of L. if possible even more completely, holding textiles, clothing (men and women), shoes, leather, fur, furniture (a CP controlled set up, in this case much weaker than the combined strength of the A.F. of L. in the miscellany of carpenters, upholsterers and federal locals), agriculture and cannery (again due to the CP, being the exception to C.I.O. set ups in other industries in being weaker than A.F. of L. federal locals council) and meat packing. The A.F. of L. in this field holds the ace of the printing trades, and the hat and millinery workers of the needle trades group, but the additional items with the above noted exceptions of furniture and agricultural workers, in men's clothing, leather goods, shoes, tobacco, brewery miscellaneous federals and butchers are no match for the C.I.O. list.

The A.F. of L. today has important but quite inconsistent and varying parts. The report of the Executive Council showed that including the main group and the most stable group of A.F. of L. unions, the building trades, it had not even in 1937 recovered the strength they held in 1929. This was true of an entire group including Barbers, Boot and Shoe Workers, Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers, Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, Cigar Makers, Railway Clerks, Carpenters, Hod Carriers, Lathers, Plumbers and Steam Fitters, Leather Workers, Sheet Metal Workers, Painters, Papermakers, Plasterers and Street Electrical and Bus Employees (now rivaled by the United Transport Workers of the C.I.O.).

A middle group which had just about got back 1929 strength included Boiler Makers, Railway Carmen, Musicians and printing trades.

The gainers were highly significant. Outside of the important exceptions of the Machinists, Teamsters, Operating Engineers and Electrical Workers the gainers were mostly in the light or service trades including the Bakery Workers, Brewery Workers, Building Service Employees, Hotel and Restaurant Employees, Meat Cutters, Retail Clerks, Teachers, Millinery workers and Maintenance of Way Men. There is nothing consistent and solid to hold this last group together as in the case of the building trades.

The A.F. of L. without basic unions of the C.I.O., is and will continue to be of distinctly secondary importance nationally although not in certain localities and one or two trades. It must be pointed out that the record above is that of the most prosperous period of "Roosevelt Recovery", the first six months of 1937 when the level of production in the United States approximately reached the 1929 level albeit in the meantime population had increased about ten million over

(Continued on Page 15)

SOCIAL PLANNING AND DEMOCRACY

by Harry W. Laidler

(Paper read at the June Conference of the League for Industrial Democracy, at Unity House, Forest Park, Pa., on Friday evening, June 10, 1938.)

ONE of the most frequent remarks made today by our "rugged individualists" is that no national planning can be carried out without something akin to a dictatorial control of industry. Introduce planning into our economic system by one door, they declare, and democracy will inevitably fly out of the other door, leaving bureaucracy, regimentation and dictatorship in complete possession of our economic household. This has been the almost daily refrain, among others, of the Honorable Herbert Hoover, leader of the party of the Mellons, the DuPonts, the Morgans, the Weirs, the Fords, and other great democratic spirits, who have shown a lifelong abhorrence to all forms of dictatorships and bureaucracies which do not leave them in complete command of their respective feudalistic strongholds.

On his return from Europe, with his discriminating economic mind, Mr. Hoover threw into the same category fascist planning, communist planning, the New Deal and socialist planning and condemned all systems of planning and alleged planning as utterly undemocratic. On the regimentation and bureaucracy found in our unplanned capitalist system, Mr. Hoover was significantly silent. One would infer from that silence that the controls exercised by our great corporations, trusts and combines were essentially democratic, with little or no taint of bureaucracy, regimentation or dictatorship. It may be true that, under a system of monopoly and semi-monopoly capitalism, where the government gives industry a free hand to exploit the masses, the heads of industry are not regimented, but under such a capitalist set-up, the owners and managers of industry use their tremendous power to regiment the masses of workers. An objective study of the attempts at ruthless suppression of trade union organization in most of our great corporations during the last twenty years through the iniquitous spy system; through company guards and thugs; through deputy sheriffs in the pay of the corporations; through the control of the police, constabulary, militia, courts and forces of public opinion; through company and so-called "independent unions"; through the canny use of alleged social welfare plans, and through the sheer economic power of the corporation to hire, fire, promote, demote, and blacklist the worker, would give some idea of the sweeping character of modern bureaucratic control of privately run industry and of the extent to which the mass of workers were deprived of democratic rights under the "rugged individualism" of our unplanned economic order. A fur-

ther study of the controls of the giants of the steel, auto and other industries over the political and cultural activities of the communities in which they are dominant economic forces and over the mass of inarticulate consumers and gullible investors would provide further evidence of the extent of modern industrial dictatorship and regimentation.

The chief problem before the American people is how to evolve to a system of social planning which will be thoroughly democratic in all of its many ramifications.

To attain a democratically planned society, many things must be done. In the first place, the ownership of industry must be placed on a democratic basis. That means that industry as a whole must be owned by the community and by voluntary cooperative groups. Such ownership is a necessary preliminary to genuine social-economic planning and to the application of democracy to industry.

When industry is in the hands of thousands of separate corporate and family groups, each intent on securing for itself maximum profit, it is impossible to plan on a national scale. An individual can plan what he should do with his own property. A housewife, who has title to the furniture in her home, has no difficulty in making and carrying out plans for the arrangement and disposal of that furniture, but a housewife would have difficulty in carrying out plans for the disposition of property that belonged to some other housewife. A community would likewise find it extremely difficult to bring scientific planning into industries it did not own. When planning is superimposed on private industry by a government which has no share in its ownership, each attempt at planning leads to vigorous resistance from large groups of the private corporations intent on maximum profit. An attempt to compel these corporations to live up to a plan made by the government in respect to production quotas, prices, quality of goods and services, wages and salaries, profits, savings, improvements, etc., leads to the employment of armies of government inspectors and regulators, to the development of government bureaucracies and to wholesale attempts to force recalcitrant employers to adhere to the government plan.

Where, as in the case of the N.R.A., private corporations are organized for the purpose of "planning", such an attempt usually results in a decision to cut down production with a view of stabilizing prices at a high level and of ensuring a so-called reasonable profit to the less efficient corporation, which means an unreasonably high profit to the more efficient. This leads to

diminished production, to failure to utilize to the full the industrial equipment at hand, to high prices, diminished mass purchasing power, more unemployment, the continuance of an economy of scarcity. The employment of those fortunate enough to obtain work under this system of capitalist planning may be stabilized; but the unemployment of the jobless is also likely to be stabilized.

Moreover, in so-called capitalist planning, the stabilization of an industry on high price-low production basis, may mean the increasing instability of other industries dependent upon that industry for their production. If the steel industry, for instance, carries out a plan for the production of a strictly limited volume of goods at a high and rather inflexible price, the enforcement of this plan might bring havoc and chaos into the automobile industry, the building industry and other businesses which use steel on a large scale. Any comprehensive system of planning for the common good, a planning based on the full utilization of the human and mechanical equipment at the disposal of society and the equitable distribution of the products of industry among the masses of the people, is impossible without social ownership of the chief and essential industries of the nation.

This does not mean that all industry, under a socially planned society, must be publicly owned. A considerable section of industry might well be left to voluntary groups. At present consumers' cooperation in many lands is a powerful factor in the field of retail distribution. In the United States, agricultural cooperatives are growing in numbers and influence. In Soviet Russia, while many state farms exist, most of the farming is now operated by various types of collectives or cooperatives. In a cooperative commonwealth, in a planned society, we are likely to see existing side by side with publicly owned industry many voluntary cooperative enterprises, particularly in the field of retail distribution, agriculture and intellectual production.

In some of these fields, a larger amount of coordination and planning would be needed than in some others. It is essential that society secure in any one year a large enough quantity of wheat, vegetables, milk, clothing and other materials to feed, clothe and shelter the population. There must be careful planning—as careful as the weather, international, natural, mechanical and human relations will permit. In certain types of intellectual and cultural production, on the other hand, no careful planning is possible or desirable. As there should be plan in material production, there must needs be a certain amount of anarchism in intellectual production. Some of this production might be the product of a public enterprise—we in America have witnessed during the last few years of depression an enormous increase in artistic production under public auspices; some of our intellectual production, such as the publication of peri-

odicals of opinion, might be controlled by voluntary cooperative groups and some might be the product of individuals, artists by vocation or by avocation.

Such division of the field of socialized industry between public and cooperative industry should advance the cause of democracy, and greatly add to the flexibility of the industrial structure of the cooperative commonwealth. It would not be conducive to the best democratic results if all of our publications were issued by public bodies. In fact, under a planned economy, the individual and the voluntary group—cultural, economic or political—must be given full opportunity to publish magazines, pamphlets and books, representing their varied points of view and otherwise to educate or propagandize for their respective beliefs. This is essential to a democratic socialism and to any type of democratic social planning. Individuals and voluntary cooperative groups should likewise be able to start new ventures under proper supervision by the public, and to operate these ventures until the public deems it essential to transfer them to the community.

If social planning is to be truly democratic, furthermore, each socially owned industry should be administered democratically. That does not mean that the workers in each industry should completely control that industry, as syndicalists would urge. The final control of a publicly owned industry should be in the hands of society-as-a-whole. If the miners had complete administrative charge of the mining industry, they would be in a position to fix prices and the volume of production, boost wages out of line with the workers in other industries, and exploit the consumers. In any public industry, some plan should be worked out which would give each functional group adequate representation on administrative boards. The workers should be represented, since they are tremendously interested in the conditions under which they work. The consumer should have a say in the development of policies, since they are vitally interested in the quality, the volume and the prices of the goods produced. The administrative and technical staff should have a voice on the governing board because of their expert knowledge of the industry. All those groups should be represented on the directing body whose training and interest give them a significant stake in the enterprise. One of the major means of making social planning democratic is to adopt a system of democratic, of functional control of a publicly owned, as well as a cooperatively owned, industry.

Many opponents of social planning and of Socialism often maintain that such planning is bound to be dictatorial, since, under a planned society, it will be necessary for some central authority to determine how labor shall be distributed, and to compel labor to shift from one industry to another. Such compulsion might have to be resorted to if every worker in every industry obtained the same wage or salary and if no material in-

(Continued on Page 16)

Popular Front—Middle Class Weapon

by Henry Haskell

CHAMBERLAIN embraces Mussolini and thumbs his nose at the League of Nations; Daladier forgets Stalin and stretches out his hands to Chamberlain and Mussolini; Roosevelt makes "quarantine" speeches and quarantines democratic Spain alone. During the past month the capitalist democracies have hammered nail after nail into the coffin of collective security. But its supporters keep on shouting that it would live, if it were only given air. The ears of the idealists of the "Nation", Communist Party, American League for Peace and Democracy stripe are so full of their own honeyed words that they do not hear anything else. Actions to them do not speak louder than words. Or do they think that their own incantations will somehow change the face of the world, so that things as they are will inevitably become the things they ought to be?

The big struggle among American liberals and radicals is that between the advocates of the People's (or Popular) Front, and the opponents of capitalism. The question of collective security of capitalist states versus independent international workers' sanctions is only one phase of this question. The advocates of the People's Front and the advocates of collective security are the same people. They take the middle position in both cases—in national affairs they are between the extreme reactionaries and fascists to the right, and the revolutionaries to the left; in international affairs they are between the reactionary autarchist nationalists on the right, and those upholding the traditional Marxist internationalism on the left. That they are in the middle in both cases is no chance happening. That their opponents line up as they do is not a matter of luck. For the advocates of the People's Front and collective security represent the program, the hopes and fears and aspirations of the middle class. Its opponents are the Marxists, traditional representatives of that portion of the working class which has no delusions about capitalist democracies or the class struggle—or reactionary big capitalists.

Socialists and Communists in this country have engaged in a noisy and acrid debate over the question of the Popular Front. Unattached liberals, surprised and pleased that the once uncooperative Communists have become prime movers in the direction of the Popular Front are dismayed that the once docile Socialists should oppose it so vigorously. They cannot see why radicals should fight each other instead of uniting in opposition to fascism and war which threaten to swallow them both.

The point to be made is that while this disunity is very unfortunate, no unity is possible for radical political groups which start from opposing premises, advocate different methods of achieving their purpose,

and have only that general purpose as a unifying agent. That is why American Socialists advocate the united rather than the Popular Front for although these terms have been distorted and confused, they express fundamentally different concepts.

The united front is a pact entered into by two or more groups for obtaining a single limited objective common to them. You have a united front May-day demonstration to indicate to capital the strength of the working class. The united front could be used to lower the price of milk; to boycott fascist products; to protect the exploitation of their colonies by the French government; to break Mayor Hague's political neck, or any one of fifty thousand other specific objectives which different groups hold in common. Lenin had no objection to entering into such united front pacts with the devil himself—but when a pact included as a prerequisite being swallowed by Satan, Lenin just couldn't see it.

And that is just what the people's front seems to the revolutionary Socialist. That is exactly what has happened to radicals every time they have united organically with liberals and progressives, which is the meaning of "People's Front." For the people's front has as its fundamental concept united action by different groups—working class, middle class, etc.—for a *common general program*. And history shows that this program eventually becomes the same as that of the liberal middle class, and is adhered to by the radicals in order to keep the support of that middle class. Eventually the original program of the radicals themselves is watered down, compromised and all but obliterated. That is what Socialists mean by saying that in the people's front the radicals are swallowed by the liberals. Red and pink won't mix—the whole mess becomes pink.

Is it necessary to prove the point by examples? History furnishes many such. The coalition which Ramsey Macdonald had to accept with the Liberal Party was essentially a people's front. It ended in a national front which swallowed the "radical" Mr. Macdonald, and left labor holding the bag. In France the people's front swallowed both the Socialists and the Communists so completely that with one or two honorable exceptions their program in action was that of the mildly liberal middle-class party misnamed the Radical Socialist party. And no Ramsay Macdonald could have "betrayed" the workers more completely in action than the French Socialists and Communists have the Spanish workers, however revolutionary their words may have been. Finally, during this last cabinet crisis in France, Leon Blum tried to make the Popular Front resemble

Ramsay MacDonald's fiasco even more minutely when he tried to form a "national front" government. So that American Socialists, while espousing the use of the united front in specific cases, reject the people's front as an emasculating, derevolutionizing agent. And now, in the field where it is most needed, the field of action for peace, they reject even the united front with the Communists.

There is nothing new in what I am trying to show. But the American public has not as yet become aware of the fact that in some important respects the Communist Party has assumed what is accepted as the traditional position of social democracy, while the Socialist Party in the United States has turned sharply to the left of that position. Manifestations of this are numerous. They permeate every activity undertaken by the two groups, and shine brightly from the paragraphs of their publications. Their peace programs illustrate this best of all because peace is the outstanding issue of the day, and because these programs indicate so clearly the irreconcilable differences in fundamental outlook and method which make united action by the two groups impossible in a major field like that of international relations.

The communists arrive at their advocacy of collective security as the instrument of peace by this reasoning.

The large masses of the people, including important sections of the middle class as well as of the working class, have certain interests in common, especially opposition to war and fascism.

Fascism was able to come to power successfully in Germany, Austria, etc., because these groups did not combine effectively against it. Even if social and economic conditions in a country made the movement toward fascism powerful, the united action of these groups could have stopped it.

In today's world fascism is the most aggressive form of capitalism. The interests of the democratic capitalist states lie with peace, as do those of the Soviet Union. Their only chance for peace lies in combining with the Soviet Union to preserve that peace.

In the international field the lack of unity between the democratic nations and the Soviet Union (now also "democratic"), has permitted successful fascist aggression in Manchuria, Ethiopia, Spain and China, and may permit further such aggression in Czechoslovakia, Austria, the Ukraine, and perhaps eventually the entire world.

Soviet Russia is the hope of the world, and ultimately she above all others is menaced by fascism. Action by Japan in China and by Germany in Czechoslovakia, Austria, etc., are only preliminaries to the attack on Russia, the spearhead of anti-fascism. While Russia is conceivably capable of defending herself against the attack of any or all fascist nations, if she were to have

help from the democratic capitalist states the struggle would not be so severe and would leave her stronger and fresher to build the communist state.

Unity between the democratic capitalist states and the Soviet Union for peace cannot be effective if it rests merely on pious pronouncements and fervid moral denunciations of fascist aggression, but must rest on the economic and military power of these countries. Their combined economic strength can bring any or all fascist nations to their knees, while if the use of this power brings war in its train, (and it admittedly might), the armies of peace and democracy will wipe fascism off the face of the earth.

Therefore, our policy in the United States will be, (once we are convinced they will be used against the fascist states), to urge increased military appropriations, larger armies and navies, increased military training for our youth, and above all, a united nation—capitalists, middle class and workers—backing up its president and its government to the hilt in any stand they may take against fascist aggression—even to the conscripting of its sons for the armies of peace and democracy by a military dictatorship which in all probability would be established once war is declared.

Having once settled fascism's hash with the help of democratic capitalist states via collective security action, the time will have come again to consider settling democratic capitalism's hash, not excluding that of the victorious democratic former allies of the Soviet Union.

The Communists do not consider this program ideal, of course. They would undoubtedly prefer a Soviet America, a Soviet Britain and a Soviet France as allies of Soviet Russia, but seeing that there is no likelihood of being able to attain this in the immediate future, and being faced with the present menace of fascism, they consider this the only workable program, and act accordingly. If it comes to war they undoubtedly would prefer a democratic war-regime, provided it was effective, but none of them denies that in all probability the United States will immediately have to submit to a dictatorship if it enters a war. And the frankest of them admit in private that such a war is not only possible, even if collective security becomes a reality, but likely.

Starting from their premises, the Communist program is logical, cohesive and appealing. Emphasis is placed on the fact that this program calls for united action of at least the workers and middle class within each state, and of capitalist states (however democratic), with proletarian Russia. It is equally important to emphasize that while the Communists hope that this program will mean peace, they admit at least the possibility that the issue may come to one of military force, in which case they would give full support to the armies of the capitalist-democratic and Soviet alliance.

Mr. Earl Browder recently has advocated collective

security for still another reason. He said in the New Republic for February 2, 1938:

"At the present moment in world affairs, America needs the cooperation of the Soviet Union for her own protection from warlike aggression far more pressingly than the Soviet Union needs America for the same purpose."

This was not included in the above outline of the Communist position. The reason for this is that at the time it was first written the danger of invasion of the United States by Japan was spoken of only by a few California crack-pots and William Randolph Hearst. It is difficult to believe that this is a fundamental part of the Communist peace program, and that it is the considered basis on which the Communist International is functioning today.

The peace program of the Socialist Party of the United States is arrived at by this reasoning:

Society is divided into two great classes waging a constant struggle with each other, the capitalist class and the working class. The middle class has some interests in common with each, and so pursues a vacillating, opportunistic policy, following the lead of first one, then the other, but never taking an independent stand of its own.

The State is the agency of capital. The workers, by organized efforts force concessions from it, but when these efforts or these concessions in any way threaten the power or existence of capitalism, the State drops its mask of democratic impartiality and smashes labor's organizations by force. That is fascism.

Capitalist imperialism itself is the war-making system. Fascism, begotten by capitalism, and being merely a phase of capitalism, is not a war-making system in itself, but is the most aggressive form of imperialism.

You cannot defeat the threat of fascism by lopping off its branches, for its roots are capitalism. That is like trying to stop a cold by corking up your nose. Only by the overthrow of capitalism can you end the threat of fascism and war.

Since the workers and capitalists are in an irreconcilable conflict with each other, and since capital today is stronger than labor, it is misleading and therefore dangerous to contend that labor can use the war-machine of the capitalist state for its own ends.

The diplomacy of the capitalist state, whether it takes the form of anti-communist pacts between the fascists, Nine-Power Treaties, action by the League of Nations, Kellogg-Briand Peace Pacts, or collective security pacts of any description, is merely one form of activity carried on by the capitalist state for the benefit of capital.

In the struggle of rival capitalist states the success of any one nation's diplomacy depends on the economic and military strength backing it. It isn't democracy or fascism that unites different groups of capitalist states, but only common interests of these states. If the inter-

ests of a democratic capitalist state and fascist capitalist state coincide they will work together. Who can claim that democratic England has united with democratic Spain in opposition to Italo-Germano-Spanish fascism?

The capitalist state will never use its war-machine for anything but its own gain. It will never fight for an ideal held by labor although it may use labor's ideals to draw it into the fight. It will never fight for democracy, peace, or defense of the Soviet Union, however much it may flourish these slogans in order to get labor's cooperation in waging a war. It is much nearer to fascism itself than to these ideals, and indeed is prepared to assume the fascist form at the first shot of a gun.

The only ones genuinely interested in peace, democracy and the defense of the Soviet Union are the workers, and those sections of the middle class which can be induced to follow their lead. The only way the workers can work effectively for these ideals is by steadfast organization of their own strength and opposition to capitalism and the capitalist state.

One important form that this opposition takes is opposition to war on the part of any capitalist state—including one's "own". Socialists oppose the use of the armed forces of capital in any part of the globe, whether the fascist aggression of Germany and Italy in Spain, or Japan in China, or the aggression of the democratic British capitalist state against its rebellious exploited colonials, or even U. S. marines protecting American capital in China.

At the same time they are not neutral in the conflicts about them in any sense of the term. They urge the workers to use their power as producers and consumers against capitalist aggression, *independently* of their capitalist state. They advocate workers' boycotts, refusal to make, load or transport any goods to aggressors, positive aid of all sorts to the victims. By pressing for strict mandatory neutrality laws and the Ludlow war-referendum amendment, they would put obstacles in the path of American imperialism. They urge all these but without any governmental sanction which would be interpreted by the nation against whom sanctions were being applied as the action of American capitalism in its own interests, and correctly so.

The fact that revolutionary Socialists take sides in struggles against aggressors does not imply that they are willing to accept as their ally their "own" capitalist state, which they consider the enemy of the workers. Such action would imply, in reality, that they give up the struggle against capitalism, and that they submit to the dictatorship of the capitalist military machine in war-time. When the war is over, the capitalist state, having waged the war for its own ends, would dictate the terms of peace without regard for the wishes of its gullible labor allies.

Therefore, American Socialists urge an unremitting struggle against capitalism, for socialism. They use every conceivable device except those which would mean

YOUTH, RELIGION AND PEACE

by Jeffrey W. Campbell

THE issue of peace and war has done more than any single question to carry the stimulus of advanced social thinking to groups otherwise untouched. The student who feels himself to be economically secure and yet has enough intelligence to think at all, can be forced to realize that he is not secure from the devastation of war. The minute he begins to harness his forces to resist war, he finds himself at odds with the very economic system which has provided his supposed security. From another angle the youth who has taken seriously the ethical principles of Jesus and the Hebrew prophets finds himself compelled to oppose violence and bloodshed. In opposing war as the embodiment of these evils he discovers that he has no status quo of non-violence from which to proceed.

In every period of the world's history men have tended to refer to the established institutions of their time as the focal point of their religious life. In the majority of cases the values which have most potently dictated their lives have existed outside these recognized institutions. These values have been closely related to the central issues of their day and have generally dealt with the basic characteristics of the particular society. Thus you can have a John D. Rockefeller, Sr., claiming a membership in the Baptist Church yet building his whole scheme of existence around the central core of an acquisitive, expanding capitalism.

In the youth-student peace movement of our own time one finds the youth who has been reared in the average Sunday school being presented with the socially accepted values of peace, cooperation, brotherly love and good will. No particular effort is made to imple-

capitulation to capitalism and its agencies, to keep the United States out of all wars. If in spite of this war comes, they oppose the war and the government waging that war, and use every possible means at their disposal to turn the war into a civil revolutionary war, out of which they hope to see the rise of the socialist dawn.

These views of the Socialist and Communist parties are irreconcilable, and they prohibit united action for peace. If one is right, the other is wrong. The advocates of collective security (both communists and non-communists), may gain the upper hand because their program is essentially that of the section of capital which governs American policy today, led by Roosevelt. Collective security cannot become the policy of the United States without defeating and perhaps destroying those who oppose it, both Socialists and others. But it will have to defeat them or swallow them. They cannot work together. Red and pink won't mix.

ment any concrete expression of these virtues beyond platitudes or local charity. The acme of internationalism may be, from this viewpoint, the exchanging of Japanese and American dolls by the children of the two countries. Alongside this Sunday school experience the youth will be exposed to the actual mores of his avaricious, violent capitalist society. True, the average student is shielded from the more flagrant expressions of this never ending violence, but he will come unthinkingly to rationalize the chasm between his Sunday school ethics and their inescapable contradictions in his everyday life by references to the "practical vs. the ideal". In a majority of cases this process of rationalizing continues through life and the individual may die with but a dim, subconscious awareness of the double set of principles in his life.

Only as a presentation of this dichotomy strikes the individual, not at the level of his thinking, where he can evade the obvious conclusion by some trick of logic, but at that point of his life where he actually feels concern, does he come to see his world as it really is. When that has occurred he will act in conformity with his professed values, not until.

The entire American youth peace movement is honeycombed with people and movements in varying stages of growth in relation to this central issue. They are recognizing the necessity of struggling to build a genuine peace in contradistinction to a society fundamentally at war. It is interesting to note that the approach to the peace movement divides in two distinct streams. These are the so-called "religious" and radical approaches. Those in the former bracket have largely been conditioned to accept the Sunday school virtues. As they become aware of the failure of institutions which they have associated with ethical concepts to live up to their own creeds they will cast about for instruments which may more adequately express these values. Here you will find the bulk of the Christian Pacifist groups. Many of these will continue to find identity with the church; they will try to work within it. They may do this for a number of reasons. Among these may be emotional satisfaction growing out of long association, desire to avoid breaking established ties, or reasoned belief that the institution can be brought up to par by boring from within. These will seek to establish departments or commissions for peace activity within the structure. There will be others who, disgusted with the feeble and frequently ineffective fumbling of the church institutionally, and desiring to cut across denominational lines to unite with others of similar beliefs on the peace issue, seek

to build new movements around these ends. Here one can find the majority of the religious peace organizations.

In line with the radical van, one can find a majority which has been compelled, for one reason or another, to think. These causes may range all the way from identity with a racial or religious minority, through the accident of a lonely childhood or physical disability, to a healthy curiosity intelligently stimulated by psychologically matured parents. This crew is prone to struggle for peace because it is the way things ought to be. As a rule it is driven to seek a better society by the prompting of the religious urge described above. Many of this type will either have grown up free of the Sunday school conditionings entirely or will have revolted from church institutions because of their failure to meet any basic need in the life of the individual. Here will fall the undergraduate intellectual who joins liberal and progressive movements on campus but who refuses any connection with religious bodies although their programs may be practically identical. The great majority of these students and young people will come from upper and middle class walks of life. There will be party members who will snort, "Bourgeois!" but the fact remains inescapable that from these ranks three quarters of the articulate peace movement has stemmed.

If the analysis thus far put forward has any validity whatsoever, it makes possible a very clear solution to the hodge-podge of peculiar alliances which have grown out of the existing conflict between forces of neutrality and "collective security."

As representatives of philosophies which made human values, viewed in a religious sense, their chief end, it is easy to understand why such movements as the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the War Resisters League stood firm for rejection of the war method. When the extremely liberal denominations of Potestantism were thinking their way out of a theology of hellfire and impending doom the Methodist groups were rushing about the country and world seeking to save human souls from what was to them a genuine and awful fate. More than a century later, after the fears of future torment had all been dispelled there was still a considerable residue in the Methodist Fellowship which *cared* about what happened to people. Of all the bodies of Protestantism a sizeable majority of the leadership in this group has steadfastly rejected war and with good historical background.

The Student Y's have produced an interesting cross section of student peace philosophy and action. In the average student Y set-up there is no recognized basis for adult dictatorship of program. The machinery is rather one of trusted and loved leadership which is, nonetheless bound, by the nature of prestige and experience, to reflect a considerable amount of the opinions of adults. The structure is one which has desired to include as wide a range of interests and contacts as possible and has refrained from instituting, what party

members would call even local discipline in regards to positions taken by the body. Hence within the movement one can find all sizes, shapes, and degrees of religious maturity.

It would perhaps be fair to list the reactions of the rank and file of the Y's towards major issues in the peace field as follows: Lift the Embargo against Spain? Arms mean violence . . . No. Boycott Japanese goods? Create misunderstandings instead of good will . . . No. Make the United States Government a force for peace? Cooperation . . . Good . . . Yes. Take the Oxford Pledge? . . . Well, we probably are not yet ready for that as a movement.

In short the general vein of the movement is quite prone to accept an ideology of words; those suggesting cooperation, mutual helpfulness and good will among nations will invariably elicit a favorable response, those which suggests strong feeling or arbitrary action arouse doubts. Only in the light of this analysis does the attitude of the Committee on National Affairs of the YWCA in accepting the collective security position of the Communists with so little hesitation, become clear.

At the first National Assembly of the Student Christian groups, however, a larger percentage supported the complete refusal of military service than any other position. This, too, was the Assembly which could vote by considerable majority for a resolution which stated that: "*a pure laissez-faire capitalism was now impossible; that regulated capitalism, leading in its extreme form to fascism was not acceptable; that with respect to goal the Cooperative Movement and Marxian socialism . . . were preferable.*" Here is a statement more direct than the ASU even in its palmiest days ever assumed as a body.

The connection between religious maturity and stability in adhering to a position as a body, becomes increasingly significant in comparing the present positions of the Christian Student groups and the American Student Union. The former were infinitely less clear in analyzing the minutiae of immediate situations. Their work, however, was undergirded by a philosophy which recognized that no element which they had been trained to call "peace" could ever be "Carried on the bayonets of Loyalist Spain," as Joe Lash of the ASU now so glibly states. It was lack of this fundamental philosophy which could give shape and direction to whatever action it did pursue which made the American Student Union one of the first anti-war movements to crack up.

Floating about in the maze in International Relations Clubs, Model Leagues, and League of Nations Associations is to be found that large and pitiful body intelligent enough to sense the threat of war but emotionally too weak to break from the associations and thought patterns of a lifetime even though it recognize those patterns to be the very source of the war which it dreads. Because this group feels the danger it must

act. It will mill and bellow like live stock that have smelled smoke but see no flame. Like these beasts, such groups will stampede accommodately into the blaze when it comes, carried by the sheer weight of their own terror but in the meantime they will seek to assuage their fears by pointless activity which in the end will more efficiently develop the instruments of their own destruction.

It becomes the supreme task of the Socialist movement to understand the backgrounds and motivations of the types involved in all these groups. Party members must realize that only as an individual "grows up" in the sense of being able to recognize the values which are actually his in life and to be able to direct his energies intelligently and effectively towards these goals can he be of any use in building a decent society. In carrying out this task one finds all sorts of emotional cripples strewn along the way. There will be others stunted in this respect or merely retarded in development. One could wish that he was starting with brand new human beings who could immediately recognize the thing they desire and proceed logically towards it. Such is not the case. The work means starting with people as they are. Contact of these people with the peace war question, the central issue of their day, has stirred many of them to begin again the growth which a capitalist society long ago began to crush and thwart in early childhood. It has shown the pacifist the violence for which he is responsible in his support of the status quo. It has shown the League of Nation addict the true military nature of the states he is trying to unite. To the religious person it has made inescapable the enormity of his crime against the human values he holds sacred through his tacit acceptance of mass exploitation. The Quaker cannot evade the sanction his investment has lent to the military procedures he abhors. The Communist is faced with the pettifoggery of his New Line as it blinds and confuses not only himself but the issues of a labor movement struggling for its very life. The Trotskyite can recognize the sterility of his mouthing of Marxist phrases, chapter and verse, where he cannot be understood by the masses who in the thick of struggle seek practical leadership.

But all these truths become evident only to the man who is emotionally honest and genuinely desires peace, knowing what peace actually is.

The clarification of that goal for people who are "growing up" is the job which lies ahead.



WHAT LABOR GAINED FROM CONGRESS

by Sam Lawrence

THE appallingly rapid decline in employment and business activity which faced the nation when Congress convened in January forced the Administration to abandon its budget-balancing policies and offered it an opportunity to press for the enactment of wage-hour and agricultural legislation.

Despite defeats on government reorganization and taxation, the President finally succeeded in securing the passage of the wage-hour, agricultural adjustment, and relief measures which formed the backbone of the Administration's economic program for this session of Congress.

WAGE-HOUR BILL

The wage-hour bill was unexpectedly blasted out of the House Rules Committee just before Congress adjourned. As finally passed, the Act sets a shamefully low minimum wage of 25 cents per hour, with exemptions for many of the lowest paid industries. It thus scraps the idea of providing what might be called a "fair" or "living" wage and substitutes a minimum too low to raise in any substantial manner the income of the nation's forgotten third.

After October 24, 1938, the minimum wage in the industries affected will be 25 cents an hour; it will be raised to 30 cents after one year. The 40-cent minimum demanded by labor will be reached only after *seven years*, except in industries where it is established sooner by the Administrator upon recommendation of "industry committees". These committees will be composed, in equal numbers, of representatives of workers, employers, and the public.

The effectiveness of the committees depends largely upon the energy of the Administrator and his personal understanding of labor's problems. If the Administrator fails to press vigorously for higher standards, the workers' chance of getting more than the 25 cent minimum is extremely slim. There is always the danger that the administrative machinery may bog down under bickerings over interpretation of the law or the ability of the industry to pay. Much will depend on the alertness of labor committee-men and the skill with which unions present their case to the public hearings. Thanks to the C.I.O. impetus, unions will be better prepared than were the A.F. of L. unions in the NRA days.

The law establishes a 44-hour maximum workweek for the first year, reduced to 42 for the second year and 40 hours thereafter. Seasonal industries are granted a limited exemption from the hours provisions of the law. Hours in excess of the maximum are permissible if overtime rates are paid.

Child labor is prohibited under the age of 16 years and is regulated between the ages of 16 and 18 years in occupations classed as hazardous by the Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor. This phase of the law, while a step in the right direction, by no means solves the problem of child labor. It is estimated that about 75 per cent of the children employed are working in local trades and services which are immune from Federal regulation.

High pressure lobbying and Congressional log-rolling excluded many workers from the benefits of the law. Workers employed in agriculture, in the first processing of cottonseed, beet sugar, and sugar cane (industries notorious for their low wage scales), are left unprotected.

There are other specific exemptions. The net effect is to narrow considerably the field in which the legislation will operate. Within that field the law will be subject to savage

and prolonged attacks by industrialists on the ground that their industry is not in interstate commerce, and upon other constitutional issues which Liberty League lawyers may be trusted to concoct.

WORK, RELIEF AND PUBLIC WORKS

Faced with an unemployment problem approaching in magnitude that of 1933, Congress hastily reversed the deflationary budget-balancing policy which the Administration sponsored in 1937. Probably the most significant phase of this reversal was the passage of the relief acts, which have permitted the WPA to more than double its employment rolls as compared with the low levels of last summer. The first move along this line was the passage of the supplementary relief appropriation act in the spring, permitting a rise in WPA employment of more than 500,000 over the winter peak. In the regular Relief Appropriation Act of 1938, Congress continued the new policy by providing funds for seven months' employment of around 3,000,000 persons, and a leeway of an extra month's appropriation that can supplement this appropriation if necessary.

The act placed upon the WPA the obligation to increase wages in the South in line with the new wages and hours act. Pursuant to this provision, the WPA issued a new wage schedule affecting thirteen states and involving 25 per cent increases in monthly earnings for 500,000 workers.

The U. S. Housing Act was amended to increase the amounts available for construction loans and subsidies for low-cost housing; but even with these additional funds, it would take more than 60 years to build the estimated 12,000,000 dwelling units now needed.

The same act provides over two billion dollars in loans and grants for public works, rural electrification and housing. Not since 1935 has Congress embarked so whole-heartedly on a program of spending for relief and recovery.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 continues and supplements previously used devices: payments to farmers for planting soil-building crops and preventing erosion, and crop-secured loans to stabilize agricultural prices. The Act also creates a number of new devices. "Marketing quotas" are authorized for five basic crops—tobacco, corn, wheat, cotton, rice—and a penalty tax may be imposed on production in excess of quotas. The quotas will be established only when the supply of a commodity is expected to exceed the "normal supply" by a certain percentage, and will not be operative if more than one-third of the producers oppose it in a referendum.

This plan discourages the production of commodities of which there is a "market surplus" by penalizing the marketing of such commodities. Thus agriculture, with Government assistance, is enabled to practice the scarcity economics long accepted in other spheres of capitalist production. When a steel company feels that the demand for its goods is diminishing, it shuts its plant or operates at a reduced capacity. The farmer had until recently no similar control over his plant. He naively believed, or had to act as if he believed, that an abundance of food and fiber was a blessing to himself and to everybody else. He is now given the means of adjusting his production to a probable demand.

A subsidiary device introduced by the Act is the "ever normal granary". Sound from a business viewpoint, this insurance against unavoidable disasters like drought, flood, hail, etc., applies as yet only to wheat. If successful, it will probably be extended to other crops.

Another attempt at relative stabilization of the farmers' lot

is a provision for "parity payments" or subsidies for producers of the five basic cash crops. The purpose of these subsidies is to restore farmers' purchasing power to the level prevailing during the period 1909 to 1914, and the amount of the subsidy payment is to be determined accordingly. The Act makes no appropriation for these subsidy payments, and the provision will not become effective until and unless an appropriation is made. If this plan is put into practice, farmers will be obtaining direct aid from the community in adjusting a difficulty which is not of their own making but which is due to the vagaries of our economic system.

Current farm legislation does little to help the sharecroppers of the South, the day laborers, the millions of so-called "subsistence farmers", or the farmers who produce little or none of the major cash crops. The growing importance of the rural proletariat can be seen in figures on production and income. Eleven per cent of the farmers in the United States account for half of our total commercial production of farm products. On the other hand, half of all the people in the farm group receive only eleven per cent of our total farm income. The New Deal's farm acts do nothing to rectify these inequalities.

CONSUMER LEGISLATION

The original Tugwell Food and Drug bill placed human health and lives and the pocketbooks of the people above the profits of unscrupulous patent medicine and cosmetic manufacturers. The President put no pressure behind this measure, and it was much weakened in successive revisions in each session of Congress since 1933. The Copeland Act finally passed marks some advances over the 1906 law, especially in granting the Food and Drug Administration supervision over the labeling of cosmetics and healing devices and the marketing of dangerous new drugs. But it is little to show for 32 years of crusading, including 5 years of effort under the New Deal. The patent medicine interests would have preferred to see the bill shelved, but they feared that state legislatures would pass 48 different state food and drug acts. The new Federal law is expected to head off the clamor for state action.

After a long behind-the-scenes Congressional battle, the control of advertising of foods, drugs and cosmetics was given to the Federal Trade Commission instead of the Food and Drug Administration.

The Federal Trade Commission is one of the most business-minded agencies of the Government. It is interesting to note that just a few weeks ago the assistant to the chairman of the FTC resigned in order to advise advertisers on how to get away with as much as possible while keeping within the Act which regulates their business.

PUBLIC CONTRACTS ACT AMENDMENTS

Proposed amendments to the Walsh-Healy (Public Contracts) Act would have extended the prevailing wage provisions of the Act to all government contracts of \$2,000 or more (the present minimum is \$10,000) and required Government contractors to comply with the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board.

John L. Lewis's dramatic last-minute gesture to secure the passage of the amendments over House Rules Committee objection gave an opportunity for anti-labor congressmen to denounce the CIO leader for his personal visit to Capitol Hill. These people had heard of lobbying before—and seen a lot of dishonest undercover work. Lewis's attempt was an honest and open lobbying expedition.

Lewis's efforts gave William Green a chance to join the reactionaries in tongue-lashing the CIO head, despite the fact that the Federation also desired the enactment of the amend-

ments. The whole incident once more underlined the great need for labor unity.

ANTI-LYNCHING BILL

The anti-lynching bill took the Senate floor early in the session, and provided the occasion for long speeches on moral issues and national crusades. The southern Senators once more showed enough unity to filibuster. Roosevelt several years ago promised the late Senator Costigan of Colorado, co-author with Wagner of the Senate anti-lynch bill, to aid him in this fight, in return for Costigan's vote on a pending measure. Such aid never materialized. Of course those interested in holding together the Democratic party were worried by the filibuster, and took the opportunity to change the subject. Lacking the aid of the President, the supporters of the bill, who included a majority of Congress, were forced to yield to the bludgeoning of a few Southern Senators; and another heartbreaking struggle by Negro and liberal organizations ended in failure.

TAXATION

In response to a barrage of propaganda from the business world that entirely confused the issue for all but the most careful students of taxation, Congress reduced the tax on the undistributed earnings of corporations to a level at which it will be largely ineffective. Wealthy individuals will again be able to reduce their income tax burden by allowing earnings to be plowed back into the business; corporation directors will again be able to increase the amount of capital under their control without consulting the investors who are thus involuntarily reinvesting their earnings. To cover the reduction in revenue thus brought about, the basic corporation income tax rate was raised to a new record high level. On the other hand, the proposal made by Senator La Follette to raise the rates upon the lower income brackets and to lower the personal exemptions was rejected.

FOREIGN POLICY

The fundamental trend in the Administration's foreign policy was toward closer alignment with Great Britain and her satellites in the bloc of "satisfied" imperialist nations. Moving cautiously in the face of traditional American isolationism, State Department officials have taken the first steps toward preparing the people for another war for democracy. Their statements are trial balloons; if the approbation of the *New York Times* and the ecstasy of the *Daily Worker* are reflected elsewhere we may expect Roosevelt himself to follow them up. Meanwhile, the Administration took steps to implement its policy with legislation.

Provision for armaments and national "defense" included an appropriation of \$1,006,267,748 for the army and navy, the largest peace time appropriation in United States history, and a special law to authorize the future construction of a "super-navy".

Attempts to provide for the military control of the entire nation in the event of war, under the slogan "taking the profits out of war", were checkmated in a tremendous wave of opposition from labor organizations, religious groups, peace societies, and a large part of the daily press. The favorable report of the House Military Affairs Committee on the Sheppard-May bill was used by the Japanese militarists as an occasion to press for the enactment of similar legislation in Japan. A ringing dissent from the majority report on the bill was submitted by Representatives Maverick, Kvala, and Anderson. The Sheppard-May bill, as reported, had no tax provisions, but expressed a pious hope that some day Congress might enact proper tax measures to eliminate war profiteering.

A bill actually containing tax provisions of this sort, without the mobilization features, was introduced by Congressman Maverick. On this bill, hearings were never held.

Attempts to secure enforcement of the Neutrality Act against both sides in the Italian-German invasion of Spain and the Japanese invasion of China made no headway in the face of Administration opposition.

Likewise unsuccessful was the attempt to lift the embargo against Spain, sponsored by Senator Nye and Congressman Scott. It is noteworthy that this resolution provided that trade in arms with Spain should be on a "cash-and-carry" basis, and that no shipments were to be made in American vessels.

On the other hand, attempts to repeal the provisions of the Neutrality Act were also unsuccessful. Dissatisfaction with its administration led to various attempts for economic sanctions against Japan or against violators of the Kellogg-Briand Pact generally. The desire to repeal the Neutrality Act and to substitute legislation authorizing the President, at his discretion, to stop trade with an "aggressor" nation found expression in the so-called "O'Connell Peace Act". This bill died in committee without public hearing.

No action was taken on the Nye-Fish resolution for a general "peace-time" embargo against the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war at all times.

The proposed Ludlow Amendment requiring a national referendum on a declaration of war was first suppressed, without hearing, by the reactionary House Judiciary Committee. When brought to the floor by a discharge petition it was defeated, as a result of terrific Administration pressure, by a vote of 209 to 188. Later the proposed amendment was redrafted to meet various technical criticisms and introduced in the Senate by Senator La Follette. The Senate never considered the La Follette bill.

* * *

In any evaluation of the accomplishments of Congress during the past session, it must be recognized that no basic approach to the problems of capitalist crisis can be expected from the present Administration. The principal economic measures passed at this session represent merely a further development of the policies of the NRA era. The weaknesses of these measures are the weaknesses inherent in any program of capitalist reformism.

The Roosevelt program may succeed in temporarily checking the present depression, but it represents no real advance toward a lasting solution of the problems with which it deals.

C.I.O. PROBLEMS

(Continued from Page 5)

1929. Depression has not been fought nor has the A.F. of L. been able to carry through any such work to hold the loyalty and dues of its members as did the General staff of the C.I.O. and such important subsections of the C.I.O. as the auto workers. In depression as in new organization the A.F. of L., unless the C.I.O. unites the labor movement within the A.F. of L., will remain a secondary body of labor and will carry on largely rear guard actions. Workers advance, if advance there is to be, must be based on the forces of the C.I.O. which have stood the first test and showed dangerous weakness only in their political strategy which was to be expected.

SOCIAL PLANNING

(Continued from Page 7)

duancements could be made to workers to leave their employment in an industry where there was little demand for their services and to proceed to another publicly owned industry where their services were imperatively needed. However, social planners and Socialists have never urged absolute equality of remuneration for services rendered. Under a socially planned society, there would probably be a considerable range of compensation for manual and brain workers, the actual wage or salary given depending partly on the ability and productivity of the worker, partly upon his needs, and partly upon the demand on the part of society for the work which he was performing.

Where such differences in compensation prevailed, it would be comparatively easy to induce workers to shift their positions by giving them a larger income, by shortening their hours or by providing other material rewards, in addition to the more intangible rewards that come from social approbation. A certain limited graduation in service-income from a minimum to a maximum salary would eliminate the need for regimentation in this regard under a planned society and would make it possible to plan the efficient distribution of man power among the industries of the nation in a democratic manner.

Finally, if social planning is to be conducted in a democratic fashion, we must have, accompanying it, a democratic political structure. As it is difficult to build a genuine political democracy alongside of an industrial autocracy, so it is difficult, if not impossible, to develop an industrial democracy under a political autocracy or dictatorship. If the spirit of democracy is to permeate our planned economic structure, the spirit of democracy must also be shot through and through our political structure. If economic commissars are ever in fear of imprisonment or execution should they fail to follow the line laid down by the rulers of the political state, it is impossible to introduce true measures of democracy in the industrial structure over which they have control.

The maintenance and the extension of civil liberties—of the right of free speech, free assembly, free press, free association of political, economic and cultural groups—is essential to democracy within a planned economy, and everything possible should be done to make increasingly democratic our political institutions as we are democratizing and planning our economic life.

The old individualism is a thing of the past. Our planned semi-monopolized system is leading to increasing insecurity. Some form of social planning is essential to bring about a secure and abundant civilization. That planning should be democratic, if freedom and the finest

MENACE OF HAGUEISM

(Continued from Page 2)

hangout and center of bookmakers who doubtless pay well for protection. It is notorious for election frauds.

Jersey City may love Hague somewhat as Berlin loves Hitler. He dispenses bread, circuses and punishment. He gives jobs to his friends and jail, inflated assessments or deportation to his foes. A few good boys become judges, prosecuting attorneys, governor. The less fortunate get on relief rolls, WPA, etc. He commands city, county, state and federal patronage. He dreams, they say, of making his man, Governor Moore, alleged to be the beneficiary and protector of election frauds, always the blatant defender of Hague and his mob, President of the U. S.

Whatever Hague's motives, you have in Jersey a dress rehearsal of the way in which at the opportune moment Fascism will come in America. Hague like Hitler is "the People's friend" and the defender of his country from all whom he calls "Red". Hague like Hitler, is "the law", Hague like Hitler on the road to power, organizes his mob and then uses it as an excuse for officials to deny to the victims of the mob their constitutional rights. To make the thing complete, Hague has even advocated in court a concentration camp in Alaska like Hitler's and Mussolini's.

If you would know the mind of the dictator, the small time Hitler—a more ambitious, dangerous and intolerant dictator than the older American municipal bosses—read Hague's own bombastic eulogy of himself and his Americanism in his own peculiar English, in Judge Clark's Court. No wonder the pro-Nazi bund felt that it would be at home in Hague's parade, and that he has been praised in Berlin as well as in Italy. Yet, he claims to have had thousands of messages of approval from Americans.

It is clear that the fight against Hague and Hagueism is far more than an affair of court proceedings, or even the defense of civil liberties. Court proceedings properly handled (the C.I.O. case before Judge Clark was disappointing) may be enormously useful even if they do nothing more than show up what passes for justice and serve as a sounding board to the nation. The fight for civil liberty is essential, and we want all the allies we can get in that fight. Particularly, do we want to arouse labor to the necessity of the defense of what rights it thinks it has. The Workers Defense League is an invaluable organization. But as Socialists, we long have known that the answer to Fascism in all its forms and all its stages is not the mere defense of what we have, it is the winning of what we ought to have. It is in short, an aggressive Socialism, and I rejoice at the new activity of the party in New Jersey.

development of personality and not merely economic security are to be our social goals. Democracy and social planning are thoroughly compatible. Let us do our part, in the development of planning in the United States, to see that everything possible is done to introduce democratic procedures in all phases of social planning and to bring about a cooperative fellowship of free men.

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NOTES ON CURRENT EVENTS

TWO CONVENTIONS

WITHIN a few days of each other, two very important conventions took place recently. The convention of the Socialist Party at Kenosha received very little publicity. It was opened by a mass meeting of some 500 people. The reception to the delegates was attended by about 500. Its sessions were not spectacular. It made no decisions which were so strikingly in contrast to its previous course as to focus the searchlight of nation-wide comment upon them. Nevertheless, the convention will show, to those who are accustomed to careful and searching analysis, that the Socialist Party convention continued the process of establishing as the program, strategy and tactics of the Party those principles which have come to be known as revolutionary socialism, a process which was begun at the Detroit Convention in 1934 with the adoption of the now famous Declaration of Principles. The convention reaffirmed the Socialist Party's support of the movement for the establishment of a labor party as the next political step for the American workers, but it also reemphasized its own opposition to alliances with capitalist parties as a means for setting up such a labor party, reserving for itself, even in cases where it supports labor parties or labor tickets, the right to run Socialist candidates against capitalist candidates endorsed by or supported by labor parties. The convention, while supporting the C.I.O. and the struggle for industrial unionism, continued the fight for labor unity. It also pointed out certain shortcomings and abuses in the C.I.O. which are weakening the latter and giving arguments to the reactionary leadership of the A.F. of L.

The Socialist Party convention further adopted measures for strengthening its organization and the propaganda activities for Socialism. Above all, the convention adopted a ringing declaration against war, against support of any war conducted by capitalist-imperialist groups, and against support of any government conducting such a war. It, therefore, also called for opposition to all measures aimed at strengthening the war machine or the war spirit, such as collective security, the armament race, etc., and for support of all measures which will weaken the drive toward war, such as the Ludlow war referendum amendment. It is noteworthy that while on all other measures there was considerable debate and difference of opinion, on the war issue there was complete unanimity. This speaks sufficiently for the Party's firmness, and for its dependability in the coming war crisis.

The Communist Party convention was in all respects the opposite of the Socialist convention. It was held in New York with much pomp and ceremony. Its leaders received the kind of demonstrations to which Hitler

and Stalin have already accustomed us, not at all the kind intelligent people accord a beloved and respected leader. It received columns of publicity, and its decisions are the exact opposite not only of those of the Socialist Party, but of traditional Communism as well.

The Communist Party is *against* a labor party because it wants to mobilize support for Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. The Communist Party is for war (provided the war is conducted by "democratic" countries; even non-democratic ones, for that matter, so long as they line up with the Soviet Union). The Communist Party, in a war would not only fight for imperialist America, but would support the government conducting that war. Lest the convention decisions left any doubt on that matter, Browder hastened to reassure the capitalists by his testimony before the McNaboe committee. Even in a war between the United States and the Soviet Union, Browder could not declare unequivocally that he would not support the American government. When asked this specific question, he replied that in any *conceivable* war he would support the United States. A war between the United States and Soviet Russia may be inconceivable to Browder at this moment, but there are lots of people in this country to whom it is quite conceivable. But even if this possibility were put aside, a war between the United States and Mexico surely must be conceivable even to Browder. He is quite ready to support American imperialism even against Mexico!

As the convention of the Socialist Party marks its continued development toward revolutionary socialism, the convention of the Communist Party marks the final transformation of that party from a party of revolution into a party of reform, one might even say into a party of counter-revolution. Its new constitution (after the adoption of the new Soviet constitution embracing bourgeois democracy, the adoption of new constitutions by the various Communist parties is, of course, inevitable) and its new program, discarding the traditional theories of Communism in favor of the jingoistic patriotism of the American Legion, today represent the true face of Communism, not a mask put on to win converts more easily. The Communist Party is today far worse than Noske and Scheidemann were at their worst. Browder's promise that in a revolution against the American government the Communists would support the government and help repress the revolutionists, is an exact *verbal* imitation of Noske's *actions* against Liebknecht, Luxemburg and the Spartacans. The Communist declaration of fealty to American "democratic" institutions in no way differs from the actions of the post-war reformists, who saved the "democratic" institutions of capitalism and thereby saved capitalism. The

difference is that Noske and his prototypes did not boast in advance of their intended actions. The Communists do. The Communists are openly preparing to play the game of imperialist agents in the next war. The Communists have tipped their hand. Let every advanced worker take notice. Forewarned is forearmed.

* * *

SUPPORT THE KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR CONGRESS

The Keep America Out of War Congress, held in Washington over the Decoration Day week-end, was far from being a Socialist congress, either in composition, or in program. It was a mixture of proletarian and petty bourgeois, revolutionary, pacifist and liberal elements, trade unions and peace organizations. The adopted program merely represented those common points upon which all present were agreed. Therefore, the Congress program is concentrated upon opposition to collective security, opposition to a big army and a big navy and all militarist legislation and activities and support of activities for keeping the United States out of war. Socialists support this program for two reasons: first, because they realize that the struggle against war must be waged, in each country, against war by that country. Every one can be a great anti-warist when his own country is not concerned. This is no proof of being anti-war. It merely proves one to be anti-Japanese war, anti-Italian war, anti-British war. The Japanese who are opposed to war must be anti-Japanese war; the Italians must be anti-Italian war; the British must be anti-British war; and the Americans must be anti-American war. The fight to keep America out of war is therefore a fight against war conducted by the Americans. Only this movement, together with similar movements in other countries, can really be forces for peace.

Socialists know further, that in the course of fighting against war, non-Socialists will gradually come to the realization that war is inherent in the capitalist system, and if they are genuinely against war, they will have to make a choice: accept capitalism *and* war, or reject war *and* capitalism. Many will undoubtedly capitulate to capitalism, but many more will in the long run reject capitalism and thus strengthen the army of Socialism. However, this is possible only if Socialists remember that beyond the program of the KAOW Congress, which they support, there is also the Socialist program which must be made known to the masses, so that the masses, learning from their own experiences that to fight war they must fight capitalism, will not have to grope in the dark, but will find the Socialist program ready to be taken up to become their new weapon.

THE SPLIT IN FRENCH SOCIALISM

REVOLUTIONISTS everywhere will greatly regret the events in the French Socialist Party which led to the setting up of a new party, the Socialist Workers and Peasants Party led by Marceau Pivert. Up to recently, two outstanding features made the Socialist movement the magnet for the advanced workers: the fact that the Socialist movement was relatively united, whereas the Communist movement was split into numerous splinter groups and sects; and the fact that inside the Socialist movement, it was possible for the revolutionists to operate, carry on their activities and develop their views, even when they differed from the official views of the party, as against the one-mind condition in the Communist parties. Thus, even when revolutionary workers were in complete disagreement with the official policies of the party, they knew that they had an equal chance of presenting their views and having them adopted by the membership. Faced with the choice between two parties following reformist policies the workers chose rather the one in which a revolutionary policy could develop. So long as the Socialist parties continued operating along these lines, they had a future before them. Does the development in the French Socialist Party mark the beginning of a new method of operation?

As far as American Socialists are concerned, there can be little doubt as to their sympathies. The Left Wing in France has a program very close to that of the American Socialist Party. On the issue which led immediately to the split, support by Socialists of the Daladier anti-labor government, we are in complete agreement with the French Left Wing. Not only is the Daladier government a war-government, but its internal policies are reactionary. Daladier, with unconcealed cynicism and ruthlessness, is completing the job of liquidating every gain the workers made in the great struggles featuring the sit-in strikes. Daladier, as no premier before him dared, has lined up 100% with British imperialism to strangle the Spanish republican government. By threatening to abrogate the Franco-Russian pact, he has silenced the Communists, who made a vague show of opposition when Daladier first came to power. Waving the bogey of a fascist invasion, he has whipped Blum into the sham of a "national front," the precursor to national unity for war. It is for opposition to this government, that the revolutionary socialists were expelled from the French Party.

It is obvious from the proceedings of the Royan Congress that "violation of discipline" was a handy excuse for the administration. The real reason for the expulsion of the left was to insure victory for the support-Daladier program sponsored by Blum. Thus, Blum won on the expulsions by less than 1000 votes, and on policy by somewhat more than 1000. But in his majority was

included over 500 votes of the Paris organization (Seine Federation) where the overwhelming majority supports Pivert, but which was represented by administration supporters because the administration took good care to reorganize the Federation and disfranchise the left majority before the Congress. (These great believers in democratic processes act quite differently when the democratic processes operate against them!) Deduct 500 votes from Blum's majority and add them to the opposition total and the Royan Congress assumes quite a different appearance.

The expulsions take on further significance at the news that Paul Boncour, a renegade Socialist, who left when the party refused to give him permission to join a bourgeois cabinet which the party considered anti-labor, has decided to rejoin the party, and that a section of the Republican Socialists (approximately like progressive Republicans in this country) are considering joining the Socialist Party. In order to become sufficiently respectable for these petty bourgeois elements, the leadership of the party has to rid itself of the embarrassing proletarian left wing. This process is not new. It was also done in Germany, with well-known results. If Blum has decided to follow in the footsteps of Mueller, he can hardly expect the left wing to submit supinely to this course.

THE RUSSIAN PURGES GO ON FOREVER

Articles in the official Communist and Soviet newspapers Pravda (truth) and Izvestia (news) (a popular Moscow pun indicates the feeling of the people about these papers: Pravda ne Izvestia a Izvestia ne Pravda—roughly, there is no news in Pravda and no truth in Izvestia) indicate that the purges which have already taken a heavy toll, including practically all those who led the Bolshevik revolution and all of Lenin's co-workers, will continue unabated, but on a somewhat altered basis. The articles imply that the original purges were a plot by enemies of the Soviet Union to accomplish two things: rid the country of the real Bolsheviks and arouse discontent with the Soviet government. Now these plotters are being exposed and in turn purged. This is a beautiful scheme which will enable Stalin to go on with the purges forever, or until they catch up with him. It will further enable him to get rid of those who helped him in the original purges and consequently have the goods on him. Stalin used the original purges not merely to rid himself of possible rivals and of possible leaders of the mass opposition to him, but also to divert the mass discontent which developed from the collapse of his internal and external policies. By blaming this collapse on saboteurs, foreign spies, agents of the fascists, wreckers, (and the totalitarian control of every phase of public life made it possible to make the story stick, in spite of its absurdity) he could still claim that the policies were correct, but their execution was hindered or prevented by interference of enemy elements.

Now he can continue this game, blaming every failure upon others, and simultaneously getting rid of all those who no longer can swallow this concoction.

But these articles raise an even more important issue which must be brought before the gullible American liberals (not C. P. stooges) like Charles Recht, who continue to believe in the genuineness of the trials and confessions. Stalin now officially confesses that some of the purges were frame-ups to get rid of political rivals. If this is possible of secondary figures, both among the victims and the purgers, why is it impossible among the primary figures? Furthermore, this eliminates the old question as to why the confessions which was the keystone of the liberals' belief. Stalin officially declares that in spite of confessions, numerous purges were nothing but vicious frame-ups. Undoubtedly, the G.P.U. in Moscow is no less capable of supplying the necessary confessions for a trial than in Tajikistan. Or do these liberals desire more convincing exposures of the trials than Stalin's?

Let these liberals also ponder the admission that the purges "aroused discontent". Were we not told that the trials and executions were greeted with enthusiastic support by the workers; that nowhere was there any solidarity with the victims; that the workers welcomed the executions as evidence of the strength of the Soviet Union, of its successes? But now a different story is told; now discontent is discovered. Has it suddenly developed—years after the trials? Obviously not. Stalin's effective censorship merely kept it from us until such a time as it was to his advantage to use it.

The Stalin lackeys who parade as impartial correspondents pretend to see in the above-mentioned articles a relaxation of the regime in Russia. Nothing is further from the truth. These articles indicate that new purges are in preparation, and that Stalin will continue to hold the weapon of the purge in reserve to use against any and all who threaten his own ruthless, personal dictatorship.

THE WRONG KIND OF POLITICAL ACTION

The wave of organization which developed, first with the N.R.A. and later with the C.I.O. and the Labor Relations Act, brought with it a strong tendency toward independent working class political action. As this tendency was strongest in the ranks of the newly organized workers in the basic industries, it was but natural that it should be most sharply expressed in the C.I.O. Undoubtedly, the formation of the Labor Non-Partisan League expressed, if it did not represent this tendency. That what might have been the basis for a genuine independent labor party did not bear fruit is due to two serious errors committed by the C.I.O., which are important to note in order to avoid in the future.

Instead of developing the tendency toward labor political action into an independent party, the leader-

ship of the C.I.O. continued the old A.F. of L. policy of "reward your friends, punish your enemies" in a more vigorous, more militant and more organized fashion. It even put up slates of its own in various primary battles of the old parties. Thus, instead of encouraging workers to turn away from the two parties of capitalism, it encouraged them to look toward them, or elements in them, for political salvation. As a concomitant, lobbying became an important activity of the C.I.O. and the Labor Non-Partisan League. Even in places where independent labor parties were long established, as in Minnesota, or newly formed, as in New York, they were discouraged from participating in political campaigns independently, and told to be "practical" and make deals with the old parties. In Wisconsin, where an independent organization (Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation) refused to make deals with the old capitalist parties, the C.I.O. leadership officially refused its support and even threatened to make deals of its own with these parties. True, this was the action of the local C.I.O. leadership, dominated by the Communists, but in the absence of any different statements or actions by the national C.I.O. leadership, this must stand as their policy also.

In the beginning, this policy seemed to be very successful. But after the first flush of success, difficulties began. Former "friends" like Earle and Lehman, were suddenly discovered not to be friends at all. Politicians elected through C.I.O. votes immediately used their office to smash the C.I.O. (Judge Cotillo of Brooklyn, elected with the support of the A.L.P., has recently granted the most sweeping injunction against a C.I.O. union which has yet made its appearance.) And finally, different sections of labor disagreed as to who is a friend and who an enemy, leading to a public struggle over Lehman between two sections of the A.L.P. in New York.

The second error the C.I.O. leadership committed was in so closely associating political activities and bodies with the C.I.O. proper as to practically exclude all non-C.I.O. participation. When the A.L.P. was first formed in New York State, the president of the State Federation of Labor was a member. But the general C.I.O. policy gave an excuse to the A.F. of L. bureaucracy to issue a blanket "bull" against all political agencies in which the C.I.O. was interested, including the A.L.P. This close association between the C.I.O. as an economic organization, and the various political set-ups, further made possible the interpretation of every political setback as a defeat for the C.I.O. and tended to discredit the C.I.O. So that not only was independent activity of the workers not developed, but the traditional forms of action of the workers, namely through Democratic and Republican parties, were objectively encouraged. And this will prove in the future to have been one of the biggest set-backs suffered by the Labor Party movement in this country since the LaFollette debacle in 1924.

H. Z.

BOOKS

WHITE TERROR IN SPAIN

"Burgos Justice", by Ruiz Vilaplana. Pp. 241, New York, Alfred Knopf, \$2.00.

To radicals generally the capacity of the Military-Clerical-Fascist clique of Spain for wholesale terror will not come as news, but there can be no doubt that every radical who follows events in Spain should make it his or her business to get a copy of Ruiz Vilaplana's "Burgos Justice". Even more so should this book be recommended to the public as here one finds a courageous work that tears aside the heavy curtain that has so far concealed events in Fascist Spain. Hitherto any attempt to tell this story would only result in a general controversy. The Fascist sympathizers would raise the cry of propaganda. Dean of the Commissioners of Justice in Burgos, presently capital of Fascist Spain, since 1935, an ardent Catholic, at no time a member of a political party, Vilaplana will successfully meet the withering fire of his own church and the anti-Loyalists generally. I pay tribute to his courage and unselfishness. A family, church-going man, with prestige and the security of his important position, facing the life of an exile, he made his decision so that the truth shall be known.

Many were the gruesome jokes told in Fascist Spain which found their way into Loyalist Spain and France but the ones I will always remember were those in reference to the finding of "Sardines" in the rivers or on the shores of the Mediterranean. Some poor unidentified workman, whose only crime was that he was a member of a "Syndicate", would be fished out of the river and the next day the vile jest would go the rounds, as Vilaplana records it, "A 'sardina' was found in the river this morning."

The finding of bodies was not confined to the rivers, for one of the main duties of his office was to "certify" the hundreds of bodies of men who had received the full benefit of Fascist Justice. His gruesome journeys into the surrounding hills of Burgos will turn your stomach as it did Vilaplana's, but the job had to be done and the record kept straight and so "in the judicial files there appeared the recurrent and sinister inscription 'seven unidentified bodies found on the hills near the 102 km. stone on the road to Valladolid'."

Vilaplana is most effective when he deals with the reign of terror, the make-up of the various movements in his part of Spain, the role of the church, the Germans and the Italians and the resulting feuds. Of course we cannot expect that he would see this gigantic struggle in its proper light and therefore he barely touches upon the fundamental economic struggle going on in Spain, but on the whole, if you want an authoritative analysis and a long look behind the censorship curtain in Fascist Spain, read "Burgos Justice" by all means.

SAM BARON

NEW METHODS IN FIGHTING UNIONS

"Anti-Labor Activities in the United States", by David J. Saposs and Elizabeth T. Bliss. Pp. 40. Appendix. L.I.D. Pamphlet Series. 15c. New York, League for Industrial Democracy.

Declaring that anti-union employers in the United States are operating through a current, new and "well-organized mass offensive in their fight against organized labor," David J. Saposs, chief economist of the National Labor Relations Board, finds in this study that the formerly open opposition

SOCIALIST REVIEW

on the part of employers is today "camouflaged" by indirect, anti-labor maneuvers and stratagems in order to accomplish old objectives and to win the approval of the "third party" or the public.

Based on Board investigations, four separate anti-labor techniques are listed and discussed by Mr. Saposs, who was aided in his study by Elizabeth T. Bliss, a colleague in the N.L.R.B. They are:

1. "Independent" unions.
2. Back-to-work movements.
3. Vigilantism.
4. Pseudo-patriotic organizations.

The authors declare that "the increasing skill with which these employers crystallize public opinion through their manipulation of the 'independents', back-to-work movements, citizens' committees for 'law and order', and the vigilante groups places in grave jeopardy their employees' right to organize and bargain collectively."

The development of "independent" unions Mr. Saposs traces to the Supreme Court decision upholding the National Labor Relations Act which outlaws company unions as such. "Independent" unions he describes as "lineal descendants of the company unions."

Of eighty-five "independent" unions analyzed by the Board's Division of Economic Research, fifty-five were found to compete with bona-fide unions engaged in organizing campaigns; fourteen were formed during a strike in the plant or company involved; and twelve were formed in "loyalty" or back-to-work movements whose origins were traceable to employer sources.

Regarding back-to-work movements, the N.L.R.B. economist has this to say:

"These activities appear ostensibly as civic movements, designed to support a spontaneous desire of a large number of employees to return to work. However, investigation by the Board has consistently revealed that they are surreptitiously organized by employers involved in labor disputes, by employer groups which are resisting the organization of labor, and by business dependents who have been subjected by employers to economic pressure . . . They are designed to terrorize and demoralize striking employees and to stampede them to return to work . . . Business and professional men, public officials and others in the community are likewise terrorized and brow-beaten by the threat of a permanent loss of the plant's pay-roll in order to force them to fall in line with these unlawful procedures."

Vigilantism places itself above the law; it makes no effort to maintain an outward semblance of legality. Mr. Saposs reports: "Employing violent means it (vigilantism) seems to break up unions and to coerce workers to forswear their right to organize."

Pseudo-patriotic organizations are revealed as "still another agency through which the employers operate in their manipulation of public opinion against unions." Employing the protective symbolism of Americanism, such organizations—the authors cite, as examples, the Constitutional Educational League and the National Americanism Foundation—are "presumably organized to fight subversive movements. They actually direct their energies toward fighting legitimate labor organizations which they falsely attack as radical and anti-government."

The names of the fifty-five "independent" unions declared by the National Labor Relations Board to the company dominated are included in the appendix to the report.

L. I. D.

UNEMPLOYED YOUTH

"Scholastic, Economic, and Social Backgrounds of Unemployed Youth", by Walter F. Dearborn and John W. M. Rothney. *Harvard Bulletins in Education*, No. 20. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1938.

The authors of this interesting study attempted to seek out factors in the backgrounds of youth differentiating the unemployed from the employed. Finding this, they could determine the general characteristics and background of unemployed youth and possibly determine causes and cures for unemployment.

They made a careful study of 1,360 young people who were measured by the Harvard Growth Study from 1922, when they were in the first grade in New England's schools, until they left school or graduated high school in 1934. The study was conducted with the most modern scientific and educational procedures on an excellent experimental group. A thorough questionnaire of 74 items was used in the study.

The results showed practically no real differences between the unemployed, irregularly employed, and employed youth in education, attitudes on various subjects, training, physical appearances, and other important factors in their background. Incidental findings show that unemployed youth want to work and are earnestly seeking work, while those who are employed receive small wages, averaging between \$15 and \$18 per week and rarely exceed \$1000 per year. Forty-nine percent of the group were unemployed. The study can serve to dispel many false ideas about unemployment.

The authors found no special scholastic, economic, or social backgrounds of unemployed youth. Their backgrounds are the same as the employed youth. The reader must logically seek other causes of unemployment, not in the youth who are unemployed, but in the society in which they live.

BENJ. STAHL

BOOKS RECEIVED

Peaceful Change. By Frederick S. Dunn. 156 pp. New York: Council on Foreign Relations. \$1.50.

America on Relief. By Marie Dresden Lane and Francis Steegmuller. 12 mo. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. \$2.

Leon Blum, Man and Statesman. By Geoffrey Fraser and Thadée Natanson. 8 vo. Philadelphia, Pa.: J. B. Lippincott Company. \$3.

Documents on International Affairs, 1936. Edited by Stephen Heald in conjunction with John W. Wheeler-Bennett. 8 vo. New York: Oxford University Press. \$14.

Wages and Income in the United Kingdom Since 1860. By A. L. Bowley. 8 vo. New York: The Macmillan Company, a Cambridge University Press book. \$2.50.

The First Russian Revolution, 1825: The Decembrist Movement, Its Origins, Development and Significance. By Anatole G. Mazour. With a Foreword by Robert J. Kerner. xviii. 324 pp. Illustrated. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press. \$4.

The Labor Movement in America, by Marjorie Clark and S. Fanny Simon. (Norton, \$2.) A study of its origins and history.

The Anti-Trust Laws. Pamphlet. New York: Standard Statistics Company, 345 Hudson Street. \$1.

Trends in Relief Expenditures, 1910-1935. By Anne E. Geddes. Pamphlet. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Earth Lore, by S. J. Shand. 144 pp. E. P. Dutton & Co. Inc., N.Y.C. \$1.75.

