

Workers Age

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. 7, No. 5.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JANUARY 29, 1938.

5 Cents a Copy

New Cabinet In France

Radical-Socialist Regime
Gets Huge Confidence
Vote In Chamber

By an almost unanimous vote of 502-1, the new Chautemps cabinet won a vote of confidence in the French Chamber of Deputies on Friday, January 21. The extreme right-wing elements abstained from voting, while most of the bourgeois groups, conservative and liberal alike, supported Chautemps, as did also the socialists. The Communist Party ran true to form: after loud grumbling and threats of opposition, it capitulated and voted confidence, but this time its votes were no longer necessary to assure a majority.

After five days of political shuffling, the Radical-Socialists finally succeeded last week in putting over their carefully conceived plan of reorganizing the Chautemps cabinet to the right by squeezing the communists out of the coalition supporting it, reducing the role of the socialists and rallying behind it conservative elements outside the People's Front altogether. To achieve this end, the Radical Socialists had gone to the point of precipitating a cabinet crisis over financial policy and achieve it they did, at least for the time being, when Chautemps announced on January 18 that he had succeeded in forming a new government composed exclusively of Radical-Socialists and allied groups, with himself as premier and Bonnet, former Finance Minister, as Minister of State "for coordinating economic and financial action."

Despite Leon Blum's plea, the socialists refused to participate in the new cabinet but they pledged it support in the Chamber. The Communist Party declared its opposition to the new regime but nobody took this threat seriously.

Immediately after assuming power, Premier Chautemps announced that he would follow the general line laid down by the preceding cabinet, especially on financial policy, precisely the point on which that cabinet had broken down because of communist and, to some extent, socialist opposition. But, under present circumstances, Chau-

(Continued on Page 6)

UAW Advances On GM Contract

Plans for bringing to a speedy conclusion the negotiations with General Motors for the renewal of the collective-bargaining agreement, were laid last week at sessions of the International Executive Board of the United Automobile Workers of America, held in Detroit.

The board went on record unanimously reaffirming the stand of the union on its responsibility in abiding by the agreement and on its opposition to unauthorized strikes, as embodied in the letter sent by the U.A.W. to General Motors on September 16, 1937. In the communication to G.M. announcing this decision, Homer Martin, president of the U.A.W., called attention to the fact that "the carrying out of the agreement between the union and the corporation is a mutual responsibility and that effective handling of any unauthor-

French People's Front At End of Its Rope

(AN EDITORIAL)

WHEN, over two years ago, the People's Front policy was first enunciated by the Communist International, we were assured that it was merely a maneuver of transition to the "struggle for soviets," for such horrendous phrases were still used by the Stalinites in those days.

Somewhat later, when the first People's Front government was set up in France as a socialist-Radical-communist coalition, we were assured that this regime would accomplish great things: it would wipe out fascism, reform the army, bestow on the workers all sorts of social and labor legislation, give French political life a lasting impetus to the left, aid the forces of "democracy" against fascism in Europe and convert the Franco-Soviet pact from a mere declaration to a "real alliance."

What has been the record of the People's Front since then?

Under the People's Front, the fascist leagues have been permitted to continue their activities unhampered; they have merely changed

the shingle under which they operate. Fascist sentiment has grown among the lower middle classes and peasantry, as the Stalinist Humanite frequently admits with groans.

Under the People's Front, the reactionary and fascist officers clique dominating the armed forces has not been disturbed because—God forbid!—that might "undermine the defensive power" of the country.

Under the People's Front, the achievements of the great strike wave of June 1936 were, indeed, "recognized" by the government in the famous "social laws." But they have since been largely nullified by the devaluation of the franc and the consequent rise in the cost of living, by constant "compromises" forced by the government and by administrative restrictions on trade-union action that would not be tolerated in this country. What the workers have won, the government has undone.

Under the People's Front, the treacherous "non-intervention" policy, carried out by France under

(Continued on Page 2)

AFTER THE WAR TO "END WAR"

1918-1919: Polish-Ukrainian war for Eastern Galicia.

1919: Counter-revolution and Allied intervention in Soviet Russia.

1919-1921: British "Black-and-Tan" war in Ireland.

1919-1922: Spanish war in the Rif (Morocco).

1919-1926: Wars among the Arabian states.

1920: Soviet-Polish war, resulting from a French-inspired attack by Poland on Russia.

1920: Turkish-Armenian war.

1921-1922: Greek-Turkish war.

1925: French war against the Druses in Syria.

1925-1935: Prolonged Bolivian-Paraguayan war over Chaco.

1931-1932: Japanese invasion of Manchuria.

1932: Japanese attack on Shanghai.

1935-36: Italian attack on Ethiopia.

1936-1937: Fascist uprising in Spain.

1937: Japanese invasion of North China.

Big Business Gives 'Line'

President Hints At New
N.R.A. And Anti-Labor
"Regulatory" Laws

Addressing the forty-nine members of his business Advisory Council, which functions under the Department of Commerce, President Roosevelt declared last week that he was considering the establishment of a permanent, non-statutory group of about twenty-five men to represent the various interests involved in the country's economic life and to "coordinate" production and business policy under governmental supervision. There was no intention, he said, of reviving the complicated administrative machinery of the N.R.A. but the general objective would be more or less the same. He also indicated that he was contemplating some sort of "regulatory" legislation for trade unions.

The President's remarks came as a commentary on the council's statement read by its chairman, W. Averell Harriman, chairman of the board of the Union Pacific Railroad Company. A summary of the recommendations of the council follows:

1. Wage-hour legislation: A "fresh study" of the subject, that is, indefinite delay.
2. Business practices: Revision of the anti-trust laws so as to retain "much that is desirable to preserve" of the "cooperation within industries . . . under the N.R.A."
3. Holding companies: "Any general move to outlaw proper holding companies" deplored.
4. Public utilities: "Disturbed" over the existing relations between the administration and the public-utilities industry.
5. Labor relations: Legal regulation of trade unions, in line with Roosevelt's hint in his recent message to Congress. On this point, the President indicated his general approval, adding that the problem should be worked out by "common consent."
6. Housing: General approval of administration policy.
7. Taxation: "Modification" of the undistributed-profits and capital-gains tax.
8. Railroads: General approval of administration policy.
9. Annual wages: General endorsement of the President's recommendations.
10. Social security: Amendments to the law urged.
11. Agriculture: "Sympathetic with the protection of farm incomes thru federal legislation."
12. Monetary policy: No further cheapening of the dollar and no further "pump-priming," that is, federal spending in order to encourage recovery.

ister an economic activity below the pre-depression levels.

Inescapable Conclusions

The meaning is inescapable: Our economic system is afflicted by a permanent economic crisis that marks the decline of American capitalism—a crisis and decline that makes it impossible normally to restore full prosperity in terms of continuously higher levels of economic activity and comparatively complete employment.

The conclusion is inescapable: If and when this recession is

(Continued on Page 2)

WHAT MEANS THIS CRISIS?

By Lyman Fraser

The business recession has produced a sharp downward movement of economic activity and has added three or four millions to our unemployed. That has created new problems and new tasks for the labor movement, shaping its immediate strategy and tactics. This is of great importance in itself but still greater is the larger meaning of the recession in terms of the immediate future of society and labor.

It is true, as capitalist economists and apologists say, that this is the "usual cyclical recession" that comes after every recovery of prosperity from depression. But, in making that argument, the apologists admit that crises, recessions

ized action must eventually depend upon cooperation between the union and the corporation."

With the declaration on responsibility confirmed, the resumption of negotiations with G.M. was expected within a few days. Asked if the U.A.W. would call for contract changes with G.M., Mr. Martin replied: "The only contract changes will be those to make collective bargaining more effective."

Reports given by regional directors at the U.A.W.'s board meeting indicated that the union was in a strong and stable conditions and was weathering the depression very well, despite heavy unemployment.

and depressions are inherent in capitalism; they admit that it is impossible, in spite of all the New Deal "planning," to control and regularize economic activity. Underlying the argument of the apologists is the fatalistic (but correct) conclusion that capitalist society must always move toward another great economic crisis and depression.

Two Fundamental Differences

But the capitalist economists and apologists are only partly right when they say that this recession is the "usual cyclical" affair. They are thinking only of customary developments, of what happened in the past; they are not thinking of new developments, of what is new and of peculiar historical significance in this recession. There are, however, two decisively new aspects that distinguish it from all previous recessions:

1. Never was the decline of economic activity as swift and sharp as in this recession. Within a short period of six months, economic activity has fallen around 30%. That is much greater than in any previous recession that took place immediately after the recovery of prosperity from depression. The fall in economic activity has even been swifter and sharper than in the crisis and depression years 1929-30.

2. As a part of that development, but still more significant, is the fact that this recession has occurred in the midst of an incomplete prosperity. Every previous recession of this type occurred in the midst of a prosperity that had gone beyond the pre-depression levels, with unemployment having moved downward to the comparatively small minimum of "normal" unemployment characteristic of capitalist prosperity. But the "new prosperity" was still below the 1928-29 levels when this recession began, with around 8,000,000 workers still unemployed. This time, capitalism was unable to restore full prosperity!

The chronology of events makes the meaning of those developments still clearer:

1930-33: four years of the worst depression in American history.

1933-35: nearly three years of slow, painful recovery.

1936-37 not quite 2 years of an incomplete, fitful prosperity—for the last five months of 1937 experienced recession.

1930-37: more than eight years during which economic activity was below the older levels, in which economic activity did not move to higher levels—the longest period of its kind in our history. The eight years, moreover, are a minimum, for this year also will reg-

CARNIVAL
and
DANCE

Saturday
January 29
131 W. 33 St.



SPANISH
MARIMBA
BAND

Arranged by: Independent Communist Labor League (Dressmakers)

WORKERS AGE

Organ of the National Council, Independent Communist Labor League, 131 West 33rd St., New York City. Published every Saturday by the Workers Age Publishers...

Entered as second class matter Nov. 5, 1934, at the Post Office New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879. Phone: BRyant 9-0127

Vol. 7, January 29, 1938. No. 5.

LABOR AND ARMAMENTS

TO the applause of the war-mongers, President Roosevelt is taking the first steps to launch an armaments program the vast extent of which cannot yet even be guessed tho it will unquestionably put the United States in the forefront of the world arms race.

Because the people want peace and are quite suspicious of the intentions of the government, an effort is being made to disguise the naval-expansion program as a recovery measure. We will reserve for a future occasion a systematic exposure of the economic fallacy involved in such a claim.

There is still another angle from which labor must view the arms program of the administration with the greatest hostility. This aspect of the case, we believe, can best be presented in the words of Aneurin Bevan, well-known British socialist, delivered at the recent congress of the Labor Party.

"We may be told—indeed, we are told by Mr. Ernest Bevin—that it is necessary, in the existing situation, to have a strongly armed Britain in order to deal with the immediate dangers; that a strongly armed Great Britain is a bulwark for peace in a warlike world and that, therefore, the movement should support the government and its arms program because of the immediate situation. If that argument is accepted, certain grave consequences will follow from it.

These are true words. For labor to support the government's armament program means abject surrender to the forces of big business that are behind the arms program and the war aims with which this program is linked.

These are true words. For labor to support the government's armament program means abject surrender to the forces of big business that are behind the arms program and the war aims with which this program is linked.

Anti-Fascist Prisoners Hail Nov. 7 in Spain

(We take the following items from November 27, 1937 issue of La Batalla, the underground paper of the P.O.U.M., published in Barcelona.—THE EDITOR.)

Barcelona. The anti-fascist prisoners in the Valencia Jail wanted to celebrate with the means at their disposal the anniversary of the two glorious dates: the triumph of the Russian Revolution and the victory of the Madrid defense.

In the evening, our dear comrade, Julian Gomez Gorkin, gave an extensive talk explaining the development of the Russian Revolution and its significance. It was a magnificent and instructive historic resume, full of parallels with our own revolution.

The November 7 celebration in the Valencia Jail will live in the memory of all those present.

The "Senor" Minister of Public Instruction (a Stalinite—The Editor) recently bought for himself a car for the price of two hundred thousand pesetas!

There were present at this meeting 400 comrades, members of different anti-fascist organizations, mainly C.N.T. and F.A.I., who listened attentively to Gorkin and approved his ideas.

At night, all the anti-fascist prisoners gathered on the ground floor and in a chorus, sang the

"International," "To the Barricades," "The Young Guard" and other revolutionary songs. To the protest made by an anarchist comrade that they should not have sung the "Young Guard" because it is the "hymn of the tyrants that are keeping us at present in jail," our comrade, Juan Andrade, answered by pointing out that "The Young Guard," the same as the "International," belongs to the millions of workers all over the world and that is why the members of the P.O.U.M. claim it as their own.

The November 7 celebration in the Valencia Jail will live in the memory of all those present.

The "Senor" Minister of Public Instruction (a Stalinite—The Editor) recently bought for himself a car for the price of two hundred thousand pesetas!

The country is calling you, anti-fascist youth. Everybody to the front. . . The son of la Passionaria, you ask? He is in the Soviet Union, fighting Trotskyism!

Jay Lovestone in Dress Market.

ABOUT 500 needle-trades workers, most of them dressmakers, heard Jay Lovestone, secretary of the Independent Communist Labor League, speak on "Labor and the Present Crisis" at a meeting at Hotel Center in New York on Saturday, January 15.

He assailed the absurd theory of the Stalinites that the present slump was just a "sit-down strike of big business" and clearly indicated that such periodic depressions were inherent in the capitalist system, emerging out of its inner contradictions and antagonisms.

Mr. Lovestone described the historical significance and magnificent achievements of the C.I.O., declaring that the horizon of the international labor movement has been immeasurably widened by the new vitality and militancy that it has brought to American labor.

The speaker described in detail the destructive, factional role of the Communist Party in the labor movement and warned the workers present against the sinister intrigues of the Stalinist demagogues.

The great importance of A. F. of L.-C.I.O. unity was emphasized but Lovestone warned against making a fetish of "unity" in the ab-

stract. He pointed out that real unity could be achieved only on the basis of the C.I.O. proposals, as advanced by Philip Murray in recent conferences.

A lively period of questions and discussion followed in which members of various trade unions took the floor.

Literature

CIVIL WAR IN SPAIN

by Bertram D. Wolfe 25c per copy

PORTRAIT OF AMERICA

by Diego Rivera and Bertram D. Wolfe Published at \$3.75 Our Price \$1.50

Special Offer

One year of Workers Age and a copy of Portrait of America \$2.00

131 West 33rd Street New York City

By Lambda

WORLD TODAY

Behind The Panay Incident; China Needs Agrarian Revolution

London, January 8, 1937.

A NUMBER of factors indicate that the sinking of the Panay and the bombardment of British warships were deliberately planned by Japan to ascertain—before embarking on a campaign to conquer South China—whether the United States and Great Britain would send warships to the Far East to protect their interests.

Japan may safely conclude that she has a free hand in South China. England has refused to evacuate Hongkong which the Japanese asked them to do before their contemplated attack on Canton.

Step by step, preparations are under way to turn the Sino-Japanese war into a world conflagration, while neither the Spanish nor the Ethiopian conflicts have been settled.

Japan itself is developing more and more into a totalitarian state. The "imperial command," established after some wrangling amongst the various tendencies within the Japanese ruling class, is arrogating greater powers to itself.

Japan has never had a really constitutional government, not even to the extent of the German government under the Kaiser; yet even what it has is being undermined, on the one hand by the military achieving victory after victory, and on the other by the intensification of the economic crisis.

Agnes Smedley, well-known author, writing in the Weltbuehne of December 9, 1937, confirms the fact that the ruling class of China, led by Chiang Kai-shek, has made no concessions to democracy whatsoever:

"Chiang Kai-shek stubbornly refuses to arm the people. . . He does not like our propaganda because he is opposed to anything that will arouse the masses. (Miss Smedley is at present in former Chinese Soviet territory.—Lambda.) China is still without a democratic constitution. The November elections for the National Assembly were a farce, since only the well-to-do were permitted to vote."

And she reaches the conclusion that: "China will never win the war if she continues her present policy. The army alone without the aid of the masses cannot defeat the Japanese. The ruling class of China is mortally afraid of mobilizing and arming the masses. . . The masses of China have indeed little that is worth fighting and dying for—kept as they are in economic and political bondage. The capitalist class of China is well aware that the mobilization, training and arming of the entire people would threaten the very basis of its despotic rule. . . If the Japanese continue their military successes and their intrigues with certain pro-Japanese groups, we are likely to develop a situation similar to that of Spain."

Lenin As A Politician

(Continued from Page 3)

tory, it is simply not true that, before the war, Lenin regarded German and international social-democracy as utterly hopeless and therefore advocated a split and a radical realignment. He did, indeed, condemn very sharply the extreme right-wing tendency represented, for example, by Legien and other trade-union leaders, but essentially he still retained his confidence in and respect for the party leadership associated with the "Marxist center" of Kautsky, even tho he was very frequently at odds with it on Russian questions.

It was, therefore, natural that, in the Summer of 1914, he should believe that the German Social-Democratic Party, and with it the International, would come out against the war. Zinoviev relates:

"I remember having had a bet with him. I said to him: 'You will see, the German social-democrats will not dare to vote against the war but will abstain in the vote on war credits.' Comrade Lenin said: 'No. . . They will not, of course, fight the war but they will . . . vote against the credits. . . . In this case, Lenin was wrong and so was I. The European social-democrats . . . all voted for the war credits. When the first number of Vorwarts, the organ of the German social-democrats, arrived with the news that they had voted the war credits, Lenin at first refused to believe it. 'It cannot be,' he said, 'it must be a forged number. Those scoundrels, the German bourgeoisie, must have deliberately published such a number of Vorwarts in order to compel us also to go against the International! Alas, it was not so!'"

No, it was not so! The German social-democracy and the International, as Lenin soon learned, had capitulated to chauvinism and had abandoned both their internationalism and their socialism in the crisis. Now, again, literally one glance was enough for him; he saw that the old party-vehicles of the movement had broken down and fallen to pieces and that a new movement, on a new political foundation, was historically necessary for the emancipation of labor.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor has made a study of sample collective bargaining agreements showing the progress of unionism in the past few years. The report states: "In less than five years, the picture of employer-employee relations has markedly changed. By expanding first in industries only partially organized and then to the mass-production industries, collective bargaining thru trade union agreements has grown to a point where it has now become the accepted procedure in establishing wages, hours and working conditions in a considerable part of American Industry."

The types of employer-employee relationships where union agreements exist are divided into the following four general groups:

- 1. Blanket contracts between all or practically all employers organized into an association and a union or group of unions. Such relations exist in clothing, pottery, anthracite mining, railroads and West-Coast shipping.
2. Model contracts between a union and one or more companies so prominent in the field that all contracts tend to conform to this. The examples of this type of arrangement are given as: aluminum, cut-glass and flat-glass, and steel (the agreement of S.W.O.C. with U. S. Steel).
3. Industries where no single firm or group of firms predominates, but where union agreements tend to be uniform, such as: boot and shoe, leather, hosiery, elevator construction, typographical, theater and motion picture production and contractors for asbestos insulation and lath work.

- 4. Industries where there is no uniformity in union contracts. These are: textile, certain branches of the clothing industry, lumber, electrical products, furniture, trucking, and East-Coast shipping.
Tho there is some overlapping and the lines between the four groups are not always clear-cut, the report finds, on the basis of

Tho there is some overlapping and the lines between the four groups are not always clear-cut, the report finds, on the basis of

\$ A YEAR SUB TO WORKERS AGE 6mos. 60¢ subscribe now!

Labor Notes and Facts

THE first three cases involving the National Labor Relations Act to be heard by the Supreme Court of the United States since its decision of last April declaring the statute to be constitutional, were argued early in January.

In these three cases, injunctions were being sought to restrain N.L.R.B. proceedings. In two of the cases, the N.L.R.B. appealed against the decision of lower courts granting the injunction and, in the other case, the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company appealed against the refusal of the lower court to grant an injunction.

Counsel for the shipbuilding company argued that the N.L.R.B. had no jurisdiction in its case because its business was not interstate. Counsel for the N.L.R.B. answered that the case was not properly before the court and the company could not be granted immunity because no effort to enforce the law had as yet been made.

Another case, more important in its implications, that the Supreme Court has agreed to review is that of the Santa Cruz Fruit Packing Company. The issue involved is whether a firm whose interstate business consists of less than 50% of the total (in this case it is 39%) is subject to the National Labor Relations Act. The Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco, accepting the broad interpretation of interstate commerce, ruled that the N.L.R.B. does have proper jurisdiction. If the Supreme Court reverses the decision of the lower court, it will be a serious limitation of the scope of the Wagner Act in some very important fields.

Types Of Collective-Bargaining Agreements

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor has made a study of sample collective bargaining agreements showing the progress of unionism in the past few years. The report states: "In less than five years, the picture of employer-employee relations has markedly changed. By expanding first in industries only partially organized and then to the mass-production industries, collective bargaining thru trade union agreements has grown to a point where it has now become the accepted procedure in establishing wages, hours and working conditions in a considerable part of American Industry."

- 1. Blanket contracts between all or practically all employers organized into an association and a union or group of unions. Such relations exist in clothing, pottery, anthracite mining, railroads and West-Coast shipping.
2. Model contracts between a union and one or more companies so prominent in the field that all contracts tend to conform to this. The examples of this type of arrangement are given as: aluminum, cut-glass and flat-glass, and steel (the agreement of S.W.O.C. with U. S. Steel).
3. Industries where no single firm or group of firms predominates, but where union agreements tend to be uniform, such as: boot and shoe, leather, hosiery, elevator construction, typographical, theater and motion picture production and contractors for asbestos insulation and lath work.

- 4. Industries where there is no uniformity in union contracts. These are: textile, certain branches of the clothing industry, lumber, electrical products, furniture, trucking, and East-Coast shipping.
Tho there is some overlapping and the lines between the four groups are not always clear-cut, the report finds, on the basis of

Tho there is some overlapping and the lines between the four groups are not always clear-cut, the report finds, on the basis of

The National War Front Is Being Rapidly Formed

(Continued from Page 3)

In the labor movement, it is necessary for us to realize that the differences between us and the Communist Party today are not tactical differences. The differences are differences in attitude towards the whole social order. The Comintern today wishes to distinguish between the "stuffed" beasts of prey and the "hungry" ones. To them, the beast of prey whose maw is crammed is no beast of prey at all. On the other extreme are the bourgeois pacifists of a type who propose to satisfy the "hungry" beasts of prey—Germany, Japan and Italy—at the expense of the backward peoples and who call Germany, Japan and Italy by the lovely proletarian-sounding name of the "have-nots."

Danger On The Maritime Front

FOLLOWING upon recommendations made by the U. S. Maritime Commission for introduction into the maritime industry procedures similar to that embodied in the Railway Labor Act for employees of railroads, a bill was introduced into Congress by Senator Copeland to that effect. This bill is opposed by the maritime unions as well as by J. Warren Madden, chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

The effect of the bill would be to take disputes between seamen and shipowners out of the jurisdiction of the N.L.R.B. and to leave enforcement to the district courts of the United States. At present, labor disputes in the shipping industry are enforced thru the court procedures of the Wagner Act, which is much more favorable to labor. The Copeland bill also provides for compulsory mediation of disputes.

CP Tries to Alibi Itself

Cleveland, Ohio. John Williamson, state secretary of the Communist Party, was the speaker here at a meeting called especially to give the Stalinist position in the United Automobile Workers.

Williamson assured the 50 persons attending (of whom only about 10 were not C.P. members) that the C.P. stand for "unity" and that big business was on a "sit-down strike." This is not a real depression, stressed Williamson. He was all for the Ford drive and was "againtly" factionalism. Then he promptly went into a rage against the "Lovestoneites" who are "professional factionalists," according to him. He had nothing to say about Pontiac, Flint, Lansing; he had nothing to say about the Chrysler agreement and the C.P. orders to defy the settlement made by Lewis and Martin. He had nothing to say about the "unity" caucus leader, Ryan, who, after sitting in a peace meeting between progressive and "unity" men, went into Lansing and preached secession from the U.A.W.A. and was consequently suspended from the union. The only thing that Williamson had to say was that the "Lovestoneites" were so dreadful that they had to be "smoked out" of the union.

Upon being questioned on the matter of factionalism and on the wave of constant protests that the C.P. inspires in the Auto Council, in the Executive Board and in the local unions, Williamson explained: "Those who do not act as good communists are not responsible for"—which means that, when C.P. members carry out decisions which are exposed as anti-union, then the party leaders leave them holding the bag!

The progressive union men are asking this question: "Who is Williamson and what right has he to speak for the U.A.W.A.?" The progressive unionists are interested in building their International and have no desire to see any political party get control of it. The C.P.

many and England will be together or not in the next war?

Furthering Fascism Here Another slogan, more effective because it has not been disgraced and exposed as has been the slogan, "Make the world safe for democracy," is the slogan of the "war against fascism," which the Comintern offers us as justification for imperialist policies in the coming war. We cannot make too clear that, while fascism on the one hand is a preparation and driving force for war, war on the other hand is a preparation and driving force for fascism. The living body of Tom Mooney is still rotting in jail in this "free democracy" as the first victim of a mere preparedness campaign in 1916 prior to our entrance into the last war. Have we forgotten the censorship during the last war? The raids? The jailing of Debs, Ruthenberg and Bentall? All three are dead—but are their names so soon forgotten?

Modern warfare is totalitarian warfare. It must of necessity embrace the entire population. And modern democracy is dictatorial "democracy" of a ruling class that has become imperialist, reactionary and is in full decay. Consequently, imperialist war can only give us a fascist state and a war in the name of the struggle against fascism must inevitably bring fascism to this land and to all other bourgeois participants. You can see it coming at the present moment.

War, like fascism, requires the myth of national unity to obscure political issues and class lines. I say that the declarations of Landon, Knox and Stimson are little short of terrifying in their significance. They have come out for "national unity" in a "national emergency." That means that, in the judgment of our ruling class, the emergency is here.

Examine the Landon letter, also a "Christmas season" document, dated December 20th. It says: "Politics cease at the water's edge." That is a beautiful formula. It says: "There must be no demagogic playing of politics at the expense of the country's unity in dangerous situations such as now confront us." Landon even goes out of his way to attack the British Laborite members of Parliament who opposed the entrance of Great Britain into the war in 1914. He denounces the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment and Roosevelt rightly replies: "Your pledge strengthens the hand of the government."

The Stimson letter also opposes the LaFollette-Ludlow Amendment, demands full power for the Executive and, to give proof that the Executive should be trusted with full power, cites the examples of President McKinley and President Wilson in the Spanish and World Wars! McKinley—who concealed the fact that he had in his desk, at the moment, the Spanish apology for the blowing up of the Maine and their offer to withdraw from Cuba, because he wanted America to enter into a war with Spain. And Wilson—who concealed his pledges to enter the World War and ran for reelection on the slogan: "He kept us out of war." If we need any practical proof on the danger of trusting all power to the executive head of a "democratic" imperialist nation, McKinley and Wilson give us that proof.

The national front for war has been formed. Stimson of Hoover and Standard Oil fame, Landon of the Liberty League (Browder's chief American "fascist"), Colonel Knox of the Chicago Daily News and Earl Browder of the Daily Worker!

CONTRIBUTE TO THE \$10,000 DRIVE

(The second article in this series will appear in the next issue. —THE EDITOR.)

Trade Union Notes

By Observer

THE "unity" discussion goes on. Perhaps the silliest contribution to date is the unsigned article "Who Blocks Labor Peace?" in the January 15 issue of the Socialist Call.

The issue, we are told, is "not one of craft as against industrial unionism." Why? Because "the C.I.O. has chartered craft unions and craft unions of the A. F. of L. have organized along industrial lines." Obviously, "more fundamental reasons exist. Of these reasons an important one is the clash of personalities and, even more important than that, is the drive for power. The issue is not what kind of unions shall be built but who shall control the labor movement."

The C.I.O. is indeed ready to recognize that craft unionism has a legitimate secondary place in certain fields of American industry. And certain A. F. of L. craft unions are quite ready, as a war measure against the C.I.O., to grab off big groups of workers without any too much scruple about craft-jurisdictional lines. Thus, at one time, the machinists union tried to grab up the transport workers; the carpenters union, the lumber workers of the Northwest; the electricians union, the radio workers—all of them, of course, to be kept in a subordinate, "Class B" status, without rights or privileges or real possibilities of industrial expansion. To interpret these developments as a sign that the struggle over industrial unionism has come to an end and that the issue has disappeared, indicates an ignorance of the present labor situation that is positively hair-raising!

Among the "more fundamental reasons" is the "clash of personalities." But if Lewis and Frey (or Wharton, or Hutcheson) are so temperamentally allergic to each other, why didn't this constitutional antipathy show itself before 1934-1935? Why only in the last few years? Why now? Evidently, there must be reasons even more fundamental than the "more fundamental reasons" of the Socialist Call?

Ah, but it is all a struggle for power, we are told. Very well, but has the struggle for power no meaning in terms of labor policies and strategy? Would it make no difference to the future of the labor movement whether it falls under the control of Hutcheson and his group or Lewis and his? Would the cause of militant industrial unionism, upon which the whole future of American labor depends, fare equally well under the one as under the other? Isn't it obvious that the struggle for power is really a struggle for power for something—for the perpetuation of the craft-unionist stranglehold, in the one case; for the recognition of industrial unionism as the standard system, in the other? Evidently the "struggle for power" is something more than an empty clash of ambitious personalities.

Unions In The Depression

THE report of the N.L.R.B. on collective-bargaining elections in the New York, New Jersey and Connecticut region for the few months since the new depression, should prove very instructive to all serious students of trade-union problems. In the four months since the slump made itself felt in September, only 7,324 employees in these states cast ballots in N.L.R.B. elections—as compared with 49,808, over six times as many, in the four-month period preceding September (May, June, July and August 1937). In November, furthermore, for the first time since the validation of the Wagner Act last April, the number of votes cast for both the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. fell below 50% of the total, the rest going to "independent" unions (usually disguised company

unions) or to no unions at all: the C.I.O. got 25%, the A. F. of L. 24%, "independent unions" 29% and no unions 21%. In December, the proportions were substantially the same. But, in the June-July period, the C.I.O. obtained 67% of the vote, the A. F. of L. 8%—together 75%—"independents" 18%, no unions 6%.

The point is obvious. In this, as in other periods of depression, trade unionism is on the defensive: there is a decline in the demand for collective-bargaining elections, accompanied by a fall in the proportion of union victories generally and C.I.O. victories in particular.

Such is the fact and a realistic trade-union strategy will take it into full consideration. The Stalinist demagogues—who, in their "own" unions, are ever ready to yield to the slightest pressure of the employers—may raise an hysterical alarm over the "Lovestoneite depression theory" for the sake of their own filthy factional ends but fortunately the responsible leaders of the C.I.O. pay not the least attention to them. The policy for the moment is, as defined by Lewis: Dig in—hold on to and consolidate what you have—and prepare for a new offensive when the time is ripe!

The Stolberg Articles

EVERYBODY'S talking about Ben Stolberg's brilliant series of articles, "Inside the C.I.O.," that has just finished its run in the Scripps-Howard papers. The historical significance of the C.I.O. and its unparalleled achievements receive enthusiastic recognition at his hands, while a fearless searchlight is turned on the dark intrigues of the Stalinites threatening the unity and stability of the movement. Stolberg's thumb-nail sketches of outstanding C.I.O. leaders are incomparable. Together, the articles constitute an invaluable guide-book of the far-flung realm of the expanding industrial-union movement.

Naturally, the Stalinites have set up an ear-splitting shriek of interminable length, for no intriguer relishes having his sinister machinations dragged out into the light. They have suddenly discovered that the whole thing is a "Trotskyist plot." It means nothing to them that Stolberg dismisses the Trotskyites in a rather off-hand manner as "a tiny sect which plays no role in the C.I.O."—a curious way for a "Trotskyist plotter" to act! It means nothing to them that the one or two Trotskyites in the auto union find themselves in the Stalinist-controlled "unity" caucus, which Stolberg exposes so effectively. It's all a "Trotskyist plot" anyway—just like the substitution of a Jenny for a Jimmy in the Soviet movie version of "Treasure Island" or the poisoning of the animals in the Moscow zoo, about which we read so much in the press recently!

You Too, Harry!

EVIDENTLY another economic crisis is in the offing," declared Harry Bridges at a maritime-workers conference at San Francisco the other day. So Harry Bridges, too, is falling for that damned "Lovestoneite depression theory"! Doesn't he know that it's just a "sit-down strike of big business"? Doesn't he even read the Daily Worker?

New Cabinet In France

(Continued from Page 1)

temps does not have to pay the slightest regard to the desires of the communists. "In the Ministerial declaration," P. J. Philip reports in the New York Times of January 22, "almost every point of policy enumerated was satisfactory to the Rights and, at times, notably the passage referring to freedom of exchange, it was the Right which cheered and the Left which sat silent."

Despite its big vote of confidence, the present Chautemps cabinet is obviously, a transition regime leading, very likely thru some intermediate stages, to a broad "national-union" coalition of right-wing bourgeois groups, under Radical-Socialist leadership, with or without the support of the socialists. To this has the now bankrupt People's Front policy led!

(Read the editorial on page 1.—The Editor.)

Fur Union Progressives Call for United Struggle

(We publish below a declaration recently issued by the Furriers Progressive League.—THE EDITOR.)

THE business recession in the country has thrown hundreds of thousands of workers out of factories and mills, adding more numbers to the roll of the unemployed. In times like these, it is to be expected that the big industrialists should attempt to destroy labor unions and rob the workers of their gains. On the other hand, organized labor must be on the watch to preserve the unions and maintain working conditions. Special care must be given to secure such conditions as will relieve unemployment and meet the high cost of living.

In this business recession, the fur workers are among the hardest hit. Since last August, when the fur workers were expecting the season, they have been laid off in mass. There is no hope for an immediate preparation for the new season.

The New Agreement And The Union Demands

On January 31, the agreement between the manufacturers and the union expires. The old agreement never contained the point giving the worker security on the job. In spite of the fact that the fur workers fought for this demand, they could not get more than six months of equal division of work.

Because of the general critical situation, our union has put up demands aiming to solve to some extent the problems of the fur workers. Security on the job with equal division of work is a fundamental demand won by all the needle-trades workers long ago. It is no more than right that the fur workers, having been organized in a union for over 26 years, should by now have security on the job.

The demand for a shorter work-week would partly solve the unemployed situation.

Equally important is the demand for higher wages, condemning the high cost of living, rent and clothing.

Counter-Demands of The Bosses

The bosses in our trade, who but yesterday were themselves workers, and who once suffered from the same plagues, know deep in their own heart that our demands are justified. But, instead of negotiating and reaching an understanding with the union, these greedy bosses put up their counter-demands. With these counter-

FOR WAR--AGAINST DEMOCRACY!

THE following from the January 15 issue of the "liberal" Nation, in an attack upon the LaFollette-Ludlow war-referendum proposal:

"The assumption that the people as a whole are better equipped than their elected representatives, either in information or in native intelligence, to deal with the most vital questions affecting national policy is, to say the least, questionable."

So the Nation, too, joins the chorus of valiant defenders of "our constitutional system" against the menace of "pure democracy." And no wonder: Once you take your stand in favor of the war-making policy of the administration, you must necessarily take your stand also against democracy where it counts most!

Martin Hits War Makers

Strong opposition to the jingoist campaign now being promoted by the pro-war forces of this country was voiced last week by Homer Martin, president of the United Automobile Workers of America, in a statement commenting on the anti-war resolution adopted by the recent session of the U.A.W.'s board. (The full resolution was published in last week's issue.—The Editor.)

"War fever is running high in Washington," he said. "It began with the bombing of the Panay and has not abated. The people ought to know that the Panay was escorting Standard Oil tankers 300 miles up the Yangtze River when it was hit. Three Americans aboard were killed after President Roosevelt ordered them out of China."

"The Robinson Crusoes, great adventurers and patriotic maniacs are trying to plunge America into war with Japan. Many of these war maniacs are people who think they can make double profits out of war—by selling both to Japan and to the United States."

"An investigation should be made into the forces who are agitating for war. As far as I can influence the U.A.W., we are not going to fight Wall Street's wars."

Stands By C.I.O.

The following telegram was sent on January 13 by Homer Martin, president of the United Automobile Workers, to John L. Lewis, C.I.O. chairman:

"The International Executive Board of the International Union United Automobile Workers of America, in executive session today, reaffirmed their unwavering support of and loyalty to the Committee for Industrial Organization. The automobile workers of the nation realize that industrial unionism is the only basis for organization in the automobile industry and the other mass-production industries and reiterate their faith in the program of the C.I.O. and for organizing and maintaining organization within the mass-production industries of America."

Questioned as to differences within the C.I.O. on the problem of A. F. of L.-C.I.O. unity, Mr. Martin declared: "The place to iron those things out is in a C.I.O. conference. We're part of the C.I.O. and we're proud of it. We make our statement clear and without equivocation that we're not going to fight with organized labor anywhere. We're not going to war on labor; we have no fight with labor and eventually those things will be ironed out."

to use the only sure weapon of the workers.

The Furriers Will Fight

Of course, we would like to gain our demands thru negotiations if possible, but we are also ready for a fight if necessary.

An end must be put to the irresponsibility of the bosses.

The furriers voted overwhelmingly for the security on the job and they mean business.

The Furriers Progressive League wholeheartedly supports these absolutely necessary demands. We stand ready to support our union in all preparations and mobilization of the fur workers. We stand ready to serve on all committees to which we will be appointed and to devote all our time and energy to help bring about a successful agreement for the fur workers.

We are convinced that, with united efforts for one aim, the victory of the fur workers will be assured.

SUBSCRIBE NOW TO WORKERS AGE

mands, they aim to smash the union and to wipe out all the gains that the fur workers have ever won.

The bosses, who are mainly responsible for violation of the agreement, have the nerve to accuse the union of irresponsibility.

They go even further, demanding a free hand to interpret the agreement to their liking.

Amongst the 23 counter-demands put up by the bosses, we find such points as the demand to legalize contracting and over-time; to reduce wages; to reduce the number of legal holidays from 8 to 6; to reduce the time of equal division of work from 6 to 4 months; no responsibility for aged workers.

In putting up such counter-demands, our fur bosses are trying to imitate the steel barons and auto magnates; they go them even one better because even those big industrialists had to agree to security of the job.

The Bosses Have Learned Nothing

It seems that the fur bosses have not learned anything from the past. They build castles in the air and keep on dreaming of the "wonderful" past. It is about time the fur bosses should know that, as a result of long years of struggle, the fur workers have attained a high level of class consciousness and militancy. The fur workers understand perfectly well the scheme behind these counter-demands. They see in it a fake maneuver. It is equally clear to the fur workers, that, if the bosses want any profit from the fur trade, they will have to recognize the just demands of the workers.

The bosses may speculate on divisions amongst the fur workers. Maybe they dream of another 1926. Let us declare right here that, if in those days the bosses were beaten, today they may expect to be smashed altogether.

The bosses may also speculate on the weakness of the workers, because of the bad season and continuous unemployment. But here, too, they are much mistaken. Embittered because of misery and starvation, the workers will throw themselves with more vigor into the struggle to win their demands.

Hitherto our union leadership has been diplomatically mild in the negotiations. But the bosses seem to lack an understanding of mild language. The only language the bosses can understand is the language of power. If the bosses will continue insisting on their counter-demands, the union will be forced