

Support Thomas, Krueger In the Fight Against War!

THE nomination of Wendell Willkie as Republican candidate for President ought to have a healthy effect in clearing the air and making it plain that no one really concerned with keeping America out of war has anything to hope for from either of the two old parties. The platform pledges may sound somewhat different, both parties, by virtue of their standard-bearers, will make their appeal to the country as advocates of a foreign policy very much the same and equally dangerous to the peace and welfare of the American people.

The Democratic party, meeting in national convention on July 15, is quite certain to nominate either President Roosevelt himself or some one whom he will name. In either case, the party platform will "point with pride" to the present Administration's record in foreign affairs and will pledge to continue the Roosevelt policy. It is hardly necessary, in these columns, to go out of the way to prove that the Administration's foreign policy, since that ill-starred "quarantine" address in Chicago in December 1937, has been about as inept and disastrous as it could well be, a policy conceived in the fiasco of "collective security" and dedicated to the purpose of making the United States an active participant in the tangle of European power-politics in the capacity of ally to Great Britain. It has been fundamentally a war-breeding foreign policy, and only the unremitting pressure of popular opinion has prevented it from driving the country into catastrophe upon one occasion after the other. If any party ever deserved the name of war party, it is the Democratic party as dominated by the present Administration—and dominated by the present Administration it will be at the Chicago convention, despite the vigorous protests of Senators Wheeler, Clark, Johnson and other Democratic advocates of a policy of keeping out of war.

The Republican convention at Philadelphia adopted a platform in which the foreign-policy plank is obviously a crude compromise between the "interventionist" and "isolationist" wings of the party. But exactly what the platform says is of little real significance, for according to the procedure of American politics, as Alfred M. Landon pointed out at the convention, the party platform means just what the leading candidate says it means. And we know what Mr. Willkie's views are on this subject—as like to President Roosevelt's as two peas in a pod. In the weeks just preceding the convention, Mr. Willkie proclaimed with emphasis upon at least half a dozen occasions that he supported the President's foreign policy in all its essential features. He was a little more cautious, a little more ambiguous, at the convention itself, naturally enough, but now that he has won the nomination, it may be taken for granted that the Republican party, under his leadership, will be a war party only second in blatancy to the Administration Democrats.

As things have shaped up, therefore, the only genuine anti-war candidate in the field is Norman Thomas, the nominee of the Socialist Party. Many supporters of the anti-war movement have hitherto hesitated to give their backing to the Thomas candidacy in the hope that the Republicans would name a man so thoroughly opposed to the President's foreign policy that they would be able to go along with him. Now this hope is gone. Surely there is no serious expectation that the Democrats will do any such thing. Norman Thomas is the only man they can honestly and sincerely support if they really believe that keeping the country out of war is the prime issue.

A vote for Thomas and Krueger will by no means be "thrown away" if all of us who are conscious of the critical situation and of our duty in the crisis pitch in and devote our energies to bringing the message of Norman Thomas, the message of peace, freedom and socialism, to the masses of the American people!

Fascist State Is Established in France

We Have Missed an Issue!— Don't Let It Happen Again!

FOR the first time in over two years, we have missed an issue. The Workers Age could not appear last week simply and solely because we didn't have enough money. Our emergency appeal for aid in the July 6 issue did not meet with sufficient response in time for us to be able to go ahead without interruption. These are the facts and we tell them to you in plain words.

To miss even a single regular issue in times like these is a tragedy. It means that the voice that has valiantly championed the cause of socialism in the midst of the greatest difficulties for more than ten years must be stilled precisely at the moment when the chaos of swift-moving events makes it more essential than ever that it be heard far and wide.

Because we have managed to get out this issue does not mean that our financial difficulties are over. Quite the contrary! Unless we get prompt aid from the friends and readers of the Workers Age—and get this aid in the shortest possible time—there is real danger that we may

be obliged to suspend publication altogether! There is no use in our trying to picture to you what that would mean. If you prize this paper, if you value the work of clarification and education it has done in the last decade, if you believe it is needed more than ever in these critical days, our words will not be necessary.

We make this straight appeal to you. If you want this paper to survive and carry on in these dark days when its services are more vital than ever, YOU MUST HELP! The next two months are the difficult months, the critical months. Only an emergency effort, only the real devotion of its readers and friends, will help the Workers Age survive this period. It's up to you!

SEND IN EVERY CENT YOU CAN SPARE! GET SUBSCRIPTIONS! MAKE COLLECTIONS AMONG YOUR FRIENDS AND FELLOW-WORKERS. A DOLLAR IS BETTER THAN A NICKEL—BUT EVERY NICKEL COUNTS!

Laval Clique Heads Nazi- Ruled Regime

Fierce Air, Sea War Rages
Between Britain and Reich;
New Stalin Move Expected

France became a fascist state last week as parliament, meeting at Vichy, voted to annul the old democratic constitution and to give the Petain government full powers to draft a new constitution along totalitarian lines. The vote in the Chamber of Deputies and Senate, and then in the combined National Assembly, was overwhelming, since these bodies were under the complete control of the pro-fascist, capitulatory clique, headed by Pierre Laval, who had at his disposal the bayonets of the German army of occupation. The only concession that could be wrung from the new masters of France was that the fascist constitution, when drafted, would be submitted to a plebiscite for approval, instead of being simply promulgated by the government. But even this concession was recognized as largely an empty gesture, since Laval, Petain, Flandin and the rest will presumably know how to "manage" a plebiscite in the true Hitler manner.

The character of the new constitution of the fascist France to replace the Third Republic was clearly indicated in the preamble to the enabling resolution. The preamble called for:

1. Complete governmental control of all political, economic, professional and educational institutions—that is, "coordination" of these institutions into the totalitarian state.

2. The placing of each Frenchman "where he may best serve the nation"—that is, the complete eradication of personal, civil and political rights and the total subjection of the individual to the all-powerful state.

3. Integration of France "within the continental system of production and exchange"—that is, the economic vassalage of an agricultural France in a German-dominated Europe.

A modified form of racialism, stressing anti-Semitism, was also contemplated as part of the new order.

From official indications, there will be some sort of parliament under the new regime, but the two houses will be merely advisory. The Senate will be appointed by the government and the lower house will be similar to Italy's Chamber of Fasces and Corporations. The government, as the executive power, will be supreme—within the limits of action that Hitler will grant to his French satellite state.

The decrees proclaiming the new totalitarian regime in France were immediately issued by Marshal Petain in royal form: "We, Philippe Petain, Marshall of France . . ." Formally, all power, executive, military and legislative, passed into the hands of the aged marshal, but actually a triumvirate made up of Pierre Laval, General Maxime Weygand, and Adrien Marquet dominated affairs. And they, in turn, are completely subject to the will of the Nazi overlords. In the new cabinet

(Continued on Page 4)

F.D.R. Plans Setting Up New "Creel Committee"

Groundwork for War-Time Censorship Propaganda Agency Now Being Laid

Washington, D. C. GROUNDWORK for a new "Creel Committee" to control public expression in the event of war is already being laid in Washington. Observers assume it will be headed by Lowell Mellett, former Scripps-Howard editor. As director of the Office of Government Reports, an agency under the President's direct control, Mellett is already virtually the Administration's propaganda minister. He has been seeing his good friend, President Roosevelt,

with increasing frequency. The operations of the new committee will be far more extensive and far less crass than those of the old Committee on Public Information, which was run by George Creel, Ray Stannard Baker and other Wilson liberals.

Recently, Mellett sent letters to educators throughout the country asking them to come to Washington to confer on an "educational" program to bolster national defense. He has

(Continued on Page 2)

Educators Assail Peace-Time Draft As Totalitarian

240 Distinguished Men and Women Issue Manifesto Denouncing Conscription

New York City. More than 240 distinguished educators, writers, artists and professional men last week signed a manifesto condemning peace-time military conscription as "smacking of totalitarianism" and "highly dangerous to the spirit and traditions of American democracy." The manifesto was sponsored by and issued through the Committee on Militarism in Education, of which Dr. William H. Kirkpatrick, professor-emeritus of education at Teachers College, Columbia, is chairman; Dr. George A. Coe and Dr. Harry A. Overstreet, vice-chairmen; Oswald Garrison Villard, treasurer; John Nevin Sayre, assistant-treasurer; and Edwin C. Johnston, secretary.

The manifesto based its opposition to peace-time conscription on the following grounds:

"First, the essential idea underlying military conscription is the major premise of every dictatorship and all totalitarianism. It is the assumption that the individual citizen is but a pawn in the hands of unlimited state power. . . . Second, we consider that peace-time conscription is in itself a flagrant negation of democracy. . . . Third, the adoption of military conscription in peace-time would be a radical departure from historic American tradition. . . . Finally, we oppose conscription because of the disruption it will cause in our American way of life, and also because we question its necessity and wisdom as a defense measure."

Among the signers of the manifesto were: John Dewey, Morris R. Cohen, Edwin Borchard, the Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, C. Hartley Grattan, George W. Hartman, John Haynes Holmes, Charles W. Pipkin, Quincy Howe, Harry Elmer Barnes, and others.

tection and pursuit planes cannot fly as far as bombers and still get back to their bases. German planes are causing a lot of damage in the European war, but over short distances. There has been practically no really long-range bombing by either side. The fact is, we cannot be conquered by airplane. Hitler cannot even conquer England by air. If he could, he would not have fought savagely for every foot of soil in Belgium and northern France.

6. By Sea?

The U.S.A. today has an unexcelled navy. Naturally the longer the war lasts in Europe, the better our navy gets—tho that's no reason for wanting the war continued. Military experts agree that we cannot be successfully invaded unless our navy is sunk. So Hitler's first job would be to get a navy bigger than ours, establish and protect naval bases in the western hemisphere (he doesn't have any now), and then defeat our fleet, which meantime would have the advantage of operating from its home bases.

But again this would be only the first step. Hitler's navy, under constant attack from our air forces, would then have to get past our mine fields. Next, he would have to

(Continued on Page 2)

F.D.R. Asks for Five Billion More for Arms

Pledges Not to Send Soldiers Abroad; 1941 Arms Appropriation Now 10 Billion

Washington, D. C. President Roosevelt called upon Congress in a special message last week to authorize and appropriate \$4,848,171,957 more for military and naval expansion. At the same time, he pledged that the United States would not send an expeditionary force abroad in any foreign war.

Of the total funds asked by the President, \$2,161,441,957 would be in the form of immediate cash outlays for the current fiscal year, and \$2,686,730,000 would be for contract authorizations. The two sums would bring the total amount voted by the present Congress for arms to \$9,930,382,037, since \$5,082,210,080 already has been approved in appropriations and authorizations. Ten billion dollars for arms in a single year is not only far and away above the figure for any previous peacetime year, but it almost equals the all-time record of \$11,011,387,000 appropriated for the World War fiscal year of 1918.

But even this ten billion dollar figure may be too low, as there is hopeless confusion as to the exact amount, barring duplication and overlapping, so far appropriated for armaments. Some estimates put the total appropriated by the present session of Congress as high as fourteen billions.

In asking for this vast sum, President Roosevelt declared: "We will not use our arms in a war of aggression; we will not send our men to take part in European wars."

(Continued on Page 2)

Can Hitler Invade America?

AN organized campaign is under way, inspired and directed from the White House, to scare the American people out of their wits at the prospect of an imminent Nazi invasion and thus whip up a mass panic under cover of which the Administration will be able to put over its war-making foreign policy. The latest example of this criminal attempt to terrorize the American people is the preposterous picture spread in the June 24, 1940 issue of life depicting "how America may be invaded." To counteract these poisonous attempts to stifle the country with a blanket of fear and hysteria, the American Anti-War Crusade, consisting of the Keep America Out of War Congress and six other groups, has issued a short pamphlet discussing the problem in a sober and realistic manner. We are glad to have the opportunity to present it in full to our readers.—Editor.

YOU are worried about Hitler. If you are not, your neighbor probably is. It's natural enough he should be worried. Apparently, Hitler will stop at nothing to get what he wants. You and your neighbor have been told that after Hitler cleans up the Allies, he will be all set to come over here and to clean us up too. A few of your more hysterical neighbors may be taking target practice to pick off parachutists.

What are the cold facts? Let's recognize that Hitler has been winning in Europe so far. Then let's use known facts, the opinions of military experts and plain common-sense to figure out what Hitler would have to do before he could invade our country.

1. Beat the Allies.

First, of course, Hitler would have to conquer France and England. It won't be easy but it is entirely possible. Defeating the Allies would not mean defeating the British and French empires. Hitler still would not have Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the British West Indies and the rest. Before he could even think of getting them, he'd have to have a real navy—and he doesn't have one.

There is fear that Hitler will get the British navy, but it is not shared by experts. Major George Fielding Eliot wrote on May 27 that "one cannot imagine British officers and men handing over naval vessels to

the Germans at the behest of any group of frightened politicians." Rear Admiral Yates Stirling, Jr., former Chief of Staff of the U. S. Fleet, said on May 27: "The British navy will remain to protect England, and will, to the last ship, if necessary, sink, with its colors flying, before surrendering or retreating to Canada." Admiral William D. Leahy, former Chief of Naval Operations, also insists: "The British won't surrender their fleet."

Let's suppose, then, that Hitler conquers France and the British Isles. Right here we must note that it will have cost the Nazis hundreds of thousands—perhaps millions—of dead, untold numbers of wounded, the tremendous quantities of munitions, oil, steel, tanks, airplanes and everything else that goes into war. In other words, victorious Germany won't be too much better off than defeated France and England.

2. Keep Them Beaten

Then would come the job of keeping 42,000,000 Frenchmen and 46,000,000 Englishmen in submission. It would mean one of the largest police beats in history. Many thousands of German troops will be needed and they will have their hands full. But that isn't all. The complete picture of Hitler's policing job would look like this:

Over 42,000,000 Frenchmen, 46,000,000 Englishmen, 8,400,000 Belgians, 8,700,000 Netherlanders, 2,700,000 Norwegians, 3,700,000 Danes, 22,000,000 Poles, 9,500,000 Czechs, 6,500,000 Austrians and even 300,000 Luxembourgers.

The vast majority of these 149,800,000 people are more bitterly opposed to Hitler than we are—they have more reason to be. Further-

more, inside Germany itself all is not well. The power of Germany's underground movement is anybody's guess. But it's there. With this threatening mass of hatred around him, Hitler would probably think more than twice before he looked for more enemies.

3. What About Stalin?

Now the conquest of France and England would be only the preliminary item in Hitler's grandiose "program" for Europe. He is much more interested in what he calls the "Drac Nach Osten"—the drive to the East. His real "living space" is in the Balkans and in the Soviet Ukraine where there is the oil and wheat to fuel and feed his military machine. Hitler has admitted all this in "Mein Kampf."

But when Hitler starts looking East again, he will run smack into Joseph Stalin who is boss of the Ukraine and would like to be boss of the Balkans. Nobody knows much what goes on in Moscow, but we can take it for granted that Stalin doesn't want Hitler running wild in the Black Sea and the Dardanelles—and neither does Turkey.

Of course, Hitler and Stalin might "reach an agreement" and divide up the Balkans as they did Poland. But it would be a mighty shaky truce. Two ambitious dictators cannot go on indefinitely wanting the same thing. Stalin cannot afford to let Hitler get too powerful and Hitler can't let Stalin be top dog. Sooner or later, they might start scrapping. At any rate, we must definitely figure on Hitler working out his relations with Stalin before he does anything about us.

4. Westward, Ho!

Now we are ready to consider Hitler's drive to New York, Pittsburgh and points west. We're assuming that he has conquered and subjugated western Europe and that he has conquered—"peacefully" or otherwise—eastern Europe and the Near East. We are also assuming that he has buried all his dead, that he has found new cannon-fodder, that he has replaced his armaments, that his war-weary people have been whipped into a new frenzy of hatred—this time against us because we are mistreating the Germans in Milwaukee or some such nonsense. We are assuming that Hitler continues to be the Fuehrer and that

he is still in good health. We are assuming a lot of things. It would be the nearest trick in history if Hitler could pull it off. But let's assume it anyway.

How would he whip the U.S.A.?

5. By Air?

A few weeks ago, President Roosevelt called up the Washington airport and got some time-tables. He found that it is 7 hours by airplane from Cape Verde Islands off the west coast of Africa to Para in Brazil. From Para, it is 4 hours to Caracas, Venezuela. From Caracas, it is 2½ hours to Tampico, Mexico, and from there, it is only 2¼ hours to Kansas City, Omaha and St. Louis. This is interesting travel information. But if President Roosevelt offered it as military information, he left out all the important facts.

Suppose Hitler were really thinking of sending a fleet of bombers to Omaha via Africa, Para, Caracas and Tampico. Here's where we get technical. His first job would be to establish an air base off the west coast of Africa. That's not as easy as it sounds. It means a tremendous air field, many large hangars, supplies of oil and high-octane gas, machine tools for repairs, spare parts, anti-aircraft guns and a military force to protect the base, facilities for aviators and a large ground crew. The German air force has 2 pilots and 15 men on the ground for every plane. In addition, provisions would have to be made to protect the lines of communication and supply to the base.

That's the beginning. Exactly the same procedure would have to be followed in Para, Caracas, and Tampico. Hitler would have to "persuade" the South Americans to let him use their territory to establish military air bases from which to attack the U. S. It probably would mean that he would have to conquer South America first or send over so many "Fifth Columnists" that it would be war anyway.

While we're on the subject, let's get it clear that a bombing plane is something altogether different from a passenger plane. There isn't a bomber in existence that can fly more than 1,000 miles fully loaded, drop its bombs and return to its base. And it will be quite a time before there will be one. Bombers also need small pursuit planes for pro-

Big Business Hails Willkie Nomination

(From the New York Times, July 1, 1940)

IT can not be doubted that the result of the campaign has been heartening to conservative minds—not from the previous affiliations of the candidate but from the belief that his well-known personality and record insure a vigorous campaign against New Deal extravagances, and, from the mood of the convention, create a possibility that the nomination may foreshadow future control of government by a man perhaps more capable of unraveling the tangle into which our national financial and industrial policies have been allowed to drift in the past seven years.

(From an article by Edward H. Collins, associate editor of the New York Herald-Tribune, on July 1, 1940.)

WHAT every one in the business and financial district was interested in was the Republican national convention in Philadelphia where, as the eventualities turned out, history was in the making. When the incredible happened—when the convention on Thursday night turned back on tradition to nominate for presidency a man totally without political experience, for the simple, almost unbelievably forthright reason that he was far and away the best equipped man in the country to lead the fight on the New Deal—when this happened, the spirits of the business community were lifted as they had not been lifted by any event in recent years. It was as if for the first time a gleam of light had penetrated the murk of defeatism in which the business world has been immersed for seven years . . .

Time and again business men, watching Mr. Willkie in action, have shaken their heads dispiritedly and observed: "What a pity that man cannot run for the presidency!" For was not Mr. Willkie, utility magnate, tarred, as the phrase goes, with the Wall Street brush. . . ? By all accepted standards, they were entirely right in assuming that such handicaps as these should have been insuperable. They should have been, but in this one case they were not.

Bridges Union Tries Grab Move in C.I.O.

Invades Wholesale and Retail Clerks Field

New York City. A major jurisdictional conflict in the C.I.O. that may have serious consequences for that organization was brought into the open recently by the United Retail and Wholesale Employees of America, a C.I.O. affiliate, in a statement declaring that the national appeals committee of the C.I.O. had rejected the application made by Harry Bridges, Stalinist head of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, to organize workers in inland warehouses into his union. The U.R.W.E.A. had challenged Bridges's application. The report of the appeals committee was, however, tabled by the Executive Committee of the C.I.O. at its session in Washington in the early part of June.

Despite this action by the C.I.O. Executive Committee, the U.R.W.E.A. served notice that it regarded the appeals committee's verdict as a vindication of its right to retain complete jurisdiction over all wholesale and warehouse workers, as originally granted in 1937 by the C.I.O.

The appeals committee took the view that the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, was essentially a maritime union and that its jurisdiction should extend only to longshoremen and to employees in waterfront terminals.

The reviewing body was made up of John Brophy, director of local industrial unions for the C.I.O.; Clinton S. Golden, of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee; and James J. Matles, Stalinist leader of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America. Bridges's application was referred to them after the United Retail and Wholesale Employees had informed the C.I.O. that it regarded warehouse workers as the life-blood of its organization.

"In view of the failure of the parties to this controversy to reach a mutual agreement as to their respective organizational boundaries," the report said, "the committee on appeals recommends that the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union confine its field of activity to the extension of organization among the longshoremen and the employees of warehouses closely adjacent to the waterfront, leaving the warehouse field inland and more easily related to the retail and distributive industry to the United Retail and Wholesale Employees."

The report noted that the distributive field, in which the United Retail and Wholesale Employees functioned, embraced about 6,000,000 workers.

"In so gigantic a potential field for organization," it declared, "we believe it to be unwise to create any rigid rules for the future development of organization. Instead, the C.I.O. should be free to perfect such plans as circumstances and accumulated experience warrant to

Can Hitler Invade the United States?

(Continued from Page 1)

destroy our coast defenses. Finally, he would face the problem of landing his expeditionary force and facing the U.S. army and National Guards.

7. By Land?

Now landing a modern army is not like paddling a canoe up a beach. Major General Johnson Hagood, Chief of Staff, Line of Communications, A. E. F., says that there are not more than five ports in the United States in which an enemy could find the harbor equipment necessary to disembark an invading force with its artillery, tanks, poison gas, airplanes, ammunition, medical supplies, etc. In addition, Major Eliot points out that the invader would have to bring with him lighters, armored barges, movable piers, cranes, base equipment, reserve stores and special landing devices. All this time, we would be in our own country right on top of our own supplies and Hitler would be far from home and from his sources of supply. Military experts maintain that what would really happen is that our navy and its airplanes would easily stop Hitler long before he could get anywhere near our shores.

Where are we now? Can Hitler really do all these things: beat the Allies; keep western Europe under his thumb; take care of Stalin, Mussolini, Turkey and the Balkans; recover from the current war; build himself a navy; establish naval and air bases in the western hemisphere (maybe take over South and Central America while he's at it); sink our navy destroy our coast defenses; wipe out our army; destroy our air forces; and finally, make Fritz Kuhn our Fuehrer?

Just saying it sounds fantastic. But we have calmly examined the facts and the testimony of military experts; we have used our common sense. And we have found tremendous difficulties in Hitler's way, any one of which might easily stop him or destroy him. We have found that an invasion by Hitler is as near to impossible as anything in the world could be.

meet the organizing problems in this field."

Despite the adverse opinion of the appeals committee, Bridges announced at a meeting of C.I.O. leaders in this city some weeks ago his intention of enrolling workers in inland warehouses. At that time, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers joined with the United Retail and Wholesale Employees in warning against any jurisdictional encroachment by the Stalinist C.I.O. official.

The failure of the C.I.O. Executive Committee to act on the report when it was submitted was officially ascribed to a complaint by Bridges that he had had "insufficient opportunity to present his arguments to the committee."

The clash between the U.R.W.E.A. and the Bridges organization, which latter has the tacit but effectual support of John L. Lewis, is not merely a jurisdictional conflict between two unions, informed quarters point out; it is also an aspect of the organizational and political division that has been growing wider and wider in C.I.O. ranks in recent months. The United Retail and Wholesale Employees of America stands with Sidney Hillman in his conflict with John L. Lewis on the issues of labor unity and support of President Roosevelt for reelection. It was the New York locals of this union that sent Lewis a joint telegram recently protesting against his defense of Herbert Hoover and his attack on the New Deal before the platform committee of the Republican convention in Philadelphia. On the other hand, Harry Bridges, as a Stalinist, naturally supports Lewis both in his hostility to peace in the labor movement and in his attitude to Roosevelt.

WPA Is Found Essential in Social Survey

Boston, Mass.

AN investigation of the records of families on the Emergency Relief Administration and the Works Progress Administration from 1935 to 1937, was completed recently at Harvard University by Dr. Elizabeth W. Gilboy, secretary of the Elizabeth W. Gilboy Committee on Research in the Social Sciences, and published under the title, "Applicants for Work Relief."

Dr. Gilboy found that the relief problem probably was permanent; that the majority of persons applying for work-relief were not "ne'er-do-wells," but ordinarily were hard-working people who were well able to support themselves before depression unemployment set in; that the unemployed put off applying for work-relief as long as possible, exhausting all resources and going heavily into debt; that, far from living in luxury on the relief rolls, work-relief families had been poorly fed, clothed and housed, with income running well below the minimum standards established by the relief authorities; that the average debt of families seeking work-relief was \$234, and that families had to continue to subsist on credit for part of current expenses; that unemployment was disproportionately severe among youths just out of school and workers over forty, and that most public complaints of relief workers refusing jobs in private industry were not justified by the facts.

Dr. Gilboy supports work-relief for the able-bodied, employable unemployed, as opposed to direct relief, or dole. Despite the many criticisms of the government work-relief program, including charges of poor planning, inefficiency and politics, she concludes that in view of the emergency conditions, the government system has functioned adequately.

Dr. Gilboy's reasons for believing there is a permanent relief problem are four. First, she says, "the chances of reemployment for those on the relief rolls who are forty years of age or older are small, unless the preference in private industry for hiring younger men changes." Second, "there appears to be a distinct prejudice against hiring workers who have been on relief." "This prejudice," she continues, "may be attributed to some extent to the idea which still persists that there is something wrong with any one who applies for relief. But it is partly due to the belief that work relief affects adversely the skill and morale of its recipients." Third, "there are undoubtedly cases where the poor management of relief projects, the bad use of skills, political maneuvering, etc., have had the reverse effect of that intended, and have led to the deterioration of workmen on relief." Fourth, "in a state like Massachusetts, where a declining industrial tendency was observed early in the twenties, there is very little hope of reabsorbing the unemployed, even if they were all considered desirable workers and industry wished to hire them."

Read—Spread

WORKERS AGE

Read—Spread

WORKERS AGE

What Recent Labor Board Figures Show

Washington, D. C.

FOR the two weeks ending June 4, 1940, C.I.O. unions participated in 22 collective-bargaining elections under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board, according to N.L.R.B. reports. Of these, it won 12, or 54.4%. A total of 9,698 workers participated, and the C.I.O. secured 4,355 votes, or 44.9%.

A. F. of L. unions took part in 44 elections, winning 25, or 56.8%. A total of 8,013 workers participated, of whom 4,670, or 58.3%, voted for A. F. of L.

"Independent" unions participated in 14 elections, of which they won 6, or 42.8%. A total of 4,908 workers took part, of whom 2,731, or 55.7%, voted for the "independent" group.

In the next two weeks, ending June 18, 1940, the C.I.O. participated in 30 elections, involving 12,569 workers. It won 18 of these elections (60%) and polled 7,279 votes (57.9%).

The A. F. of L. participated in 25 elections involving 6,693 workers. It won 12 of these elections (48.0%) and polled 3,183 votes (47.6%).

"Independent" groups participated in 8 elections, involving 1,664 workers. They won 5 elections, (62.5%) and polled 902 votes (54.2%).

The C.I.O. and A. F. of L. clashed in 11 elections during this latter period, the C.I.O. winning 3 elections and 2,635 votes, and the A. F. of L. taking 6 and 2,425 votes. In the remaining 2 elections, neither union received a majority.

Progressives Gain Victory In Food Union

New York City.

THE progressive forces in Cafeteria Employees Union, Local 302, A. F. of L., carried the elections for president held in that union recently and defeated the Stalinist machine which had been in control for three years. W. Kincheloe, progressive leader, polled 2,400 votes on his United Orange Ticket as against 2,150 for C. Dritsas. The special election was held owing to the resignation of the former president, S. Mesovich, who had worked with the Stalinists but later supported the Orange Ticket.

With the defeat of C. Dritsas, who was the strongest possible candidate the Stalinists could have put forward, the Stalinist machine in Local 302 was virtually smashed. Some weeks before, the Stalinist administration was swept out from Brooklyn Cooks and Countermen's Local 325. And a few weeks before that, the progressives scored a big victory in Waiters Local 16. The revolt against Stalinist control is becoming a real storm.

F.D.R. Plans Setting Up New "Creel Committee"

(Continued from Page 1)

been discussing censorship problems with newspaper publishers. One of Mellett's favorites, Robert Horton, was made public man for the National Defense Advisory Commission and seems destined for a key post in the final set-up.

These reports of a new "Creel Committee" are strongly confirmed in the June 29 issue of Editor and Publisher. The recognized trade journal of American newspaper publishers reports that "moving in utmost secrecy, aides to President Roosevelt in matters relating to the war emergency have proposed a program of press and public relations, installing Lowell Mellett, former editor of the Washington Daily News, as Director of Information." Editor and Publisher indicates that this new ministry of information will not wait for war before starting its operations but will begin functioning "if danger of involvement in the conflict becomes more pronounced."

Censorship will also be under Mr. Mellett. Editor and Publisher hastens to add that this censorship will not extend to newspapers or other publications, but that "the espionage law would be invoked in exceptional cases when the facts warrant so drastic a step." One of the principal results of the new set-up will be the imposition of a "complete clamp" on information from all bureaus and agencies of the government and the canalizing of all federal news thru this one office.

The new agency, Editor and Publisher reports, will have a much larger organization than the Creel Committee in the World War, which was confined principally to Washington. It will use a "national network of trained propagandists." A radio division, unnecessary in the last war, will be established under Robert Berger, former radio director of the Democratic National Committee. Motion pictures will be handled by Pare Lorenz, formerly with the Farm Security Administration, movie critic and producer of

Progressive Painters Win In Brooklyn

But Stalinists Prevail in Manhattan, Weinstock Beating Zausner in Race

Brooklyn, N. Y.

PROGRESSIVES in Brooklyn District Council 18 of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers scored a decisive victory recently when they elected the secretary-treasurer and four business agents in a hotly contested election in which they routed the Stalinist forces. Only one candidate on the Stalinist slate was elected, Jack Wellner, a notorious character, who managed to get in as business agent by six votes. Sam Freeman, progressive leader, was the successful candidate for secretary-treasurer.

In District Council 9, New York, the Stalinist ticket came out victorious. It was headed by Louis Weinstock, who received 3,882 votes for secretary-treasurer as against the 2,385 votes of his opponent, Philip Zausner, candidate of the progressives. Weinstock had served as secretary-treasurer from 1936 to 1938. Lack of close cooperation of the progressive forces was said to be responsible for the Stalinist victory.

Jobless Union Warns Against Stamp Plan

Says Scheme Is Like Old Voucher Evil

New York City

Editor, Workers Age: THE food stamp plan is coming closer to New York City and the unemployed fear it. Newark and Yonkers have it, and plans are under way to bring it here to Brooklyn on August 1.

The general public has been deluged with arguments in favor of the plan coming from those who will get the primary benefits—the farmers, grocers, and the political element seeking that block of votes.

The Unemployed and Project Workers Union—a union which was built from locals that broke away from the Workers Alliance a year ago in order to rebuild a non-partisan and democratic union for the unemployed—is opposed to the plan because it is too much like old-fashioned voucher relief, and may open the way to relief cuts and general food rationing.

The claim that the plan will increase the food budgets of the unemployed by 50% is not true. The 50 cents worth of free blue stamps to be given with each purchase of one dollar's worth of orange stamps is not all extra, but merely replaces the food now given out free in the Federal Surplus food depots. It will be extra food money to the extent that more surplus foods are offered in the stores than in the present depots, and, even more important, if the disadvantages of using the orange stamps for food purchases now made with cash do not outweigh any small gains.

What "Equal Rights" Plank In G.O.P. Platform Means

PROBABLY the delegates to the Republican national convention at Philadelphia did not know what they were doing when they wrote into their platform an endorsement of the so-called "equal-rights" amendments to the Federal Constitution.

For one thing, the proposed amendment would wipe out every law on the statute books of the nation and the states which seeks to protect the wages and working conditions of American working women.

Nothing more atrocious than that has ever been put forward by any responsible political organization.

It was backed in Philadelphia by a large and very active lobby representing the National Woman's Party. This is not a "party" at all, but an organization largely financed by a handful of rich women who never had to do a day's work in their lives.

It has been very appropriately dubbed "The Ladies Auxiliary to the National Association of Manufacturers," and has frequently "fronted" for sweatshop bosses who wished to defeat or repeal laws in the interest of working women.

The most charitable view that can be taken of the action of the Republican convention is that the delegates were "caught asleep at the switch."

American working women can scarcely be expected to support a program which will strip them of all legal safeguards.

(This is an editorial in the July 2, 1940 issue of Labor, official paper of the standard railroad unions.—Editor.)

Hosiery Union Chief Urges U.S. Shun War

Milwaukee, Wis.

WARNING that dictatorship is fostered by economic insecurity, Alexander McKeown, general president of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, recently told delegates to that organization's twenty-ninth annual convention that the task of defending democracy is not in Europe but on our own shores.

"Those of us in the hosiery union, like the overwhelming majority of Americans, cannot help but be in sympathy with the Allies," McKeown said.

"We abhor the methods used by Hitler in destroying the labor movement in Germany, the iron heel which has killed or driven into exile those Germans who believed in the elemental civil rights which Americans regard as sacred," McKeown added.

"The entrance of Italy into this battle completes the list of those totalitarian nations which, in their effort of self-aggrandizement, are destroying European civilization," he said.

"But we must not let our hatred of totalitarianism blind us to our responsibilities in this nation. It has been said the Americas remain the last outpost of democracy in a dictatorship-ridden world and that the fate of democracy lies in the hands of the United States. If this be so, then I cannot say too strongly that the greatest service that we can perform for the cause of democracy is to see that those conditions which nurture it are expanded in this country.

"We have seen that war ends democracy even in those nations which profess democratic aims. Our own experience in the last war demonstrates that it means lower standards of living for masses of workers and suppression of workers rights. It cannot be said too often that the best protection the United States can give to democracy is to safeguard it here.

"We are vitally concerned by what happens in Europe. We must look to our defenses, but while we do so, let us see that labor has some voice in determining the policy. Let us see that we are preparing to defend this nation against invasion from overseas, and not preparing to send Americans to fight battles in Europe; that while we build up our defenses, we do not lose our civil rights.

"Our experiences in the last war indicate clearly that we cannot protect democracy in Europe."

F.D.R. Asks for Five Billion More for Arms

(Continued from Page 1)

At the same time, Mr. Roosevelt added a virtual endorsement of the Burke-Wadsworth compulsory-military-service bill, although he did not mention it by name.

While certain Congressional spokesmen hailed the pledge against sending men abroad, others pointed out that the pledge did not cover direct official participation in the European war and added that, once such participation was a fact, it would be difficult, if not impossible to limit the degree of participation, despite previous pledges.

Political observers expressed a belief that Mr. Roosevelt's pledge foreshadowed the general character of the "peace" plank of the Democratic national convention, which meets in Chicago on July 15.

New York Times remarked editorially: "War brings many collateral disasters. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, suffer. We think we shall be wiser and cooler the next time, if there is one; and we shan't."

Congress, which has frowned on the spread of government publicity bureaus, can be expected to develop a keen interest in the O.G.R. Perhaps anticipating this, the White House, thru Stephen Early and Mr. Mellett himself, specifically denied the Editor and Publisher story, although admitting that "some thought" had been given to the handling of news dispatches "in event of the nation's involvement in war."

Save The WORKERS AGE (See Appeal on Page 1)

INFORMAL HOUSE

KERHONKSON, N. Y. (7 miles from Ellenville)

Situated at the foot of the Catskills midst all the wonders of woods and water. An ideal vacation spot for adults—known for its friendly, informal spirit and rustic charm.

Rates: \$2.75 per day—\$16.00 per week

For further information call or write

ARTHUR BOYER, Manager Informal House Kerhonkson, N. Y. Tel. Kerhonkson 8118 R

EDWARD K. WELSH 40 Morningside Avenue New York City Tel. MOument 2-3117

\$1 A YEAR SUB TO WORKERS AGE 6 MOS. 60¢ subscribe now!

See WOODSTOCK TYPEWRITER

Enjoy your vacation at BOWRY CREEK FARM SOUTH DURHAM, GREENE COUNTY, NEW YORK

Most picturesque section of the Catskill Mountains MODERN ACCOMMODATIONS — HOMELIKE COOKING COMRADELY ENVIRONMENT — INDIVIDUAL ATTENTION

Weekly Rates \$16.00 and up

REDUCED FARES TO CATSKILLS

Directions: To Catskill by Hudson River Day or Night Line, West Shore and New York Central Railroad also bus lines. For information write to Milton Mata, Bowery Creek Farm, South Durham, N. Y. or call New York phone TRafalgar 7-2085.

On Our Basic Attitude to the Present War

By BERTRAM D. WOLFE

(This is first of a series of discussion articles on socialist policy on the war by Bertram D. Wolfe. The second article will appear in the next issue. As in all discussion articles, the views expressed are those of the writer himself and not necessarily those of this paper or of the I.L.L.A.—Editor.)

THE second world war is the continuation of the first. Both of them are the result of the rapid decay of capitalism. The salient characteristics of this decay are: a. Growing monopoly: Displacement of the free movement of goods, materials, men and private property by monopoly, by government regulation of the flow of capital and movement of human beings; government-regulated trade through embargoes, tariff walls, prohibitions on import and export, subsidies, barter, and exclusive trade treaties; monopolization of sources of raw materials.

b. Trend of a few powerful countries to monopolize whole regions of the earth under their hegemony: Failure of the masses to develop a socialist economic unity of a continent like Europe strengthened the trend to economic organization of Europe into a single unit from above. The decaying capitalist world is shaping up, temporarily at least, into a German-dominated Europe, a Japan-dominated Far East, and a United States-dominated North and South America. Even this does not put an end to the descending cycle of war and decay, but rather increases the size and might of the combatants and diminishes the regions left to divide, thus increasing the magnitude and probable frequency of the convulsions and death struggles of a decaying order.

c. Trend to the fusion of government with business, in which business is subordinated to the contest for control of these vast spheres of influence. The biggest business men and financiers, at some stages and in some lands, thereby get a larger control of government. But in the long run, the mounting bureaucracy and armed force, with its voracious appetites and right to first consideration in these gigantic struggles, makes the bureaucratic military machine more and more of a consumer of revenues, a preferred user of everything, a destroyer of the very possibilities of profit, and erects it into a dominant totalitarian machine, subordinating economy and national life and the life of all weaker nations to its law of being which is expressed thru war, consolidation of its dominance over vast regions, and preparation for further war. Industry becomes more and more staffed. The state makes ever more ruthless war on its own masses as a prerequisite to foreign war; integrates the entire economy, press, thought, science, culture, business, daily life into its war machine; subordinates all weaker neighbors and vanquished regions.

d. All great powers and even lesser ones manifest this same general trend. The victory of none of them will tend to reverse the trend. Only the cooperation of the masses in all the lands involved, including the colonial and subordinated countries, only a successful struggle by them, first of all against their own ruling class, only the securing of control of their own economy and their own political power and control of their own destiny can bring about, not a reversal but a complete change of direction in the trend: in place of decaying capitalism and an economy organized and planned for war, a new socialist economy organized and planned for peace, well-being, world cooperation and freedom.

DIFFERENT RATES OF DECAY

Altho this trend is universal, and advancing with giant strides here in America, as well as in England and France, the rate of progressive decay and the degree of it is distinctly different in different lands for a series of historical reasons. Chief of these—from the standpoint of their practical significance for our present analysis—are:

a. The differing portion of the world already in the possession of a given land and the size of its reserves: England developed the trend more slowly than Germany or even France, because of and at the expense of its tremendous colonial reserves and the exploitation of the colonial peoples. It represents a ruthless totalitarian regime in India, for example, a precarious senior partnership with regions like Canada, a totalitarian regime for the natives of South Africa and Australia but a senior partnership for the white colonists, etc.

b. The consequences of victory or defeat: The defeated lands in the last war had to accelerate the trend enormously. Strictly speaking, fascism is the organization of all of economic, social, political and cultural life for the purposes of war, and the nations poorer in reserves, and the late-comers on the scene, the defeated and partially dismembered ones, devoted all their energies for a decade wholeheartedly to that purpose. That explains their superiority for war and their victory in its

IN DARKEST GERMANY



Elderly man in The Washington Post

initial stages. But a victorious Germany, while it might slow up the speed of this trend, could not and would not reverse it, while a defeated France and England, if they are able to struggle at all, will greatly accelerate the total preparation of their nations for the next conflict.

MERGER OF NATIONALISM WITH IMPERIALISM

c. The late-comers on the scene had an added advantage in the sense

that the last wave of popular enthusiasm for national unity in the 1870's (Italy, Germany) could be and was merged into the new wave of imperialist totalitarian organization and spirit. This explains the apparent greater chauvinism and easier "goose-stepping" of the German and Italian peoples. It is not a matter of "race" (Frenchmen, Spaniards and Italians are all Mediterranean Latins) but of tradition and dynamics of historical develop-

Some Questions on Our Policy on War

Urges "Revolutionary Defense" for Britain

By S. MEFFAN

(This is a discussion article on socialist policy on the war. As in all discussion articles, the views expressed are those of the writer himself and not necessarily those of this paper or of the I.L.L.A.—Editor.)

THE best way I know to open this discussion is to cite as a reminder a quotation from Will Herberg's article, "Basic Dilemma of Socialism," in the Workers Age of June 15th. He says: "Marx often, almost always, argues as if once appropriate means have been set in motion to achieve a goal that is the end of it. . . . Under not unfavorable external conditions, the goal will be reached and no untoward by-products need be feared. . . . And yet these untoward by-products are frequently as intrinsic to the situation and as important and far-reaching in their consequences as the main products themselves; that is, those that are desired and intended."

I quote this because I believe traditional Marxist analysis can be applied to the present world situation, but that most traditional socialist cure-all slogans might as well be thrown in the ash-can.

The major premise of our analysis remains true. This is a war between rival imperialisms for control of markets and raw materials, the same as in 1914. Is there any difference between the situation in 1914 and 1940? Traditional socialism says no—apply the principle of revolutionary defeatism. Any thinking man today knows that is a huge over-simplification. Let us analyze these two imperialist groups.

POSITION OF THE TWO CAMPS

First, there is Anglo-French imperialism, which has been vainly attempting to compromise between outright fascism and capitalist democracy and has succeeded in neither. This group has been terrifically weakened in late years by its inability to grant the workers security, the unemployed jobs, and its lack of program for any element of its huge population. Therefore, the masses cannot be inspired to white heat to defend an empire which obviously does nothing for them.

Then there is German-Italian imperialism, dominated by the Nazis, spurred by shameful defeat in 1918, by the failure of socialist and communist movements. It has succeeded in stabilizing capitalist imperialism under a new form on a lower plane for the working class. Nevertheless, a powerful new ideology has been created out of mass discontent, hatred of the "oppressors of Germany," the promise that, with the crushing of its opponents, good times for the German masses will follow. The main question for socialists is this: Under what conditions can socialists work at all? Under an Axis victory or an Allied victory? And let me add here that the slogan of revolutionary defeatism is not a principle, but a tactic to be used when conditions demand it. So the question is, I repeat: Under what conditions can the socialist movement benefit most or suffer least?

A victory by Hitler, which at the moment seems likely, will first of all be not only a military victory, but also an ideological one.

Indeed, this is already proved in a number of countries such as Holland, Norway, Belgium and France.

ment. Japan shows, and conceivably a capitalist China might show, a similar trend. In the United States, the weakness of the tradition of class independence might render easier the trend to regimentation, altho there are both economic and political social-traditional counter-forces.

d. A subject land fighting for independence under present conditions might easily merge its national revolutionary movement if successful into an imperialist-totalitarian trend, but not necessarily so. This depends on many economic and historical factors. An example of this trend was post-Versailles Poland, but an example of the opposite—after a period of hesitation—was post-Versailles Finland. In any event, in every struggle to maintain or secure national independence, we must emphasize the independent class role and the "Jacobin" or popular revolutionary nature of the struggle both to insure its maximum strength and the maximum support of the masses of the dominating country, and to preclude such a negative development as the conversion of the struggle for national freedom into imperialist chauvinism. This applies not only to countries like Spain and Ethiopia, but to India, or to the struggles of France, Holland, Belgium, etc., to regain their independence. Only a popular-revolutionary struggle of a country like France under proletarian leadership can conceivably reawaken class independence in Germany, can conceivably be successful, or bring desirable results if successful. Our support cannot be to the present French government, or to General de Gaulle, agent of a Britain ready to sacrifice the fate of France to its military objectives, or to an anti-Pétain government of Reynaud or any other bourgeois politician. We can only support an underground French movement directed simultaneously against Pétain-Gaulle-Reynaud and Company, and against Hitler.

Since the example of Marx versus Liebknecht is so often cited to prove all sorts of things, it is necessary to record that Wilhelm Liebknecht, not Marx, was proved right by subsequent historical developments. Marx underestimated the possibility of the struggle for German unification being merged, as it was actually in 1870, into a struggle for imperialist domination. He overestimated the ease with which the masses can be trained to independence and switched in war time and under its censorship!—from support of the ruling class to opposition. Only opposition from the very beginning, as Liebknecht proposed, had any chance of favorable result—even then a slim one. Not only did 1870 prove that Marx misjudged the war when he treated France as "aggressor" and Prussia as "defender" of national unity and independence—the German ruling class and government prepared the war no less

CONSEQUENCES OF FRENCH CAPITULATION

However, let us look for a moment at the possible consequences as a result of France's capitulation. Theoretically, several things could happen. The armed workers could start a socialist revolution. This is what traditional Marxism has always hoped for and what actually happened in Russia. However, with the increasing triumph of fascist ideology and Hitler's military might intact and healthy, and the past left-wing failures in France, does any reasoning socialist think this will happen? Wishing won't make it so. Secondly, a return of capitalist democracy is out of question in France. Forces to establish such a return do not exist. We can write that off. However, it is quite possible that, indirectly aided by Germany, reactionaries in France itself might be permitted to go thru with a fascist revolution without military aid from Hitler. The Nazis, who are masters of politics and propaganda, probably understand this only too well. The best we can say of France is that the socialist movement will be underground for a long time to come, and if it is to survive, will have to build an entirely new type of movement, discarding much of the past.

Supposing the Allies should win, which seems rather unlikely, they have no program by which to hold the masses of people in Europe. They would, of course, try to set up their own brand of totalitarianism, which would face a much tougher job than Hitler's Nazism. Hitler never made any pretense of giving the workers any kind of democracy, whereas France and England have. Socialists would have a much better chance in a Europe run by a harassed Allied dictatorship than in a Europe run by Hitler's well-oiled Nazi machine. Many socialists hopefully assume that the Nazi system may break down as its problems increase. This may be so, but is not inevitable in any immediate sense. Traditional socialist thought made many of us certain that in Germany the underground movement would quickly overthrow Hitler. Yet Hitler stabilized his economy—only for the time being, it is true—on a much lower level for the masses. But the odds against him made him smart and he has made several modifications of the capitalist system, which have revived it, tho not its pure form. I refer to the further control of profits, thus tending to state capitalism; the substitute of barter for the gold system; the lowering of wages; and the "coordination" of the unemployed thru labor camps, armament industry, etc. Finally, he has eliminated opposition thru concentration camps and executions. Thus Hitler has accounted for every-thing, something which capitalist democracy has absolutely failed to do. Is this a defense of fascism? No; it is a recognition of a powerful, vigorous reactionary system which, at present, seems to offer more to the masses of Europe than any other idea, particularly capitalist democracy. I abhor the social content of fascism, which has played on all the

WHY THE FRENCH DEFEAT?

Upon my arrival in New York, I gave a report on the situation in France and the spirit of the French people in the face of war. The mass of the French people did not want the war and did not support it. They had no war morale. Let us explain the reasons for this. The French people knew that Versailles was an historical injustice dictated by the rapacious spirit of the Anglo-French imperialists. They knew that the Anglo-French imperialists had contributed their utmost to the stifling of the German revolution and were the main culprits for the rise of Hitlerism to victory, having supported its counter-revolutionary policy and mass rearmament. In 1936, the French people had great illusions about the People's Front, but the latter led to complete failure. All the gains won in 1936 were taken away in the following years. Little by little, the most reactionary

energetically and aggressively than the French, rather more so—but the whole subsequent development of Europe in general and Germany in particular proved that Marx had misjudged the relative weight of the "national-unity- and -freedom" and the "imperialist" components of the Franco-Prussian War. It was a quite natural error then, for 1870 was the pivotal year of transition from the old to the new type of war, and Marx quickly altered his position as the real aims and dynamics of the war became visible. But it is no longer pardonable to make the same error or cite the example of this as a guide in the present situation.

CHARACTER OF PRESENT WAR

It is not sufficient to characterize the present war as imperialist. This does not complete the basic description of it. Moreover, there is a danger of noting its imperialist character as a formal generalization for the record, and then forgetting that description in proposing practical measures, and unconsciously slipping into another basic conception, namely that it is a war between fascist and non-fascist powers, defensive on one side, aggressive on the other.

Nor is it correct to say that the defeat of Germany would mean the end of the totalitarian trend in capitalism, as for example:

"For Hitler and for the world as a whole, this war will spell for some time either total prestige or total ruin of fascism. Should he win, fascism would win tremendously. Should he lose, there are many reasons to believe that fascism will lose all, not only in Germany and Italy, but in all countries. This is true despite the headway made by totalitarianism even in the most democratic countries" (Jay Lovestone, Workers Age, June 1, 1940).

It is true that a victory of Germany would hasten, and a victory of England slow up, the trend to totalitarianism, but a victory of neither camp would reverse that trend.

For these reasons, it is necessary to emphasize that the present world war is the continuation of the first and both are part of a general secular trend to the decay of capitalism and growth of monopoly, totalitarianism and war. There is a difference, and a real one, in the rate of development and acceleration of that trend, but the trend promises to and will continue regardless of any outcome except one, the growing independence, organization, and might of the working class of all the countries involved and of the colonial peoples, and a growing independent collaboration between them.

(The second of this series of discussion articles by Bertram D. Wolfe on our policy on the war will appear in the next issue of this paper.—Editor.)

Marceau Pivert Makes a Proposal to Gen. de Gaulle

P.S.O.P. Leader Offers "Effective Weapon"

(We publish below the communication addressed by Marceau Pivert, secretary of the French Socialist Workers and Peasants Party, to General de Gaulle, head of the French National Committee in London. The appeal of the International Workers Front Against War to which reference is made in this letter was published in the last issue of this paper.—Editor.)

June 23, 1940.

To General de Gaulle: I HAVE just heard your radio appeal, and I do not doubt your desire to continue the struggle against fascist and Nazi slavery.

For my part, as a militant socialist, I have always been and will always remain an uncompromising fighter against the greatest menace not only to the independence of my country but to the liberties and the living conditions of my working-class brothers. No doubt, your methods of struggle against fascism necessarily differ from those which we advocate. Yours is the field of military force. Yours are powerful military means, but you yourself have just recognized that force is broken if it is not placed in the service of a clearly defined cause. Our methods of struggle against fascism are inspired by our analysis of economic and social processes, that is, by the international class struggle.

More than ever, we are convinced that only a radical transformation of our social order on the basis of socialism and freedom can destroy fascism. This conviction has earned us persecution; my friends are in French jails, imprisoned by governments which at the same time were freeing the Cagouleurs, the direct agents of Mussolini and Hitler, who today believe they are in power in France. But no repression ever succeeds in crushing strong and sincere convictions. It merely strengthens our convictions and fortifies our struggle to the end that the workers terminate this war by conquering power and displacing the war-makers, as Lenin did in 1917.

It was in those days that a French Royalist officer, desiring to stop the advance of the German army on Petrograd, placed at Lenin's disposal his technical knowledge of dynamiting bridges. It is thus not extraordinary that a militant socialist, faithful to his banner, which is not yours, today proposes to place at your disposal weapons he believes effective—if you are not afraid to make use of them.

We know as a fact that, despite the military victories of Hitler, a conscious section of the German proletariat is not indifferent to the international propaganda which we have carried on since the outbreak of the war. My friend, Ferner Brockway, secretary of the Independent Labor Party, can give you further information on this subject. But naturally, neither Mr. Churchill nor yourself could have the least authority for undertaking any propaganda campaign among the German masses. Nevertheless, the conduct of such a campaign may not leave you indifferent.

I therefore take the liberty of sending you herewith the magnificent appeal issued by our European militants in the International Workers Front Against War and which has just arrived at the Independent News office in America. If your sense of realities is as strong as ours, I dare hope that you will not hesitate to reproduce and spread this appeal far and wide—particularly, in German and French—by every means at your disposal. Thus, there can develop the movement of revolutionary fraternization which we believe is still possible across the chasm of the horrible sufferings that war imposes on the masses, the vanquished and the "victors."

I am not unaware of the danger of being misunderstood in this communication, which is inspired only by the desire to forge a political weapon against all totalitarian powers. I know that there are powerful interests that can render this letter vain; but of what importance is this risk in the face of all others? If on the other hand, the spirit of liberty and the desire for national independence, to which you have appealed, are not mere ruses designed to galvanize the struggle of anti-fascist workers for the service of a privileged class, then you still have powerful means of action which can bar the route of fascism. In Africa and in Asia, there are now people hungry for liberty and independence. That is where your true reservoir of political ammunition is located. It is therefore necessary to demand the immediate liberation of all their imprisoned nationalist leaders. The cart must be completely overturned. The British Empire and the French Empire are lost in the dictatorial form of exploitation in which they have functioned; now the dikes of liberty must be opened. Thus alone can fascism be defeated. All the resources, all the forms of collaboration of the liberated colonial peoples, ruling themselves democratically, will thus be gathered into a powerful confederation on which Hitler and Mussolini can have no hold. This political overturn, everywhere proclaimed, would have enormous repercussions in all oppressed countries and even in France. I have confidence in my comrades. They will recognize their proper perspectives and duties. Then the liberating anti-fascist spirit of a people who have made four revolutions, of a people who had to be shamelessly deceived to that Hitler and Mussolini could impose on them "Gaulleite" Laval, would find appropriate ways and means of overcoming the infamous treachery which has delivered them to the most infamous of butchers.

MARCEAU PIVERT

We Must Reexamine Our Attitude on the War

Hitler Victory Greatest Disaster to World Workers

By JULIAN GORKIN

(This is a discussion article on socialist policy on the war. As in all discussion articles, the views expressed are those of the writer himself and not necessarily those of this paper or of the I.L.L.A.—Editor.)

THE present situation in Europe and in the world, resulting from the signing of the French armistice with Germany and Italy, obliges us to outline the situation and reexamine our attitude. We cannot fall into either of two errors: an underestimation of present-day realities in the name of principles, or a lapse from principles under pretext of present-day realities. We must defend our principles permanently, strongly. Our political line was and continues to be right. The problem consists of determining how we should and how we can maintain this line, while taking account of the new historic situation. I submit for your consideration the following hastily drafted ideas.

WHY THE FRENCH DEFEAT?

Upon my arrival in New York, I gave a report on the situation in France and the spirit of the French people in the face of war. The mass of the French people did not want the war and did not support it. They had no war morale. Let us explain the reasons for this. The French people knew that Versailles was an historical injustice dictated by the rapacious spirit of the Anglo-French imperialists. They knew that the Anglo-French imperialists had contributed their utmost to the stifling of the German revolution and were the main culprits for the rise of Hitlerism to victory, having supported its counter-revolutionary policy and mass rearmament. In 1936, the French people had great illusions about the People's Front, but the latter led to complete failure. All the gains won in 1936 were taken away in the following years. Little by little, the most reactionary

and unpopular men regained power. The People's Front was a tremendous political swindle. It deceived and demoralized the French proletariat. The latter placed its hopes for a moment in the revolutionary Spanish proletariat. But this heroic proletariat was defeated, even more by Anglo-French "non-intervention" and the criminal policy of Stalin than by the intervention of Hitler and Mussolini. Following came the capitulation of Austria and Czechoslovakia.

The Anglo-French imperialists thus did everything to help Hitler. This policy made the war inevitable. Stalin, who for a long time had been playing the game of war, contributed to the outbreak of the war by his pact with Hitler. This was the last stunning blow on the head of the French proletariat. The Socialist Party and the C.G.T. hastened to support a policy of national defense and Sacred Union. The proletariat lost practically all its faith in the workers parties which had continually betrayed it. It was dragged by force into this most unpopular of wars. The idea of Fatherland and Nation played a progressive role in the epoch of bourgeois revolutions; in our epoch, this conception serves only to mask the appetites of the imperialists. The war of 1914-18, furthermore, destroyed all its value for the masses. These were the main factors which accounted for the lack of war morale on the part of the French people.

In addition to the great political errors committed by the French bourgeoisie, there were great military errors. The Spanish people resisted for thirty-two months, and were defeated by internal treachery even more than by the superiority of enemy arms. The French army collapsed in a week. There is a great difference between the resources of Franco and those thrown by Hitler into the Battle of France. But there is also a great difference between the means that were at the disposal of the Spanish people and those of

France and England. Must we conclude that the French people do not possess the qualities of courage and heroism of the Spanish people? Not at all! The French people has, during the course of its history, given proof of courage similar to that of the Spanish. It will give more such proof, but in a revolutionary war, not in an imperialist war.

We have witnessed the collapse of the French regime. What will remain of it? Not much, of course. All French political parties, socialist and communist included, will be held responsible for the disaster. They will be unable to escape their responsibility. The capitulation of France, as it has taken place, creates an extraordinarily curious and interesting situation. The war continues. England does not recognize the capitulation of the Bordeaux government. She will do everything to erect a French movement favorable to the continuation of the war, possibly a new government as opposed to the capitulatory government. She can probably count on the French army in the Near East and a large part of the French fleet. The United States will surely support her in this regard.

This situation will disrupt French national unity, the discipline of the French state, of the army and the navy. . . . Such a situation opens a revolutionary crisis of the first order, enormous revolutionary possibilities for the French proletariat. And not only for the French proletariat, but for the colonial peoples oppressed to this very day by French imperialism. What will they do? Will they be resigned to passing under the yoke of German, Italian and Japanese imperialism? It is hardly likely. The collapse of the French regime opens tremendous revolutionary perspectives not only in France but in the French colonies.

THE DILEMMA: WAR OR PEACE

We cannot pose the problem of war or peace from the point of

view of principle. We know that as long as the capitalist system exists, no peace, or at least no durable peace, is possible. Our pacifism is revolutionary. The only possible peace is a socialist peace, and this can be attained only by the revolutionary destruction of capitalism. The problem which we must pose today is this: What tactic is possible to bring us closer to this goal? By peace, there can today be understood only the peace imposed by Hitler and Mussolini, the peace which glorifies their victory and places under their control not only Europe but the maritime routes and colonial markets. The European proletariat would fall into conditions of slavery and exploitation similar to that of the German and Italian proletariat. The proletariat can, therefore, neither desire nor support such a peace which would seal its fate of slavery and postpone the hour of its revolutionary emancipation. For we cannot fool ourselves—a victorious Hitler, Mussolini and Franco would render a revolutionary victory of the French proletariat practically impossible. They would play a role a thousand times more counter-revolutionary than that played by Poincaré towards the German revolution of 1919 and 1923. We must, furthermore, ask ourselves this question: Are the German and Italian working classes in a position to help the French proletariat and to conduct a revolutionary struggle against the Hitler and Mussolini regimes? Today, it would be madness to think so. On the other hand, six months or a year more of war would undoubtedly weaken these regimes, despite past victories, and would place the Italo-German proletariat in a position to initiate their own revolution, coincident with the revolutionary struggle in France and in the colonies. We must condemn with all our strength the peace dictated by Hitler and Mussolini, and we must call on the French, the German, the Italian proletarians—as well as the international proletariat—to fight against the conditions of such a peace.

We must not, from near or far, solidarize ourselves with British imperialism and with the war it is conducting against German-Italian imperialism. This imperialist war, today like yesterday, is not our war. But, in the present situation, we must not systematically oppose its continuation. Nor can we oppose the shipment of war material from America to England. Everything which will contribute to the work-

(Continued on Page 4)

Workers Age

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

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

WILL HERBERG, Editor

Vol. 9. SATURDAY, JULY 20, 1940. No. 28.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLEDGE

PRESIDENT Roosevelt has now repeated in explicit form his pledge that "we will not send our men to take part in European wars."

Exactly what is this pledge worth? We are not questioning Mr. Roosevelt's personal sincerity, which, of course, is taken for granted. But it should not be forgotten that Woodrow Wilson, one of the most sincere of men, made his reelection campaign in 1916 on the slogan, "He kept us out of war." And less than a month after Mr. Wilson had been inaugurated in 1917, the United States was in the World War!

The question is: Can the President's pledge stand the strain of the logic of his own foreign policy? The President's foreign policy is openly interventionist. As a result of his foreign policy, we are now already unofficially in the war, and apparently on the very verge of getting in officially. If the President does get us into the war officially—and he does NOT pledge that he will keep us out of war, only that he will send no expeditionary force abroad—will he or any one else be able to restrict our participation in the war within the limits of any previous pledge, no matter how sincerely made? Of course not! If we're in the war, we're in to win, and if the navy and air force are not enough to win, men will have to go, pledge or no pledge. That's as clear as daylight.

In fact, therefore, the President's pledge means nothing at all unless it is coupled with a pledge to keep us out of war in every way. This pledge Mr. Roosevelt will not give and cannot give because it runs directly counter to his own foreign policy since the end of 1937.

LEARNING FROM FRANCE

WHAT was responsible for the astounding collapse of France? The spokesmen of reaction in this country are doing everything in their power to create the impression that the debacle was due to the "excessive" demands of the French masses for social and economic reform, which allegedly prevented France from arming itself adequately against the German menace. It was the forty-hour week and paid vacations—the big-business propagandists tell us—that led France to ruin. And the moral obviously is: Let us "learn from France" and avoid making the same "mistakes" here.

But this version of the French collapse is nothing but a fraud deliberately perpetrated on the American people. There is no evidence whatsoever that such meager reforms as were won by the workers in 1936 weakened France in any way; the exact opposite is the case. If anything, it was the systematic undermining and destruction of these reforms in the two years preceding the outbreak of the war that demoralized the French masses and created discouragement and apathy everywhere. It was the reactionary drive to wipe out the social achievements of June 1936 that prepared the way for Hitler's triumph.

In the July 3, 1940 issue of the New York Post, there is a very significant article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer on the French debacle, significant not only for an understanding of what happened in France but also for an insight into the problem that faces this country today.

"The entire [French] nation, with but few exceptions," writes Mr. Mowrer, "was reluctant to fight the present war."

Mr. Mowrer does not make any serious attempt to account for this "reluctance" among the masses of the people. But the question can be answered. To the masses of the French people, it naturally appeared that they were being called upon to fight to preserve an existing system, a status-quo, in which they had neither faith nor abiding interest. They were inspired with no dynamism, with no forward drive. The French tragedy proves once again that, under present-day conditions, a defense that is simply defense of the status-quo is futile and self-defeating; it can never acquire that spirit and drive that alone can meet the challenge of totalitarianism. The French masses were kept chained to the status-quo by their own leaders, working hand in glove with the representatives of the ruling class. Worse than that; even the status-quo was being rendered more and more repugnant to the masses by the reactionary drive against the social achievements of June 1936, while as soon as war broke out a ruthless dictatorship was established that seemed designed for nothing so much as to suppress popular freedom and to perpetuate gross abuses. Hardly a situation to inspire a fighting morale!

Even more decisive were the political and moral developments in the upper layers of French society that produced a defeatism of unbelievable proportions. Here Mr. Mowrer's account is particularly illuminating:

"Finally, it must be said that certain richer Frenchmen . . . feared a victory in this war almost more than defeat, as likelier to bring 'revolution', an elastic but fear-inspiring term, that in their mind meant anything from paid vacations for employees to tumbrils and the guillotine for the rich . . . [It] actually reached the point where one heard a preference for 'Hitler in Paris rather than Leon Blum in the premier's office' . . . Reserve officers, nourished intellectually on such ideas, could hardly be enthusiastic [in carrying on the war]. This correspondent was often surprised at officers outspoken hatred of French democratic institutions."

Mr. Mowrer's observations completely bear out the point we made recently in these columns in explaining the French collapse: "There is every reason to trace the disasters of France to the fact that the upper layers of French society were literally honeycombed with defeatism. . . . These people, who had the fate of France in their hands, were themselves too thoroughly permeated with the fascist spirit, too closely identified with the dark forces of fascism at home, either to desire or to be able to fight against it when it confronted them as a foreign invader . . . In their eyes, a reactionary France that was merely a satellite in the German constellation was immensely preferable to a great, strong and independent France that was radical, revolutionary or socialist. To keep France safe for the entrenched interests of big property was their first and only consideration: for the sake of that, . . . they betrayed their own country to Hitler and Mussolini, whether they were conscious of such betrayal or not. So thoroughly rotten had these ruling groups become that they were no longer capable even of national defense. After the first serious setbacks, they rushed headlong to capitulation" (Workers Age, July 6, 1940).

This is the real "lesson from France"!

ALL AID TO REFUGEES!

HERE is one way we can do a worth-while piece of humanitarian work and legitimately aid the Allies, both at the same time, and yet not yield an inch on the road to war. That is by our government assuming responsibility for some part of the vast number of children, as well as women and old people, now leading a precarious existence in beleaguered England and greatly adding to the difficulties of the British war effort. Ordinary humanity demands that we take prompt action to help them out of their desperate plight. Let all quota and other immigration restrictions be suspended for the duration of the emergency; let the federal government appropriate a sum of money sufficient to house and care for these refugees once they are brought here thru agreement with the British authorities. Useful work can be found for some of those who seek shelter here, and the burden will certainly not be more than we should be willing to bear. Private assistance can do a great deal, but government action is absolutely necessary.

Why doesn't the President do something? Recently, Oswald Garrison Villard called on Mr. Roosevelt to convene a pan-American conference on the resettlement of refugees in the new world. That might be a fruitful approach to the problem. But clearly something ought to be done about it and done without delay.

Socialist Policy on the War:

What Kind of War Is This!

By D. BENJAMIN

(This is the first of a series of discussion articles by D. Benjamin. As discussion articles, they are an expression of the views of the writer himself and do not necessarily represent those of this paper or the I.L.L.A.—Editor.)

THE present European war and its recent developments pose many important and difficult problems to the working class. Upon the approach taken depends not only the solution of the specific problems but the very future of the working class and of mankind.

IS THE BRITISH WAR PROGRESSIVE?

Basic to a sound approach is the necessity of a correct evaluation of the present war in Europe. Is the war of imperialist England against Nazi Germany and fascist Italy a progressive war, one in the interest of mankind and its future, or is it an imperialist total war taking place under conditions of an imperialist, reactionary, super-brutalized, desperate, decadent capitalism, moving rapidly towards totalitarianism on a world-wide scale? If it is the former, England should be supported by labor and all progressive forces. This, under such circumstances, might include not only all "aid short of war", but all aid, including war, by the U.S.A. on the side of England. If, however, the present war is essentially a reactionary war on both sides, then labor must find a third, independent position by means of which it tackles the problems posed by the war and seeks to advance the interests of progress and humanity.

It is my contention that the present war is a reactionary and imperialist war on both sides. Few will quarrel with that characterization, when applied to the imperialist block of Nazi Germany and fascist Italy. And that is as it should be. Hitlerism—the destroyer of the German labor movement; the persecutor of the Jews; the enslaver of the German people; the despoiler of whatever independence small nations have had, turning the non-Germanic peoples into helots; the perverter of science, art, culture; the assassin of free inquiry, the critical spirit and the democratic method—must be overthrown and destroyed. The defeat of Hitlerism is not sufficient; its destruction must be sought. The menace of its spread thruout the world makes it an immediate enemy of the masses in all lands.

However, we must not forget that Hitlerism represents the resurgence of German capitalism and imperialism under conditions of the Versailles and post-Versailles world. German capitalism felt it could realize its reactionary imperialist ends only thru the institution of a totalitarian regime. The essential aims of Nazism were to smash the German labor movement, consolidate completely the power of German capitalism, and prepare with the maximum speed and efficiency for the next war where German imperialism once more would attempt to establish its hegemony, as was its purpose in 1914-1918. The fundamental imperialist character of its role cannot be doubted because it thinks, speaks and acts in terms of political and economic control of Europe, the smashing of its main enemy, British imperialism, the securing of colonies, sources of raw materials and markets, and so weakening its rivals in a military and political sense that they should not be able to challenge it in the future, as it was able to do two decades after the first World War.

ENGLISH WAR ALSO IMPERIALISTIC

However, it is also necessary to understand that the war on the part of the British government is just as imperialistic as that of the German government, that it is a case of possessor versus aggressor. And certainly to the exploited working class and to the oppressed colonial people, the fact that Britain is a possessor of imperialist power rather than the one seeking possession does not and should not make it more palatable. The African peoples and the Indian masses wish neither of the two robber bands. And as to brutality of regime, the Negroes of Africa were taught the concentration camp, the pariah and helot status, the crime of dissidence and disagreement, even before the German and neighboring peoples were given that lesson by the Nazi regime.

What must be absolutely clear is that the British ruling class has no quarrel with Hitlerism; what it is resisting is the challenge to its imperialist dominance that Hitler Germany represents. Had Hitler moved eastward rather than westward, had the Nazis declared war against Russia rather than against Britain and France, the British ruling class would have cooperated with Hitler—yes, hailed him as the champion and liberator of mankind. The fact of the matter is that it was the definite strategy of the British ruling class to get Nazi Germany involved in a war against Russia. That was its chief objective at Munich. In that way, the British ruling class hoped to kill two birds with one stone—dispose of the Russian "Red" imperialist rival, Hitler Germany. The British ruling class was playing, and it is now, dirty imperialist and power politics. The lives of millions that would be killed in a war, the unimagined wholesale misery that

would result from war, meant nothing to it, if the net result was to be the maintenance of its imperialist system and hegemony.

Nor should we forget that the same characterization must be made of the Churchills, Lloyd Georges, Edens, Duff Coopers, as is made of the Chamberlains, Hoares, Simons, and Wilsons, for there was a difference in policy among them as to how British imperialist objectives could best be furthered. The same game of power politics for imperialist ends dominated one group as the other. One felt that the Russian menace should be dealt with first and then that of challenging German imperialism; the other felt that the Nazi imperialist aggression was more immediate and challenging and that Russia could be dealt with later. A labor movement working independently could try to utilize such differences, but could never base its fundamental line of action or its main dependence upon that factor.

The crux of the matter is that the British ruling class, exemplified at the present time by the Churchills, Edens, Coopers, Lloyds and Amerys and by the Chamberlains, Hoares, Halifaxes and Simons, are not fighting Hitlerism and Nazism, but, as agents of British imperialism, they are resisting the challenge of German imperialism. The British ruling class as such cannot fight and do not wish to fight Nazism as a system. However, they will fight, as they are doing, for its imperialist life and rule.

CHURCHILL'S RECORD

These are not abstract statements nor figments of the imagination. Must we forget the 1927 statement of Churchill after visiting Italy:

"If I had been an Italian, I am sure that I would have been wholeheartedly with you (the fascists) from start to finish in your triumphant struggle against the bestial ap-

petites and passions of Leninism.

"I will say a word on an international aspect of fascism. Externally, your movement has rendered a service to the whole world. She (Italy) has provided the necessary antidote to the Russian poison. Hereafter, no great nation will be unperturbed with an ultimate means of protection against cancerous growths."

But it might be said: "That was in 1927, that was before Hitler came to power; that was the period of castor oil, but not the period of concentration camps and Nuremberg decrees. After all, Churchill may have changed his mind. Let us do learn you know." Well, then, let us listen to Churchill on November 11, 1938, over five years after Hitler came to power.

"I have always said that if Great Britain were defeated in war, I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among the nations."

Not only is Churchill not opposed to Nazism and fascism; he actually praises them, holds them up as examples to be followed, and states frankly that if British capitalism is ever placed in the same position that German capitalism was in after 1918, or that confronted Italian capitalism in 1920, he would call for a course of action similar to that pursued by Hitler and Mussolini. Is it not clear that Churchill is not fighting Hitlerism, and that he is incapable of making such a fight? Rather that he is prepared to travel, if he is not actually doing so now, the road towards totalitarianism! Is it not clear that Churchill is fighting for British imperialism against German imperialism, and not for democracy against fascism, nor for civilization against modern savagery?

(The second in this series of discussion articles by D. Benjamin will appear in the next issue of this paper—Editor)

Fascist State Is Set Up to Rule France

Laval Clique Heads German-Ruled Regime

(Continued from Page 1)

named by Marshal Petain, after the resignation of President Lebrun, these three men hold the important posts of vice-premier, minister of defense and minister of the interior respectively.

But even this regime is probably more or less temporary. Violent attacks in the controlled German and Italian press, angrily berating it for its "weakness" in permitting as many as 80 deputies out of 660 to cast negative votes in the National Assembly, foreshadowed a very short life for the Petain government. A new regime, "stronger" and more serviceable to Hitler, a regime headed directly by such notorious pro-German, pro-fascist capitalists as Laval, Plandin, Deat and Marquet, was believed to be in the offing.

Actual fighting during the last fortnight, the forty-fourth and forty-fifth weeks of the war, was primarily in the air and on the sea. German air attacks against Britain multiplied in number and fury, with the aim of cutting the island's deep-sea supply lines, reducing industrial production, aggravating the food situation, breaking down morale—in general, of "softening up" the population for possible attempts at invasion. The British answered not only by beating back these assaults at heavy loss to the Germans, but also with vigorous counter-attacks on important points in Germany and German-occupied territory. The war between Italy and Africa came more prominently to the foreground.

By a series of sensational moves, the British navy took over control of French war ships in British ports on the ground that these ships would otherwise certainly be turned over to the Germans. By the end of the week, the major part of the French fleet either had joined the British, had been bottled up in British-held ports, or had been destroyed. With this British action as a pretext, the Petain government broke off relations with Britain, and virtually joined Hitler against France's former ally.

Rumors of Anglo-French "peace" talks died down somewhat last week but in England a powerful movement, with labor as the driving force, was initiated to oust from positions of power those who had been associated with the Chamberlain "appeasement" policy—above all, the former prime minister himself.—in the interests of an effective struggle against Hitler. The National Union of Railwaymen and the South Wales Miners Union adopted resolutions to that effect in conferences held recently. The official leadership of the British Labor Party, however, falling in with Churchill's "conciliatory" attitude, did what it could to stifle the movement, ever to the point of expelling certain trade-union leaders particularly prominent in the anti-Chamberlain drive.

In the diplomatic situation, Russia's position remained equivocal. On the one hand, Moscow declared in a formal statement that its moves in the Balkans were aimed not against Germany but "against plans

of the Anglo-French war-mongers." On the other hand, however, it was clear that the Berlin-Moscow Axis was under the greatest strain. The Russian drive in south-eastern Europe appeared by no means completed. Moves against Turkey and Iran (Persia) were believed to be imminent, with control of the Dardanelles as an immediate objective of Russian policy. Complete absorption of the Russian-controlled Balkan states into the U.S.S.R. was also expected very soon.

Anglo-Japanese diplomatic relations appeared to be on the mend last week as the British bowed to the Japanese demand to close the Burma road—one of the supply routes of the Chinese government—to certain categories of traffic for three months. But relations between Japan and the United States took a sudden turn for the worse, as was reflected in the excitement in Japanese quarters over an "incident" resulting from the arrest of sixteen Japanese gendarmes in the American defense sector of Shanghai.

President Roosevelt pressed forward with his super-arms drive last week and asked Congress for an additional sum of nearly five billion dollars. He also announced his decision, subject to Congressional approval, to call up four divisions of the National Guard and other anti-aircraft and harbor-defense units for a period of service.

Some Questions On Our Policy On the War

(Continued from Page 3)

backward prejudices of humanity and which has taken away from the workers what limited rights they had wrested from the capitalists.

However, it cannot be denied that this great contradiction, which was formerly suppressed chiefly by forceful means, is, at the moment, being combated by ideological means as well, making the task of socialist doubly difficult. In plain words, at the moment, and also in complete victory for Hitler, a socialist revolution in Germany is impossible. I am informed that most German socialist agree on the necessity of a military defeat of Germany.

Immediately, the question comes up: Why not support the Allies and urge that America enter the war? Again, I ask you to look at our basic concern. Will America's entry on the side of the Allies help socialist: either here or in Europe? Again the answer is no. An Allied victory in Europe with the help of American troops and American equipment would ensure a totalitarian victory of an Anglo-American variety enforced by the American army. Therefore, I say unequivocally: Keep America out of war. Send no troops or arms to Europe. But definitely, it would be better for Britain to defeat Hitler and leave the working class a breathing spell to try and rally its forces for socialism.

What of England? I believe the slogan of revolutionary defeatism

Socialism Can Develop the Drive to Defeat Nazism!

(This declaration is from the June 13, 1940 issue of the New Leader, official publication of the British Independent Labor Party.—Editor.)

TO defeat Nazism we must have the moral enthusiasm which comes from its opposite—social justice and freedom.

Social inequality, poverty and luxury side by side, is always a crime. In war-time, it is an infamy not to be tolerated.

The I.L.P. demands that a National Standard of Life shall be established, sharing what is available among all soldiers and civilians alike. Luxury incomes should be confiscated. Wealth should be conscripted.

At the same time, freedom should be extended to all peoples now living under British rule. The right of India and the colonial populations to independence should be recognized. The economic exploitation from which they suffer should be ended.

If Britain did these things, Nazi propaganda against "British imperialism" and "British plutocratic capitalism" would lose all its force.

Knowledge of our social and political transformation could not be withheld from the German people. Broadcasts could penetrate every attempt of Hitler to hide it.

The next step would be to convince the German people that we stood for a peace based on the same principles of equality and freedom.

We should declare for a peace of national liberty for all peoples, of international cooperation and of the socialist distribution of the world's resources according to the world's needs.

By broadcast and leaflet distribution, the knowledge of the peace we desired would be taken to the German people.

This would undermine Hitler's authority. It would encourage the German people to revolt. It would be the beginning of the end of Nazism.

A capitalist-imperialist government in Britain will not adopt this policy. We must demand and work for a socialist government with the courage to do it.

In working for social equality in Britain and political freedom in the British Empire, we are not only working for justice and liberty for ourselves and our colonial brothers.

We are doing the most effective thing to undermine Hitlerism and to end Nazism.

We Must Reexamine Our Position on War

Hitler Victory Greatest Menace to Labor

(Continued from Page 3)

ing of the power of Hitler and Mussolini and to the liquidation of the material conditions and the moral effect of their victory is progressive, revolutionary. This, of course, does not represent a betrayal of our principles and of our political line, which we must maintain with the greatest firmness. We must continue to uphold the principle that for each proletariat the main enemy is its own bourgeoisie, the one it must conquer in the day of revolution if it is to achieve liberty. We must continue to advocate that only international proletarian solidarity will be capable of destroying fascism and imperialism and imposing a socialist peace. More than ever must we pose the question: Socialism or fascism? The continuation of the capitalist system after the war is possible only under the form of fascism. Bourgeois democracy has had its day everywhere, despite the hollow phrases of the Roosevelts and the Churchills. There is no other solution for humanity than socialism.

THE ATTITUDE OF STALIN

Everything points to Stalin's preparation of a new turn in his foreign policy. The Finnish experience has forced him to reflect on the situation. Italy's entrance into the war created the danger of the war spreading to the Balkans. Stalin exerted pressure on Turkey to prevent the latter's entering and signing the trade pact with Germany, at the same time that Germany put pressure on Mussolini to prevent his carrying the war to the Balkans, so as not to precipitate the Stalin turn while he (Hitler) was occupied on the western front. Stalin wants to avoid war at his frontiers at all costs. Today, he clearly feels the danger to him of a lightning victory for Hitler and Mussolini. That is not what he had counted on or desired. A Hitler, victorious and master of Norway and Sweden, would threaten Russia's positions on the Baltic; master, along with Mussolini, of the Mediterranean and the Balkan countries, he would threaten Russia's positions in the Black Sea. The threat of Japan would then be still greater. Stalin would then be at the mercy of these totalitarian countries, and above all of Hitler, master of Europe and always dreaming of the Ukraine and the magnificent Russian market. Stalin therefore has no interest in a lightning victory for Hitler. He is taking precautions, making preparations in the Baltic countries under his dictatorship so that they should not fall into the orbit of a victorious Germany. At the same time, he negotiates with

Churchill. Of course, he still does not want to lay open his cards completely, because that might become too dangerous. He prepares and he waits. He waits for the continuation of the war and the resistance of England, with the aid of the U.S.A., contributing to the weakness of Hitler. He will not "betray" Hitler completely until the time when he sees Hitler practically lost.

WILL AMERICA ENTER THE WAR?

Official opinion in the U.S.A. seemed to be that the U.S.A. would enter the war directly on the side of England and France. The capitulation of France caused Washington to reflect. American imperialism is no doubt ready to give all possible aid to England in her war against Hitler. But will it be ready to enter the war directly? That will depend on the development of events. For the moment, the United States intensifies its armament, makes tremendous military preparations. All of these armaments will undoubtedly not be used in the present war. American imperialism understands that it will have to wage a great struggle tomorrow if Hitler and Mussolini are victorious in Europe and Japan continues her expansion in the Far East and, under pretext of preserving order, puts her hand on certain French colonies. It is very possible that the United States will not directly intervene in the present European conflict. But there is no doubt that in case of a Hitler victory, the U.S.A. would prepare for a future war. It would be absurd to believe that all these military preparations have only a defensive aim when we know that the U.S.A. feels its imperialist future and its whole economic system threatened.

ROLE OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND STALINISM

The collapse of the French regime is a terrible blow for French social-democracy. The latter will not easily rise again. But in a given situation, similar to the German situation of 1918-23, it can still play a fatal role. But much more dangerous than social-democracy undoubtedly is Stalinism. The French Communist Party is again taking up an ultra-demagogic line. It demands the placing of responsibility for the disaster, denounces and accuses everyone. The German Communist Party solidarizes itself with the French and British proletariat! If Stalin makes a new turn tomorrow, there is no doubt that the Comintern will still be in a position to play a certain role. Not for a single instant must we forget this danger, this counter-revolutionary menace.

ALL OUR AID TO THE P.S.O.P.

In the present situation in France and in the world, with revolutionary perspectives opening in France, we must give the greatest attention to our French party, the P.S.O.P. The revolutionary way out depends to a great extent on the P.S.O.P., on its political position, its development. Circumstances are truly favorable for its ideological clarification, for a platform of struggle, for its numerical growth. But we must aid it with all our strength. Our French militant socialists must have the means of publishing a permanent political literature, of making their position known, of telling the French proletariat that the P.S.O.P. is the only party which has not betrayed it, and which is free from responsibility for the disaster. We must make tremendous efforts in this direction. It is our primary task today.

has no meaning there any more than in France. I do not know exactly what socialists in England are doing, but in line with this article it would seem that revolutionary defense (if we must have a slogan) should be the order of the day. By that I mean a program which would include the following: a demand that a socialist peace be offered to the workers of the world; that self-termination of the colonies, notably India, be granted; that this was the only basis on which an invasion of Britain could be successfully stopped. And finally, a refusal to support war credits except on the basis of this program. I am in no position to know if there is any way of advocating this in Britain openly. I am hopeful, however, that the realism characteristic of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain at various critical times in the past will stand it in good stead now.