

WORKERS AGE

A Paper Defending the Interests of the Workers and Farmers

VOL. 3, No. 20

NEW YORK, N. Y., NOVEMBER 15, 1934.

PRICE 5 CENTS

New Right Cabinet Now Rules in France

With the fall of the Doumergue Government in France, the situation in the country has become more tense. For the moment Flandin has been able to set up another "true" cabinet. The resistance of the great mass of French petty bourgeoisie, rallying under the banner of the Radical Socialist Party, headed by Herriot, has so far been able to check the frontal attempts of the extreme right wing forces, the ultra-reactionary faction of the French capitalist class, to further weaken the parliamentary structure.

The Flandin Government will, in substance, pursue a political course constantly but cautiously rightward. While appearing to avoid some of the crude steps taken by Doumergue in preparing the ground for Fascism, Premier Flandin will undoubtedly try to show a strong hand against the workers. In his first speech to the Chamber of Deputies the Premier gave a pledge to bar dictatorship. At the same time he warned that "the Republican State will not capitulate to factions." Enraged by the splendid anti-war demonstration organized by the united front of the Communist and Socialist Parties on Armistice Day, he declared he would prevent all demonstrations and suppress the carrying of arms. Having ridden into office on the basis of opposition to Doumergue's anti-parliamentary tendencies, the new Premier hastened to serve notice on Parliament that he would dissolve it immediately if it would do anything to break or disturb the political truce.

The economic situation in France continues to worsen. The official unemployment figures have reached a height untouched even during the immediate post-war period. On October 20 the government was compelled to admit that there were approximately 340,000 officially registered as unemployed in France, in comparison with about 230,000 in the corresponding period of last year. The total capital issued continued to dwindle constantly. The fading confidence in French economic stability is particularly indicated by the fact that in September the total of issued capital was only 134 million francs in comparison with 593 million francs in the same month of 1933. This is the worst in many years.

The rapidly developing and in-

THANKSGIVING

DANCE AND
ENTERTAINMENT

Thanksgiving Eve
November 28

IRVING PLAZA

Irving Place & 16th Street

Admission 35c

Auspices: Down Town Unit
Communist Opposition

Mooney Appeal In Supreme Court

Once again a faint gleam lights the cell of San Quentin prison where Tom Mooney has spent eighteen years as a human sacrifice to the gods of wealth.

The United States Supreme Court has issued a writ asking that California show cause why the court should not review the Mooney case.

Freedom for America's most famous class war prisoner would be more than a generous gesture of a capitalist court. Despite mistakes, factional squabbles, misguided propaganda, it is the American workers who have kept the Mooney case in the forefront, who have made a stirring battle cry of "Free Tom Mooney!" To the workers was the battle and to them will be the victory.

Imperialist Intrigue Grips London Naval Confab

It has been a long time since an international conference has so clearly evidenced the unbridgeable chasm among the leading imperialist powers as does the present informal, preliminary naval conference in London. The American, British, and Japanese imperialist naval experts, representing three of the most powerful capitalist robber groups in the world, appear hopelessly at loggerheads. On the surface it would seem that they are quarrelling over the continuation of the 5-5-3 naval ratio agreed upon at the Washington Conference in 1922. Serious as the dispute over these figures may be, there is much more involved in the discussion. The intrigue sur-

rounding these confabs simultaneously tends to hide and emphasize the basic conflict of interests.

Japanese imperialism is seeking to secure a navy of world dimensions in order to enhance its prestige on the Asiatic mainland and to fortify its position, particularly in China, at the expense of other imperialist groups, and of course, against the Chinese people.

British imperialism is striving to maneuver the United States into a position in which there will be an open, violent conflict between American and Japanese interests. In this conflict Lombard Street hopes to play the role of the "benevolent neutral" with all the benevolence in the interest of the Bank of England and all the "neutrality" at the expense of Wall Street. In other words, John Bull is manipulating so that he can play the role that Uncle Shylock played in the last war.

The United States imperialists have their ears to the ground and their noses very sensitive to all the intrigue being woven about them. Wall Street spokesmen in this conference sense the danger; they fear a deal will be made behind their backs between Japan and the British; they are striving to underscore the conflict over markets between Japan and Britain; they are especially afraid of some concessions being made by Japan to British heavy industry as indicated in the forty million dollar deal reported to have been concluded by the Federation of British Industries with the Manchukuo blotter government. How worried Uncle Sam's diplomats are can be gauged by the fact that they are having their press agents lay down repeated gas barrages about the horrible consequences which would flow out of a rupture of friendly relations between "the two great English-speaking nations," the Anglo-Saxon peoples,—the "Chosen People of the Twentieth Century."

Within the imperialist triangle now in commotion in London there are to be found the most explosive contradictions and the most poisonous infections plaguing international capitalism. At this writing it appears almost certain that the three ends of the triangle will agree to disagree, will agree to stay apart. It is precisely in the soil of such "agreement" and in the atmosphere of such disagreement that the germs of imperialist war flourish.

Steel Workers, On Guard!

In the October 15 issue of Workers Age, we wrote: "We learn on excellent authority, that a number of secret conferences have been held with the aim of splitting the Amalgamated Association and setting up a new industrial union."

Not a word of denial has come from the TUUI, which is behind this move. Our information has been again substantiated thru further information received by us.

Steel Workers: Do not be misled into the blind alley of dual unionism. Your hatred against the bankrupt Tighe leadership of your union is more than justified but the road of splits and secession is not the road of struggle against the bureaucrats in your union but rather assists the leaders to strengthen their strangle hold over the membership because of the withdrawal of the militant and fighting workers.

Steel Workers: Dual unionism and secession is to be condemned in any industry because it hurts the economic struggles of the workers. More so it is true in the steel industry—an industry of giant trusts—where the greatest unity of the workers is required and where the greatest possible support from the entire trade union movement is necessary

to achieve victory. Dual unionism will isolate you and will doom your struggles for economic improvements to miserable failure.

Steel Workers: Dual unionism in the mine fields and other industries has led to bitter, bloody war among the workers, to the great glee of the employers. Do you want this condition in the steel towns?

Steel Workers: At a time when the A. F. of L. has gone on record for the organization of the mass production industries and has pledged its full organizational and financial resources to the organization of the steel industry, is it the sheerest kind of criminal stupidity to weaken your ranks thru splitting your union.

Steel Workers: Company unionism has grown by leaps and bounds in the steel mills. Splits and secession weaken your union and strengthen the company unions of the steel barons.

Steel Workers: Stand by your union! Fight inside your union for rank and file leadership and militant policies. He who proposes to you secession and dual unionism, whatever his intentions, is your enemy. Turn your back upon him. Your hope and salvation in the struggle against the arrogant steel barons lies in the unity and the strength of your union.

NRA Plots Destruction of Unions

by Saul Held

Trade Unions, Incorporated? Official Washington is agog with speculation over the revelations concerning Roosevelt's plan for the incorporation of the trade unions. How is the plan to be carried through? How will labor react? These are the questions that the Washington-wise are asking these days as the greatest anti-union offensive is getting under way in a carefully planned and bitterly determined fashion.

Smash Unionism! This command of Wall Street to Washington calls for a new strategy of attack, calls for the most vigorous action to destroy the very basis of American trade unionism.

Unable to stem the rising tide of unionism by arbitration boards, by study commissions, by promises or bullets, there has now been prepared in Washington the most insidious method whereby the Roosevelt Administration hopes to strangle the growing giant of American Labor. The New Deal's latest and most dangerous attack on the trade unions—its most carefully planned move on the labor front—

is the plan to incorporate the trade unions. To transform the economic organizations of the workers into object slaves of the courts lies at the very essence of the plan. Coming weeks shall see the Government pressing toward this objective along the following lines, the Workers Age has been reliably informed. In an alleged drive to rid the unions of gangsterism and racketeering it will strive to make the unions subservient to the courts. Should the Administration succeed in its battering toward this goal, the Courts will have the power of placing the unions in receivership thus not only taking control of the union apparatus but also of its funds.

Court control means that in strike situations and outside of such situation any petition of the employers against workers on grounds of "intimidation" and "coercion" the courts may step in and throttle either strike action or even contemplated action! And, has there ever been a strike where em-

ployers have not preferred such charges against the workers? Incorporation automatically grants the courts this despotic power! The recent cries of the trade associations, chambers of commerce, and all employers' organizations for the legal outlawing of strikes, were rocket flares in the darkness of night signalling the oncoming attack.

The semi-official literary expression of the New Dealers, "Today," fired the first gun in the great battle when in its November 3rd issue, it presented the conflicting viewpoints of Clinton L. Bardo, President, National Association of Manufacturers and William Green, President, American Federation of Labor. Mr. Bardo, who speaks "For the employers, as a class," states the employers', and Administration's, case in unequivocal language:

"Social safety demands that there shall be no exercise of power without corresponding legal responsibility for its use. Every combined action of em-

(Continued on Page 2)

Unemployed! DEMONSTRATE AT UNION SQUARE
Sat. Nov. 24, 10 A. M. (See Page 2)

THEATRE BENEFIT

for the
Weekly Workers Age

"Sailors of Cattaro"

(pre-view performance)
Friday December 7th
CIVIC REPERTORY
14th St. & 6th Ave.

Prices: 30c, 45c, 60c, 75c,
\$1.00 and \$1.50

Secure Your Tickets Now From
WORKERS AGE
51 West 14th Street
New York City

NRA Plots Destruction Of Trade Unions

(Continued from Page 1)

ployers or employees should be equally controlled by public authority, legally answerable for its own conduct and equally subject to judicial remedy. The right and liberty to choose and pursue a lawful calling, free from molestation or coercion, concerns the happiness and security of all men. The right to remain at work which others have abandoned is identical with the right to quit.

Are the robber barons determined? Will they wage this battle to the last ditch? Mr. Bardo speaks on behalf of his class:

"Until Unionism in America is saddled with legal responsibility for its own acts . . . society can scarcely expect a return of mutual respect and confidence within industry which is so necessary for individual betterment and social progress." The mailed fist looms menacingly through the dignified rhetoric. The menace to unionism in this incorporation drive cannot be exaggerated, and we predict that, coming weeks will find this matter of paramount import to the unions.

The courts, the legal instruments of the employing class, have demonstrated throughout their existence that the unions can only expect deadly decisions from them, which strike at the very vitals. The Supreme Court of the United States has in past decisions laid down these principles, which have never been superceded by any later decisions. First, that "whatever may be the advantages of 'Collective bargaining' it is not bargaining at all, in any sense, unless it is voluntary on both sides. The same liberty which enables men to form unions, and through the union to enter into agreements with employers willing to agree, entitles other men to remain independent of the union and other employers to agree with them to employ no man who owes any allegiance or obligation to the union."

"This Court repeatedly has held that the employer is as free to make non-membership in a union a condition of employment, as the working man is free to join the union, and this is a part of the constitutional rights of personal liberty and private property."

Secondly, this decision which was handed down in 1917, contends that neither employer or employee organizations come under the jurisdiction of the courts in the eventuality of a disturbance of interstate commerce during a period of industrial strife.

This decision throws the following into the limelight bearing on the present situation. First, the Courts are against the closed shop therefore against unionism; secondly, federal intervention cannot be based on the charge of disturbance of inter-state commerce. The incorporation drive is therefore finding other legal bases.

Gompers And Green

William Green answers Mr. Bardo in the same issue of "Today" referred to above, but in rather weak-kneed and unimpressive fashion. "The American Federation of Labor" says Green, "never has favored, and does not now favor, the incorporation of its member

unions." Fine—so far. But why are the trade unions against incorporation? "Trade unions in no way resemble business enterprises. Trade unions do not engage in business for profits. . . . Therefore, 'Trade unions . . . have never considered, and do not now consider it necessary to incorporate, since they are not engaged in business.' Finally Mr. Green gets down to essentials: "But the proposal of the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce looks to compulsory incorporation for unions, with the purpose of establishing employer control over the conditions prescribed for incorporation."

"Is it not natural for Labor to suspect that this proposal may mean another move to hamper the wage earners' right to organize and bargain collectively, through representatives of their own choosing?"

To all of the above every worker can subscribe, but . . . Mr. Green is indulging in mere debate, which he conducts in such placid and gentlemanly manner, in the face of an oncoming attack on the trade unions unparalleled in its scope and destructive character. The Trade Unions face the menace of being obliterated as instruments of the workers, and Mr. Green, argues rhetorically at a time when he should be sounding the tocsin for battle! Mr. Green knows that the NRA is determined to subject unionism to the reign of the courts, to the reign of Big Business which controls the courts. Why not expose these plans, why not a stirring call of battle against these plans? But Mr. Green's attitude will not be that of the rank and file of the Federation once they are aroused to this menace.

Samuel Gompers, head of the A. F. of L., in the days before Green, when faced by a similar situation fought tenaciously. The testimony of Gompers before the Lockwood Committee on April 21 and 22, 1922, showed a keen realization of this menace, and this despite Gompers' philosophy of class collaboration. After discussing many practices of trade unions which, it was charged, result in injury to the workers themselves, Mr. Samuel Untermeyer, counsel for the Lockwood Committee asked:

"Mr. Untermeyer: Where they (the unions) do confessedly a wrong thing, an oppressive thing, a vicious thing to their own people, don't you think the law should step in and give redress?"

"Mr. Gompers: No sir.
"Mr. Untermeyer: . . . don't you think that the state should regulate that so that the courts would have the right of review over the expulsion of members?"

"Mr. Gompers: No sir.
"Mr. Untermeyer: You think the Labor Unions should be permitted to exercise this autocratic and despotic power of capital punishment without any say-so by the courts?"

"Mr. Gompers: GOD SAVE LABOR FROM THE COURTS."

Gompers then went on to explain the nature of the trade union movement. Labor, he said, is:

"An organization of a mass— masses of men and are likely to

make mistakes, likely to err. They have the right to err. They have the right to struggle for their protection and improvement."

"Mr. Untermeyer: If they err and make mistakes that injure the public and injure innocent third parties with whom they deal, is it your idea that there should be no relief for that?"

"Mr. Gompers: Not by law.
"Mr. U: Where should the remedy lie?
"Mr. G: The law should not provide a remedy.

"Mr. U: That means you would support no regulation whatever except by the unions that are committing the abuses?"

"Mr. Gompers: No.
"Mr. U: Where would there be any redress for those abuses that are being perpetrated?
"Mr. G: By the general labor movement.

Behind the Drive

What has brought this latest and most dangerous attack on the trade unions? The tidal wave of unionism has swamped the labor unions with the greatest membership in history; the recent strikes were titanic in character, paralyzing industries in some cases, and causing forth sympathy action; unionism sweeps into the open-shop mass production industries; the recent A. F. of L. convention takes forward steps toward industrial unionism and organization of the mass production industries; and all this, in an economic situation which even the New Dealers admit will continue to look black for a long time. Small wonder that Big Business is bestirring itself in great alarm, and plotting unionism's destruction.

The American employing class has for a long time attempted to legalize certain anti-labor provisions. Incorporation of the trade unions would basically accomplish this objective. It is not accidental that employers organizations have for a long time clamored for legislation identical to the provisions of the British Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Act of 1927. Incorporation is such legislation. The British Act contains the following provisions:

1. A strike or lock-out is illegal (and it is illegal to commence or support one) if (a) the object is other than in furtherance of a trade dispute (b) designed to coerce the Government directly or inflicting hardship on the community.

2. Civil employees cannot be unionized. Picketing is illegal if it is likely to intimidate workers or to cause disturbance. Penalties for violation are provided.

This is sufficient to show that never in all of America's history has labor confronted such a grave danger. Never has the need for militant unionism been so imperative. American labor will battle for its very life in the coming period. Sound the Alarm. Crush the viper of incorporation!

JOBLESS MOBILIZE FOR NOVEMBER 24

A call to action of the nation's unemployed has been issued by the National Action Committee for November 24th Demonstration. The affiliated organizations, with a membership of more than 750,000 unemployed and part-time workers, are as follows:

Wisconsin Federation of Workers Committee, National Unemployed League, Florida Federation of Unemployed Leagues, Eastern Federation of Unemployed and Emergency Workers, Dallas, Texas, Central Council of Workers, Minneapolis Central Council of Workers, Illinois Workers Alliance, American Workers Union, California Workers Association, Ft. Wayne, Indiana, Unemployed League, Unemployed Citizens League of Alleghany Co., Pa.

In the face of the deliberate failure of the Administration to pass legislation for this winter's relief of the unemployed, the demonstrative, organized, militant action of the unemployed, demands the passage of the Lundeen Workers Unemployment Insurance Bill; an extensive system of public works on a basis of \$30 for a 30-hour week, with the payment of skilled or union rates, where such rates are higher; pending the passage of unemployment insurance, direct cash relief, \$10 for single

persons, \$15 a week for a family of two, with \$4 for each additional person; the right of all workers on public works to organize and engage in collective bargaining; the thirty hour week with no reduction in pay; war funds to the unemployed; federal disability compensation on all public projects to and from work.

The committee urges the necessity for all unemployed to participate in this demonstration, pointing out that these demands can only be won by concerted action.

WORKERS AGE

Published twice monthly by the Workers Age Publishing Association

51 West 14th Street
New York City

Vol. 3 No. 20
November 15, 1934

Subscription Rates:
\$1.25 per year, 75c for six months.
Foreign Rates:
\$1.50 a year, \$1.00 for six months.

Application for second class entry at the post-office of New York, N. Y. pending.

What Next In The SOCIALIST PARTY?

— Hear —
GEORGE F. MILES
Editor Workers Age
Wednesday Nov. 21 - 8 P. M.

WORKMENS CIRCLE
LYCEUM
190 Belmont Ave.
NEWARK, N. J.

B
r
a
d
e
y
s

For
Breakfast
Lunch
Dinner
or a
Southern
Waffle
at
Midnite
Patronize
Bradley's
Cafeteria

6th Avenue
& 14th Street

Amkino Presents
WORLD PREMIERE
3 Songs About Lenin
I have rarely been more moved by any work of art . . .
WILLIAM C. BULLITT
... makes the Hollywood films seem pallid studio exercises . . .
HEALD TRIBUNE
C A M E O
42nd St. East of Broadway

What Next In The SOCIALIST PARTY?
— Hear —
GEORGE F. MILES
Editor Workers Age
Sunday Nov. 25 - 8 P. M.
WILKINS HALL
1330 Wilkins Avenue
BRONX, N. Y.

New Workers School FORUM
FALL SEASON 1934
Nov. 25, I. B. Matthews
Capitalism's Double-Barrelled Exploitation
Dec. 2, Dr. Haim Kantorovitch
A Socialist Estimate of Bolshevism
Dec. 9, Ludwig Lore
Hitler on Top of the World
Dec. 16, James Waterman Wise
Jesus Under the Soviet
Sun. Nights at 8 Admis. 15c
Questions and Discussion
RIVERA HALL,
NEW WORKERS SCHOOL
51 West 14th Street
(Near 6th Avenue)

4 & 5 Course
LUNCHEON 40 & 50c
6 Course
CHICKEN DINNER 60c
SPECIAL LUNCHEON 35c
SERVED ALL DAY
Spaghetti - Dessert - Coffee 35c
A La Carte All Day
GIUSTI'S
SPAGHETTI INN
WINE AND BEER SERVED
49 WEST 16th STREET
NEW YORK CITY

DELICIOUS FOOD?
GOOD SERVICE?
go to
Field's
RESTAURANT
523 Sixth Avenue
N. Y. C.

WORKERS GREET WEEKLY AGE

SYLVIA HASENBERG MILES HYMAN ROSENBLUM T. HASENBERG HARRY FRIEDMAN P. KUTT F. REEK A. NIGOL	PETER OOL P. HALLENEN F. OTSEN A. KOBEL H. LINN N. LINN D. KAPLAN H. WINKLER A. MOVING
--	--

GREETINGS TO THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WORKERS AGE

Progressive Dressmakers Greet the Workers Age.
A. Hirsch, H. Hinden, Jacob Goldstein, Abe Albert, Frank Ginsburg, H. Siegel, Harry Rabinowitz, Bennie Borin, M. Schneider, Yushlesky.

We want 1000 new Subs by 1935
A GIFT COPY OF LENIN'S "LEFT-WING" COMMUNISM awaits each new subscriber to the New Weekly Age
\$1.50 a year 85 cents for 6 months
WORKERS AGE
51 West 14th Street
New York City
Please enter my sub to the Weekly Age for.....
Name
Address
City State

Another American Centrist Still-Birth

An Estimate of the Workers Party Program

by D. Benjamin and Ed. Sagarin

Based on an historically incorrect analysis of the role of the Communist International today, imbued with a false Americanism borrowed in toto from the American Workers Party, but without rooting itself in the soil, the traditions and the peculiarities of the American working class, with a Trotskyite approach to the Soviet Union and to the colonial problem, for a united front—but not from below and not from above, openly proclaiming a dual unionist policy, we find that the much ballyhooed marriage of the Musteite and Trotskyite groups is now bringing forth what we venture to predict will be a stillbirth, the Workers Party of the U. S. A.

The Militant of Oct. 27, 1934, prints in full the "first draft of the joint programmatic statement issued by the Negotiating Committees of the Communist League of America and the American Workers Party."

A Program of Centrist Reformism

The Program of the W.P. betrays its reformist, centrist character. On the very basic principles of the Communist, the revolutionary, working class movement—armed insurrection, dictatorship of the proletariat, Soviet power, Soviet Union as the workers' Fatherland, as well as on the evaluation of the Communist International and the Social Democracy—the W.P. takes an equivocal and centrist stand.

The revolutionary party of the working class must make very clear to the working class in its country in the statement of its principles that it stands unequivocally for armed insurrection, that only armed insurrection can bring about the overthrow of the capitalist state. The W.P. program evades this question entirely. It does so even though the Trotskyite section, a former section of the Communist movement, knows that this is a basic question for the revolutionary working class movement on which there can be no silence. It does so even though the A.W.P. section of the new merged "party" has been publicly criticized time and time again for its silence on this important question in its previous program.

However, the W.P., in an essential sense, does have something to say on this. Its program states, "To defeat the capitalist government, and to transform all power to the Workers Councils, the workers must be prepared to use whatever means are necessary. (Emphasis ours—B. and S.) This is a repetition of the stand of the A.W.P., previously characterized by the Trotskyites as Centrist. By what other means than by armed insurrection can the working class hope to achieve power? Is parliamentary action intended? Is non-resistance the way out? Is it the general strike only? These were suggested by Muste in pre-

vious articles. Again we meet the same vague formulation. The workers are still left to flounder about by the party that claims to be the leader of the working class to find out what means are necessary "to defeat the capitalist government and to transfer all power to the Workers Councils." The W.P. should speak frankly to the workers; it should state what other means it has in mind "to defeat the capitalist government."

Dodging Clarity On Road To Power

Similarly, on the all-important question of the dictatorship of the proletariat and Soviet power, questions which no one can consider in the realm of the academic, especially since the proletarian revolution in Russia in 1917, especially when we consider the accomplishments of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the Soviet Union during the last 17 years. Only those who turn their backs on Marxism-Leninism can fail to take an unequivocal stand for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Only those who take a Centrist stand can offer the vague formulations—Workers State and Workers Councils, which can be interpreted by different workers in different ways. To the reformists the Workers State means a parliamentary government with the Socialist Party or the Labor Party as the leading majority party. To many confused workers it might mean the collaboration of the various parties of the working class in the government, such as the C.P. and S.P. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat has a very definite meaning. Why does the W.P. evade taking a stand on this? Why does it not speak clearly? How is it that at a time when workers throughout the world are becoming increasingly more friendly to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat on the basis of its accomplishments while the capitalist world is in the midst of its most serious crisis, this new so-called "revolutionary party" hides behind a formulation that can mean anything and everything?

In like fashion the Workers Party tries to forget the question of Soviets. One would think from reading the Program that Soviets were not in existence, that Soviets did not play a certain role in Russia in 1917, that Soviets are not an important international fact. The Trotsky wing of the W.P. which formerly posed as the Bolshevik-Leninist Opposition forgets that it was Lenin himself in his book "Infantile Sickness of Leftism" who pointed out in an analysis of the proletarian revolution in Russia that the establishment of the Soviets and the role they played was a lesson of international significance for the working class.

The term "Soviets" has a specific, historical and international significance. As the organs of struggle of the workers and toiling masses in the revolutionary period for the forcible overthrow of capitalism, as the state form of the Proletarian Dictatorship after the capture of state power, it has a definite scientific character which must be popularized by the revolutionary party of the working class. Nor can the excuse be given that it is a foreign expression. One might as well propose that the class struggle should not be advocated, because it too as yet is not accepted by the great majority of the workers of this country.

Is it an accident that armed insurrection, Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Soviet power, are all omitted from the W.P. Program, not mentioned even once, while other formulations are introduced of vague character, subject to various interpretations of a centrist, reformist character? At a time when many Socialist workers, as a result of their experiences, developments in various European countries, and the Socialist progress in the Soviet Union, are beginning to realize the correctness of Communism and its fundamental principles outlined above, the American Trotskyites reinforce the A.W.P. on a definite centrist basis. Not only has the American Trotsky group, together with other Trotsky sectionettes, abandoned the name "Communist," but also with that has it given up the principles underlying the revolutionary working class movement.

Continuing Trotskyist Anti-Soviet Stand

It is especially on the question of the Soviet Union that the W.P. shows its true colors. Musteism and Trotskyism found common ground on this question. The Trotsky theories of Thermidor and National Bolshevism permeate the Program on this point. In fact the Thermidor theory has been extended to the Communist International. The Program states, "The rise of fundamentally anti-Marxian nationalist tendencies and the abandonment of the principle of workers' democracy in the Third International and its sections constitute the source of their decline and impotence." (Emphasis ours—B. and S.) The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, leader of the Russian Revolution, leader of the Proletarian Dictatorship, whose policies have been approved by the workers and peasants, is guilty of "anti-Marxian nationalist tendencies." From this it naturally follows that these same "anti-

Marxian nationalist tendencies" permeate the Soviet Union and become an attribute of the Soviet Union itself. That this is so can be seen from a further examination of the Program. "The leaders of the C.P.S.U. . . . adopted the position . . . that the building and defense of Socialism in the Soviet Union is the first and well-nigh exclusive task of the entire world revolutionary movement. . . . These parties (Com. Parties—B. and S.), instead of concentrating their attention and their energies primarily upon advancing the revolutionary movement and seeking the overthrow of the capitalist state in those countries, became little more than agitational groups dedicated to so-called 'defense of the Soviet Union' . . . This degeneration of the Communist Parties everywhere and their diversion from the task of achieving the revolution in the capitalist countries. . . . (Our emphasis). In other words not only do we have the old Trotskyite theory of Thermidor—that the Soviet Union is degenerating, that the October film is unwinding backwards, that the Soviet Union is passing back to capitalism—a theory, by the way, which this Program does not reject, since the Trotsky group is one of the organic parts of the new party; not only is the Soviet Union guilty of National Bolshevism, concerned with the advancement of its own interests separate and aside and at the expense of the world proletariat as a whole; but we have the additional point that the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries have given up the task of winning the workers for the proletarian revolution and are only concerned with the advancement of the interests of the Soviet Union.

WP Is For Civil War In U.S.S.R.

More than that, Trotsky, in the Militant of October 21, 1933, writes the following imaginary dialogue, with the answers of A being his own views:

"A. To speak now of the reform of the C.P.S.U. would mean to look backward and not forward. . . . In the U.S.S.R. it is necessary to build a Bolshevik Party again.

"B. But isn't that the road of civil war?"

"A. Answers that the civil war has already in essence begun, that the counter-revolutionary forces used the Stalinist bureaucracy as an instrument to crush the only true revolutionary force, the left opposition, and now the counter-revolution will split the Stalinist bureaucracy and proceed to the next stage of the civil war.

"B. So the civil war is inevitable.

"A. Right at the present moment it is taking place . . ."

The Program tells us that it "pledges its support to those revolutionists in the Soviet Union who fight for the revival of the Communist Party of Lenin's time, based on the principles of revolutionary internationalism and party democracy," in other words, for those forces who are for civil war in the Soviet Union. And all this under the name of "defense of the Soviet Union." And all this under the slogan of restoring the C.P.S.U. to the "principles of revolutionary internationalism."

The Program then summarizes this point by one last slander on the Soviet Union by implying that the Soviet leaders believe that the defense of the Soviet Union depends upon the League of Nations, non-aggression pacts, etc., as though the Red Army were not a factor, as though the industrialization of the Soviet Union will play no role, not to mention the part to be played by the revolutionary workers of the various countries of the world.

Duplicity On Attitude to S.P.

It is peculiar that this "party" says of the S.P. that it "is not a party of revolution but of reformism and pacifism. It is affiliated and gives allegiance to the bankrupt Second International which bears the responsibility for supporting the last imperialist war and whose leading section, the German Social-Democracy, openly aided the capitalists to suppress revolutionary uprisings of the workers and made possible the triumph of Fascism in Germany.

. . . The Party (S.P.) and the Second International with which it is affiliated therefore serve the purpose of preventing the consistent evolution of the workers to revolutionary Marxism." (Emphasis ours.) And yet the Trotsky groups in various European countries are entering and becoming an organic part of the Social-Democratic Parties, and we can expect in the future a similar development in the U. S. on the part of the Trotsky-Centrist Party, the W.P.

In its Program the W.P. states that it "firmly opposes the formation of any centrist organization . . . trying to occupy a middle-of-the-road position between the C.P. and the S.P." But this is the very thing that the W.P. is doing. But like other 2 1/2 international movements, it will find itself sooner or later in the Social-Democracy.

(Note—In the next issue of the Workers Age, there will be a second article dealing with the anti-Leninist and sectarian position of the W.P. on such basic questions as Fascism, the present objective situation, the colonial question, imperialist war, united front, Labor Party, and trade unionism).

Knitgoods Workers Resist Boss Offensive

With the approach of the slack season the Knitgoods bosses are making a concerted attack on the wages of the workers in the industry. Wage cuts or no work is their policy. The Joint Council Knitgoods Workers Union is meeting this attack on the wages, hours and working conditions with a determined and aggressive campaign to force the bosses to live up to the agreement. Louis Nelson, Manager of the Joint Council, stated today at a general shop chairman's meeting that it is the policy of the Union to hold the bosses to the agreement with the Joint Council during the slack season just as it did during the busy season.

Every complaint of violation is being vigorously followed up and the workers' rights defended. This is reflected in the number of complaints handled during the three weeks ending October 30. Out of 115 complaints filed by workers, 76 were settled favorably for the Union, six are pending and the

rest withdrawn. Of the seven complaints of the Bosses Association only one was settled in their favor, five for the Union and one dropped.

The Union will not hesitate to use all means at its disposal, as it has successfully done in the past, to prevent the bosses from violating the agreement. In this policy, it has the wholehearted approval and support of the entire membership.

At the same time a steady and energetic campaign is being conducted to organize the open shops. The successful strike at the Robinson and Press shop put an end to its company union and improved conditions for the workers. In this strike, as in its entire campaign against the open shops, the knitgoods workers had the active support and assistance of Local 22 and

the Joint Board of the Dressmakers. The Joint Council gratefully recognizes the help given it as a sign of the solidarity of the garment workers in the I. L. G. W. U. In the Rudolph Knitting Mills, despite a bloody attack upon a Union Committee which visited the shop, the boss had to immediately grant a 10% wage increase and reduce the hours to 36 per week.

Thru leaflet distribution at open shops, meetings with unorganized workers, and the activities of the Educational Department of the Joint Council, progress is being made in unionizing these workers. The Union Members are being constantly informed of every move and policy of the administration. In line with working out policies with the membership, 79 shop meetings have been held during the three weeks ending October 30. These shop meetings in addition to discussing industrial problems have been used to push the Anti-Fascist Drive of the A. F. of L. and the \$50,000 campaign of the I. L. G. W. U.

In addition to shop meetings,

there have been held two general shop chairman's meetings during the past month. Meetings of the Local Unions that compose the Joint Council are held regularly. Section meetings were held in Newark and West New York at which the members pledged themselves to work to organize the open shops in those sections. A general membership of the Joint Council was held last month with an attendance of over 2,000.

The Educational Department is now in the midst of its activities. 307 individuals have enrolled for courses with 629 registrations. Classes at the Union Headquarters, 28 Graham Avenue, Brooklyn, include classes in American History and Elements of Unionism on Tuesday evenings, Mandolin Orchestra, Wednesdays, and Dramatics on Fridays. Classes in the residential neighborhoods have been made possible for members thru the financial cooperation of Local 22, Educational Department, and Unionism.

The attitude of the workers towards the union is indicated by the following letter:

Joint Council of Knitgoods Workers Union
28 Graham Avenue
Brooklyn, N. Y.
To our Brothers and Sisters in the Joint Council:

In behalf of the workers of the Robinson and Press shop I want to thank the leaders and members of the Joint Council for the splendid aid and cooperation that they gave us during our struggle for the abolition of the company union that the boss sponsored when he tried to destroy our bona fide union. With the victory made, less hours and other conditions that made our jobs 100 per cent better were immediately given to the workers. But more important than the higher wages is the fact that we still have our union, the only means we workers have in maintaining the gains we have won and of forcing wages and conditions to still higher levels.

We hope that our struggle shall be repeated by the workers in every industry throughout America every time a boss tries to establish a company union.

(Signed) Irving Gans
Chairman, Robinson & Press Shop

J. B. Matthews "CAPITALISM'S DOUBLE-BARRELED EXPLOITATION"
Sunday, Nov. 25, 8 p. m.—51 West 14th Street

As to "Freedom of Opinion" in the S. P.

A Discussion on the Nature of a Revolutionary Party

by Bernard Herman

The confusion on tactics so prevalent in the revolutionary movement is not only matched but surpassed in regard to the problem of party organization. This is not a minor matter: The first break between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in 1903 came on the question of party organization. The struggle was sharp and of greatest significance for the future of the Russian Revolution. It was the struggle between revolutionary firmness of organization, democratic centralism, the subordination of the lower organizations to the leading center chosen by the membership of the party, and the exacting of the strictest discipline for members of the organization, on the one hand as opposed, on the other, to the democratic looseness of organization of the Mensheviks which dissolved the party amongst its sympathizers making discipline an utter impossibility and giving the widest autonomy to the local organizations.

Opportunism in Party Organization

After three decades which have fully confirmed the correctness of the revolutionary Leninist position on organization questions, the various leftward tending forces in the Socialist Party, after beginning to break away from the devil of reformism in principles fall into the deep blue sea of opportunism on the question of party organization. The rejection and distortion of Leninist principles of organization by the official Communist Party, the conversion of democratic centralism into a bureaucratic centralism; the transformation of revolutionary discipline based upon conviction and periodic party discussions into a "cadaver-discipline"; the denial of the right even to think have had much to do with the corresponding reaction to the most extreme among even the left in the Socialist Party.

Socialist "Freedom"

The theoreticians of the American Socialist Quarterly pride themselves upon the vast superiority of

the Socialist Party as compared with the Communist Party in regard to the democracy to be found in their organization. "Freedom" is theirs, they boast. Reformists, flag-wavers, Centrists, revolutionists—all are to be found in the one organization, with freedom to do as they please and to advocate diametrically opposed principles to the working class. This phenomenon, which represents a process of disintegration of the Social Democracy, and is a temporary and anomalous condition is held up by the Socialists of all shades as the apex of development of revolutionary organization! David Felix, for example, writing in the American Socialist Quarterly of autumn 1934 on a Program for Revolutionary Socialism, declares:

"No matter how deplorable one may consider the present condition of the socialist parties—they are the picture of glowing health compared to the communist shambles. One notes tense ideological struggles in the Labor and Socialist International . . ." (my emphasis —B.H.)

Socialist "Glowing Health"

Let us examine this example of "glowing health." The Socialist Party is a strange spectacle of organizational confusion and democratic "feudalism." In the name of "democracy," each state, city and branch organization is a principality unto itself—as is each individual member. In the name of "democracy," Socialists in the trade unions work with the greatest vigor against each other as was dramatically displayed at the recent convention of the United Textile Workers of America, where many "Militants" voted with the McMahon machine against their fellow Socialists. More recently, the National Committee of the S.P. extended a rather pointed invitation to the Gitlowites to join the party in the name of democracy

and freedom, and under the same banner the New York organization under the domination of the right being refused them admission into the party. The National Committee is forced to look around for friendly states that will carry out its decision!

The Declaration—On Ice

What is even more revealing is the remarkable haste with which the defenders of the organizational principle of democracy relegated to the ice-box the democratically arrived-at-by-referendum Declaration of Principles. The referendum was hardly over before Norman Thomas announced in the New Leader, October 20, 1934:

"The one thing we Socialists cannot afford to do is to allow it (the Declaration of Principles) to break our unity, destroy our discipline, or continue to distract our energy. . . . There is room within the Socialist Party for considerable divergence of view on certain points if only we will work for Socialism. . . . But neither the adoption or the rejection of the Declaration will of itself win America for Socialism, and that is our job."

Why Thomas was for the Declaration as a statement of the Principles of the Socialist Party if one can go on "working for socialism" with those bitterly opposed to these principles is indeed a mystery. What kind of principles are these which are of no basic consequence in the winning of America for socialism? What sort of road to socialism has been here discovered the following of which is of less importance than unity with proponents of a crudely reformist and false road? Clearly these appeals to unity with the reformists are only possible on the basis of following the peaceful and reformist road. It is only too plain from

innumerable lessons of the past, that organizational unity with the reformists leads to the dissolution of the revolutionary resoluteness of the working class, is again being repeated. And, pray, what has become of democracy, which means the subordination of the minority to the majority?

Unprincipled Unity

How can a party following several different roads at once, and advocating contradictory principles, displaying organizational chaos in every action be in "glowing health"? How can such a form of party "democracy" do anything but prevent a revolution, even granting correct principles, for the sake of argument? Is the "instrument of revolution," the Socialist Party, to quote the "Militant" formulation, to march into revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie in the States of Wisconsin and Michigan, while the "instrument of revolution" waits endlessly in the States of New York and Pennsylvania for the peaceful transition to socialism? Or is the dictatorship of the proletariat to be set up in Georgia, while "bogus democracy" will be permitted to reign in Massachusetts? Is it not evident that there is not a grain of principledness or correctness in such organizational unity of opposites? Yet such is the theoretical confusion, that the unity of Thomas, Ho, Sinclairites, Right Wingers, "Militants" and Revolutionary Policy Committee is a matter of pride! And as they glory in their unity with chauvinists, they at the same time boast that they have nothing to do with Communist organizations! God forbid! Nothing could be more unprincipled than this unity of defenders of the dictatorship of the proletariat and enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one party: advocates of the revolutionary path to socialism and supporters of peaceful transition; the defenders of parliamentarism and the opponents of legalism and constitutionalism. With this they negate the very idea of a revolutionary party of the working class being the resolute vanguard of the working class united on a revolutionary Marxist program. The only principled course of a Socialist who has travelled to a Marxist position is to break the unity with the reformists and to establish organizational unity with Communists with whom he agrees. No appeal to the principles of democracy can condone the refusal to separate from the reformists.

Engels On Separation From Reformists

Such a principled position was advocated not only by Lenin, but two generations ago, Engels castigated unity with the reformists, in a letter to Bebel in October 1879. Attacking the advocacy of lawfulness and reforms by Schramm, Hochberg and Bernstein, Engels wrote:

"In a petty-bourgeois country like Germany, such ideas certainly can be justified—but outside of the Social Democratic workers' party. If these gentlemen formed a social-democratic petty-bourgeois party, they would be perfectly within their rights: one could then deal with them, form blocs with them according to circumstances, etc. In a workers' party, however, they are a corrupting element."

R. P. C. Confusion On Organization

Unfortunately, not even the Rev-

olutionary Policy Committee, which, of the various groups, has achieved the greatest activity in principle, has freed itself of illusions in regard to separation from the reformists and allying itself with the Communist movement. It relies on ill-founded hopes of reforming the Socialist Party and the Second International. In this it falls into the swamp of opportunism on organization questions, and in attempting to defend its position negates the role of the Party as the vanguard of the proletariat and the highest form of working class organization. It even compares the Party to a trade union! It writes in the first issue of the Revolutionary Socialist Review:

"If trade unionists outside the SP can be won over to revolutionary socialism—and they must be—why cannot the members of the Socialist Party?"

The argument for the revolutionizing of the trade unions is not an argument for the revolutionizing of the Social Democratic Parties as such. The trade unions are all-inclusive organizations of workers of diverse viewpoints and principles while a party includes only those subscribing to its principles. On the contrary, the revolutionizing of the trade unions is a powerful argument for the greatest revolutionary clarity of principle and resoluteness and discipline in the action of the party of the working class, otherwise the party will not lift the trade unions to its level but sink to the backwardness and reformist level of the trade union struggle.

Trotsky's Menshevism On Organization

A similarly crude and fallacious analogy between the Social Democratic Parties and the Labor Party is made by Trotsky as a justification for joining the party of reformism. The Socialist Party is viewed as a federation of parties! And did not Lenin advocate that the British Communist Party should affiliate to the reformist Labor Party, asks Trotsky. Here again, Trotsky's Menshevism in organization matters is apparent. The Labor Party is a bloc of labor organizations, mainly trade unions, based upon a minimum program. None of the affiliated parties give up either their organizational or programmatic identity. The Socialist Parties, however, are based on individual membership and the endorsement of the program of the party by the membership. The Labor Party is only a bridge to higher revolutionary development of the masses. It will be left behind as the trade unions become revolutionized and throw their support to Communism. The Socialist Parties on the contrary, in the concepts of the Reformist and Centrists, are the "instruments of revolution."

While, as Engels well said, a bloc with these bourgeois-minded reformists "according to circumstances" is correct, whether in a united front or in a Labor Party, unity with them in one party means the destruction of all "proletarian resoluteness." It means the transforming of the workers party into a vehicle for conveying bourgeois ideas to the labor movement. Revolutionary organization cannot be divorced from revolutionary policies. The revolutionary teachings of Lenin on organization must be learned by leftward moving Socialists as the fog on questions such as democracy and dictatorship of the proletariat begins to clear away before them. Both are essential for their revolutionary advancement out of the morass of reformism.

Have They Learned?

by George F. Miles

Social-Democracy has learned its lesson well, declared Ben Gitlow, just before he crawled into the Socialist Party thru "the back door."

We read the interviews with and the speeches of Herr Gerhart Seger and Dr. Julius Deutsch, Ben Gitlow's party comrades, and we ask:—Have they learned?

Still Defending Democracy

When in the heat of the heroic struggle in Austria, Julius Deutsch announced that it was not a revolution but a defense of democracy and the constitution, revolutionary workers were puzzled. Surely the man must see that bourgeois democracy is dead and that the armed struggle must be for proletarian rule! But the Bauers and Deutschs did not see. Too deeply ingrained had become their hatred of proletarian rule and their loyalty to bourgeois democracy. They led their supporters to defeat rather than meet the revolutionary needs of the moment.

And now, the same Julius Deutsch informs us (World-Telegram—Nov. 2, 1934):

"For defense. Thus it was with the Schutzbund, to defend democracy. We were not engaged in revolution but in defense."

Have they learned?

How To Fight Fascism?

Despite all talk by Socialist leaders of resistance by the working masses to fascism, we find their main interest centered elsewhere. The unfinished wish of Herr Seger speaks volumes on their lack of confidence in the mass struggle against fascism. "If there were war against Germany . . ."

So says Herr Seger! We are to depend upon the imperialist powers to rid us of Fascism by means of imperialist war! The very same imperialist powers which are growing a bumper crop of their own fascism are to liberate the toiling

masses of Germany from Hitler's bloody reign. And in this battle Herr Seger stands ready to become a loyal soldier.

"There are those of us Germans who have discussed the formation of a corps like the Czechoslovakian legions in the last war," said Herr Seger, "a corps of Germans who would fight Hitler."

And what are those glorious traditions of the Czechoslovakian legions which Herr Seger would inherit? The traditions of a mercenary band of counter-revolutionaries which did yeoman service for world imperialism against the red armies of Socialist Russia.

Has Herr Seger learned?

Austria's Solution

Also in the case of Austria do we find that the strategy of the Social-Democratic leadership (the foreign committee in Czechoslovakia) has its eyes turned in a direction other than proletarian revolution as the way out.

In so many words (I have not the clipping at hand) Dr. Deutsch blandly states that Social-Democracy is working hand in glove with the government of Austria a status similar to that of the Saar Basin—A League of Nations mandate over Austria.

This leader of the now bankrupt Austro-Marxism sees nothing incongruous in Social-Democracy's becoming a willing tool in the imperialist intrigues of central Europe.

Has Dr. Deutsch learned?

To Make The World Safe For Democracy

Revolutionary workers and many in the ranks of Social-Democracy look back upon the black treason of August 4 with dread and horror. Never again, naive socialists

tell us, will a socialist international go war-mad and become the patriotic drill master for imperialist butchery. And yet—

"In Holland and Denmark," said Dr. Deutsch, "Socialist legislators have supported preparations to defend their democracies."

"And it is so in Switzerland," interposed Herr Seger.

Once again then are socialist legislators supporting their bourgeois governments in war preparations. But only "to defend their democracies" we are told. As if any bourgeois power has ever gone to war without the cry of "defense." As if it were possible to cut thru the maze of diplomatic intrigue to determine who is the offender.

And as to defense of "their democracies" let us recall Germany and Austria, where thru "their democracies," which the socialists defended, fascism came to power. Let us also remember that "their democracies" in Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, etc. are bourgeois democracies.

When socialist agree to support these preparations for war they are once again preparing the masses to fight in a capitalist war, for a capitalist government. Even the popular slogan to catch the imagination of the masses have already been coined—War To Save Democracy From Fascism. Leaders of Social Democracy are now preparing another August 4.

One does not destroy fascism by supporting a bourgeois government. Capitalism in this period of crisis and decay is the breeding ground of Fascism. The way to destroy fascism is the communist way—the conscious preparation of the masses for the overthrow of capitalism. Those Social-Democratic workers who have learned the lesson of Germany and Austria are turning to communism.

An Example of Genuine Working Class Solidarity

How the active labor solidarity of the garment workers helped to win the recent strike of the elevator men in New York City is graphically described in a letter sent by James J. Bambrick, president of the New York Local 32-B, Building Services Employees International Union, to Charles Zimmerman, acting manager of the

Joint Board of the Dressmakers' Union of the I. L. G. W. U. The energetic support of the women's garment workers and Mr. Zimmerman's personal intervention particularly, Mr. Bambrick declares, were directly responsible for the favorable outcome of the strike. On behalf of his union, Mr. Bambrick fervently pledges unstinted

"Self-Annihilation" in Negro Question

The C. P. and the Theory of Self-Determination

by Jim Cook

It is a time of stock taking in the international today. False tactical methods of work (trade union line, united front, etc.) are finally, after five years of disastrous results, being overhauled and changed. Not thoroly and painlessly, but piecemeal and painfully. The change is nevertheless there, developing under our eyes. There is another field of work also, which the C.I. generally and the American party particularly must re-examine critically, and that is in the sphere of Negro work. That the party has made relatively little advance in winning Negroes to the revolutionary movement is apparent to those willing to face the facts. This in spite of the richest objective possibilities existing in this direction during the last 5 or 6 years of the gravest crisis in the history of American capitalism, a crisis which came down, especially hard, upon the Negro masses. Thanks for this can be laid chiefly to the theory of self-determination, the key tactical slogan of the party program on the Negro question. A theory more fantastic, running more counter to historical fact and to the main tendencies and movements amongst the Negro people it would be hard to imagine. This is becoming more and more apparent to Party comrades, and especially Negro comrades, many of whom we know, are in disagreement with the self-determination theory. Unfortunately, in the absence of an atmosphere conducive to full and free critical discussion of Party problems, this feeling has been insufficiently reflected in the ranks of the Party. For this added reason, and in a period approaching the 7th World Congress, an analysis of the theoretical fallacies, as well as the disastrous practical results of the self-determination theory becomes imperative. The C.P.O. criticized the self-determination theory on its appearance. That criticism has been proven valid. It is time to restate the position.

What Is This Self-Determination?

The adoption by the Party of the self-determination theory as the chief tactical slogan for work among the Negroes was based upon an estimation of the Negroes in the U. S. as constituting an oppressed nation. The difficulties inherent in the application of this

assistance to any future struggle of the garment workers.

The letter follows:

November 4, 1934
Dear Brother Zimmerman:

"I want at this time to extend to you my personal feelings on what you have done for Local 32-B in the past week. There are trade union leaders who feel that their respective locals are wrapped up in water tight compartments and admit of no relationship to other trade unions. Obviously you are not of this type.

"Your personal intervention in the strike of the elevator operators was a most decided factor in bringing about an agreement between our union and the Real Estate owners. I would be a fool if I did not recognize that if it were not for you the strike might have been a failure. The nature of our strike implied at the outset that we must have allies. Allies that could not only furnish us with immediate assistance, but whose rank and file were educated sufficiently to recognize that labor must clasp hands in order to mutually advance forward.

"I personally pledge to you, Brother Zimmerman, here and now in writing, that whether you solicit it or not—my men will back your union in every trial and struggle that you may encounter. I want you to accept this, not as a gesture that comes from the flush of victory, but as a deep-seated feeling that labor can only advance through fraternity and solidarity in action—not in words.

"When the strike situation cools down a bit, I would like to meet you and have a personal talk with you.

Fraternally yours,
James J. Brambick, Pres.

theory becomes immediately apparent when we consider the implications of the meaning of a nation. For the formation of a nation there is necessary a community (and distinctness) of language, of territory, of economic life (a national economy) of culture and tradition. Not a single one of these conditions is characteristic of the Negroes in the U. S. today. The Negro people form an integral element of the American nation and of the American national economy. Their language and culture are inseparable from American development, are absolutely indigenous to American soil. The original African slaves did not by far constitute a homogeneous mass. There were sharp differences among them as regards language, culture, economic organization, as well as geographical origin. The historical development was the wiping out of original differences. This was accomplished by the brutal hammer blows of slave oppression. The progressive-ly acquired common outlook, common traditions of the Negro masses is thus inseparable from American historical development. There is no homeland to look back to. Common traditional heritage points back only to an America which was built by the blood and bones of the oppressed Negro masses. In this definite sense Negro is an original American if there ever was one.

Taking these facts into consideration one realizes how fantastic is the expectation of striking a burning response for separate nationhood in the ranks of the Negro masses. The idea of separation both by colonization elsewhere, as well as upon American soil has a history of its own among the Negro masses. Let those who laud the seemingly desirable banner of "self-determination" learn from this history. Movements for separation on whatever basis were always fathered by the most reactionary and backward elements among the Negroes. The response gotten was at all times almost nil. And no wonder. There is no material basis for its realization. On the contrary, the drive in its most conscious form has always been and is in the opposite direction, for the hammering out of freedom on soil which is their own, which they developed, in a country which they built. One cannot, of course, affirm that there are no tendencies for national separation amongst the Negroes. But it cannot be too sharply underscored that they influence an infinitesimally small number of Negroes (and in the South, which is supposed to be the geographical base for the new nation—practically none at all) and that they are fathered by the most reactionary and backward elements in the Negro race today. (Garveyites and neo-Garveyites—supporters of Japanese Imperialism as friend of the Negroes). In propounding the theory of Self-Determination therefore, the Party is willy-nilly playing directly into the hands of these reactionary elements among the Negro masses.

No Basis For Party Theory

The attempt to provide a seemingly logical base for the self-determination theory receives its most absurd development around the question of the necessary community of territory (obviously the first requirement to be satisfied if we are to be able to speak of a nation). I refer to the so-called "Black Belt." And in its creation may I say that historical and geographical facts are juggled with a dexterity that is truly marvelous.

It is admitted that there are about 200 contiguous counties in the South in which the Negroes constitute a majority of the population. In these counties there are less than 4 million Negroes, out of a total of more than 12 million. Quite apart from the fact that less than 30% of the Negroes live in this "Black Belt," who will maintain that the "Black Belt" has any real economic, historic or social unity, that it is basically different from bordering counties where the

Negroes form not the majority but a very large part of the population? What will be the relationship between these two pieces of territory? Further since the self-determination theory is predicated upon the geographical base of the "Black Belt," what about the North? Listen to the answer. Says Haywood (who steps in where angels fear to tread):

"In the North the Negro Question is also a national question, having its roots, in the final analysis in the position of the Negro masses in Southern agriculture."

How is that for geographical sleight of hand? Must one argue against such fantasies?

Disastrous Results Of False Theory

In the field of practical activity, wily nilly in spite of the subjective desires of its proponents the "self-determination" theory can have only disastrous results. The theory completely underestimates the significance of the Negro proletariat. Since the peasantry is the historic bearer of the national revolutionary movement, and since the Negro question is a national question, the Negro peasant (in the South) becomes the fundamentally decisive section of the Negro population. The struggle of the Negro industrial proletariat becomes objectively subordinated to the national liberation struggle. The objective support to reactionary-separatist tendencies was mentioned before, the result of which can only be to widen the rift between the races where the crying need is to close the breach and bring the races closer together.

Fortunately, the self-determina-

tion theory is being less openly proclaimed than heretofore. It is being shoved in the background in a sort of surreptitious fashion. Is it because its disastrous results are beginning to take effect? But this is not enough. What is needed is an open facing of the issues, an open acknowledgement of its falsity, and a re-examination of the entire question in order to determine the correct Marxist approach to the Negro question in the U. S. This, the C.P.O. has offered before.

The Negroes—A Subject Caste On A Racial Basis

The Negro people in the U. S. constitute, in the words of Lenin, a subject caste on a racial basis. In the American social edifice they, as a race, occupy a peculiar and depressed caste status. This depressed caste status is rooted primarily in the semi-servile conditions of the Negro farmer in agriculture (heritage of the Reconstruction period) and in the inferior position of the Negro worker in industrial life. The under-privileged state of the Negro socially (Jim Crowism, segregation, lynch law) and politically follow directly. The emancipation of the Negro cannot be realized within the framework of the capitalist system. His oppression is one of the clearest expressions of the rottenness of the system as such. Only the revolutionary proletariat can bring freedom to the Negro, north and south.

But this general perspective can today assume vitality and general significance only if it can be shown in life itself to emerge as a natural program of immediate action, intimately associated with every phase of Negro life under the caste oppression of American society. The Communists must defend

and represent the basic interests of the Negro workers, and Negro peasants and of the Negro petty bourgeois, to the extent that the latter constitutes a progressive historical force. The Communists must try to weld together the masses of the Negro people (workers, peasants, city petty bourgeois) under the leadership of the Negro proletariat and against the white ruling class and its Negro agents (Negro bourgeoisie). The Communists must throw all energies into breaking down all barriers between the Negro and white workers and into strengthening the bonds between the white worker and the Negro people. The Communist program must champion the abolition of peonage and the serf conditions of the Negro farmers in the South, the organization of leagues of sharecroppers and tenants and unions of farm laborers. The Communists must stand for the complete equality of the Negro in industry, the smashing of the barriers against the Negro workers in the trade unions, the organization of the unorganized and the unskilled Negro workers. The Communists must take up the struggle against lynching, Jim Crowism and discrimination. The Communists demand the complete social and political equality of the Negro race. The Communists strive to break the hold of the capitalist political parties over the Negro masses and to win the masses to the cause of labor. Through the participation of the Negro masses in these struggles (and of Negroes and whites side by side) thru the development of these struggles to ever higher levels the road will be opened for the realization of the far reaching perspective of the final emancipation of the Negro people from their submerged caste position as a phase of the general emancipation of the toiling masses from the yoke of capitalism.

Steel Trust Generosity

by Edward Wright

Arthur H. Young, the \$75,000 a year Vice-President of the United States Steel Corporation, in a speech recently made before the National Steel Labor Board, said that the representation plan (company-unions) now in effect in 165 mills of the steel corporation and its subsidiaries are devised as a "legal vehicle for collective bargaining." He was supported by Mr. Desvernine, attorney for the Carnegie Company who said, "The company is firmly convinced that its plan of employee representation constitutes a fair and impartial arrangement for collective bargaining on the part of all employees. . . . The plan is probably the most forward looking arrangement of its kind in operation in any industrial enterprise."

"Fair and forward looking." Strange! They who ride on the backs of millions suddenly halt overwhelmed by remorse. They have made too much profit. Something must be done to alleviate the misery of the steel workers. "We must be fair and forward looking." In the name of humanity the steel workers deserve better treatment. If collective bargaining will effect a favorable change for them, let them have it. Unfortunately, there is an annoying obstacle in the way—the specter of unionism. It must be destroyed. Unionism robs the worker of his Hooverian liberty and deprives him of his constitutional right to starve ruggedly. If we are to be fair and forward looking, if we really have the interests of the steel workers at heart, we must have company unionism as the ideal vehicle for collective bargaining. Since this is intended to effect the steel workers, what will be their reaction?

There are over a half million employees in the iron and steel industry of whom 519,500 are wage earners. The conditions of work prevailing in the steel industry are quite far from being pleasant. Occupational diseases, such as convulsions of the arms and feet, kidney trouble, hot-mill, cramps, pneumonia "the worst scourge of

the steel workers" and carbon monoxide poisoning causing, among other things, vomiting, anemia, indigestion, general debility, mental dullness and depressive insanity, are a few of the gifts of the million-dollar-yacht owners to the makers of the pulse of the nation. These gifts are ordinarily followed by violent deaths which are twenty per cent more frequent, relative to other deaths, for the steel workers than for the average worker in other industries.

In the steel industry the twelve hour day has found a warm and comfortable home. Although Captain William Jones, of the Carnegie Steel interests, said in 1881 that, ". . . it was entirely out of the question to expect human flesh and blood to labor incessantly for twelve hours, and that therefore it was decided to put on three turns, reducing the hours of labor to eight," the constant introduction of machinery eliminated the toughest jobs and made it possible for the steel companies to go back to the twelve hour day in 1892. A movement to reduce the hours of work has nevertheless been going on partly because of the general labor activity in this country, partly because of the great steel strike of 1919 and partly because of the success of organized labor in abolishing the two shifts in steel and iron producing European countries. This trend did not prevent Albert H. Gary, of the U. S. Steel Corporation, from stating as late as May 1923 that, ". . . Abolishment of the twelve hour day in the iron and steel industry is not possible or feasible at this time." And even today under the code of fair competition in the steel industry the matter of daily and weekly maximum of hours is to be applied "insofar as practicable."

The long hours of work, the fluctuations in wage rates, the speed-up and rationalization schemes, classically applied in the

steel industry and the terrible low standard of living resulting from the irregularity of employment have furnished a background against which immortal monuments of heroism have been erected by the fighting steel workers. The Homestead strike of 1892, the Bethlehem strike of 1910, the Youngstown strike of 1916 the great steel strike of 1919 that shook the nation and the scores of plant strikes since the introduction of the NRA were all fierce, bloody class struggles fought by the steel workers to improve their conditions. In all these strikes the "holy three," the police, the militia and the hired gangsters, performed their duties admirably.

The campaign of terror and the murders and kidnappings of strikers and organizers have not deterred the steel workers from struggling to improve their lot. They are ready to fight and to fight hard. In the last two months twelve steel plants were struck involving about six thousand workers. Not one of these strikes was a picnic. The usual "incidents" took place. (In Kohler, Wisconsin three strikers were killed and 175 wounded by armed deputies). Yet in addition to company unions the steel workers are faced with a menace that is infinitely worse than the terror of the steel trust—the paralyzing influence of dual unionism. Of the twelve strikes just mentioned, some were led by the A.F.L., others by the I.W.W., still others by the Steel and Metal Workers Industrial Union (TUUL) and still others by no union at all. Aware of this confused situation and fearing the effectiveness of one union in the industry, the steel manufacturers are attempting to legalize company unionism for their feeders. Will they succeed? The smashing defeat the workers of the Aluminum Company of America gave to the company's attempt to institute a company union in the plant, is an excellent example, but hardly enough. The best security against company unionism is the smashing defeat of dual unionism.

H. B. Davis, "Labor & Steel."

Trade Union Notes

—by G. F. M.—

THE party line on the trade union field appears to be tangled up in a pretty bad way. While denying indignantly that any change in the trade union line has been undertaken two main lines of policy appear, nevertheless, in the daily trade union work of the CP. We must also add that no attempt has been or is being made to provide a theoretical premise for either of these two contradictory tactical approaches.

In the honey-moon days of the recent dual-unionist wave (1929-30) the party line was "crystal clear." The existing unions of the A. F. of L. were company unions, fascist unions, that had merged with the capitalist state apparatus, they were holding back the great masses of radicalized workers from rushing to communism. This was very clear to every loyal supporter of the party line. The task was equally clear—the organizational unity of these unions must be destroyed and the radicalized hostages thus released were to be herded into the brand new and revolutionary industrial unions. This was proclaimed from the rostrums and shouted from the rooftops. This was the apex of revolutionary wisdom. Woe unto him who did not echo these cries or who harbored treasonable doubts for he was mercilessly cast out and damned to the perdition of socialism.

BUT today things are not so clear. The tremendous extension of trade unionism, under the banner of the A. F. of L., mortally wounded both the theoretical foundation as well as the organizational super-structure of dual unionism. Its line cut to pieces by the hard realities of trade union developments and lacking the courage to call for a fundamental revision in its trade union course, the party leadership has lapsed into confusion worse confounded. What are these two main lines of policy in evidence today? The liquidation of certain of the industrial unions and the simultaneous attempts at the organization of new industrial unions. Both are today the products of a bankrupt line.

THE industrial unions have been liquidated in the dress, title (even the "red flame" still flickers here and there) and in the mining industry. Even if we grant that the aim of the CP members, upon returning to the reformist unions, is the same, i.e. working for a new base for dual unionism—and from all indications it is so, how does this liquidation square with the ponderous theories so painfully forced upon the communist movement? Are the unions less "fascist," less "company union" or less "merged with the capitalist state apparatus"?

No wonder therefore that these unions were liquidated with very lame explanations indeed. In the textile industry the CP suddenly discovered that the unity of the textile workers is necessary, in the general strike. And when isn't the unity of the workers in the unions necessary? In Cooper Union, the silver-tongued apostle of dual unionism—Ben Gold, told the few dressmakers who came to listen to him, that only now is it correct to liquidate because a year ago the industrial union still held a "respectable" position in the industry. How and why was this position lost? In the case of the miners not even a lame excuse is to be found. Only the statement of Jack Stachel that the CP members should have been in the U. M. W. A. "long ago." But where is the underlying general line upon which these actions are based? No answer. The fountains of "wisdom" have run dry.

THIS is as far as the new approach in the CP trade union line has gone. The "malignant germs of dual unionism," as Foster so aptly put it in 1922, have merely been transferred into the reformist unions.

We are quite certain that the party leaders could not have failed to note the collapse of the theory of dual unionism—does not Stachel, one of the most unscrupulous of them, now state that the CP "always" was against it as a "general policy"—but we are equally certain that they nevertheless cling to the old practice.

The fact remains that in a number of industries (food, furniture, fur, marine, etc.) the CP still maintains its dual unions. In the steel and auto industries the CP is now engaged in frantic activity

to build new unions. Such are the two phases of the CP's trade union line today, which have caused untold confusion in the very ranks of the party itself.

THERE is this to add: it is relatively easy to change the content of CP work within the reformist unions, once the dual unions are abolished. It is in this sense that this new approach may, in the future, become the bridge by means of which the CP will return to a healthy trade union position.

The changes in the trade union line of many European Communist Parties, and the undermining of dual unionism here, leads us to believe that also here the change may not be so very far off.

Anthracite Progressives Battle Lewis Machine

A determined, fighting opposition to the Lewis-Brennan machine gave a stormy character to the Ninth Biennial Convention of District No. 9, United Mine Workers of America, held during the third week of October, Lykens, Pa., on the morning of October 19, 1932. A familiar scene being reenacted: President Mart F. Brennan opening a convention, as his drunken henchmen—several of them well known pugilists of the region—waited for the brewing storm to break.

Locust Gap Local Union Denied Representation

The Credentials Committee brought in a recommendation that the Locust Gap Local be refused its six votes at the Convention. Heading this delegation was Frederick I. Blase, whose name was removed from the ballot in the district election of September 24 as a candidate to succeed Mart F. Brennan. Blase was ordered on August 17, by John L. Lewis, International President, to resign his position as treasurer of Locust Gap local pending investigation of a charge that Blase interfered with the operation of a colliery in the strike at Locust Gap in 1932. It was during the outlaw strike in March 1932 that Blase lost his job, and despite the fact that he was elected as treasurer by over 400 votes in June, the District Executive Board ruled that since he had lost his job thru his own individual actions, he was ineligible for any local or other union position. Brennan contended that Blase had not submitted the 1932 controversy to the District Conciliation Board. Blase informed assembled press representatives that he was not bound by the union constitution to take such action, his own local having refused to question his eligibility for the privileges of the organization, and that a committee appointed by Lewis to investigate the case had never handed down a decision. Turnoil broke out as a motion to accept the report of the Credentials Committee was made and carried. Infuriated delegates shot to their feet shouting at Brennan: "You're afraid of Blase," "You railroaded that through," "You won't give us a break." Leo Sitko of Mount Carmel, attempted to block the vote by rising to a point of order, but Brennan refused to recognize him. Debate on Blase was checked by a standing vote of 80 to 39.

Sitko Leads Fight

An appeal by the Locust Gap Local to the Grievance Committee against the unseating of its delegation was not sustained. Sitko, leading anti-administration delegates, declared from the convention floor after the ousting: "Whenever militant and progressive leadership develops in a local union, international officers always find means of weeding it out." The most flagrant parliamentary trickery was employed to stifle and drown the opposition.

On the third day of the Convention, Leo Sitko made a motion to dispense the rules of the convention and picket a shirt factory in Elizabethtown on a strike called by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. The motion passed and the factory was closed. The next day Sitko appeared on the convention

floor wearing a pair of handcuffs, which his attackers refused to remove, and his head bandaged. He had been slugged by the police and CCC workers while on the picket line. The Convention thereupon voted a protest against this "brutal treatment" which was sent to President Roosevelt and the NRA Code authorities. Sitko had literally dynamited the reactionaries into undertaking a sympathetic act toward other union workers. Always ready and eager for the fray, Delegate Sitko led the fight against the Administration right down the line. A motion by Sitko to have defeated officers leave their posts within two weeks of the convention instead of several months as at present, was turned down. Another motion to have vacancies filled by popular vote instead of presidential appointment was also defeated.

During the course of the convention Sitko availed himself of the opportunity to attack the New Deal bitterly. He scored the New Deal's strike-breaking role, denounced the labor faker's praise of the New Deal, declared that the road to better conditions is the road of militant strikes and organization, and rammied the last shot home by appealing to the convention to go on record for a Labor Party. Sitko was ably backed by anti-administration delegates amongst whom were Joe Gladski, candidate for vice-president, Dave Molard, candidate for International Board Member and Felix Frazik.

Resolutions adopted included: "That we go on record demanding the unconditional pardon of Tom Mooney and Warren K. Billings and join with the rest of the workers in a world wide move to bring about their liberation."

"That district officers use all the power of our union to the end that all men idle due to their union activities be reinstated." "That stripping work such as removal of clay, rock and coal be discontinued on days that mines and collieries are idle; also any other work that cannot be construed as maintenance work."

"That the 5-day week and 6-hour day be adopted." It was significant that on many of the questions raised by the opposition, neither the administration nor many of the delegates dared speak their position, they merely voted against in silence. Significant, too, was the decision to hold the next convention in Tower City located in a rural section (as was Lykens), in order to keep future delegates from being influenced by the sentiments that prevail in the heart of the coal regions. The vote on this matter was very close, 161 to 131.

BEFORE AND AFTER!

"It would be interesting indeed to see Lovestone come here and tell the workers to go back into the strike-breaking U. M. W. A." WILLIAM Z. FOSTER "COMMUNIST"—July 1931

"In the mining area, all of our comrades are or should be in the U. M. W. A." JACK STACHEL "COMMUNIST"—December 1933

New Recruits for the Communist Opposition

STATEMENT OF DOROTHY DARE

Baltimore, Md.

I joined the Communist Party in July 1929. What I knew about the CPO came from a song which ended with the determination "to hang Jay Lovestone on a sour apple tree."

During my membership in the party I criticized it for being sectarian, without myself realizing that the sectarianism of the Party was due to the ultra-left tactical line and not, as I then thought, to the fact that we did not lead enough struggles.

Mainly I had disagreements on the way the tactical line was applied (or not applied) or else I criticized isolated instances of ultra-left actions; united front from below; exposing the social-fascists; splitting reformist-led unemployed movements; building unemployed organizations which endorsed the C. P.; creating "red" and "revolutionary" unions which endorsed the CP; or having too many unprepared demonstrations.

Despite these disagreements I carried out all party decisions as a loyal member. I was arrested several times for distributing TUUL leaflets at mill gates and served six weeks in the Washington workhouse after being arrested in a demonstration before the Japanese Embassy, even though I did not think the slogan of driving out the Japanese diplomatic representatives, a sensible one.

Why did I do so? Because when one has confidence in the party, in one's right to criticize and correct, one is willing to carry out all decisions. After Hitler took power without a struggle I began to raise

Anti-Fascist Editor Threatened by Fascists

A sensational charge that various editors of Italian language newspapers, published in this city, have been threatened by gangsters, beaten up and warned that their lives are in danger, is contained in a statement published in a recent issue of Il Martello, New York weekly published by Carlo Tresca, well-known anti-Fascist.

The newspaper charges that an editor of Stampa Libera, local anti-Fascist daily, has been threatened with violence unless he abandons his present opposition to the policies of Generoso Pope, well known building-supply merchant and publisher of several pro-Fascist dailies.

After detailing a whole series of terroristic acts of Pope's strong arm squads against newspapermen who incurred the disfavor of Pope, Il Martello goes on to say:

"During the recent past, a controversy has been going on between the editors of La Stampa Libera, anti-Fascist Italian language daily, and Pope. As far as literary arguments are concerned Pope was getting the worst of it."

"After the controversy had assumed sharp form, an editor of Stampa Libera received a series of visits from the same underworld characters. These people requested that Stampa Libera cease to publish criticism of Pope. The editor of Stampa Libera refused repeatedly to make any such commitments."

"On the occasion of their last visit, the underworld characters informed the editor that they would not call again and that the editor should 'know what that means.'"

Il Martello considers this "an attempt to inaugurate in the Italian colony in the United States the same political regime in the press as prevails today in Mussolini's Italy" and calls on all to resist this Fascist gangsterism.

BUILD THE AGE FOR UNITY

questions. Was dual-unionism a good tactic in Germany when the CPG issued calls for general strikes and not a single factory responded? Was the united front from below such a good tactic since it was proven that the CPG did not succeed in winning over Social Democratic workers, despite the treachery of their leaders?

As I began to criticize the tactical line I became aware that democratic centralism existed in words but not in practice; that most comrades in the CP had been taught that the basis for membership was not only unity of principle and unity of action, but also unity of tactical views and opinions. To question the tactical line seemed like questioning the basic principles, to these comrades. I began to see before me the evils resulting from a lack of democratic centralism: low political level; irresponsibility; decisions remain on paper; membership fluctuation; bureaucratic leadership and a wrong tactical line. This, since changing conditions did not bring a corresponding change in tactics which can come only thru discussion and criticism.

My knowledge of the CPO being confined to the lies and slanders circulated in the Party, I could see no way out and was in a fair way of becoming thoroughly demoralized.

I must confess that it was the party which set me on the road towards the CPO. I had expressed the view, in the course of a discussion, that Muste was a centrist and not a social-fascist. The section promptly elected an enlightenment committee and after some conversations on united front, social-fascism, dual-unionism, etc. I was told that I was conciliating with "Lovestoneism"! This was news to me. It was then that I began to read carefully the Workers Age and found the Party to be perfectly correct. My views were the views of the CPO.

I was expelled by the District Secretariat without even the formality of a hearing before the section committee or the membership.

This much the CPO has done for me—it has restored my confidence in Communism, in the cause of the working class. In joining the CPO I can't promise to set the Chesapeake Bay on fire. But I hope to do some effective work for the communist movement in this city—by working for the unity of the Communist Party on the basis of democratic centralism, against sectarianism, reformism and centrism. For a Leninist Communist Party that can do the job of ridding us of this bankrupt capitalist system.

STATEMENT OF JACK ARTHUR

Baltimore, Md.

A communist must take a course based upon principle. I am joining the CPO because I believe that thru it I can do most for communism.

I did not choose to be expelled from the Communist Party. Had democratic centralism been more than an empty phrase I would not have been expelled. Surely there must be something seriously wrong with the tactical line of a party which cannot stand the acid test of discussion and criticism. If the tactics are correct they will be strengthened by discussion. If the tactical course is wrong it will go down and deservedly so in the face of critical analysis. Only on the basis of democratic centralism can a healthy revolutionary movement be built.

I hope that the party members will continue the fight for democratic centralism, for the right of communists to hold different tactical views inside the party.

In joining the CPO, I am fighting—not against the party—but against the sectarian tactics of the party; tactics that are weakening communism and hindering the working class struggle.

By joining the CPO I continue the fight for democratic centralism, a Leninist approach to the working class of America, a united communist Party.

Book Reviews

THE PASSING OF THE GODS, by W. F. Calverton. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1934.

In this work Calverton combines the elaboration of an essentially new and very fruitful approach to the problem of religion with a consecutive summary of the main results of that social critique of religion which is one of the most characteristic features of modern thought. To paraphrase the Young Hegelians, it is the annihilation of religion thru critical social consciousness.

The problem that must face every serious student of the question is: What function has religion exercised that it has persisted as a world force thru the ages in spite of its (to us) manifest irrationality? What are the roots of religion and where are they to be sought? What is the nature of the religious mentality? What has been the relation of religion to the general life of mankind? These are some of the questions that this book tries to answer.

Calverton's method of analysis is thoroughly sound, based as it is on historical materialism. Religion is not, in my contention, he insists, "an individual reality but a social experience. . . . To understand religion, therefore, one must study not only its psychological characteristics but its sociological origins. . . . In order to understand religion, it is necessary to do more than study it as an isolated institution or force; what is more important is to study the interests it has served, the interests which inspired its creation and perpetuated its function." He also does quite well in defining his subject in such a way as to refer to religion as it has actually appeared in human history and not to the vague "cosmic religion" of an Einstein, for example, in which the term is used without the slightest regard to its historical content.

Approaching the problem from this angle Calverton comes to the conclusion which is the main thesis of this volume: "Religion derives its power over the human race by virtue of reading the material interests of man into the scheme of the universe." Or to put it more concretely—Religion has persisted as a world force because it has promised man effective power over his environment, natural and social. On the basis of this, its social function, a many-branched spiritual superstructure has arisen of characteristic beliefs, emotions, usages, a veritable complex of the social consciousness, a "cultural compulsive," surviving until the present day. This social complex, this compulsive drive to religion, is in its very nature virtually inaccessible to reason; it can be affected only by undermining its social base, by depriving it of the social interests nourishing it. Self-conscious rational action in the field of nature and of society is the antithesis of religion and entirely fatal to it because it robs it of its age-old power function. And self-conscious rational action can be achieved by mankind to a full extent only in a classless socialist society in which man is at last master of his own fate. To this conclusion, explicitly stated, Calverton brings his study.

The fruitfulness of the approach here outlined is attested by the whole book for, with it as a clue, the author traces the various aspects of the problem of religion, piling up a vast amount of anthropological and historical data. In this limited space I can do no more than call attention to the most profound of these studies, the chapter on "The Ego and the Religious Compulsive," which penetrates searchingly into the spiritual life of man under religion.

The work is bound to take its place immediately as the outstanding discussion of religion from the modern sociological standpoint. Some of its particular conclusions may probably be shaken by subsequent criticism and investigation but its fundamental thesis, that religion can be understood only if it is conceived as a practical instrument of power in the social life-process of mankind, seems to me to be almost unchallengeable.

And the originality and wealth of illustration with which Calverton develops this theme makes for some exciting reading.

WILL HERBERG

COMBINATION OFFER

Since many Age readers and prospective Age readers will find "The Passing of the Gods" a valuable addition to a revolutionary library, we are offering a special combination.

You may secure the Weekly Workers Age for one year and a copy of "Passing of the Gods," a \$1.50 value for only \$3.50 by remitting to Workers Age, 51 West 14th St., New York City.

POEMS: Stephen Spender

POEMS: W. H. Auden

Published by Random House, New York.

Out of dying English capitalism, the voices of these two poets have come, raised in weary, half-hearted protest. "Comrade," "revolution," "communist" are the essence of revolutionary poetry, then these men are the answers to our prayers. . . . But, unfortunately, we demand more of a revolutionary poet than the use of revolutionary words.

Auden, essentially a satirist, is very disgusted, and sees only death about him. (Satire as an art-form, today, is essentially a non-revolutionary one; it is used

as a transition form by those who leave the dying class, come to the revolutionary class, and, with it, cover up their own doubts by universal laughter). In the poem "Dance of Death" there is some excellent satire on fascism. But Auden sees social forces as something inert, to be moved only by a demagogue. The masses are born to be fooled Auden deeply suspects that Communism is the way out—but he doesn't quite like it. Only occasionally, moved probably by personal experience, does he find enough inspiration in the working-class to write—and then he can sustain the mood only for a lyric. Spender has absorbed the great tradition of English poetry; his delicate verse, faintly protesting the existence of the poor, sighs in a decidedly pitiful fashion. His acceptance of Communism is more whole-hearted than Auden's—but less understanding. Some golden utopia of brotherly love and equality is his vision. Very well, if Spender chooses to spend his time that way, but this is neither revolutionary nor proletarian poetry. It is the faint-hearted despairing grasp of a liberal.

It is Auden who presents the most promise for development. But he must slough off the leprosy skin of bourgeois despair and slothfulness, and learn to comprehend more deeply our movement. As yet both poets have to approach the revolutionary only in their subject matter. Auden loses himself time and again in the unintelligible murmurs of the intellectually muscle-bound; Spender leans over towards the working class, must extract his formal and aesthetic roots from a dying class.

M. S. M.

The Plight of the Student Movement

by Albert Epstein

The American student body cannot be understood unless one realizes that it differs from other student bodies in the world. It is completely erroneous to expect the American student to play the revolutionary role his brothers did in Czarist Russia, in present day China or Cuba, or in any country in which capitalism has not yet fully developed. And yet this mistake is made daily. We shall select one instance of this abstract and consequently wrong generalization. In the November 1934 issue of the Student Review, Robert Morse Lovett writes: "In some countries, such as Russia, China, and Cuba, the students have formed the spearhead of the movement for a new and better social order. . . . But although in the U. S. the self-conscious activity of the body of students has lagged far behind that of the same class in Europe and Latin America, there are signs of change."

The struggles of the students in these countries were the struggles of the middle class against feudal oppression or imperialist domination. They formed only a section of the larger front of the rising capitalist class fighting for parliamentary democracy as the political expression of its economic power. America is the most advanced capitalist country in the world. The next stage in its development will have to be carried through by the working class. The bourgeoisie in the U. S. has long become a reactionary force. The student in the U. S. finds himself confronted with entirely different tasks from those that face his brothers in other countries.

Class Lines Among Students

The difference does not end here. In no other country is the student body as numerous as it is here. The student does not constitute a class by himself or even a distinct section of another class. Judged by his antecedents he represents every class, but in inverse proportion to the actual class composition in society as a whole. By his aspirations the student, except for the small section that has adopted a working class philosophy, is wholly bourgeois in outlook. Those students who come from the working class wish to escape from it and rise to the middle class, thus attempting to reverse

the process actually at work in capitalist society, that is, the sinking of the middle class to the level of the proletariat. It should be clear that the student is no part of the working class and its interests are not identical with it though not contradictory. On the whole the student comes closest to the petty-bourgeoisie. Incapable of acting alone in the class struggle, he must either side with the bourgeoisie or with the working class. L. Kamenev has summed up the role of the student today, neatly, when he said "The history of the student who at one time was synonymous with the revolutionary orator and propagandist, is now ended, the history of the proletariat youth has commenced."

At present the student is largely a supporter of capitalism. This was amply proved in the poll conducted in the colleges on the eve of the last presidential elections. But if the present capitalist parties fail to hold the students, a fascist movement could easily succeed in winning them through its clever demagoguery. It is precisely such a declassed element that forms part of the mass base of fascism. Only a real and able approach by the working class can keep the students and the rest of the petty-bourgeoisie away from fascism. Therefore, not only is it necessary to have a powerful and militant labor movement, but also a sane policy for the students in order to win them for the working class.

The Radical Student Movement

Unfortunately the radical American student movement today is limited to two comparatively small organizations—the Socialist affiliated Student League for Industrial Democracy, and the Communist controlled National Student League. The former claims a membership of 3,500 and for the latter we have only the New York City membership claim of 800 which would make 1500 a liberal estimate for the whole country. For the two, a maximum of 5000. The number of students enrolled in colleges is well over a million. Thus, only one half of one percent of the students of America belong to the organized radical student movement—not much to boast about.

Basin For Radical Weakness

What is responsible for such a sad state of affairs? The unfavorable

Stage and Screen

by Robert Arthur

"Our Mother, the Earth is a maiden again
Young, fair, and a maiden again"

Thus Sean O'Casey ecstatically celebrates his faith in Life with a capital "L," as the curtain rises to reveal the gates painted upon the folds of another curtain, representing the entrance to Hyde Park, in the production at the National Theatre of his newest play, "Within the Gates." And, as you enter with the Dreamer this at once real and fantastical Hyde Park stretching endlessly before you, despite the threadbare familiarity of the characters and the triteness of the symbols attached hereto—The Young Whore . . . Her Old Mother . . . The Hypocritical Bishop . . . The Dreamer . . . The Scarlet Woman—all representing nothing more than the stereotyped vices and virtues, you are, nevertheless, arrested by the boldness of the playwright in using such trite symbols and the immensity of his more significant undertaking.

Although, in this production, the richness of his humor and the sharpness of his wit are immeasurably dulled and the dances which introduce each of the four sequences or Seasons are nearly the worst concoction yet invented to hide the beauties that might lie within his script, purged of these sins of stagecraft, "Within the Gates" makes O'Casey neither the saint of the modern drama George Jean Nathan would have you believe, nor the infinite variety of devil others profess him to be. Measured by the best standards his play is a worthy failure. If our mother the earth is a maiden again, the complexities of O'Casey's pen, I fear, make her a very, very confused young lady, especially when she is cavorting upon the stage.

O'Casey recently broke loose in the newspapers with the statement that, "If the theatre is only for realism then to hell with it," forgetting no doubt, in this picturesque dismissal, that among the finest realistic plays of our time are his own "Juneteenth," "The Plough and the Stars," and "The Unfortunate" for its presentation on the stage

that "Within the Gates" is a hybrid play, a cross between the realistic and the fantastic, never being absolutely sure when it is one or when it is the other, cleaving in the beholder an insecure emotional response to its own too patent uncertainties.

But, if this play is almost totally devoid of dramatic incident except for an immature but exciting scene between the Dreamer, the Whore, and the Bishop, this somewhat formless work nevertheless brings within our ken some of the most beautiful poetry heard in our time, and the richest satirical humor we have read in any play. It is doubly unfortunate, therefore, that it also contains some of the most distressing moments of sheer wasted opportunities, of which the Chorus of the Down and Outs is the most vivid example. O'Casey's story (one can hardly say there is a story) is composed of the struggle of the Pies-in the person of the Young Whore who is torn between the Dreamer, representing the happy, carefree, amoral way of life, and the Bishop who represents the severe respectable and hypocritical mouthings of the Church. What else there is shows the conflict of Science and Religion, established Religion and Atomism, the author providing therewith a running commentary on most of the faults and foibles of modern life. And yet, wise enough to have one of his characters say:

"Your politics are husks that only swine will eat, your power's behind a battlement of hunger; your religion's as holy as a colored garter round a whore's thigh, truth's bent in two and hope is broken. . . ."

O'Casey uses the only symbol in his play that might have represented the magnificent force of a characterization of an aware and aroused proletariat, rather as the symbols of all those who have lost faith in life or the courage or will to live. Had he used the Down and Outs properly the playwright might have succeeded in integrating his play in the moments where he has failed most completely in attaching to his theme the grandeur that it ought to have.

Despite its manifold uncertainties "Within the Gates" is far, far better fare than Broadway usually has to offer. Indeed, it is not Broadway's child at all, but was, in a manner of speaking, forced upon it. It is sad to think that it had to remain an orphan. Challenging the ingenuity of its producers by the quality of its purpose it found them woefully wanting. Its production is pedestrian beside the flights of the author's work. Except for a really magnificent performance by Lillian Gish who has never before shown anything that would indicate the new-found rapture of her performance as the Whore, Bramwell Fletcher as the Dreamer, and to a lesser degree Mary O'Connell as the Old Mother (perhaps the most difficult role in the play and the most confused) the acting, dancing, and direction are, to put it mildly, unimaginative and dull.

A great play, someone has said, has no place on the stage. Near-great, perhaps. Anything less, all right. The contention is that the facilities of the stage, its players, all the component parts, are no match for true greatness. So seldom is it permitted a genius to match genius that of a truly superlative work can hardly expect to find an equally worthy interpreter. King Lear, Hamlet, The Lower Depths—these are outstanding examples of plays which challenge genius and seldom if ever find it in the theatre. And it would seem to be a theory not without merit. While we do not profess that "Within the Gates" is a great play, perhaps, in calling it a worthy failure we speak too often of what we saw projected upon the stage of the National Theatre. Certain it is that in the reading and despite all the reservations we have made in this review, it has a quality which only a creative writer, one of the few standing head and shoulders above the playwrights of our time, could give it.

The S. L. I. D. considers itself
(Continued on Page 8)

Workers Age

Published Twice Monthly by the
 Workers Age Pub. Assn., 51 West 14 Street, New York, N. Y.
 Phone: GRamercy 5-8903
 Organ of the National Council of the
 COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U. S. A. (OPPOSITION)
 Subscription rates: Foreign \$1.50 a year, \$1.00 six months, 5 cents
 a copy. Domestic \$1.25 a year, \$0.75 six months.

Vol. 3, No. 20 November 15, 1934.

Straws in the Wind

MORE than ordinary mid-term election significance must be attached to the results of the latest Congressional contests. For the first time in about two generations of American politics a party in power has come back after Presidential elections to strengthen its hold on both houses instead of losing its ground or holding its own.

This achievement scored by the Democratic Party in the last election is to be explained by the prevailing situation in the country. In essence the conditions shape themselves up along the following lines: There is tremendous discontent in the country. The great mass of people is dissatisfied with things as they are and embittered at things as they have been. To the average John Farmer or Henry American, Roosevelt and his Democratic Party symbolize to-day a desire to change, a non-acceptance of the status quo, an effort to try something new in order to get rid of, or improve, the old. The adroit political maneuvering of the President, his "fireside talks," his throwing of hundreds of millions of dollars into all sorts of public enterprises for private relief, the stupid stand-patism of the Republican opposition, have all contributed to swelling the size of the Democratic popular vote.

But in this very overwhelming victory of the Democratic Party there are found forces undermining the foundation of the American political set-up—the two-party system. It would be folly to say that the Republican Party is finished. It would be equally false to overlook the all-important fact that the vote polled by the Democratic Party itself is not so much a vote for the Democratic Party as such as a vote going across and beyond party lines.

This huge vote appeared on the surface as an endorsement of the Administration. Really it is a barometer of the storm that is coming. Great hopes and even greater illusions accompanied this tremendous vote of confidence given to the Roosevelt government. Now that the election contest is over, there is every reason to believe that the Roosevelt administration will proceed in the spirit of the President's address to the Convention of the Investment Bankers Association. Given the so-called mandate, the President, in charge of the Executive Committee of the capitalist class, will move with a firmer and more stable hand. The direction in which this hand will be moving, the body at which its blows will be aimed, will, of course, determine the character of the Roosevelt policies. These will be increasingly more conservative in substance and less radical even in appearance. This is true despite the fact that the Roosevelt Administration is now prating so much about social legislation. Without doubt, the United States, which until recently was along with India and China, one of the very few big countries having no social legislation, is soon to enact some such measures in the very interest of capitalism's self-preservation. These measures will be most inadequate and all efforts will be directed at making the workers pay for them.

Another index of the general discontent in the country and an index having much more significant latent potentialities, is to be found in the fact that in almost all cases where a more radical-sounding and more left-appearing ticket came before the masses, that ticket received the endorsement as against the New Deal. We have in mind particularly the fact that the Farmer Labor Party of Minnesota was able to withstand the onslaught of Farley and his silver-lined tongue orators and gold-lined pocket agents. It is true that the Roosevelt Administration, at the behest of the Investment Bankers Convention, at the last moment, turned on Sinclair, double-crossed him, and relieved him of the California governorship. Still, with all the confusion and idiocy characterizing the Sinclair Epic Movement, it must be granted that the many hundreds of thousands of votes piled up for this ex-Socialist are important straws in the wind. These votes have been cast, as in Minnesota, in defiance of the blandishments, as well as the blows of the New Dealers. This is true, tho both Sinclair and Olson tried to outdo themselves in fawning before the High Priest of the New Ordeal—President Roosevelt.

The results of the elections clearly indicate the ripening soil for a mass labor party movement in the United States. The huge vote for the New Deal is a vote for change, a vote for a change for the better which can not be realized, and which, within the coming months, will take a turn for the worse.

A further weakening of the two-party system and the utterly insignificant vote of the Communist and Socialist parties, except in isolated localities, only emphasize the point that the great mass of American workers have yet to break as a class with the parties of big capitalism—the Democratic and Republican parties. The objective conditions for a labor party are now approaching a point of development similar to the situation prevailing in the immediate post-war years. The next months will see increasing interest in and rising activity for a labor party in the ranks of the great mass of organized workers, that is, in the ranks of the trade unions. Class-conscious workers, dedicating themselves to the task of advancing the interests of the proletariat as a whole, must lend all aid to stimulating this movement towards a labor party, to hasten this process of the American working class entering the next necessary historically progressive stage, the stage of mass independent political action.

Plight of Student Movement

(Continued from Page 7)
 an organization of socialist students although it tolerates non-socialists. Its official magazine "The Student Outlook" is also subtitled "the intercollegiate Socialist Review." Some of the chapters in the larger cities even bear the name of Socialist Club. In the last presidential elections, Revolt (Vol. I, No. 2, Dec. 1932) informs us of the "formation of over 200 college Thomas-for-President clubs, most of which are now being transformed into permanent L. I. D. chapters or Socialist clubs affiliated with the L. I. D." In line with this conception, the last N. Y. C. membership meeting, on Friday, September 28, heard a proposal for the establishment of a committee on relations with the Socialist Party and Y. P. S. L. and for the exchange of representatives between the New York S. L. I. D. and Y. P. S. L. The first proposal, after protests from the floor, was formally but not actually modified to the election of a committee on political relations, but the second was adopted without change. In answer to questions, it was stated that since the S. L. I. D. was affiliated to the I. S. S. F. there is no reason why the same relation should not exist in New York City. The argument is irrefutable, even if the premise is fallacious.

The theoretical justification for the present set-up of the S. L. I. D. is given by Mary W. Hilley in the Young Socialist of July-August 1932. "There can be no conflict between members of the League for Industrial Democracy and members of the Yipsels. In many instances they are one in two! The L. I. D. is an educational organization whose purpose succinctly states 'Education for a new social order based on production for use and not for profit.' The Y. P. S. L. is the vanguard of a political party endeavoring to establish a new society, a cooperative commonwealth." This type of reasoning does not differ from the ultra-leftist sectarianism of the C. P. But then sectarianism is not a communist monopoly.

The National Student League

The National Student League has passed through three stages in its short existence. When it was first constituted as the New York Student League, it expressed its program in broad and general terms. The third period had not yet reached the campus. The purpose of the league was declared to be: "To arouse in students an interest in the fundamental questions of social justice and organization; to bring home a realization of the active part the student must play in the economic order by critically evaluating and reorganizing the social environment of which he is an integral part; to make students conscious of their intellectual obligations and sensitive to all the duties involved." In our opinion this general statement is superior to all subsequent pronouncements, the length and "leftism" of later programs notwithstanding.

In the second phase the National Student League declared itself the "revolutionary student movement." Exactly what this meant was never explicitly defined in words but clearly expressed in their attitude towards events and movements. To be "revolutionary" meant to be "communist." And so we find in the March 1932 issue of the N. S. L. magazine, the "Student Review," an editorial on "Socialist Imperialists." It opens with these lines: "Though for many students the political role of the Socialist Party is quite clear, it requires a political crisis to make its treacherous purpose more evident." We find that when there were two unions in the ladies garment industry, the N. S. L. supported the N. T. W. I. U., "which is at present conducting a real strike and not a strike of the N. S. L. is actively supporting." At the first conference, (end of March 1932) Wm. W. Weinstone, a well known C. P. leader, addressed the conference. So "left" had the N. S. L. gone that Scott Nearing was the extreme right at that conference. Proposals of unity with the L. I. D. were laughed out of court.

FORWARD MARCH! to the Weekly Workers Age

WE NEED \$3,000
 WE RAISED \$490.55
 For A Weekly Workers Age by January 1st

Our drive to make the Workers Age a weekly is beginning to receive an enthusiastic response. By the time you read the figures below we will be well past the \$500 mark. We urge all our comrades and friends to speed up the work in order to make doubly sure of reaching our goal.

C.P.O. MEMBERS:
 Pay up your pledge immediately, even if you have to borrow the money to do so.
 Secure a collection list and approach your fellow workers for contributions.
 Go after your friends for a sub to Workers Age.

C.P.O. SYMPATHISERS:
 The weekly will be an effective instrument to aid you in your revolutionary activity. Help us realize it!
 Send your contribution now.
 Secure a collection list and approach others for donations.
 Subscribe yourself and get others to subscribe.

ALL TOGETHER NOW—LET US PUT OVER THE WEEKLY WORKERS AGE BY JANUARY FIRST

WEEKLY AGE BUILDERS
 (The figure in parenthesis is the amount previously donated by the comrade)

Athero S.	5.00	Naveira Rosita	5.00
Anonymous	5.00	Nehama Sabi	5.00
Bail Abe	3.00	Pickenback Helen	3.00
Bail Sam	(5.00) 4.00	Rose Ellen	5.00
Benjamin D.	10.00	Riley Eldica	5.00
Brent Alice	(1.00) 2.00	Rabinowitz Celia	2.00
Bell Albert	(1.00) 1.00	Rabinowitz Lena	5.00
Blecker H.	5.00	Stewart Mac	5.00
C. S.	2.00	Smith Lily	5.00
Christie C.	2.00	Steinberg Sophie (2.00) 4.00	
Collenberg B.	5.00	S. E.	1.50
Cutler H.	2.00	Stone Julius	2.00
Cork Jim	10.00	Saks Rose	5.00
Cibulski	1.00	Sympathiser	1.00
Dimitroff and Pope	25.00	Turner Bill	10.00
Dasheff Eva	1.00	Welsch Edward	1.50
Fisher Rose	5.00	Zeldin I.	2.00
Fried H.	10.00	Zelnick Morris	5.00
Fox Harry	1.00	Yaker Sam	5.00
Greenberg Lena	2.00	Young B.	5.00
Green Claire	5.00	Montreal Unit	35.94
Heberg Will	10.00	Paterson Unit	
Hinsdale Rachel (10.00) 35.00		Anthony J.	5.00
Hall Lee	1.00	Keller Eli	5.00
Herman Bernard	25.00	Vaughan Harry	5.00
Hines Cora	3.00	Philadelphia Unit No. 1	(25.00) 3.11
Jordan L.	2.50		
Jenkins Clarence	1.00		
Kun Lou	5.00		
Kass Sam	5.00		
Kaufman J.	3.00		
Lifshitz Gertrude	1.00		
Michael and Macklin ..	5.00		
Michaels Ray (10.00) 10.00			
		TOTAL	\$348.55
		Previously Listed	\$142.00
		Grand Total	\$490.55
		Still to go	\$2,509.45

Correction: The name of M. Yablon was listed in the last issue by mistake. The total from last issue is therefore \$142 and not \$147.

The program adopted at that conference condemned pacifism and endorsed revolution. It said: "The course of student activity against war, lies not in acceptance of pacifist phrases but in support of the working class as the only force historically destined to eliminate through revolutionary class struggle." (Emphasis mine A. E.) But it was not enough to condemn the pacifists. So they proceeded to the L. I. D. next in the following words: "Dominated by a thoroughly middle-class, non-student leadership which is completely out of touch with students and their problems, and based on a philosophy of social reform and pacifism, this organization is a major obstacle to the development of a revolutionary student movement." (My emphasis). In the mind of the young, enthusiastic, but inexperienced young communist, to be revolutionary meant to be against every one who did not agree with them 100%. To build a revolutionary student movement meant to build a student movement of communists and their sympathizers. It was only natural that they should also stand for the "struggle toward self determination in the Black Belt." The then more consistent Trotskyites proposed that the N. S. L. chapters be openly converted into the communist student fractions on the campus. The Y. C. L. accepted the advice in deeds though not in words. In an editorial at-

tack on the L. I. D. which had accused the N. S. L. of being a communist organization, we find no denial of the accusation, but rather a plea not to announce the fact from the houseposts, on the basis that some foreign born students might be deported if the administration learned of their communist affiliation.

But facts are stubborn and life is hard. The beautiful revolutionary theories spun in the ivory attics were destroyed by the early frosts of bitter disappointments. By December, 1933, the N. S. L. had discovered, in good scape-goat style, that: "In some places, (!) the N. S. L. groups took the extreme left position on everything, flaunted Communist slogans and phraseology and succeeded in isolating themselves completely. In a few others the indecision and confusion gave rise to a feeling of hopeless futility and thence, of course, to inactivity." It did not require prophetic vision to foretell that this would happen, for even a blind man could have seen the isolation of the N. S. L.

(To be continued)

BUILD THE AGE FOR UNITY