

In the Next Issue:

KARL MARX'S HUMANISM

By SIDNEY HOOK

Vol. 9, No. 40.

Workers' Age

Official Publication of the Independent Labor League of America

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1940.

AN ANALYSIS THAT MISSES . . . by Will Herberg . . . page 4.
IS THERE ANYTHING "PROGRESSIVE" IN FASCISM? . . . by D. Graham . . . p. 3.

5 CENTS

French Socialists Pledge Renewed Fight on Fascism

(Through the good offices of a French socialist who has just arrived in this country, we have received an important manifesto signed by a large number of leading French socialists, whose names will naturally be withheld. We publish this manifesto below.—Editor.)

THE great majority of the French Socialist Party, faithful to the policies set down at the most recent conventions in Royan, Montreux and Nantes, unqualifiedly condemn those socialist deputies who, at Vichy on July 2nd, handed over the destinies of France to Marshal Petain, proven fascist and reactionary, and to the disreputable clique of Pierre Laval. By their vote, these deputies have disapproved not only socialism but democracy itself.

The newspaper, L'Effort, organ of Spinasse, Rives and other traitors, has no relationship with socialism, and, as Marx Dornay has said in a statement suppressed by the censor, "could in no way involve the responsibility of the Socialist Party."

The signers of this statement add that they did not wait for the war and the defeat to demand a constitutional reform which, in their opinion, should have extended far beyond the constitution itself, and which, by freeing the state from its abject tyranny to the moneyed interests, would have assured the full development of the working class and socialism in the complete exercise of democracy.

They are convinced that the Socialist Party, weakened by reformism, opportunism and machine politics, has been partially responsible for the progressive deterioration of democracy in France. They believe that new methods and a new spirit are essential, so that socialism, which is not dead and shall not die, may again be able to accomplish its historic mission which coincides with that of the working class.

As long as the forces of exploitation, oppression and aggression, accompanied by class antagonisms, continue to exist, the signers of this statement are determined to lower the banner on which is written: Abolition of classes! Emancipation of the workers by the workers themselves! International accord of the national sections of the labor movement!

Finally, convinced that England is defending alone at this hour the freedom of the entire world against the appalling campaign of enslavement which Hitlerism and fascism represent, French socialists greet the resistance of Britain with profound admiration. In this, they are certain that they express the almost unanimous conviction of the French people.

But, as socialists, they maintain that this war now being carried on by England, in order to reveal the fullness of its significance, must assume broader aims than the crushing of Hitler's Reich; it must envisage even now the advent of a new social order without classes and without exploitation, in which all mankind will enjoy well-being and freedom.

LONG LIVE SOCIALISM!

Somewhere in France
September 1940.

Letters to an English Friend

By JAY LOVESTONE

(We present below some paragraphs from two recent letters from Jay Lovestone to one of the leading figures in the British Independent Labor Party.—Editor.)

New York, October 11, 1940.

YOUR letter of August 28th took more than a month getting here. It was most welcome.

I am in full accord with you that the American factor in the world situation tends to strengthen the specific gravity of conservatism, or even a species of reaction. Even a Roosevelt Administration, let alone a Willie regime, would tend to be well to the right of what you have in England today. It is for this reason that I have stressed in my articles my great hope that you folks in England would be able to finish off Hitler as quickly as possible without full American intervention.

The world, as is obvious, is certainly dilemma-ridden today. You need American planes, ships, guns, food with which to back Hitler. Yet an American alliance would contribute toward a strengthening of the conservative elements, and even toward making more conservative the dominant labor forces in your country. Risk as it is, I am prepared to take it [American aid] in order to ensure the maximum possibility of beating back Hitler. At least, in the latter situation, we have a chance of counteracting and even defeating American political backwardness. However, should there be a Hitler victory, which, in my opinion, is hardly avoidable without American help, then none of us will even get a chance to discuss or think about our mistakes of the past or about our lost possibilities.

I am much encouraged by the shifts made by Laski. I am sorry that the Independent Labor Party is not in the Labor Party today. A responsible, constructive voice of opposition and criticism inside the only mass labor movement that the British working people have—the only mass movement, regardless of all its serious shortcomings—is far more effective than a voice, clear as it may be, yet separated from the great mass. I have watched with interest the Tribune and have found increasingly encouraging reactions there. I think they still have some illusions about Russia. They still have some illusions about certain forces in your country. Nevertheless, one cannot deny that increasing health is being displayed in its columns.

I am prepared to accept, as the basic approach, the one indicated by you in your August 28th letter: "I reckon nobody can question the degree of my hostility to Nazism. Still, I am not of the opinion that we must go through a certain stage of fascism in all countries. A smashing blow at the head and heart of world fascism—Nazi Germany—will tend to serve as a knockout blow to fascism everywhere. You know that in social movements, when something happens very quickly the body politic. Take and heart, then something permeates and pervades very quickly the body politic. Take the case of Russia, once the center of revolutionary world socialism. When Russia was set back, barred in, strangled, without socialism suffered a disaster not only within the Russian boundaries, but throughout the socialist movement in all lands." On the basis of your statements, we have to recognize fascism as the worst evil which capitalism has thrown up, and must resist its extension; therefore, we defend all which capitalism has thrown up, and must resist its extension; therefore, we defend

A.F.L. Pledges War on Labor Rackets

Lewis Keeps Grip on C.I.O. as Murray Becomes President

Dominates Convention, Bars Genuine Fight on Stalinists; Unanimous Resolution Slams Door on Early Labor Unity

Atlantic City, N. J., Philip Murray has been chosen president of the C.I.O. and John L. Lewis still retains much control over that organization and his policies are still dominant in its ranks. This is the net result of the C.I.O. convention which concluded its sessions here last week with Lewis holding all the strings in his hands and operating his steamroller as ruthlessly as ever.

Philip Murray, on whom all the dissident elements in the C.I.O. had fixed their hopes, was nominated by Mr. Lewis himself at the last day of the convention. His election was by acclamation, after he had been seconded by Sidney Hillman, leader of whatever opposition there was among the delegates. Despite a pretty vigorous "draft" movement gotten under way by the Stalinists, Lewis insisted on keeping the presidency made a few days before elections to resign should President Roosevelt be reelected.

Hardly had Mr. Murray been installed in his new post that he made an official declaration to the convention that he was going to adhere to the policies of the Lewis regime, especially on the question of unity. His address was regarded as locking and bolting the door to unity that had already been slammed shut somewhat earlier in the proceedings by Mr. Lewis in his presidential re-election. Murray reiterated Lewis's doctrine that the C.I.O. could not seek unity with the A. F. of L. until it had grown stronger and more powerful; he even warned the Roosevelt

Administration not "to force a short-run agreement between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L."

There were some in informed quarters, however, who maintained that Murray's uncompromising words were mostly for effect and that his real attitude to the problem of unity, once he actually took the direction of the C.I.O. into his own hands, would be far more reasonable and conciliatory. But there was no indication of this at the convention.

In fact, the convention, at all times in Lewis's grip, not only endorsed the policies sponsored by him and his Stalinist allies but rebuffed the Hillman opposition on every front. The Hillman forces had come to the convention with a three-point program: (1) more democracy in the C.I.O., at least to the point of limiting the arbitrary powers of the president; (2) eradication of Stalinist influence in the C.I.O.; and (3) unity with the A. F. of L. Their own vote was on the third point. In his presidential address, Lewis went out of his way to pour scorn on those who were urging immediate unity. The C.I.O. was not yet strong enough to obtain an honorable peace, he said, thus reversing his previous argument that the C.I.O. was so strong that it did not need unity. The Lewis-Stalinist clique that ran the proceedings presented a resolution bluntly endorsing the Lewis standpoint. The resolution was adopted unanimously with the votes of Hillman's so-called

opposition! It was then that the fair character of this opposition became evident.

On the Stalinist menace, the procedure was even cruder. The Hillman resolution, sponsored by the New York Amalgamated Clothing Workers organization, was barred from the committee on some technical ground, so that no minority report was possible. Thomas Kennedy, of the United Mine Workers, made the committee report and proposed a resolution simply rejecting consideration of all policies emanating from totalitarianisms, dictators and foreign ideologies, such as Nazism and communism. The resolution was an obvious subterfuge, for the problem facing the C.I.O. convention was not general ideologies but the party spirit which Stalinists were in control of many key positions in the C.I.O. and certain of its affiliates. This resolution deliberately ignored, in fact, Lewis maintained in his opening address that there was no such problem at all, since there were no communists in important positions in the C.I.O. When the resolution was brought to the floor, Kennedy moved to eliminate all discussion as a demonstration of "unity." The resolution was then adopted unanimously, with a few of the Hillman faction abstaining.

Philip Murray, it was said, is personally hostile to Stalinist influence in the C.I.O., but again it is not so much Murray's personal attitude that counts as the entire system is controlled by the C.I.O., represented by John L. Lewis.

To make it clear that no purge of communists in the C.I.O. was contemplated and that Stalinists would continue to be tolerated and even encouraged, Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, after one of the six vice-presidents of the C.I.O. Curran is a notorious Stalinist agent and his election could not have been intended for anything but a demonstration of the utter meaninglessness of the resolution adopted. The other vice-presidents elected were: Emil Rieve, Textile Workers Union; S. H. (Continued on Page 2)

Public Supports Federal Control Of Trade Unions

Many More Urge Restraints On Unions Than on Business In Gallup Poll Survey

New York City.

A majority of voters favor more regulation of labor unions and less regulation of business at the present time, a survey by the American Institute of Public Opinion, which Dr. George Gallup is director, indicates.

"Leaders of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. may well ponder the state of public opinion in the nation regarding labor," Dr. Gallup said. "The survey indicates that labor unions face a much more serious problem than business. The study shows that business stands far higher in public favor today."

"The study put two questions to a cross-section of voters the nation over. The first was: 'During the next four years, do you think there should be more or less regulation of business by the federal government than at present?'"

"The vote of those with opinions was as follows:

More 27%
Less 51%
Same 22%

"One voter in five, 20% was undecided or without an opinion. "The second question dealt with regulation of labor unions. 'During the next four years, do you think there should be more or less regulation of labor unions by the federal government than at present?'"

"The returns show that more than twice as many people favor more regulation of labor unions as favor more regulation of business.

More 60%
Less 21%
Same 19%

"Approximately one voter in four, 27%, expressed no opinion. "One discovery made by the poll is that desire for greater labor-union regulation is not confined to the upper and middle-income groups. These groups favor such regulation by over 60%, but even in the low-income group, among people earning \$20 a week or less, a substantial majority—57%—is for union regulation."

"The low-income group is, however, much more in favor of business regulation than the middle and upper group."

Britain, Greece Push Advance Against Axis

Italian Navy Again Badly Hit; Hitler Meets Snag in Balkans Pact Drive

Britain scored another important victory in the elusive naval war in the Mediterranean last week. The destruction of the Italian fleet, begun at Taranto on the night of November 11, was carried a step farther near Sardinia, the British Admiralty reported. In a detailed account of the naval air battle, the Admiralty listed shell or torpedo damage to a 35,000-ton battleship, two 10,000-ton cruisers, one 8,000-ton cruiser, and two destroyers. The British losses were slight.

On the land front, Athens reported that its troops were still driving forward on all sectors, giving the Italians no opportunity to reorganize and make a stand. Greatly aided by British aviation, the Greeks made a steady headway into Albania, after having cleared their native soil of the intruder. Italian base at Koritza was taken and Gyrokastron, another important Italian base, had either fallen or was about to fall into Greek hands.

The Italian rout created a critical new situation for the Axis powers. Whatever the original German attitude to the Italian adventure may have been, it was clear that Hitler now could not afford to have the Greeks emerge completely triumphant, because that would mean not only British control of the strategic Near East but also a terrific blow to Axis prestige everywhere. But for Hitler to come to Mussolini's aid required

a "clarification" of the Balkan situation, which was far from achieved last week. It is true that, after a brief diplomatic drive by Berlin, Hungary, Rumania and Slovakia joined the Axis pact, but all three were already under German domination. The critical spot was Bulgaria, and Bulgaria last week apparently refused to sign up. This snag in Hitler's diplomatic drive was probably due both to the effect of the successful Greek resistance and to the stiff attitude taken by Turkey, unofficially backed by Russia. In Yugoslavia, too, the Axis drive for a "new order" in the Balkans was meeting with increasing difficulties.

As part of a carefully prepared plot to throw the country into hopeless chaos and thus provide Germany with the pretext for taking over complete military control in the interests of "preserving order," the Nazi-dominated Iron Guard ran amuck in Rumania last week, spreading murder and terror right and left. Scores, perhaps hundreds, of people, including many prominent political and public personalities, were assassinated in a "blood purge," and Rumania was virtually in a state of anarchy. The government of Premier Antonescu declared itself "helpless," in view of the ultimate source of the disturbances. By the end of the week, German troops were pouring into all parts of Rumania and taking over control.

* The part of the letter referred to reads: "We and you are united in looking at the war from the point of view of socialism. We would like to see the war end in socialism, but our view of policy cannot be limited by thinking of that complete realization. We must also consider what will occur or retard the possibilities of growth to socialism even if the whole task is not achieved."

JAY HESTER "American Labor Meets in Convention" THURSDAY Dec. 5, 8 P.M. 131 West 33rd Street • Large Hall • 7th Floor • ADMISSION 25 CENTS will speak on

