

NEW MILITANT

Official Organ of the Workers Party of the U.S.

VOL. 2, NO. 1

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1936

PRICE 3 CENTS

War Policy Causes Clash in Students Unity Conference

Resolution Adopted Ambiguous on Crucial Question of Soviet Union; S.Y.L. and Yipsel Members Fight Stalinist Social Patriotism

COLUMBUS, Ohio.—In spite of all attempts to avoid a clash on the major political issue confronting the fusion convention of the Socialist Student League for Industrial Democracy and the Stalinist National Student League, held here over the Christmas holidays, an open fight on the question of war marked the last hour of the convention.

The Stalinists controlled a decisive majority of the four hundred and twenty-seven delegates. The S.S.L.D. had 116 delegates and the N.S.L. 144. The unattached delegates included liberals, conservatives and a host of Stalinist students.

The main tendencies represented at the Congress were the liberals, who wanted a liberal student movement; the Stalinists, who wanted the same type of organization but were ready to accept almost anything the young Socialists demanded; the young Socialists who in their majority desired a broad student organization which accepted the Oxford Pledge "against support of any war declared by the United States Government" and finally, the Spartacus Youth delegates who fought for fusion on the basis of a revolutionary program particularly on the question of war.

The separate conventions of the S.S.L.D. and the N.S.L. opened on Friday afternoon. At both conventions a draft program was presented which the membership had never seen or discussed. Spartacus delegates presented their position at both meetings.

S.S.L.D. Convention

At the S.S.L.D. convention the original draft program accepted by the leaders of the two student organizations and whose interests we are anxious to serve was revised. A section stating that "we love our country as profoundly as anyone else" was deleted due to pressure of Left Socialists and the Spartacus delegates. Among the young Socialists seven delegates led by Monroe Sweetland voted against fusion with the N.S.L. on the ground that the latter would accept any program but that their real program would lead them to support the U.S. government in case it was allied with the Soviet Union. Another section of the young Socialists agreed with the Spartacus program for the fusion—the class struggle in society, the alliance of the students with the working class and a revolutionary program against war. However, Yipsel discipline prevented them from voting for the Spartacus position.

The S.S.L.D. convention also accepted a resolution on war which concretized the Oxford Pledge. It outlined three possible types of wars which could arise under present conditions and denounced support of any of the three: a so-called "defensive war" of the United States; "democratic" wars against Fascist nations; in case of alliance between the U. S. and a "progressive or non-imperialist" power. Apart from the failure to present the basic causes of war and the ultimate solution, the resolution had two defects: viz, the Ethiopian situation (which involves the questions of League of Nations sanctions and "neutrality laws") was not dealt with and the Soviet Union was not mentioned, though implicit in the phrase "progressive or non-imperialist power."

The steering committee of the S.S.L.D. for the fusion convention was empowered to prevent the fusion if the general line of this resolution was not adopted or call a caucus meeting of the S.S.L.D. delegates to consider the matter.

At the N.S.L. convention a motion was adopted to accept the "spirit" of the report of the national secretary which included the draft program. Spirited discussion on the question of war was led by Spartacus delegates.

The first day of the fusion convention was occupied with the election of committees. On Sunday discussion was opened on the program for the fusion. The N.S.L. had accepted the changes made by the S.S.L.D. convention. The program traced the cause of present ills in the domination of the "inner oligarchy" over the "plain people."

"The American Student Union is not a political organization. Although it recognizes the need for basic social change, it leaves to political organizations the achieving of these changes." The Oxford Pledge was endorsed. The abolition of the R.O.T.C. was called for. The program was discussed section by section. The opposition to the program from the right quoted the statements of the leaders of the fusion that "we must include

(Continued on Page 2)

Road Is Cleared for French Fascist Coup

People's Front Abandons Defense Corps

By H. F. ROBERTS

In Italy in 1921 Mussolini's Blackshirts organized and signed an agreement with the Italian Socialist Party for "mutual" disarmament. This pact, made under government auspices at a time when the country teetered on the brink of civil war, led to the disappearance of the workers' Red Militia. Their path thus smoothed, the Blackshirts two years later took power and smashed what was left of Italian workers' organizations.

In Germany in 1932 Heinrich Brüning's Bonapartist government decreed the "dissolution" of military-political formations. After this "victory" against the Fascists, the Rote Front, workers' combat organization, passed out of existence. And the Storm Troopers? Listen to Roehm, their leader:

"But only the uniforms and insignia had to disappear. After the dissolution, as before, the detachments of the Storm Troopers continued to train on the training grounds of the Reichswehr (German army) at Dohrenitz, as on other state training grounds. Only they were no longer called the Storm Troops but the League of Popular German Sport. (From Roehm's Memoirs.)

A year later the armed Nazi representatives of the German bourgeois state trampled underfoot the disarmed and disoriented organizations of the German working class. The Perfidious Example Followed.

In France last month the Socialist and Stalinist parties bound themselves to a similar agreement for "mutual" disarmament and dissolution. In a terrible scene of "reconciliation" in the Chamber of Deputies on Dec. 6 the Socialist and Stalinist bureaucracies joined the Fascists to set the seal on the betrayal of the French workers, a betrayal not reduced one whit by the smokescreen of confusion, apology and explanation with which the events were overclouded in the days that followed. The result was perfectly clear.

The result gave the French bourgeoisie a new weapon in its systematic drive against the French workers, in preparation for new turns in the screws of exploitation under a deepening crisis, and in preparation for war.

After they had publicly disavowed any desire to organize the French workers to fight for revolutionary aims, after proclaiming their desire to avert civil war and achieve "la reconciliation française," the Socialist and Stalinist parties claimed a great "victory" for the People's Front. This "victory" must be examined with the utmost attention, for like all Stalinist-reformist "victories" it is in

reality a shattering disaster, precursor of worse betrayals to come. The Fascist Danger Over?

To listen to the People's Frontists, the Fascist danger is practically over. "Under the action of the People's Front," declared Cachin, "French Fascism is going through a deep crisis and the Hour of Hitlerism (de la Rocque's zero hour) has been perforce postponed into the dim fogs of the future." (L'Humanite, Dec. 13.) How has this miracle been performed? By a proletarian offensive against capital? But no, the voluntary disarmament in advance of the French working class has been proudly proclaimed by Blum, Cachin, Thorez and Co. It has come about through the passage of three laws by the Chamber of Deputies—three laws which upon examination turn out to be sharp weapons not against the Fascists but against the workers. And these laws were pushed through the Chamber by the People's Front! How well the bourgeoisie knows how to use its lackeys!

On Dec. 3 the debate on the question for Stalinist Sages

In the latest issue of the Communist International (Nov. 5, 1935) Manuisky informs us on page 1381:

"Such a measure as the closing of the Suez Canal demanded by the Second and Amsterdam International follows the line of the interests of British imperialism, which is displaying a very suspicious love for the 'independence' of Ethiopia."

And on page 1515 of the same number we are told that: "The Communist peace policy" includes the "closing of the Suez Canal!"

Will the Daily Worker Question Box resolve the contradiction? Or are we to conclude that "the Communist peace policy" falls in line with British imperialism?

"Factions leagues" opened in the French Chamber after Laval had won two successive votes of confidence with the aid of a large section of the Radical (People's Front) votes influenced by Herriot, whose role in support of Laval was consistently covered over in the columns of L'Humanite.

(One of these votes of confidence was the Laval-Herriot decree laws and deflation policy which was sustained by a Radical vote despite the devastating charge by Vincent Auriol, Socialist, that the Laval economic program "violated property rights"—see Populaire, Nov. 30.)

The keynote of the debate on the political leagues was set by Ramette, Stalinist deputy, and Guernut, a Radical, whose declarations are prominently featured in bold type by L'Humanite on Dec. 4:

Waving the French Flag
Ramette: "While the People's Front is realizing the union of Frenchmen behind the Tricolor and the Red Flag, the government is compromising itself with those who divide (the people) and foment civil war."

Guernut: "These (Fascist) militias, prepared for civil war, are not for civilization but for barbarism. That is why we denounce them, condemn them and demand their dissolution."

And in L'Humanite Vaillant-Couturier wrote: "This is not a matter of politics nor of economic demands. It is a question of troops for civil war, armed, trained, organized in military style... wounding or killing Frenchmen. Against them the country raises its demand for disarmament and dissolution. The Chamber must heed."

That day L'Humanite sedulously avoided reporting that Edouard Herriot was moving heaven and earth to have his supporters support Laval. Even Populaire did not hesitate to report—and bemoan—that fact!

Blum, Thorez In New Betrayal

La Rocque's Army

During the course of the speeches in the Chamber on the Croix de Feu, it was revealed that Col. de la Rocque's Fascist organization has grown to a force of 712,000 men, armed, trained, organized, equipped with guns, machine guns, armored cars and even planes. This organization—directly linked to the General Staff and the big French bourgeoisie—was to be dissolved at the request of the People's Front by Laval, puppet of the same General Staff and the same big bourgeoisie. What a frightful comedy! But the session of Dec. 6—

which the Stalinists tried afterward to dub "comedy"—heavily underscored the threat that the future still holds.

Ybarnegaray, a Croix de Feu deputy, rose and astounded his audience by introducing a law providing for the severe punishment of any private individual found in the possession of arms.

He denied that the Croix de Feu wanted civil war (!) and declared that his "friend and brother," de la Rocque, was interested only in "cleansing" the Republic and defending the regime.

"Can we not unite under the firm and salutary hand of the law?" asked the Fascist deputy. "Do you want to feel on your faces the hot breath of civil war?" He then declared that dissolution was an "ineffective and dangerous" solution but proposed disarmament by all political-military groupings.

Leon Blum rose to answer him—as he explained afterward in Populaire—spontaneously, out of a sheer upsurge of brotherly feeling. He

(Continued from Page 2)

Dismissing Scene of "Reconciliation"

recognition as the State Committee of New York.

Issue up to N. E. C.

Interest in the socialist controversy now shifts to Philadelphia where the National Executive Committee meets the coming week end. The new state committee set up at the Utica conference will have a delegation there to demand recognition. Waldman, leader of the New York right wing has announced in the press that the present "official" state committee will not attend and has declared that the recognition of the new committee will be the signal for a nationwide split. The Pennsylvania state committee, dominated by the right wing, has also warned the N. E. C. to give no support to the "secessionists" in New York. Mayor Hoan of Milwaukee, a powerful figure in the N. E. C. and in the party, has declared for "unity" and will probably attempt to force a reconciliation of the two contending organizations. This was indicated in a personal letter from him to a party member which was read at the Utica conference. The action taken at the Philadelphia meeting of the N. E. C. will very probably determine whether the split will be healed for the time being, localized to New York or extended on a national scale. In the event of the latter eventually Norman Thomas will undoubtedly carry a large majority of the party with him in support of the new state committee set up at Utica.

Olson Calls out Militia In Strutwear Hosiery Strike in Minneapolis

Troops Summoned After Cops Prove Helpless In Protecting Scabs in Face of Courage And Militancy of Striking Workers

By CARL O'SHEA

MINNEAPOLIS, Dec. 29.—Following a hard-fought battle Thursday afternoon between pickets and scabs, at which half a dozen police were stoned and clubbed and several scabs injured, sixty National Guardsmen were called out by Governor Floyd B. Olson Friday noon to assist the local "law and order" agencies in preventing further "disorders" at the Strutwear plant. A strike of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers local has been in effect at the Strutwear Hosiery Company since August 15. The governor has announced that "until we have surveyed the situation and decided on a definite course, we will close the Strutwear plant."

Immediately after the sentencing of three pickets last Monday to four and six months in the workhouse, the Strutwear bosses, with the help of Mayor Latimer and the police, began their plan to gradually open the plant. On Tuesday a crew of 20 finks were sent in to clean the machinery. (The nature of the operations are such that a full crew cannot begin work immediately. It takes about 30 days to build up the operations to a point where the full working force can be used.)

The striking union countered by distributing 50,000 leaflets among the Minneapolis workers, appealing for help on the picket line.

The Workers Go Into Action

On Thursday afternoon pickets began to gather to catch the scabs as they came out of the plant at 4:40. As the scabs came out, protected by 35 cops, about 400 pickets charged. Half a dozen cops went down as the scabs were terrorized. A door or so was torn off one of the scab cars; windows were broken in others. Five pickets were surrounded by cops and hustled into a patrol wagon. Militant workers surrounded the wagon and threatened to dump it over unless their brothers were released. The arrested pickets were released, and a hurry call went in for more policemen. The picketing squadron withdrew for one hour, and then around six o'clock made a last flying demonstration. Dashing by the plant, armed with rocks, they let fly at the windows, breaking a hundred or so. By the time additional police had arrived, the pickets had disappeared.

The determination of Minneapolis workers to keep the labor-hating Strutwear plant closed until it recognizes the union made it plain to the authorities that any further strike-breaking efforts would result in a major riot and further bloodshed. This the hated Mayor Latimer, Farmer-Labor incumbent, is not ready to take the responsibility for. Pleading an insufficient police force, Latimer on Friday appealed to the governor to send in the National Guard to take charge of the district surrounding the struck plant. Gov. Olson immediately complied with the request, pointing out, however, that the action would not be a declaration of martial law. Since Friday afternoon, the Strutwear plant has remained closed. A handful of uniformed guardsmen, armed with bayonets, are patrolling the entrances to the plant.

Public Against Strutwear Bosses

On Tuesday all negotiations between the hosiery union and the Strutwear employers were abruptly broken off by the bosses, who have refused to make any concessions to the union. Public sentiment is turning more and more sharply against the Citizens Alliance employers, and their Tory position is leading to a mounting mass anger. Their practice of underpaying their workers, keeping them on "apprentice" wages for years, their use of spies, etc., is widely known throughout the industry and the city.

It need hardly be pointed out that the present situation at the plant is very unhealthy. All those familiar with the long 1934 General Drivers strike know that the militia make mighty poor pickets; that only the workers themselves can picket effectively. Also, it will be recalled that in a similar situation the governor proved that he was very sensitive to demands from the right, and would change overnight the relationship of forces. The hosiery workers must have faith only in themselves and the working class forces which they can rally to their support. To expect the militia to keep the plant closed until the bosses come to terms is to give way to a dangerous illusion. Despite the fact that an election is looming this coming year, and that therefore the public officials will conduct themselves in a careful manner, the Strutwear strikers must be eternally vigilant. Only union workers can run machinery! Only workers can picket effectively!

2 Year Strike Is Called Off

PATERSON, N. J.—The strike of the Typographical employees of the two Paterson dailies, was called off yesterday, when the union admitted defeat and officially withdrew the pickets from the struck plants.

The strike, which was poorly conducted throughout, had lasted for close to two years, dragging on wearily and hopelessly, without militancy and without leadership. Instead of concentrating their forces on winning the strike, the union, under Stalinist influence, busied itself trying to compete with the publishers, and was finally successful in getting a few dollars together, mostly from labor sources, with the result that a new paper is now in existence in Paterson, the Paterson Press. In spite of its almost completely labor backing the new paper is not going to be a labor paper, but a "People's Paper," according to the new lingo.

It is important to note that the strike, broken from the start by the fact that other crafts were allowed to work while the types were out, failed to utilize the sympathy of other strikers when the dyes local was on strike, almost never attempted mass picketing, and kept itself in a sort of precarious existence on the strike benefit of the International and on voluntary contributions from a number of locals throughout the country.

Utica Conference of "Militants" Deepens Rupture in Socialist Party

The split in the New York organization of the Socialist Party was deepened and broadened to a statewide basis at the state conference of the Norman Thomas "militant" group held at Utica last week end. At the same time, the "Old Guard," assembled in mass meeting at Cooper Union Sunday, with sympathetic delegations of right wing socialists from other states, denounced Thomas as a "traitor" and threatened to make a split in the national organization if the N. E. C. recognizes the rival organization in New York.

It appears from the representation at the Utica conference that the Thomas group has the edge over the "Old Guard" in the state as well as in New York City. 88 delegates were in attendance at the conference according to the official report, 43 from New York City and 45 from upstate locals. Political issues were kept in the background, the strategy of the "militants" apparently being to strive for the broadest possible support of the upstate locals on purely organizational questions. The inactivity of the "Old Guard" state committee and its autocratic methods have alienated many of the locals whose members, as shown by the discussion at the conference, are far from understanding the political implications of the split. The personal popularity of Norman Thomas has also been a big factor in swinging a majority of the members of the upstate as well as the New York City organization to the

side of the new committee.

"Activism" the Keynote

The delegates, bent on having an "active" socialist party that will be democratic in its procedure and "inclusive" in its membership, manifested a determination to carry through the split and to have done with the dead weight of the "Old Guard" once and for all. The resolution adopted puts the issue squarely up to the National Executive Committee with a demand for the official recognition of the new committee. The resolution follows:

WHEREAS the State Committee of the Socialist Party of New York has by its neglect of its duty to advance Socialism in the State of New York; by its continuing sabotage of the National Party and by its wholly unconstitutional act in directing and supporting a wholesale exclusion of the most active Party members in New York State under the guise of reorganizing the Party, has forfeited its legal and moral right to recognition as a State Committee in New York;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we assume the responsibilities of an emergency convention of the Socialist Party of the State of New York and proceed to elect a representative State Committee and take such further action as may be necessary to save the Party in New York, and we instruct the State Committee to appear before the NEC at its next meeting to claim

Student Unity Conference Clashes on War Policy

this was attempted the chairman ruled it out of order. Earlier in the convention the Spartacus substitute motion on war to the program was tabled to the program committee so that it would be buried before any discussion could

PUBLISHERS
New York City

In ordering any new publication, just deduct 20 percent from list price. This also applies to International, Kerr, Pioneer and other publishers. All books sent collect unless 10 cents per item is included with order.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
100 Fifth Ave., New York City

this was attempted the chairman ruled it out of order. Earlier in the convention the Spartacus substitute motion on war to the program was tabled to the program committee so that it would be buried before any discussion could

THEATER BENEFIT
Tickets are now available for the theatre party "Let Freedom Ring" Monday evening, Jan. 13 at the district office, 55 E. 11th St. Prices range from 30c up to \$1.50.

THEATER BENEFIT
Tickets are now available for the theatre party "Let Freedom Ring" Monday evening, Jan. 13 at the district office, 55 E. 11th St. Prices range from 30c up to \$1.50.

Sectarianism, Centrism, and the Fourth International

By LEON TROTSKY

It would be absurd to deny the presence of sectarian tendencies in our midst. They have been laid bare by an entire series of discussions and splits. Indeed, how could an element of sectarianism have failed to manifest itself in an ideological movement which stands irreconcilably opposed to all the dominant organizations in the working class, and which is subjected to monstrous, absolutely unprecedented persecutions all over the world? Reformists and centrists readily seize upon every occasion to point a finger at our "sectarianism"; and most of the time, they have in mind not our weak but our strong side: our serious attitude toward theory; our effort to plumb every political situation to the bottom, and to advance clear-cut slogans; our hostility to "easy" and "comfortable" decisions which deliver from cares today, but prepare a catastrophe on the morrow. Coming from opportunists, the accusation of sectarianism is most often a compliment.

Marxian Distinctions

Curiously enough, however, we are often accused of sectarianism not only by reformists and centrists but by opponents from the "left," the notorious sectarians, who might well be placed as exhibits in any museum. The basis for their dissatisfaction with us lies in our irreconcilability to themselves, in our striving to purge ourselves of the infantile sectarian diseases, and to rise to a higher level.

To a superficial mind it may seem that such words as sectarian, centrists, etc., are merely polemical expressions exchanged by opponents for lack of other and more appropriate epithets. Yet the concept of **sectarianism** as well as the concept of **centrism** has a precise meaning in a Marxist dictionary. Marxism has built a scientific program upon the laws that govern the movement of capitalist society, and which were discovered by it. This is a colossal conquest! However, it is not enough to create a correct program. It is necessary that the working class accept it. But the sectarian, in the nature of things, comes to a stop upon the first half of the task. Active intervention into the actual struggle of the workers' masses is supplanted for him by an abstract propaganda of a Marxist program.

The Sectarian View of Society

Every working class party, every faction passes during its initial stages through a period of pure propaganda, i.e., the training of its cadres. The period of existence as a Marxist circle ingrains invariably habits of an abstract approach to the problems of the workers' movement. He who is unable to step in time over the confines of this circumscribed existence becomes transformed into a conservative sectarian. The sectarian looks upon the life of society as a great school, with himself as a teacher there. In his opinion the working class should put aside its less important matters, and assemble in solid rank around his rostrum: then the task would be solved.

Though he swears by Marxism in every sentence, the sectarian is the direct negation of dialectic materialism which takes experience as its point of departure, and always returns to it. A sectarian does not understand the dialectic action and reaction between a finished program and a living, that is to say, imperfect and unfinished mass struggle. The sectarian's method of thinking is that of rationalist, a formalist, and an enlightener. During a certain stage of development rationalism is progressive, being directed critically against blind beliefs and superstitions (the Eighteenth century!). The progressive stage of rationalism is repeated in every great emancipatory movement. But rationalism (abstract propagandism) becomes a reactionary factor the moment it is directed against the dialectic. Sectarianism is hostile to dialectics (not in words but in action) in the sense that it turns its back upon the actual development of the working class.

Ready-Made Formulas

The sectarian lives in a sphere of ready-made formulas. As a rule life passes him by without noticing him; but now and then he receives in passing such a flippant makes him turn 180 degrees around his axis, and often makes him continue on his straight path, only . . . in the opposite direction. Discord with reality engenders in the sectarian the need to constantly render his formulas more precise. This goes under the name of discussion. To a Marxist discussion is an important but a functional instrument of the class struggle. To the sectarian discussion is a goal in itself. However, the more that he discusses all the more do the actual tasks escape him. He is like a man who satisfies his thirst with salt water; the more he drinks, the thirstier he becomes. Hence the constant irritability of the sectarian. Who slipped him the salt? Assuredly, the "captulators" from the International Secretariat. The sectarian sees an enemy

Leon Trotsky Analyzes the Role of these Tendencies In the Revolutionary Movement

in everyone who attempts to explain to him that an active participation in the workers' movement demands a constant study of objective conditions, and not haughty bulldozing from the sectarian rostrum. For analysis of reality the sectarian substitutes intrigue, gossip, and hysteria.

Twins and Antipodes

Centrism is in a certain sense the polar opposite of sectarianism; it abhors precise formulas, seeks routes to reality outside of theory. But, despite Stalin's famous formula, "antipodes" often turn out to be . . . "twins." A formula detached from life is hollow. Living reality cannot be grasped without theory. Thus, both of them, the sectarian and the centrist, depart in the end with empty hands and join together . . . in their feeling of animosity towards the genuine Marxist.

How many times have we met a smug centrist who reckons himself a "realist" merely because he sets out to swim without any ideological baggage whatever and is tossed by every vagrant current. He is unable to understand that principles are not dead ballast but a life line for a revolutionary swimmer. The sectarian, on the other hand, generally does not want to go swimming at all, in order not to wet his principles. He sits on the shores and reads lectures on morality to the flood of the class struggle. But sometimes a desperate sectarian leaps headlong into the water, senses hold of the centrist and helps him drown. So was it; so will it be.

In our epoch of disintegration and dispersion there are to be found a good many circles in various countries who have acquired a Marxist program, most often by borrowing it from the Bolsheviks, and who then turned their ideological baggage into a greater or lesser degree of ossification. Let us take for example the best specimen of this type, namely the Belgian group led by comrade Vereecken. On August 10 the Spartakus, the organ of this group, announced its adherence to the Fourth International. This announcement was to be welcomed. But at the same time it is necessary to state beforehand that the Fourth International would be doomed if it made concessions to sectarian tendencies.

Vereecken's Predictions

Vereecken was in his own time an irreconcilable opponent of the entry of the French Communist League into the Socialist Party. There is no crime in this: the question was a new one, the step a risky one, differences were entirely permissible. In a certain sense, equally permissible, or, at any rate, unavoidable were exaggerations in the ideological struggle. Thus, Vereecken predicted the inevitable ruin of the international organization of the Bolshevik-Leninists as a result of its "dissolution" in the Second International. We would advise Vereecken to reprint today in the Spartakus his yesterday's prophetic documents. But this is not the chief evil. Worse yet is the fact that in its present declaration Spartakus confines itself to evasively pointing out that the French section remained true to its principles "in a considerable, we may even say, a large measure." If Vereecken behaved as a Marxist politician should, he would have stated clearly and definitely where in did our French section depart from its principles, and he would have given a direct and an open answer to the question of who proved to be right: the advocates or the opponents of entry?

Democratic Centralism

Vereecken is even more incorrect in his attitude toward our Belgian section that entered into the reformist Labor Party. Instead of studying the experiences resulting from the work carried on under new conditions and criticizing the actual steps taken, if they merit criticism, Vereecken keeps on complaining about the conditions of the discussion in which he suffered defeat. The discussion, you see, was incomplete, inadequate, and disloyal: Vereecken failed to satisfy his thirst with salt water. There is no "real" democratic centralism in the League! In relation to the opponents of the entry the League evinced . . . "sectarianism." It is clear that comrade Vereecken has a liberal and not a Marxist conception of sectarianism: in this he obviously draws close to the centrists. It is not true that the discussion was inadequate; it was carried on for several months, orally and in the press, and on an international scale, besides. After Vereecken had failed to convince others that marking time in one place is the best revolutionary policy, he refused to abide by the decisions of the national and international organizations. The representatives of the majority told

Vereecken on more than one occasion that if experience proved that the step taken was incorrect, we would rectify the mistake jointly. Is it really possible that after the twelve years' struggle of the Bolshevik-Leninists you lack sufficient confidence in your own organization to preserve discipline of action even in case of tactical disagreements? Vereecken paid no heed to comradely and conciliating arguments. After the entry of the majority of the Belgian section into the Labor Party, the Vereecken group naturally found itself outside our ranks. The blame for this falls entirely upon its own shoulders.

Adaptation to "Legality"

If we return to the gist of the question, then comrade Vereecken's sectarianism stands out in all its dogmatic uncouthness. What's this! cried Vereecken in indignation, Lenin spoke of breaking with reformists but the Belgian Bolshevik-Leninists enter a reformist party! But Lenin had in mind a break with the reformists as the inevitable consequence of a struggle against them, and not an act of salvation regardless of time and place. He required a split with the social-patriots not in order to save his own soul but in order to tear the masses away from social-patriotism. In Belgium the trade unions are fused with the party, the Belgian party is essentially the organized working class. To be sure, the entry of revolutionists into the Belgian Labor Party not only opened up possibilities but also imposed restrictions. In propagandizing Marxist ideas it is necessary to take into account not only the legalities of the bourgeois state but also the legalities of a reformist party (both these legalities, it may be added, coincide in a large measure). Generally speaking, adaptation to an alien "legality" carries with it an indubitable danger. But this did not prevent

the Bolsheviks from utilizing even Czarist legality: for many years the Bolsheviks were compelled to call themselves at trade union meetings, and in the legal press not social-democrats, but "consistent democrats." True, this did not mean pass scot-free; a considerable number of elements adhered to Bolshevism who were more or less consistent democrats, but not at all international socialists; however, by supplementing legal with illegal activity, Bolshevism overcame the difficulties. Of course, the "legality" of Vandervelde, De Man, Spaak and other flunkies of the Belgian plutocracy imposes very onerous restrictions upon the Marxists, and thus engenders dangers. But Marxists, who are not as yet sufficiently strong to create their own party, have their own methods for the struggle against the dangers of reformist captivity: a clear-cut program, constant factional ties, international criticism, etc. The activity of a revolutionary wing in a reformist party can be judged correctly only by evaluating the dynamics of development. Vereecken does not do this either in regard to the faction Action Socialiste Revolutionnaire (Left wing in Belgian Labor Party—Ed.), or the Verite group. Had he done so, he would have been compelled to admit that the A.S.R. has made a serious development forward in the recent period. What the final balance be it is impossible to forecast as yet. But the entry into the Belgian Labor Party is already justified by experience.

Discussion as a Dogma

Extending and generalizing his mistake, Vereecken asserts that the existence of isolated small groups which split away at different stages from our international organization is proof of our sectarian methods. Thus, the actual relationships are stood on their head. As a matter of fact, into the ranks

MARCH OF EVENTS

By JACK WEBER

UNDECLARED WAR IN EAST

The guerrilla warfare across the borders of Outer Mongolia between Japanese invaders and the Soviet Mongolians is the prelude of imperialist aggression against the Soviet Union. It is the beginning of an undeclared war. The Japanese are pressing on without let-up to the Siberian border. Inner Mongolia has already fallen prey to the insatiable appetite of the Eastern imperialists. The diplomatic term "incident" is not applicable to a situation in which scores of lorries filled with armed troops stage incursions reaching forty miles into "enemy" territory. This is what the Japanese army is doing in preparation for the real drive, the great push that will commence the Second World War. Now as never before the workers of all lands must be made to realize that all their hopes for a better world, nay, that the preservation of civilization itself, depend on their successful defense of the Soviet Union against the murderous onslaught of world capitalism. The struggle of the workers for liberation from wage slavery is indissolubly bound up with the fate of the Russian Workers' Republic. The fight to save the Soviet Union must be waged everywhere, on all fronts, against the system of capitalist exploitation. The enemies of the Soviet Union are the capitalists of all lands. The fight must be waged against them. Only by the revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of capitalism can the safety of the Soviets be assured. The nearer war approaches the greater becomes the urgency for organizing the forces of the proletariat against imperialist war. These forces, at present dispersed and leaderless, can be rallied for new victories only under the banner of the Fourth International.

EDEN MADE SECRETARY

Eden replaces Hoare as Secretary for Foreign Affairs—and nothing changes. Those who talk of the conservative ministry of Baldwin embarking on some new course are merely carrying out their function of deluding the masses. Baldwin's cabinet, including Eden, have only one task under many forms, the defense of British imperialism. In the carrying out of this task Eden will use cleverly the worked-up sentiment for sanctions and the League of Nations. Already England is engaged in manipulating those pawns of the powers on the chessboard of politics, the Balkan States. These states form at the same time the key to the door of communications with the East and with Africa, and also the means of entry to the backdoors of the European states that may be occupied in warfare on the Western fronts. Eden's first job is to consolidate a

military bloc with Turkey, Greece, Rumania and Yugoslavia under the fake of "exploring" the bases of sanctions. Turkey will probably be allowed to rearm the Dardanelles. Thus with the help of the British Labor Party, which approves of sanctions, British imperialism is making complete war preparations. Sanctions and the League of Nations thus serve as a perfect cover, a protective coloration of "peace" hiding the feverish plans for war. Instead of denouncing the fraud being perpetrated on the masses, the leaders of the Labor Party again show their function of advocating the views of the bourgeoisie in the ranks of the working class and betraying the workers to the ruling class by supporting sanctions. In this period social-patriotism and sanctions become absolutely synonymous.

There is even less to be said about such groups as International, or Proletaire. They also abstract their views from the latest issues of La Verite, with an admixture of critical improvisations. They have no perspectives at all of revolutionary growth; but they manage to get along without perspectives. Instead of trying to learn within the framework of a more serious organization (to learn is difficult) these abhorers of discipline and very pretentious "leaders" desire to teach the working class (this appears to them to be easier). In moments of sober reflection they must themselves realize that their very existence as "independent" organizations is a sheer misunderstanding.

LAVAL SHAKY

The Laval government, one that straddles the two major classes in modern society in the attempt to mediate between the two irreconcilables, the capitalists and the workers, has become extremely shaky. Its fall is predicted in a short time. The laws for the disarming of "armed leagues" have been made meaningless by the Senate, if one assumes that they could have had any real meaning even if passed in their original form. The Senate refuses to leave the matter of prosecution and punishment to the ordinary courts. It places the entire matter in the hands of the president and the cabinet. The armed bands are—if you please—to be disbanded and dissolved by decree, with no force to actually carry out the decrees. The farcical nature of the procedure in which the Socialists and Stalinists were led to participate by their eagerness for class-collaboration, stands nakedly revealed in this Senate proposal. Of course, nobody possessing an iota of political sanity could possibly have been led to believe that Lebrun or Laval would take any steps to disarm the forces held in reserve by their masters in case the workers become unmanageable. Far from attempting to disarm the Fascist bands, Laval will turn the attack on the workers and will do everything possible to aid his friend Colonel de la Rocque. Even if there were not direct evidence of the constant seances between Laval and de la Rocque, this course could be infallibly inferred by the most superficial study of the relations between the Bonapartist governments and the Fascist bands in every country where Fascism has come to power. Without government aid, hidden at first, more or less open later, these bandits could never have grown and become powerful.

Welsbord is indubitably closer to a revolutionary type than Field. But at the same time he represents the perfect example of a sectarian. He is utterly incapable of preserving proportions either in ideas or in actions. Every principle he turns into a sectarian caricature. That is why even correct ideas become in his hands instruments for disorganizing his own ranks.

There is no need to dwell upon similar groups in other countries. They split from us not because we are intolerant or intolerable but because they themselves did not and could not go forward. Since the time of the split they have succeeded only in exposing their incapacity. Their attempts to unite with each other, on a national or an international scale, produced no results in any single case: peculiar to sectarianism is only the power of repulsion and not the power of attraction.

of the Bolshevik-Leninists there came during the initial stages a considerable number of anarchistic and individualistic elements generally incapable of organizational discipline, and occasionally a mere failure who did not make his career in the Comintern. These elements viewed the struggle against "bureaucratism" in approximately the following manner: no decisions must ever be arrived at, but, instead, "discussion" is to be installed as a permanent occupation. We can say with complete justification that the Bolshevik-Leninists manifested a good deal, perhaps even a good deal too much patience toward such types of individuals and groupies. Only since an international core has been consolidated that began to assist the national sections in purging their ranks of internal sabotage did there begin an actual and systematic growth of our international organization.

Let us take a few examples of groups that split from our international organization at various stages of its development.

A Strange Example

The French periodical Que Faire is an instructive specimen of a combination of sectarianism with eclecticism. On the most important questions this periodical expounds the views of Bolshevik-Leninists, changing a few commas, and directing severe critical remarks at us. At the same time this periodical permits with impunity a defense of social-patriotic garbage, under the guise of discussion, and under the cover of "defending the U.S.S.R." The internationalists of Que Faire are themselves unable to explain how and why they happen to cohabit peacefully with social-patriots, after breaking with the Bolsheviks. It is clear, however, that with such eclecticism Que Faire is least capable of replying to the question what to do (que faire). The "internationalists" and the social-patriots are agreed on only one thing: never the Fourth International! Why? One must not "break away" from the communist workers. We have heard the self-same argument from the S.A.P.: we must not break away from the social-democratic workers. In this instance, too, antipodes turn out twins. The peculiar thing, however, is that Que Faire is not connected and, by its very nature, cannot be connected with any workers.

There is even less to be said about such groups as International, or Proletaire. They also abstract their views from the latest issues of La Verite, with an admixture of critical improvisations. They have no perspectives at all of revolutionary growth; but they manage to get along without perspectives. Instead of trying to learn within the framework of a more serious organization (to learn is difficult) these abhorers of discipline and very pretentious "leaders" desire to teach the working class (this appears to them to be easier). In moments of sober reflection they must themselves realize that their very existence as "independent" organizations is a sheer misunderstanding.

Field and Welsbord

In the United States we might mention the Field and Welsbord groups. Field—in his entire political make-up—is a bourgeois radical who has acquired the economic views of Marxism. To have become a revolutionist Field would have had to work for a number of years as a disciplined soldier in a revolutionary proletarian organization; but he began by deciding to create a workers' movement "of his own." Assuming a position to our "left" (where else?), Field shortly entered into fraternal relations with the S.A.P. As we see, the anecdotal incident that befell Bauer was not at all accidental. The urge to stand to the left of Marxism leads fatally into the Centrist swamp.

Welsbord is indubitably closer to a revolutionary type than Field. But at the same time he represents the perfect example of a sectarian. He is utterly incapable of preserving proportions either in ideas or in actions. Every principle he turns into a sectarian caricature. That is why even correct ideas become in his hands instruments for disorganizing his own ranks.

There is no need to dwell upon similar groups in other countries. They split from us not because we are intolerant or intolerable but because they themselves did not and could not go forward. Since the time of the split they have succeeded only in exposing their incapacity. Their attempts to unite with each other, on a national or an international scale, produced no results in any single case: peculiar to sectarianism is only the power of repulsion and not the power of attraction.

Some crank has computed the number of "splits" we have had and

arrived at the sum of about a score. He saw in this annihilating evidence of our bad regime. The peculiar thing is that in the S.A.P. itself, which has triumphantly published these computations, there occurred, during the few years of its existence, more rifts and splits than in all our sections taken together. Taken by itself, however, this fact is meaningless. It is necessary to take not the bald statistics of splits but the dialectics of development. After all its splits, the S.A.P. remained an extremely heterogeneous organization which will be unable to withstand the first onset of great events. This applies even to a larger measure to the "London Bureau of Revolutionary Socialist Unity" which is being torn assunder by irreconcilable contradictions: its tomorrow will consist not of "unity" but only of splits. In the meantime, the organization of the Bolshevik-Leninists, after purging itself of sectarian and centrist tendencies, not only grew numerically, not only strengthened its international ties, but also found the road to fusion with organizations akin to it in spirit (Holland, United States).

The attempts to blow up the Dutch party (from the right, through Molinar!) and the American party (from the left, through Bauer!) have only led to the internal consolidation of both these parties. We can predict with assurance that parallel to the disintegration of the London Bureau there will proceed an ever more rapid growth of the organizations of the Fourth International.

The Road to the New International

How the New International will take form, through what stages it will pass, what final shape it will assume—this no one can foretell today; and, indeed, there is no need to do so: historical events will show. But it is necessary to begin by proclaiming a program that meets the tasks of our epoch. On the basis of this program it is necessary to mobilize the co-thinkers, the pioneers of the New International. No other road is possible.

The Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, directly aimed against all types of utopian-sectarian socialism, forcefully points out that communists do not oppose themselves to the actual workers' movements but participate in them as a vanguard. At the same time the Manifesto was the program of a new party, national and international. The sectarian is content with a program, as a recipe of salvation. The centrist guides himself by the famous (essentially meaningless) formula of Edward Bernstein, "the movement is everything; the final goal—nothing." The Marxist draws his scientific program from the movement taken as a whole, in order then to apply this program to every concrete stage of the movement.

The Initial Difficulties

On the one side, the initial steps of the New International are rendered more difficult by the old organizations and splinters from them: on the other side they are facilitated by the colossal experience of the past. The process of crystallization which is very difficult and full of torments during the first stages will assume in the future an impetuous and rapid character. The recent international events are of incommensurate significance for the formation of the revolutionary vanguard. In his own fashion, Mussolini—and this should be recognized—has "aided" the cause of the Fourth International. Great conflicts sweep away all that is half-way and artificial and, on the other hand, gives strength to all that is viable. War leaves room only for two tendencies in the ranks of the working class movement: social-patriotism which does not stop at any betrayal, and revolutionary internationalism that is bold and capable of going to the end. It is precisely for this reason that centrists, fearful of impending events, are waging a rapid struggle against the Fourth International. They are correct in their own fashion: in the rear of great convulsions only that organization will be able to survive and develop which has not only cleansed its ranks of sectarianism but which has systematically trained them in the spirit of despising all ideological vacillation and cowardice. October 22, 1935.

NEW MILITANT

with which is merged
THE MILITANT

Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co., 55 East 11th St., N. Y. C.

Entered as second class mail matter at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879. JAMES P. CANNON Editor
Subscription rates: In the United States \$1.00 per year; 65c per six months; Canada and foreign \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 six months. Bundle rates: Two cents per copy.

Vol. 2 JANUARY 4, 1936 No.1

GET SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR THE EIGHT-PAGE NEW MILITANT.

JOIN THE WORKERS PARTY

Question Box

By A. WEAVER

N. D., NEW YORK.

Question: What is meant by the "Permanent Revolution"?

Answer: The theory of the "Permanent Revolution", the essential features of which were formulated by Trotsky about 1905, has three aspects:

The first aspect concerns itself with the problem of the revolution in backward or colonial countries in which the bourgeois-democratic tasks have not yet been solved. The essence of the theory in this regard is that capitalism has decayed too far for the bourgeoisie to play a progressive role; that the only class which can solve even these democratic tasks is the proletariat; that the solution of these tasks necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat; and that once embarked on this path, the proletariat cannot stop but must take the road to the solution of socialist tasks. Between the democratic revolution and the solution of the socialist tasks, there thus arises a **permanency** of revolutionary development. This aspect of the theory was historically confirmed, in a positive sense, in the Russian Revolution of 1917. Led by the Bolshevik party of Lenin and Trotsky, the proletariat, in the solution of the democratic tasks, had to take the power into its own hands, and subsequently embark on the road of a solution of socialist tasks. The Chinese revolution of 1927 confirmed the theory in a negative sense. Under the leadership of Stalin, the solution of the democratic tasks was placed in the hands of the Chinese bourgeoisie by requiring the Chinese Communist party to subordinate itself to the bourgeois Kuo Min Tang. The results are familiar to all.

The second aspect of the theory points to the permanent character of the socialist revolution as such. All social relationships are transformed in constant internal struggle for an indefinitely long time; there occur outbreaks of civil wars, revolutions in science, technique, economy, the family, etc. This complicated reciprocal action which does not allow society to reach equilibrium, accounts for the permanent character of the Socialist Revolution.

The third aspect of the theory points to the international character of the socialist revolution which begins on, but cannot end on, national grounds; a national revolution being not a self-sufficient whole but a link in the international chain.

For more elaborate treatment of the question, see Trotsky's "The Permanent Revolution" which is available at Pioneer Publishers.

Question: Certain Lovestones claim that by the theory of the "Permanent Revolution" Trotsky underestimated the peasantry and that this was stated by Lenin. Is this true?

Answer: On the differences which existed between Lenin and Trotsky, neither of the two men were correct, on all the points. The peculiar part of the matter, however, is that the critics of Trotsky, who attempt to find a basis for criticism in past differences, long since resolved by history, are unfortunate enough to choose those questions on which Trotsky was correct. The "Permanent Revolution" is one of these.

When Joffe, a leader of the Russian Left Opposition, committed suicide in 1927, he left a note in which he stated that Lenin, in a conversation, had admitted to him that Trotsky had been correct on the question of the "Permanent Revolution". For the benefit of those who doubt the accuracy of Joffe's death-bed statement, or who doubt that Lenin could have admitted Trotsky to have been correct, we quote the following from an article by Lenin, published November 20, 1915, in the "Sozial-Demokrat":

"To make clear the interrelation of classes in the coming revolution is the main task of a revolutionary party. . . . This task is incorrectly solved in the NASHE SLOVO by Trotsky, who repeats his 'original' 1905 theory without stopping to think why life, during a whole decade, has passed by this beautiful theory."

"Trotsky's original theory takes from the Bolsheviks their appeal to decisive revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and to the conquest of political power by it; from the Mensheviks it takes the 'negation' of the role of the peasantry. The peasantry, it says, has become differentiated, divided into strata: its possible revolutionary role has dwindled more and more; a 'national' revolution is impossible in Russia; 'we live in the era of imperialism,' says Trotsky, and 'imperialism does not oppose the bourgeois nation to the old regime; in the contrary, it opposes the proletariat to the bourgeois nation.'"

"Here we have an amusing example of playing with the little word 'imperialism.' If, IN RUSSIA the proletariat is already opposed to the 'bourgeois nation, then it means that Russia is facing a SO-

(Continued on Page 4)

Betrayal in the Present War Crisis

By JOHN WEST

(This is a chapter from the pamphlet "War and the Workers" by John West)

In the face of the developing war crisis, the forces for the betrayal of the workers in the struggle against war are maturing rapidly. From all sides, in all countries, the liberals, the pacifists, the reformists, the social-patriots, under the cover of what look like anti-war and pro-peace campaigns, are in actuality preparing for sell out to the war-makers, are making ready to turn over the masses to the imperialists.

Again, as before the last war, we find the old ways and methods and slogans of betrayal. But the old methods are not enough. New appearances must be added: the masses cannot be deceived again in precisely the old ways. It therefore becomes of crucial importance to analyze the new and special forms of betrayal which are appearing in the present crisis.

1. «Good» and «Bad» Capitalist Powers

The most fatally dangerous doctrine, a doctrine which has been systematically propagated during recent years by liberals and by both the Socialist and Communist parties throughout the world, is the theory that a basic distinction must be drawn between the comparatively "good" capitalist nations, the "peace-loving" nations—Great Britain, France, and the United States, on the one hand; and, on the other, the altogether "wicked" capitalist nations—Italy and especially Germany.

This theory reasons as follows: Fascism, especially Hitlerism, means war. Therefore, the fight against war is the fight against Fascism, and especially against Hitlerism, the worst form of Fascism. The success of Fascism means the destruction of all democratic rights. The destruction of democratic rights means the crushing of the organizations of the working class, and thus defeat for the revolutionary movement. But Fascism, especially Hitlerism, can succeed only by war, and, since Fascism means war, will inevitably undertake war.

What then follows? What follows is the betrayal of the working class of France, England and the United States. For, on the basis of the above chain of reasoning, to support the democratic nations in a war against Hitler is to defend democratic rights against Fascism; and thereby the revolution. The wheel completes its circle. Defense of the national state—that is, defense of the imperialist bourgeoisie of England, France and the United States—becomes, through this theory, a revolutionary duty!

The mortal fallacy in this position is easy enough to understand when once examined from the point of view of Marxism. The statement, "Fascism means war" is incomplete. It is not Fascism that means war. Rather is it the continued existence of capitalism that

means both Fascism and war. Fascism means war only in the sense that it marks outwardly a great intensification of the inner conflicts of capitalism, and is thus an indication of the more rapid drive of the whole capitalist system toward the highest expression of these conflicts—imperialist war. But in the linked chain of causes that make war an inevitable concomitant of the continued existence of capitalism, the democratic nations have as integral a part as the Fascist nations. From the point of view of the working class, there can be no "good," no "peace-loving" capitalist states. Every capitalist state, democratic as well as Fascist, represents one or another form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the working class, and is thus the implacable enemy of the working class. To defend the democratic rights of the working class is one thing. But this has nothing in common with the defense of the "democratic" capitalist state. The former is a primary duty of every working class party; the latter is the occupation of traitors. The latter will be put forward as the only way to protect the working class against war and Fascism; in practice, it will give the working class both war and Fascism, for the bourgeoisie of the democratic countries will not overcome the necessity for a resort to Fascism during the decline of capitalism merely by success in the next war. Indeed, the outbreak of war will in all probability be the signal for setting up Fascist governments in the "democratic" countries.

The business of the working class within any country is never under any circumstances to defend "the government"—that is, the political executive of the class enemy—but always to fight for its overthrow. To Fascism as to war there is only one answer: the workers' revolution.

2. Defense of the Soviet Union

A closely similar preparation for betrayal has gone on under cover of the slogan, "Defend the Soviet Union!"

As has already been indicated, the defense of the Soviet Union is one of the primary tasks of the working class in the coming war. But, to a Marxist, what does defense of the Soviet Union mean? The essence can be summed up quickly. It means: "Extend the October revolution." It means to strengthen the economic and political organizations of the world proletariat, to carry the class struggle on a world basis to ever higher levels, to drive toward workers' power. It means to put all faith in the working class. It means to

achieve victory in the capitalist nations. And it means these things quite openly and realistically. For these are the only possible defense of the Soviet Union.

To Stalinism, however, and to the cynical Austro-Marxists, defense of the Soviet Union means: support the program of national Bolshevism; no word of criticism of Stalin and his bureaucratic associates; put all faith in diplomatic deals with bourgeois powers, in military alliances with France and Czechoslovakia, in maneuvering in the League of Nations; reduce the working class parties to branches of the foreign office of the Soviet state. And it means: do not carry on genuinely revolution-

ary activities within your own country, because this would upset "peace"; permit the working class of Germany and Austria to be crushed under Fascism rather than risk one ounce of cement at Dniepropetrovsk or one tractor at Stalinograd. And, lastly, it means: support the war policy of your democratic government, and offer the working class to the coming imperialist war in all nations where the bourgeoisie finds its imperialist aims best served by a temporary alliance with the Soviet bureaucracy.

Naturally, Marxists do not maintain that the Soviet Union should not, whenever possible, utilize the antagonisms and contradictions among the imperialist powers to its own advantage. This was the tactic of Lenin. But this tactic can only be understood as subordinate to the strategy of the world revolution, and this strategy can base itself only on the international working class. Stalin's "maneuverings" with imperialist powers are the direct contrary of Lenin's. For Stalin "maneuvers" in such a way as to subordinate the working class to the capitalist powers, not to advance its interests. The Franco-Soviet pact is the most striking example of such subordination—whereby the French working class is turned over hand and foot to the French bourgeoisie, so long as the Pact formally endures—but this is only one aspect of the consistent and continuous policy of Stalinism. Lenin, to prevent the capitalist powers from attacking the Soviet Union, placed his full reliance on the only possible force which could in actuality defend the Soviet Union: on the working class of the various capitalist powers. If the working class and its party were sufficiently strengthened in a given country, Lenin reasoned, the government of that country would not dare to attack the Soviet Union, since it would realize that such an

attack would only pave the way for its own overthrow. Stalin, with his eyes focussed on national Russian socialism, asks only for "peace" elsewhere, to let him build at home. He places his reliance, thus, not on the international working class, but on the "friendly" capitalist governments, on any agreements or treaties or pacts he can come to with them. But to secure such friendship, he must direct the Communist parties in the various nations not toward revolutionary struggle against their governments at home (which would endanger the government's "friendship" for Stalin), but toward putting pressure on the home governments to line up with the Soviet Union; and, then, to essential support of the home government so long as it stays or pretends to stay lined up. This necessarily weakens and destroys the revolutionary struggle, which is always against the home government; and thus, in the end, disrupts the only possible defense of the Soviet Union itself, which must be a defense against and an attack on the international bourgeoisie and all their political instruments—the capitalist governments, never a collaboration with them.

We shall see the workers of France, England and the United States rallied to the flag by the leaders of the Communist Party. "Defend the Soviet Union! Enlist in the army, and—fight against war and Hitlerism! Defend the Soviet Union!"

This policy of betrayal has, also, been systematically developed over a period of many years. The recent Congress of the Communist International made it official for the sections of the C.I.: and the Dan-Zyromski-Bauer resolution on war advances it within world social democracy. Unlike the situation at the beginning of the last war, the betrayers this time wish to be fully ready beforehand.

3. Sanctions

A special and profoundly important feature of betrayal in the present war crisis revolves around the question of "sanctions." The Covenant of the League of Nations provides that when a nation has been declared an aggressor against a member state, certain financial, economic, and even military measures shall be—following an elaborate procedure—invoked by the other League member states against the aggressor nation. These measures are called "sanctions." and the term "sanctions" is being extended to include measures which might be taken by nations on their own initiative (e.g., closing of the Suez Canal by Great Britain) as well as measures taken collectively by the League members.

This extension of the use of the word "sanctions" is significant. It indicates a new and ingenious method for turning opposition to war into support of war. All that is necessary is to call the war an "application of sanctions." Then it becomes the duty of all "friends of peace" to support it.

This, indeed, is the real meaning of the doctrine of sanctions. League sanctions are, of course, nothing else than sanctions undertaken by the leading member states of the League. The League, as we have seen, is only the instrument of its dominant members. Support of

League sanctions, therefore, is exactly the same as support of sanctions applied by individual nations—e.g., by Great Britain or France.

But sanctions are war measures. They include withdrawal of financial credit, embargoes on trade, various forms of boycott. To enforce them genuinely would require a blockade of the country against whom the sanctions were invoked. The probable, the almost certain outcome of such a blockade, as history has so often proved, is war—since the blockaded nation cannot accept such a measure peacefully without surrendering political sovereignty.

Thus it follows that sanctions must be either ineffectual—a kind of large-scale bluff—or they must lead to war.

If they are ineffectual, support of them is certainly no aid to peace (or to Ethiopia). If they lead to war, support of them—no matter with what verbal reservations—means nothing else than support of war undertaken by the imperialist government applying the sanctions. In both cases, support of sanctions to be applied by capitalist governments (whether or not these are League members) is in effect support of these governments themselves. This means that such support necessarily leads to a betrayal of the revolutionary struggle

against war, and the revolutionary defense of Ethiopia, which is always a struggle against the capitalist governments and the bourgeoisie whose governments they are.

It does no good to say, as the social democrats and the Stalinists say, that we should support League and governmental sanctions, but at the same time "point out that the League and British and French imperialism are acting only in their own imperialist interests in applying them"; we are temporarily able to "use" the French and British governments to serve the interests of the working class, because their interests momentarily, though from "diametrically opposite causes," coincide. This is the reasoning of a Stalin or a Blum, but not of a Marxist. The Marxist knows that we can never "use" capitalist governments for the interests of the working class, because what these governments are instruments to be "used" for the interests of the bourgeoisie. On the contrary, we must always fight inexorably against the governments, and their acts. The Marxist knows that advocacy of governmental sanctions in any form necessarily binds the working class to the state and the class enemy, necessarily weakens the class position of the workers and thus the workers' struggle for power, and necessarily prepares for turning the workers over to the sanction-applying government when the sanctions find their natural outcome in war. If we support sanctions, and the sanctions lead to war, then we have already by supporting the sanctions supported the war. It takes more than verbal reservations to crawl out of the inescapable logic of cause and effect.

The disastrous consequences of support of sanctions are already apparent. In Great Britain a year ago, the masses were turning rapidly away from the National Government. Then the British Labor Party and the British Communist Party came out strongly for sanctions: that is, came out for the policy of British finance-capital and the National Government. This has, naturally, fatally obscured the class issue. No longer is there any clear line between the working class parties and the Conservatives on the war crisis. The Labor Party and the Communist Party have done for Baldwin what he could not do for himself: they have brought about "national unity" on the war issue. Baldwin of course understands this; and consequently

4. Neutrality

Careful notice should be given to a form of betrayal closely related to betrayal on the question of sanctions. This is a particular danger in the United States. In the United States, which is not a League member, the betrayers call, not for sanctions—which are formally irrelevant to League outsiders—but for "neutrality legislation." In the present crisis, this demand is only an American form of the demand for sanctions, combined with the worst type of ordinary pacifism.

In the United States all the rotten reformist organizations, from World Peaceways and the League against War and Fascism to the Socialist and Communist parties, are joining in this call for "mandatory" neutrality legislation to be passed by the next Congress, and are "demanding" a "strong neu-

trality policy" on the part of the U. S. government. What does this mean in the concrete? It means, in the first place, to spread among the people of the United States all the fatal pacifist illusions about U. S. isolation. As we have seen, the United States is necessarily linked up economically, socially, and politically with the rest of the world. Its pretended isolation is a complete myth. As we have also seen, the U. S. will inevitably be involved in the coming war, will in fact play a leading and decisive part in the coming war. Not to point this out honestly and straightforwardly, and instead to pretend that some form of neutrality legislation will succeed or even aid in isolating the U. S. in the world struggle is to deceive and disorient the masses, to disarm them ideologically.

Marxists, then, reject and expose as betrayal any and all advocacy of League or governmental "sanctions." Naturally, however, this does not mean that they take a passive, hands-off position in the present crisis or in any other. Marxists are not neutral in the dispute between Italy and Ethiopia. They are for the defeat of Fascist Italy and the blow to imperialism which such a defeat would be; and they are therefore for the victory of Ethiopia. But they propose to aid in such defeat and such victory not by appealing to capitalist governments and the imperialist League for their assistance and sanctions; but to the working class to apply its proletarian "sanctions." Only sanctions which are results of the independent and autonomous actions of the working class are of any value in the revolutionary struggle against war—since only these separate the class from the state and the class enemy, and only these build the fighting strength of the workers, which is alone the road to workers' power and thus to the defeat of war. Mass demonstrations, strikes, labor boycotts, defense funds for material aid to Ethiopia, refusal to load munitions for Italy, revolutionary agitation for Marxism as it applies to the war crisis, these are such sanctions as the working class must make use of. But these will be ineffectual in the immediate crisis? They are ineffectual and utopian? If so, then the revolutionary struggle is itself ineffectual, romantic and utopian. Perhaps such sanctions will not "solve" the present crisis. But they, and they alone, will help steel the class, materially and ideologically, for the struggle to come—the struggle for workers' power, which is, in the end, the only solution.

Even the Lovestonites will admit that the Russian revolution was SOCIALIST in character.

gically, to turn them aside from the genuine struggle against war, and to teach them to put reliance in exactly those forces which are preparing war—namely, the imperialist government of the United States and U. S. finance-capital, which that government represents.

Thus, as always, pacifism in the form of demands for neutrality legislation in actuality aids the war makers. It strengthens the hand of the U. S. government, strengthens its hold over the people. Since the policy of the government, like that of every imperialist government, is and must be a war policy, these demands are in reality doing their part in carrying out the war policy. The capitalists and the government officials are not slow to take advantage of the opportunity. Hearst and Roosevelt alike point out—just as does Baldwin in England—that to preserve a "strong neutrality and peace policy" the U. S. must build up its "national defense." That is to say, they use the agitation for neutrality legislation as a basis for expanding the armed forces of U. S. imperialism, to build new and more powerful battleships and airplanes, and to mechanize still further the already highly "modernized" U. S. army.

But even more than this is involved in the so-called "neutrality legislation." The substance of such legislation, if actually put into effect, can only be sanctions as the U. S. can apply them—various forms of financial and economic restrictions, boycotts, etc. As in the case of sanctions proper, therefore, the neutrality acts would be in effect war acts, and the same conclusions must be drawn with respect to them as we have already come to in analyzing sanctions. Realizing this is enough to expose the pseudo-Marxists in the U. S. who so bravely denounce the policy of sanctions in other countries (Great Britain, France); and then in the next breath advocate them (under the title of "neutrality legislation") for this country.

Here, as in any other phase of the struggle against imperialist war, the fight for U. S. "neutrality" must be a working class fight, using the methods and means of the working class. It is only the working class, operating as an independent force, which can be counted on—certainly we cannot expect imperialism itself to put an end to imperialism, which is what we do when we call on an imperialist government to avoid imperialist war. The fight must be not for a "government policy of neutrality," but always a fight against the government.

Question Box

(Continued on Page 3)
SOCIALIST revolution! Then the slogan about "confiscating the LAND-OWNERS' land" (repeated by Trotsky in 1915, after the January conference of 1912) is incorrect; then we must speak, not of the "revolutionary labor" but of a "revolutionary SOCIALIST government!" . . . (Lenin, Collected Works, Volume XVIII, International Publishers' edition, pp. 362-6; capitalized words are emphasized in the original.)

Even the Lovestonites will admit that the Russian revolution was SOCIALIST in character.

The Monkey Strike

By BILL HAYWOOD

(Editor's Note: "Big Bill" Haywood, picturesque founder and leader of the Industrial Workers of the World, who died in 1928 in Moscow, where he had lived in exile for almost ten years after his escape from a prison sentence for criminal syndicalism was the leader of countless strike struggles in the pre-war days in the United States. During one of these organizing campaigns which ended in a bitterly fought out struggle to organize the agricultural laborers in California, the fruit growers imported Japanese laborers to offset the growing strength of the I.W.W. among the white workers only to find the Japanese forming cooperatives against them. This Bill Haywood reduces the bosses' strategy to the absurd in the following story.)

The fruitgrowers were again compelled to employ migratory white labor, until a wonderful idea developed at one of the conventions of the Fruitgrowers' Association. One of the delegates got up and suggested that it would be possible to train monkeys to pick and pack fruit. This was decided upon without hesitation, and steps were taken at once to get a lot of monkey fruit-pickers.

The chimpanzee breed was decided upon as the most intelligent. Splendid little houses, all nicely painted were built and equipped for monkeys. They were actually fed and taught what they were to do.

When the fruit got ripe, the owners brought their friends from

the city to see how ingeniously they were solving the labor problem.

The monkeys were restless in their houses, the air was aromatic with the ripened fruit. When they were turned loose, they hurriedly climbed the trees. But instead of doing as they had been taught—to bring the fruit down and put it into a box, the mischievous little rascals would dart about, selecting the choicest fruit, take a bite or two, throw the rest away, and go after more.

Before the day was gone, and the monkeys with paunches full had gone back to their houses, much damage was done. The wise fruitgrowers had to seek another method. The next day each monkey

had a muzzle put on.

They went up into the trees rapidly enough, but none of them would pick any fruit. They were busily engaged in trying to rid themselves of the frightful contrivance that prevented them from eating and enjoying themselves.

The fruitgrowers were in an awful predicament with so many monkeys to feed which would do no work in return. They appealed to the Governor of the State, who regretfully replied that as the offenders were not men, they were not amenable to the law. If they were I.W.W.'s he could have them imprisoned and perhaps have them shot, but over monkeys he had no jurisdiction.

The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, who had never interested itself on behalf of the I.W.W. or the Japanese, learning that the monkeys were being neglected, threatened to prosecute the fruitgrowers if the little animals were not properly taken care of.

The chimpanzees came to be disliked as much as the I.W.W. Some of the fruitgrowers owned cotton plantations in Imperial Valley on which they had trouble in getting white and black wage slaves sufficiently docile for the work of picking cotton. It occurred to them that the monkeys could be made to pick cotton, and there would be no trouble about them trying to eat it.

So all monkeys were shipped to the new location. Strange to say, they could pick cotton and at a speed that made their owners happy. Here was the solution of the labor problem as far as picking cotton was concerned. But their satisfaction was short-lived.

One day, while all the monkeys were at work, chattering while they gathered the white balls of cotton, a gentle breeze wafted a white tuft from a monkey's hand. It amused him to see it floating through the air. He tossed up another bit, and another. The other monkeys, catching the spirit of the fun, began to do the same. At first little bits and then handfuls, till the air was full of fleecy cotton. It looked as though the first snowstorm had struck southern California.

The overseers were alarmed.

There was no way to stop the monkeys in their eager playfulness, which, before they had tired themselves out, had almost destroyed the entire crop of that particular plantation.

In some peculiar manner the monkeys on the other plantations learned of the fun, and their pranks caused the same disastrous result.

The fruit and cotton growers were at their wits' end. They knew not what to do with the monkeys, until deportation was finally decided on, and the chimpanzees were shipped back to the forests of Africa, where they now gather to-

THEATRE REVIEW

WINTERSET (The Bridge of Sighs). By Maxwell Anderson, at Martin Beck Theater.

"Winteraset," by Maxwell Anderson, is a continuation in verse of his play, "Goods of the Lightning," the drama of Sacco-Vanzetti, Judge Thayer, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the electric chair. The story of the play is the story of the fears left behind when the current of the Public Utilities of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts turned into corpses the idealistic and revolutionary Sacco and Vanzetti.

Mio, the son of the fish peddler, haunted by the innocence and death of his father, comes to New York looking for a witness, Garth, discovered by a professor of jurisprudence as never having been brought into the trial. Mio, a philosophic person, meets Garth's sister Miriam, at a spontaneous fiesta, where a cop, objecting to the festivities, attempts to slug Mio. All the characters, including Judge Gaunt, who sentenced the fish-peddler, parade under the shadow of

gether and the eldest, with a grin on his face, hanging by his tail, tells the younger generation how they won the strike in California.

the bridge. Judge Gaunt makes a point of law to the cop, who ignores his advice. Trock, who with his pal, Shadow, has just come out of jail, where both served a short sentence, fears that the knowledge of his murder of the cashier—known to Shadow, and Garth, the uncalled witness—will eventually send him to the chair, since there is talk of a new trial. He silences Garth with threats and attempts to get rid of his pal, Shadow, by shooting him and throwing him into the river.

At an informal meeting between the Judge, Trock and Mio, Shadow stumbles through the door, accuses Trock of being an assassin and a murderer. Garth, in fear of his own life, assists Trock in finally getting rid of Shadow. Through all this, Judge Gaunt, pontif, presides with his wisdom of the objectivity of the State. Mio taunts him! The State had taken his father's life! The Judge, coming out of the semi-coma which has caused him to wander about, says that there could not be a reversal of decision, a reversal would mean that the forces of law and order would lose prestige, and would endanger the Commonwealth. In the presence of two cops, Mio

accuses Trock as the actual murderer of the Dedham cashier, but is laughed at when Mirianne, who is the sister of the witness, Garth, refuses to back up Mio's statement, for fear that Trock's thugs will then rub out the last living witness, her brother. Eventually they are both killed by Trock's gang.

This play can be understood in the light of a realistic fantasy. Certainly the verse patterns, the high philosophic plane in which the play dwells, the elements of time which fuses all the characters into "poems," their sudden meeting, prearranged by the author and in no sense from a series of normal accidents, gives it a fantastic touch. What is left when the poetry and philosophy dries on their lips, is, that in the minds of all those who participated in the murder of the cashier, the electrocution by the State of Massachusetts, the son who is haunted by his father's death, the criminals who fear to be found out, the Judge who is restless, unsatisfied with his smug theories of the objectivity of the State, is, that classes exist, that nothing mouthed by the State is objective justice, that the very idealism which seems to guide the shrewd pater of the Judge comes from an association with the ethics of the Democratic State and is, therefore, class justice. They are all bound within themselves with fear-philosophy and vengeance.

LABOR WAR IN MINNEAPOLIS

SUNDAY EVE. JANUARY 5 • IRVING PLAZA HALL • 15 STREET & IRVING PL.

SPEAKER:

James P. Cannon

EDITOR OF THE NEW MILITANT