

NEW MILITANT

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

VOL. 2, NO. 2

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 11, 1936

PRICE 3 CENTS

NJ WPA Men Win Wage Rise

Officials Back Down in Face of General Strike Threat

By FELIX GIORDANO
NEWARK, N. J.—WPA workers in the Newark district have won a 10 percent increase in wages, from \$55 to \$60.50 a month, beginning from January 2, 1936.

This increase was due primarily to the organizational activity of the Association for Adequate Relief, Newark section of the N.U.L., which was the only organization to call the workers to a giant mass meeting which unanimously endorsed the demands for wage increases, lower working hours, and recognition of the workers' organization and committees.

The demands, presented to Mr. Lewis, district administrator, brought forth the usual answer that they would be kept in mind.

Tired of Promises
But the workers, who had organized to get results, were not satisfied with vague promises that bound the administration to exactly nothing. Dissatisfaction spread among them, which was heightened by the knowledge that in Pennsylvania and in New York, the two bordering states, wage increases had been obtained.

The mood of the workers was taking shape and found expression in the widespread response that the idea of STRIKE obtained on the various projects.

Local Strikes
On a number of projects, small local strikes occurred, in preparation for the general strike of all project workers, which was being prepared by the Association for Adequate Relief, and for which all the workers were getting ready.

It is against this background that the sudden decision to hand out a 10 percent increase is to be understood. For, undoubtedly the WPA officials, both local and state, were worried by the threat of an impending strike, and all the publicity that such a tremendous strike, involving close to 20,000 persons in this district, would have inevitably received.

Authorities Take Revenge

But the authorities would not be forced to grant a raise in wages without at least attempting to take their revenge. This they tried by firing a number of the more militant workers without previous advice or warning for no reason except that they carried on organizational work on their project. To be sure, this was not the official reason, but anyone with one eye could have seen it, and smelled it, a mile away.

This claim was further confirmed indirectly by Mr. Michael Condron, district labor manager, when he stated to a committee representing the Association which went to protest the firing of the men and demand their reinstatement, that one of the fired men had "threatened" to carry on organizational work on any other project he might have been assigned to.

The Association immediately (Continued on Page 2)

NEC Suspends N.Y. Old Guard as Socialist Party Split Widens

By a vote of 8 to 2 the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party suspended the charter of the New York State Committee (Old Guard) at its meeting in Philadelphia last Sunday. The state committee set up at the Utica convention of the "Militants," however, was not recognized. Instead, a new temporary committee of fifteen members was appointed as a result of a compromise of Thomas and the "Militants" with Coolidge of Massachusetts and Hoopes of Reading, Pa., who had tried to steer a middle course in the two-day debate.

The new state committee contains 9 from the Utica conference group and 6 Old Guardists, some of them camouflaged as "independents." The new committee is to function under the supervision of a sub-committee of three members of the National Executive Committee—Kryzcki, Allen and Coolidge—and is to draft plans for a state convention to be held not later than June 30, when a permanent state committee is to be constituted.

Oneal, editor of the New Leader and James Graham of Montana voted against the N.E.C. decision. Oneal walked out of the meeting,

Cleveland Hot-Air Fest A Pacifist Jamboree

NEXT WEEK!

The second of a series of articles on the "People's Front" by Max Shachtman, entitled "The Government of the People's Front, and the People's Front and the War Danger," will appear in the next issue of the NEW MILITANT. For the first installment of this series turn to page 3.

Comrade John West will discuss the decision of the Supreme Court on the A.A.A., the Roosevelt message to Congress and the new budget in the next issue.

Left Wing is Only Hope in Silk Strike

Musf Fight to Save Union From Stalinist Suicide Policies

PATERSON, N. J.—The strike in the textile industry in Paterson has now been going on for over two months. But the strike in no way resembles the historic struggles that the silk workers carried on in 1931 and in 1933.

Now under Stalinist leadership, the union carries on the strike without the pep and the militancy that made Paterson a byword of active struggle in the labor movement. Strike meetings are a flop, the workers are demoralized.

What are the reasons for such a state of affairs? First, the adventurist policy of the Stalinists, which called the strike at the most unpropitious time by whipping up a false enthusiasm among a few members of the union—mostly Stalinists and stooges—and on such a slim basis called the strike. Secondly, the very fact that there are practically no positive demands; all that the union is demanding now is a "stabilization of wage rates in Paterson." Thirdly, and most important of all, the local nature of the strike, which, as the NEW MILITANT pointed out as early as last May, could bring nothing but demoralization.

Yet, against this background, the Stalinists are now coming to the elections and asking the workers to re-elect them to office and to leadership. And what is still worse, it is safe to predict that they will be re-elected, so that the workers may be treated to a new and larger dose of the same kind of misleadership and adventurism.

Why is it that with such a record of lack of achievement the Stalinists will be able to maintain themselves in power?

Primarily because the efforts to form a coherent left wing, organized strongly and with a clear-cut program, up to now fell upon deaf ears, and also because the only other group in the field, led by Lovestonites and a couple of their stooges, is still living down some of the worst traits of the non-lamented Eli Keller.

The question poses itself: what (Continued on Page 2)

Patriots Take Lead in League for War Against Fascism Congress

By PHILIP STRYKER
CLEVELAND, O., Jan. 6.—The "United States Congress Against War and Fascism" closed its three-day session here last night, and Cleveland's city officials and businessmen are unanimous in agreeing that it was a fine convention and that this convention city will not have such a spending crowd until the Democrats get here in the summer.

The Congress opened Friday evening with a stirring rendition of "My Country 'Tis of Thee." On the second line of this anthem, on the words "sweet land of liberty," Robert Minor's voice cracked, but Earl Browder and the rest of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (present to a man) manfully made up for Minor's mishap. The national anthem was followed by an original verse, sung to the tune of "The Vagabond King":

War is coming nearer,
Fascist trends grow clearer,
Nations rushing to the fall
But the people waken
From their slumber shaken,
Form their ranks and heed the call,
Forward, forward, etc.

Harold H. Burton, Mayor of Cleveland and a prominent Legionaire, gave the official address of welcome to the congress. "We welcome this gathering to our great forum," he declared, "with faith in God, with faith in America, and faith in ourselves to meet the future in the deepest interest of humanity."

Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner of Cleveland (desisting for the evening from his labors for his millionaires congregation) also welcomed the congress, and said that religion and war were incompatible. Bishop Edgar F. Blake, Methodist leader of Michigan and vice-chairman of (Continued on Page 2)

Workers Pay for Tire War Report Shows

By JACK WILSON
AKRON, Ohio, Jan. 7.—Even a government fact finding board in the rubber industry was forced to criticize policies of the rubber barons which have brought lay-offs, longer work hours and less pay for rubber workers, as indicated in a report released by the labor department this week.

The report showed that every warning printed in the NEW MILITANT three months ago telling of the plans of the rubber companies to lower real wages so that a tire price war would be paid for by workers were correct in every respect.

The board which worked under the direction of Frances Perkins, labor secretary, made its findings specifically against the Goodyear tire company which returned to an 8-hour day last fall after having been forced on a six-hour day in 1930.

Nationwide in Scope
That this move was part of a nationwide employer drive against workers as we pointed out long ago, the board admitted in saying, "the opinion appears to prevail that if Goodyear with its large production capacity lengthens hours, other tire manufacturers will follow a similar course."

The board, which was naturally conservative in its findings, declared that, "an average of 36 hours per week would mean reducing the working forces by approximately 12 per cent." Actually a 40-hour week prevails so it can safely be said that at least 15 per cent of Goodyear's 15,000 employees have been laid-off permanently!

The basic reason for these offensives against the already poor standard of living of the workers can be extracted from a single paragraph hidden in the middle of the 96 page report.

It reads, "Goodyear management states to the board that one of the motives in changing from six to eight hours is to effect a reduction in costs. This objective appears to be to increase income. It would be better to approach such a problem from the standpoint of marketing methods and elimination of price cutting warfare than by decreasing wage rates and increasing hours per day of workers."

Workers Shoulder Costs
The relentless forces of competition drive rubber companies to gain market control at any cost and this cost has been thrown on the work- (Continued on Page 4)

President's Speech Prepares the Masses for War with the Lie of "Peaceful" Imperialist America

STALINISTS PLEDGE FAITH TO GREEK MONARCH

(The following Hayas dispatch is reprinted from the N. Y. Post, Jan. 7, 1936)

ATHENS, Jan. 7 (Hayas).—The Greek Communist Party today formally pledged allegiance to King George II whom it hailed as a "guarantee against Fascism and against any authoritarian regime."

A delegation of the party that used to call for the overthrow of existing governments and the prevailing economic and political system came to the royal palace today and was received by King George, whom it assured of the unfailing support

of its organization.

The delegation announced that the Communist Party had decided to function "within the framework of the present regime."

This unprecedented scene followed similar steps taken by Communist parties in various countries since the dictum of the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern last July which called upon members of the Third International to support existing democracies instead of seeking to overthrow them.

Toledo Auto Plant Shut Down By Mass Picketing

Two Month Old Strike Galvanized by Militant Tact Wins First Concession From Mathers Spring Co.

TOLEDO, O., Jan. 8.—Mass pickets today forced the promise from the Mathers Spring Company that the plant will be shut down immediately.

The company's vice-president made this as a personal pledge to pickets at the plant gates in return for permission for strikebreakers to leave the plant unscathed.

Negotiations are expected to start immediately. Burke Cochran, strike leader, stated that picket lines will continue until the union's demands are met.

TOLEDO, Ohio, Jan. 6.—Open clashes broke out here today between striking pickets of the Mathers Spring Co. and police and strikebreakers, as the company management proceeds with its threatened attempt to reopen the plant which was shut down two months ago. Flying bricks shattered the windshields of scab-conveying cars, police-billies flew as scores of blue-coats scurried about the picket line, which is swelling into the hundreds as a showdown fight appears imminent.

Although the strike involves only 425 men, the bitter battle these members of the Mechanics Educational Society of America have put up since the strike was called on November 1 is beginning to stir up the coals of class-warfare which have smoldered here since the Auto-Lite strike. In response to an appeal for aid issued yesterday by the strikers to all Toledo working class organizations, scores of workers from the Chevrolet plant (members and shop chairman of the A. F. of L. auto international), from the Spicer Mfg. Co., the Lucas County Unemployed League and its affiliated organization, the WPA Workers Union, and from other groups, joined the mass picket line.

Present attempts to operate the plant, or to prepare it for operation (since as yet only several dozen maintenance men have been run through the picket line under heavy police protection), began as a surprise move last Thursday when the management announced its intentions of reopening the plant, after two months of solemn declarations that they were preparing to move it elsewhere or close it permanently.

Heightened significance is added to the present developments as all signs increasingly point to the fact that the Mathers strike is being used as a test battle by the automobile and parts manufacturers to determine the present temper and organizational solidarity of Toledo labor as a guide to the strategy to be employed in the general union-busting campaign which was inaugurated here over a month ago by General Motors with the firing of 900 Chevrolet union men.

For the first time since the Auto-Lite strike, police are being used in imposing numbers and are attempting all sorts of vicious intimidation and provocation. A rigid conspiracy of silence which has been maintained in the capitalist press about the issues of the strike, in the face of wide-spread disapproval of the company's policies in refusing even to talk with the union committee or negotiate through the Toledo Peace Board, established here by Edward L. McGrady shortly after the Chevrolet strike, is expected to be broken any day, as the daily press distills its venom in (Continued on Page 2)

Progressives Gain in AFL Union Meets

Radio Workers Decide to Affiliate with Lewis Movement

By ARNE SWABECK

The convention held in Pittsburgh last week of federal local unions, representing about 50,000 workers in radio and refrigeration manufacture, decided to demand from the A.F. of L. Executive Council that it be given an international charter guaranteeing the industrial form of organization. The delegates assembled apparently had no difficulty in making up their minds on this question. At the same time it is reported, that the delegates also decided to align themselves with the aims of the Committee for Industrial Organization, headed by John L. Lewis.

Both of these decisions are important and indicative of the present trends in the trade union movement. Once again they prove that under modern industrial conditions the most elementary questions of union organization bring forward from the outset the disputed progressive issues. They are not injected artificially. They grow out of the problems that arise and thereby become necessary measures for the movement to adopt. Once the trends, now beginning to take form around the progressive issues, get to a solid basis they can be expected to sweep the trade union movement like a prairie-fire.

Join With Lewis Movement

Like the unions in other mass production industries the federal locals in radio and refrigeration manufacture found their first real obstacle to organization in the (Continued on Page 4)

Protest Lays Cuban Terror Regime to Roosevelt Gov't

In a sharp protest to President Roosevelt, leading labor organizations and prominent individuals today laid at the door of the American government the responsibility for the terroristic regime of Cuba. The Cuban general elections, set for January 10, are denounced as a fraud, since the only political parties permitted to participate are those of the wealthy landowners and employers, while every group which participated in ousting Machado is declared illegal, the trade unions are ordered dissolved, and hundreds are assassinated or executed and thousands jailed.

The protest was issued by Norman Thomas, chairman of the Labor and Socialist Defense Committee; Joseph Wagner, Secretary of the General Defense Committee; and Felix Morrow, Secretary of the Non-Partisan Labor Defense. Among the signatories are John Dos Passos, Lewis Corey, Charles Yale Harrison, James Rorty, Anita Brenner, Sidney Hook, Carlo Tresca, Bertha Poole Weyl, Elsie Gluck, Adelaide Walker, Martha Gruening, Grace Lumpkin, Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Babette Deutsch, Sherwood Eddy, Anna N. Davis, B. W. Huebsch, Matthew Josephson, Wil-

liam Pickens, Quincy Howe, Chas. S. Zimmerman, manager of Dress-makers' Union, and Paul Sturm, secretary of the Workmen's Strike and Death Benefit Fund. Another signatory is Clifford Odets, noted playwright, who was refused admission to Cuba recently because he went to investigate labor conditions.

Letter of Protest

The letter of protest to President Roosevelt, copies of which were sent to Ambassador Jefferson Caffery, President Jose Barnet of Cuba, and Secretary of State Cordell Hull states in part:

"The present political regime in Cuba came into existence through the direct intervention of Ambassador Jefferson Caffery. After years of terrible oppression, the Cuban masses had finally ousted Machado. But the American government refused recognition to the government of President Gran San Martin, which granted a minimum of democratic rights.

He Flaunts U.S. Slave Hold on South America

By A. J. MUSTE

President Roosevelt put on another good show when he made his annual address to Congress last week in person at nine o'clock in the evening. No president had ever addressed Congress at that hour in the entire peace time history of the nation. It took a little parliamentary maneuvering to arrange it and the Republican politicians would have liked to chew our dear President's ear off for thinking up this bright publicity stunt, for nine o'clock in the evening is a swell spot for a radio broadcast and one was arranged which took in every station in the good old U. S. and quite a few in some of the more benighted lands outside our borders.

Under the circumstances we shall not be far wrong, and we shall also for once be in accord with every one else in the country including the newspapers and the Republican party, if we assert that F.D.R. was addressing the American people and not Congress and was firing the opening gun in the Presidential election campaign. This only makes it more important of course that the workers should look beneath the lovely, liberal surface of the President's speech and behind his smiling face and analyze what he was really putting across.

A Cheerful Picture
The content of the speech was at many points as clever as the time and manner of its delivery. 1933 when I came into office, said Roosevelt, everything here in the U.S. was in a mess while abroad everything was quite calm and there was general hope that an era of peaceful settlement of disputes had dawned. Today everything is bright and smiling in the good old U.S. and look what a mess things are in elsewhere, what with war, armament building, etc. Fundamentally that picture holds good neither for 1933 nor for 1936, but on the surface it seems plausible and plenty of people will be fooled by it—enough in all probability to reelect F.D. next fall.

Nearly half, and this the first half of the speech, was devoted to Mr. Roosevelt's views on the world situation and the relation of the U.S. toward it. This is in itself significant. In the same breath almost he says that this country is neutral, that it stands apart from embroilment in the quarrels of other nations and he must also say that "the people of the Americas must take cognizance of...a situation which has in it many of the elements that lead to the tragedy of a general war." In other words, Roosevelt gives warning that war is coming, that we will not and cannot stand aloof, we shall be embroiled.

Creating War Psychology
The President in all this first section of his speech tried to create a psychology which will prepare the American masses to take part in the next war and in the meantime permit American capitalists through his administration to continue their huge war preparations without interference. How is this done?

In the first place, he builds up the picture of the U.S. as a righteous, noble, peace-loving, irreproachable nation. We have "democracy," not autocracy. We want to reduce armaments (sliding over the fact that we are increasing them) while others are building armaments. If a fight breaks out anywhere, we virtuously stay out of it and hope that this good example will persuade others to stop fighting. We as the big nation in the western hemisphere follow the policy of "the good neighbor" and just see the result compared to the frightful mess in Europe, Asia and Africa. Never "in four and a half centuries" has there existed "a greater spirit of mutual understanding, of common helpfulness, and of devotion to the ideals of self-government than exists today in the twenty-one American republics and their neighbor, the Dominion of Canada.... There is neither war, nor rumor of war, nor desire for war."

False Pictures
The picture, again, is false to the core. It is only a few months since there was actual war in the Chaco. American capitalism is so (Continued on Page 2)

PATRIOTS RUN WILD AT CLEVELAND JAMBOREE

(Continued from Page 1)
the American League of War and Fascism, spoke, saying: "It is to the schools and colleges and universities that we must look for the leadership that shall pioneer the way to a new day." There were other speakers of similar kidney all evening, but the chief speaker of the evening, and the most honored guest of the Congress, was Major-General Smedley Butler.

War, declared the General, is a racket, but it could be ended. The way to end war is to amend the Constitution so that no armed forces should be sent beyond the continental limits, and to build up a sufficient force of battleships and also "Ford-type" airplanes with small cruising radius, all to be used for defense. When interviewed later, the General declared hearty approval of the American League's campaign for neutrality legislation, and declared, "We must remain strictly neutral in thought, sympathy and in fact. We must cultivate relations with the Latin-American countries, which can provide all the foreign trade we need." Upon the conclusion of his speech, the General got a stirring ovation from the assembled delegates.

Another general was the chief speaker the following night: General Fang Chen, Wu of China. General Fang is being toured by the Stalinists, both here and abroad, as the future leader of the anti-Japanese movement. [An article on General Fang appears in another section of this issue.—Ed.]

A "biography" of the general in the January "China Today" fails to mention that the general was elevated to the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang in May, 1929 at the very height of the Kuomintang reaction when even liberals were being hounded, and turned to the useful slogan of "anti-Japan" together with his chief, the "Christian General," Feng Yu Hsiang, when they both had a falling out with Chiang Kai Shek. Cable dispatches today report that General Fang has patched up with Chiang and become his chief aide. We predict that his protegee, Fang, will shortly return to China.

Candor compels one to admit that General Fang is a more principled man than his Stalinist sponsors. In the days when Chiang Kai-shek and Stalin addressed each other as comrades, the leaders of the Chinese bourgeoisie had to render a certain amount of lip service to the world revolution, the proletariat and peasantry, etc. General Fang didn't go in for this kind of nonsense at Cleveland. He had a message, and he made several speeches to the congress about it: The root of war is in aggression; therefore aggressors must be stopped. The way to stop them, above all Japan, is to abolish the unequal treaties and enforce the other treaties such as the Kellogg Pact. "If only the signatories had not permitted Japan to break these treaties. . . . Breaking the treaties is an insult to the other nations, a sign of their weakness. . . . America should protect the treaties." This thoroughly bourgeois-reactionary message was cheered every time the general bared his teeth.

The generals were the ace exhibits of the congress. Their nearest competitors for honors were: Harry F. Ward, re-elected national chairman of the League and America's best-known Methodist; Roger Baldwin, re-elected to the national bureau of the League, famous, as director of the Civil Liberties Un-

ion, for his equal defense of civil liberties for Fascists and non-Fascists; and Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party. When Browder rose to speak, each time the assembled "veterans, Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, Farmer-Laborites, social workers, ministers, workers, etc." rose to their feet and (as the Daily Worker, Jan. 6 wrote) he "was received with tremendous ovation, cheers and applause lasting for minutes before he was permitted to speak." If we had not solemnly been assured that these wildly cheering delegates had registered as representing all sorts of organizations totalling two million membership, we might have thought it was just a crowd of Stalinists paying homage to their appointed leader.

Browder's chief ideological contribution to the congress was his declaration that the Communist Party would help the American League "reach out to include not only one or two but fifteen to twenty million people in America, who will make this country a decisive force for peace, taking its stand alongside that other great country, the Soviet Union."

In current Stalinist terminology, an imperialist country becomes a "force for peace" when, like France, it makes an alliance with the Soviet Union. The role of the "united front against war," therefore, can have only one function: a pressure bloc to help push the United States into a military alliance with the Soviet Union.

"Pacifism is part of the ideological preparation for war." This fundamental doctrine of the revolutionists has now been forgotten by the Stalinists. In the heroic days of the Comintern, this doctrine guided an irreconcilable struggle against pacifism. Today the doctrine is remembered for the opposite purpose of using pacifism to put pressure on the American government to make the "right" alliance, that is, with the Soviet Union. Imperialist America will then be declared to be fighting a "progressive war," the pacifist illusions will, as during the last war, be transformed into idealistic chauvinism, and the American League will have achieved its foul purpose.

The three-day congress was a field day for pacifism. Every odd variety of illusion about war was heard; everything except the voice of revolutionary struggle against war. No one was contradicted: believers in religious ways of keeping the peace; advocates of refusal to register for the draft; advocates of sending the "right men" to Washington to stop war; advocates of conscripting both wealth and men; those who swore to refuse to bear arms; advocates of constitutional amendments to stop war;

Wage Raise Won In Newark WPA

(Continued from Page 1)
took up the fight of the fired men, charging discrimination and demanding reinstatement of the men on the projects and pay for time lost. The men have in the last few days been reassigned to projects, while the appeal is pending in the state office of the WPA.

Another aspect of the struggle that the administration is carrying on against the Association is to be found in the arrests (four to date) of members of the Association who are guilty of organizing WPA workers. The arrested were Thomas Morans, Jack Dale, Felix Giordano and Victorson. A convenient excuse for such arrests is the distribution of leaflets. Anybody caught distributing leaflets for the Association is liable to arrest on sight, to be charged with anything from "distributing leaflets without a permit"—which is impossible to get—to "obstructing and interfering."

This phase of the struggle has now been taken up by the recently formed local of the Non-Partisan Labor Defense, which is in charge of the appeals.

With the victory of the WPA front, now being firmly established, a new and most important fight looms on the horizon of the Association and of all genuine unemployed organizations. From now on, it is officially reported, all new applicants for relief will not be given cash, but will be treated to a permanent "grocery order" system. This is heralded by the reactionary press as a first step toward the general reestablishment of the relief system. The real meaning of this new step, aside from being a boon to large stores, is to be found in an official announcement to the effect that the administration expects to save 20 percent of the cost of relief by the return to the food order system.

Preparing to Defeat Relief Cut
Thus what is really implied by the move is a cut in the standards of relief. What such a cut would mean to the undernourished families of the unemployed is easy to picture.

Against this new attempt of the administration the Association for Adequate Relief is preparing itself for a real struggle.

every anti-Marxist notion about ways and means of stopping war was voiced and went unchallenged. The one possibly conceivable function of such a gathering, the educational function of revolutionists making clear the difference between these crack-pot ideas and realistic methods of struggle against war—that was the last conceivable function which the Stalinists could or would exercise!

With over two thousand ostensible delegates, the congress itself was nothing more than a mass meeting, in which the delegates submitted to speeches by the generals and preachers. No provisions were made for delegates to have the floor. To make doubly sure that everything would go through greased, the rules provided, when the program and resolutions were brought in and shoved through in scarcely more time than it took to read them, that there could be no resolutions offered from the floor, and no amendments. With a hand-picked resolutions committee, this effectively prevented discussion.

The only possible place where there might have been some purposeful discussion was in the one afternoon session in which the congress broke up into commissions—religious, children's, women's, trade union, etc. In theory these smaller groups were supposed to prepare and discuss resolutions for submission to the general resolutions committee. Actually, however, these commissions were merely smaller editions of the wind-baggy of the congress as a whole. I can speak particularly of the trade union commission, which I covered. The leaders of the commission, instead of presenting resolutions for discussion, gave the floor to a series of speakers who talked on nothing and everything, and then, when the afternoon was over and the delegates were streaming out, called for the election of a well-Stalinized resolutions committee to prepare the trade union resolutions.

A resume of some of the incidents at the trade union commission is instructive. A labor attorney made a speech in favor of the NRA, which had been very good, he said, it "did away with many strikes." A representative of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen made a speech supporting League of Nations sanctions and, in closing, declared: "I endorse everything General Butler said last night." A representative of the Mexican Popular Front made a speech declaring that President Cardenas was the savior of democratic rights. It was moved and seconded and unanimously adopted, to send a message of greetings to Cardenas as the savior of democratic rights. An aging steel worker urged the audience not to let their boys go to war but to keep them at home. A machinist delegate spoke of organizing unions and the People's Front. A representative of a United Mine Workers local spoke for the united front. Charles Zimmerman objected to the congress solely on the ground that it did not include more unions. A Negro made a splendid speech against Jim-Crowism in the unions. Ben Gold made a vicious attack on Zimmerman, for which he was duly reprimanded the next day for not having learned the new line. Zimmerman answered by again complaining about the lack of trade unions in the congress. A couple of speeches, including one by the Friends of the Chinese People, and the trade union commission was about over.

Max S. Hayes, prominent Cleveland trade unionist, arose to express his indignation at the slanders cast against the League as being a Communist organization. He proposed to settle that kind of thing once and for all by a resolution which he read. The resolution declared that whereas the League existed to perpetuate the American democratic form of government, etc., therefore be it resolved that the League goes on record against all dictatorships, including the Russian. Here was an opportunity to clarify the distinction between defending bourgeois democracy and fighting for the democratic rights of the masses: an opportunity to defend the nature of the workers' state. Not the Stalinists! Louis Weinstein arose hastily to propose that the resolution be referred to the resolutions committee, where it remained buried, the only reference to it being a casual remark by the reader of the resolutions to the congress, that "two resolutions submitted were not reported out by the resolutions committee because of their political character." Then came the announcement that Max Hayes, author of such a resolution, was elected vice-chairman of the American League.

If the trade union commission was so formidable, undoubtedly the others were even worse. A glimpse into one of them was provided by the Rev. Herman Reissig, chairman of the religious commission, who reported that his commission had had a long and most interesting discussion of the difference between prophetic religion and traditional religion, but had finally decided that a resolution on this point was

not germane to the congress. Thus, deliberately, the congress was a Babel of all tongues except revolutionary ones; a veritable three-day parade of preachers and generals, politicians and professional pacifists, and a small section of earnest but thoroughly confused workers, who could not but be even more confused by the whole proceeding. The vague, pea-fog intellectual atmosphere clogged minds and hearts, stultified working class instincts and bred vast, fantastic illusions about the struggle against war.

These illusions were embodied in vicious succinctness in the temporary program adopted by the congress. The program falls into two parts, the first being points dealing with struggle against reaction. These are issues which properly should be raised and carried on by a broad labor defense organization and by a progressive movement in the trade unions, and provide no real reason for the existence of the American League. They are, in fact, quite perfunctory, and are merely window-dressing for the real purpose of the League: its pacifist program. The "anti-war" part of the program is its real essence. These points are the replica of the Stalinist line on the war question.

In reading these "anti-war" planks, one realizes the enormous usefulness of this "people's front" to Stalinism. Speaking in its own name, the Stalinist is still embarrassed by the baggage of scraps of Leninism which remain from the days when the Comintern was a revolutionary organization. Stalinism must in the same breath declare that France will fight a progressive war which Communists will support but that at the same time they will prepare for civil war. Stalinism must in the same breath declare its loyalty to bourgeois democracy in the People's Front but simultaneously swear it has not forgotten the dictatorship of the proletariat. All this baggage, so outmoded for the chauvinist role of the Stalinist, they can happily leave outside when they appear in the guise of the American League. In the name of the discipline of the "united front," they have rendered lip service to the class-struggle approach but hastened to declare that this is "a perspective we know that many people at this congress are not yet ready to accept"—and therefore the Communist party "unconditionally" accepts the American League program which is not based on class struggle!

The united front used to be a form of joint action on class struggle lines but not requiring all participants to accept the final revolutionary outcome of the class struggle. Now, under the formula of the People's Front, "against war and Fascism" in the abstract, even the elementary conception of independent class action is thrown overboard!

(Another installment on the program of the League will appear next week.)

Left Wing Is Need in Silk

(Continued from Page 1)
must be done now? Is the strike necessarily to be a complete rout of the union forces? Will the union that the workers built and tempered in struggle now be completely smashed?

First: What is to be done? We know of no other answer than the one we gave on May 1: **Build the left wing.** By that, we are forced to insist, we do not mean what is now considered by some mistaken people to be the left wing, the Stalinist misleadership and adventurism. What must be built is a group of serious union members that can gauge a situation objectively and supply the workers with the necessary program and leadership. We have lost precious time in the building of such a left wing, and we are now paying dearly for it. Still, the situation is not desperate, and if we apply ourselves to the task and actually do build such a left wing, the union will have a chance to experience a re-growth.

Second: Will the strike be a complete defeat? Not necessarily. If the left wing is built, and if it is able to rally the workers to its program, it will be possible, though in no way assured, that something may be saved out of this battle which now has all the appearances of an inglorious defeat.

Third: Will the union be smashed? Again that depends on the speedy establishment of the left wing. Such a new group would be able to give new life to the union, and steer it out of its present difficult straits. If the left wing is not built soon, then the union, as the result of the defeat, will fall back, lose membership, and become again what it was before 1931, a small group trying to be a union. And all the work of building that has been carried on for over five years will have availed us nothing, and will have to be done all over again. The task before the silk workers of Paterson presents itself in no ambiguous form: **Build the left**

FDR Masks War Plans

(Continued from Page 1)

completely dominant in the economic sense over both northern and southern continents, European nations so utterly unable to challenge it, that it can masquerade as the benevolent good rich neighbor in the same way as some individual steel, coal or textile magnate plays "the good neighbor" to his wage-slaves at the foot of the hill. Indirectly, but it may well be intentionally, Mr. Roosevelt when he draws his picture of the twenty-two "democratic" nations of the two Americas, arms all linked together and dancing the dance of brotherliness, is telling other nations that twenty-one of them are essentially satellites of the U. S., that the U. S. is not going to tolerate any other suitors, and that if any nation from the more barbaric continents steps on Uncle Sam's toes it may have to fight the other American nations too.

But the picture of noble, peaceful Uncle Sam and his neighbors, as Mr. Roosevelt paints it, is plausible and touching and subtly insinuates into many minds the idea that if ever such a country as this should be involved in a war, it would be "purely defensive" or, unashamedly on behalf of some great ideal—perhaps the missionary ideal of carrying to other lands the blessings of American peace and neighborliness. And of course when such a country now drills troops, builds military planes and war vessels, it is for the same noble, irreproachable ends! Only some nasty-minded Bolshevik could think otherwise.

The Certainty of War

Once again we note the tenseness of international relations today, the certainty of war and of our involvement in it, involuntarily acting to the surface. In the very act of picturing the peace-loving U. S. Roosevelt conjures up the enemy whom we are to fight in the approaching war. "The temper and the purposes of the rulers of many of the great populations in Europe and in Asia have not pointed the way either to peace or to good-will among men." The "twin spirits of autocracy and aggression" rule these nations. Roosevelt is not satisfied to charge the rulers of these autocratic and aggressive nations (obviously Japan, Germany, Italy, etc. are intended) with crimes. More openly than is customary in this stage of war preparation he tries to prepare the American masses to hate and therefore to fight the peoples of other lands. "It is idle," he says, "to preach that the masses of the people who constitute those nations which are dominated by the twin spirits of autocracy and aggression, are out of sympathy with their rulers. . . . They follow blindly and fervently the lead of those who seek autocratic power." After more of this kind, he becomes positively truculent, challenging these wicked nations to "knock the chip off his shoulder: 'I recognize that these words which I have chosen with deliberation will not prove popular in any nation that chooses to fit this shoe to its foot'—the implication, if they don't like it, to hell with them."

Let American workers, farmers and intellectuals make no mistake about it. Primarily, Roosevelt's speech was an expression of American imperialism flinging defiance at its foes, seeking to engender a war spirit in the American masses. "Good" and "Bad" Capitalist Powers

The Roosevelt speech gave support to the two rationalizations by means of which the imperialists—and, it cannot too often be pointed out, the Stalinist and social democratic misleaders of the working class—made use in duping the masses into participation in imperialist war. One is the idea to which we have already alluded, namely, that there are two kinds of big nations: the good, non-aggressive, "democratic" ones and the bad, aggressive, autocratic, Fascist ones. The fact that all alike are capitalist-imperialist nations, engaged in daily deadly competition with each other, which some day shifts into open, military conflict, this is pushed into the background. So is the fact that in the Fascist countries the masses are told that the "democratic" countries are pious hypocrites who have plundered and slugged their neighbors and now won't let them get up and rehabilitate themselves. Thus as in 1914 the masses are to be duped, hypnotized by looking at an illusion so that they don't realize the truth until they perish in agony in No Man's Land.

And the other fairy tale is that of the small nations who "if left to themselves, would be content with their boundaries" and whose rulers "deep in their hearts follow these peaceful and reasonable aspirations of their peoples." Poor little Belgium, noble, democratic King Al-

wing, and build it now!
No mean task, to be sure. Yet upon the ability of the Paterson silk workers to carry it out rests the very life of the union.

bert, all over again!

After Roosevelt has thus foretold war, aroused the war psychology and indicated at whom the guns we are making are pointed (mainly Japan, of course) it is not hard to discern the real meaning of our "neutrality" policy over which pacifists, including socialists and Stalinists, war so enthusiastic. There is no "moral" consistency about it certainly, for it proposes to withhold munitions equally from the "good" neighbors and the "bad" in case they are involved in war and to keep up "normal" trade if possible with both in other forms of merchandise which might be used for war purposes. For the present, while the preliminary skirmishes take place, we can hold aloof under this "neutrality" policy, go about our business of consolidating our economic power especially on the American continent, building our naval and military machine, letting other countries deplete their resources and energies. Even after the outbreak of large-scale conflict the U. S. may still for a time pursue the same superficially virtuous course, as in 1914-17, but in due time, unless the American workers under the leadership of the revolutionary internationalist party decree otherwise, when it has exhausted possibilities of gain from a "peaceful" policy will plunge again into war.

It is when we thus see clearly that the first half of Roosevelt's speech for American capitalist imperialists, a pledge that the administration will look tirelessly after the national (capitalist) 'defences,' that we can see through the sham and demagoguery of the last half which has been ecstatically hailed by liberal and all good Democrats as a fighting speech against autocratic and reactionary capitalism.

New Deal Served Capitalism

The New Deal, as Roosevelt points out in this very speech, holding it to be to his credit, saved capitalism and the capitalists. Business is on the upgrade. Stock quotations and profits are mounting. Relief funds are being drastically cut. Strikes were kept in bounds by Hugh Johnson and his successors. The basic industries are still unorganized. There are eleven million or more unemployed. But the capitalists are feeling cheery, now that profits are being made again temporarily. They want to take away from the workers even those concessions, mainly illusory, which Roosevelt realized had to be given to save the system. So there is to be a sham battle to divert the masses' attention from the truth. Some Republican hack will run against Roosevelt, champion of the forgotten man.

Unwittingly he made it clear—and this is for us the most important point in the second half of the speech—that regardless of who is elected President, which old party

Pickets Shut Mather Plant

(Continued from Page 1)

preparation for the moment when it can cry out "Violence!" and "Unruly agitators!"

There is little doubt but that every agency of the capitalist class, government, police, press, strike-breakers, reactionary organizations, are being mobilized in an effort to demoralize unionism in Toledo by restoring a plant to full operation in the face of a picket-line for the first time in a score and over of strikes during the "New Deal" period. Industrialists are deliberately driving for a violent show-down battle.

Leading figure in the strike is Burke Cochran, vice-president of the M.E.S.A. Toledo local, who has been elected to take full charge of all strike activities. Cochran was the key-speaker at the mass meeting of the Mather strikers and M.E.S.A. men yesterday, which was called for the purpose of mobilizing the forces in the strike. His indomitable drive, keen tactical sense and fighting fervor have revitalized the spirit of the strikers, drooping under two months of inactivity, tension, uncertain waiting and slim living. Today's clashes indicate that the union is going to fight bitterly. A mass picket line is being built up in icy blizzard weather.

At the moment when the scabs appear to start actual plant operation, there is going to be a fight and the outcome of this fight may determine in large measure the course of all auto unionism in this city for some time to come.

"Hottest affair since the Chicago fire!"

Harlem Jamboree

Benefit
NON-PARTISAN LABOR DEFENSE

Friday, January 17th

SARATOGA CLUB 575 Lenox Avenue, N. Y. C.

Tickets: \$1.00 per person

Dancing 10 to 4 A.M. — Midnight Supper — Floor Show

Bronx Lecture
A. J. MUSTE
speaks on
ORGANIC UNITY
Wednesday, Jan. 15, 1936
Ambassador Hall, 3875 3rd Ave.
near Claremont Parkway

WORKERS
Protect Yourself Against the
Hazards of Life. Join the
WORKMEN'S SICK & DEATH
BENEFIT FUND OF THE U.S.
1884-1935

Organized, managed by and for
workers with only one purpose:
to render protection to members
and their families, and to support
all endeavors and struggles for
the improvement of toilers.

About 50,000 members organized
in 350 branches. Reserves
\$3,400,000.

Death benefit graded according
to age at entry. Sick benefit
payments from \$225 to \$800—to
men and women, according to
classes.

Monthly assessments from 45c
to \$2.10.

For further information apply
to Main Office:
714 Seneca Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

PAUL LUTTINGER, M.D.
DANIEL LUTTINGER, M.D.
5 Washington Square North
1-2 and 6-8 Except Sundays
and Holidays.

'People's Front' - New Panacea of Stalinism

By Max Shachtman

Fascism, in seizing power in Germany without encountering the slightest resistance from the working class, revealed how utterly savage and reactionary capitalism has become in the years of its decay. It nevertheless yielded one positive result. It brutally jerked the proletarian movement out of its complacency with the old labor parties, their theories, their practical policies and their leadership, and compelled it to undertake a search for a course different from those which led it to such a calamitous and humiliating defeat. At the same time that Fascism brought to the workers everywhere an acute awareness of the hideous inferno which it holds in store for them whenever and wherever it triumphs, it also impelled them to think deeply about why it took over the helm so easily in Germany and what line of action must henceforward be adopted so that the reptile may be strangled before it strangles them.

Nothing is more understandable than the fact that the workers, alarmed by the spread of Fascism to one country after another, should lend a receptive ear to every plausible plan presented as a means whereby they may deal an effective blow to what menaces their very existence. And of the plans recently put forward, none appears so

simple, so plausible, so effective as the one now so vociferously advanced by the Stalinist parties, following the 7th Congress of the Communist International, for virtually all the countries of the globe. But only appears! For a closer examination of the Stalinist panacea against Fascism and war, which goes by the alluring name of "The People's Front," will not only reveal that the "plan" is far from a new one but also that its execution would have just exactly the opposite effects from those it promises to produce.

The opposite effects? Precisely. Do you then mean that the Stalinists, instead of wanting to avert Fascism and war, would rather bring them on? Not at all, any more than the German social democrats wanted the war of 1914-1918 or the victory of Hitler in 1933; for that matter, any more than the bulk of the members of the capitalist class "want" imperialist war. What is decisive in this, as in all other social questions, is not what you want, but what will logically result from the policy you pursue. Not even the most ardent and anxious mountain climber has ever been known to reach the top of Mont Blanc by starting to dig a ditch at the foot of it; such a method would hardly bring him half-way up the side of it.

How the German Social Democrats Followed the Road to Ruin

The classic party of the "practical" struggle against Fascism, for peace and democracy, was the German social democracy. Its policy, generously complemented by the German Stalinists, resulted in the facile victory of Fascism, the enhancement of the danger of a new world war, the destruction of the last remnants even of bourgeois democracy. Briefly its course was based upon the following conceptions:

Not having behind us the majority, we cannot yet take control of the country, establish a Socialist government, and inaugurate a socialist society. The Weimar Republic is better for the working class than the Hohenzollern monarchy; Hitlerism is worse than the Weimar Republic. We must therefore defend the bourgeois republic, for the alternative is not socialism or capitalism, but democracy or Fascism. Being in the minority in the country, we can find a majority to defend the republic ("democracies require majorities") only if we ally ourselves with the democratic elements of all classes. They will ally themselves with us in the struggle against Fascism only if we do not drive them into its arms by a systematic prosecution of the class struggle. The class struggle, in such critical times as exist by virtue of the Fascist threat to seize power, is superseded by the struggle of the people (all classes, the good people of all classes) against the psychopathological Brownists. The unity of the people is represented by the Iron Front. That we have won the democratic bourgeoisie to the struggle against Fascism, is represented by the fact that Hindenburg is our candidate

for the presidency of the republic (God knows he isn't perfect, but Hitler is worse). The struggle against the Fascists must not exceed parliamentary bounds, for actual physical struggle would precipitate a civil war of the classes in the country, which would frighten our allies into the camp of Hitler. Better a thousand times that both sides should disarm, for workers need no arms in order to conquer a majority at the ballot box.

The consequences of this course are too frightful and recent in the memory of all to require detailed comment. Now, wherein does the Stalinist policy of the "People's Front" differ essentially, in France or in the United States, from the policy of the German social democrats? In only one respect. The Germans pursued this line of thought and action out of a deeply-felt desire to protect the mighty organizations and institutions of labor, built up by years of effort and sacrifice, as the living basis for the coming socialist society in Germany. These organizations and institutions the leaders identified with themselves. The Stalinists have adopted the same line out of just as deep a desire to protect the proletarian institutions and the foundations of socialism which are being laid in the Soviet Union. In turn, they too identify them with the Soviet bureaucracy and its interests. In both cases, such a line must ultimately lead—as it already has in Germany—not only to the wiping out of these institutions and constituents of past years, but even to the smashing of the very bureaucracy whose course brings on the catastrophe.

Why the Stalinists Made the Turn to the "People's Front"

Up to the time Hitler took power, the Stalinist line in Germany (as in all other countries) was derived from the theory and practice of "socialism in one country." The source of the new Stalinist line is exactly the same theory. At bottom, the latter is based upon a loss of faith in the revolutionary capacities of the world working class, for the Soviet bureaucracy simply says, when it formulates and fights so furiously for the idolization of its theory, that backward Russia will arrive at the classless socialist society, with a standard of living higher than that ever enjoyed by any working class in any capitalist country at any stage of development, sooner than the German, French, English or American workers will overthrow their bourgeoisie. Arrive there if military intervention can be prevented, if the capitalist world, especially Europe, can be made to preserve (more or less) the status quo, without eruptions or convulsions. A civil war in Germany to prevent Hitler from coming to power, would precipitate international complications and probably war, without the German workers being able to win (that prospect, the Moscow bureaucracy simply ridicules over its teacups). That would endanger the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union. Therefore, retreat before Fascism without giving battle.

Far from dispelling the danger to the Soviet Union, this abysmally blind policy vastly heightened it. Hitler in power became, to quote Trotsky, the super-Wrangell, the sword poised for Russia's heart. Frightened, panic-stricken by the results of their whole "Third Period" policy, the Soviet bureaucrats who manipulate the Third International like jugglers, made a

complete turn-about-face in line, which was consecrated at the 7th World Congress.

Believing even less in the fighting capacities of the world proletariat now that it was prostrate in Germany, and impelled by the same nationalistic theory, the Stalinists have turned for allies to defend "socialism in one country" from Hitler to the bourgeoisie of other countries. The entry of the Soviet Union in to the League of Nations and its disgraceful adaptation to the interests and policies of the dominant imperialist gang at Geneva; the seamy pacts made with French imperialism and its Czechoslovakian vassal; the frantic efforts to consummate similar alliances with England and the United States—all these attest the extent to which the Stalin clique is relying for salvation upon the presumed friendship of capitalist allies.

It is not within the province of this article to discuss the Soviet foreign policy, to which the same criteria should not and cannot be applied as are applied to the policy of a proletarian party, be it in Russia or in a capitalist country. What is important, however, is the fact that, contrary to Lenin's policy of subordinating the foreign diplomacy of the workers' state to the international interests of the proletariat, the Stalinists have subordinated the proletarian movement they control to the interests of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs. The "People's Front," wherever it is created, is essentially a movement organized by the Stalinists as a guarantee and a prop under their Soviet foreign policy of alliances and military pacts. As such, it cannot be other than an agency for preserving in power in each country that bourgeoisie, or section of the bourgeoisie, which is

either "friendly" or "allied" with the Soviet Union, or whose "friendship" the Soviet Union seeks. This friendship (how temporary, how treacherous such friends always prove to be in a crisis!) is purchased by the Stalinists at the price of converting—more accurately: of organizing—their "People's Fronts" into recruiting agencies figuratively and literally) of the democratic imperialist bourgeoisie in the respective countries.

It is at this point that the difference between the Stalinist and the German social democratic courses comes to an end, and their identity is resumed. The difference is of little or no fundamental account, and of no practical significance; it relates to the Why and the Who, but it alters nothing in the How and the What . . . or in the results.

The Soviet government signs a military-political pact with Czechoslovakia; the Stalinists, "pleased," reads the New York Times cable (Dec. 22, 1935), "with a Soviet pact for defense against German aggression which Mr. Benes' realism induced him to conclude, voted alongside the bourgeois Catholic parties for their former enemy." Cause and effect! Litvinov signs a pact (good, bad or indifferent, that is not the point at the moment) with the Czech bourgeoisie. The Czech Stalinists promptly suspend the class struggle and every other revolutionary principle by voting for the military budget in parliament

"People's Front", Democracy and Fascism

Almost up to yesterday, the Stalinists not only rejected a united front with the Socialist parties and the reformist trade unions, but denounced those revolutionists who advocated such a bloc against Fascism as being themselves a species of "social-Fascists." Not a united front with the social democracy against Fascism, said the Stalinists, but first crush the social democracy, and there will be no Fascist problem. The head of the world proletariat, the beloved Stalin, delivered himself in 1925 of the dictum which became canonical doctrine in the International: "Social democracy is objectively the moderate wing of Fascism. . . . These organizations do not negate, but supplement one another." The hindquarters of the world proletariat, the slightly less beloved Manuilsky, warned at the 11th Plenum of the C. I., in March, 1931, that "the social democrats, in order to deceive the masses, deliberately proclaim that the chief enemy of the working class is Fascism, in order thereby to divert attention from the question of the struggle against the dictatorship of capitalism in general, to idealize the democratic forms of the latter and to create among the workers the impression that they must struggle for the 'democratic' forms of their exploitation and against the Fascist forms."

But all this was in the period when the Stalinists guaranteed us that there was a universal stormy revolutionary upsurge of the proletariat, a mass radicalization, which threatened the innermost fortresses of world capitalism. The upsurge has apparently abated considerably under the general leadership of the Stalinist staff, and from the struggle on all fronts for the proletarian dictatorship the Third International has made a forced march forward to the struggle for "the democratic forms of . . . the dictatorship of capitalism in general."

"Now the toiling masses are faced with the necessity of making a definite choice, and of making it today," announced Helmsman Dimitroff at the 7th Congress, "not between proletarian dictatorship and bourgeois democracy but between bourgeois democracy and Fascism."

To the extent that there is a kernel of truth in this assertion, the responsibility for a situation in which—in the era of imperialist decay and social revolution—the struggle for working class power has been set low on the order of the day, lies with the reformist social democracy and the no less treacherous policy of Stalinism. The conclusion, however, which the Stalinists draw does not differ by a hair from the conclusions drawn by the social democracy for years.

From the fact that on this, or the other day the working class did not yet stand on the eve of the fight for power, the German reformists concluded that not only was this fight postponed to the Greek Kalends, but that no steps should be taken to organize the class struggle in such a manner as to bring the proletariat constantly closer to the decisive battle. It is false to think that the German Socialist leaders ever declared that the ideal of a socialist government was abandoned by them—any more than the Stalinists now declare their renunciation of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat some day in the future—the distant future. The crime of the social democrats consisted not in failing to take power when it could not be taken, but in supporting the spurious capitalist democracy of

and by joining with the bourgeois parties to elect Eduard Benes, shrewd and faithful servitor of Czech and French imperialism, as president of the republic. A Roland for an Oliver! A Benes for a Hindenburg!

Ditto in France. Only here, instead of Benes or Hindenburg, the name is Herriot, or Daladier, whose renown as a fighter against Fascism was first gained on that famous February 6 when he crumpled up at the mere sight of several thousand Fascists, armed with razor-blade-tipped canes, demonstrating in front of the Chamber of Deputies.

Ditto in Mexico, the "friendship" of whose bourgeoisie the Soviet bureaucracy thirsts after. The clever bourgeois demagogue, President Cardenas, during whose less than two years in office more than 2,000 militant peasants have been assassinated in the state of Vera Cruz alone, has the ardent support of the ludicrous little C. P. of Mexico. Its manifesto only a few weeks ago, pasted all over the capital, began: "With Cardenas! Against the Callesist reaction!" and ended: "Let us support Cardenas in his struggle against the Callesist reaction!" Half the Mexican C. P. membership working in the government apparatus, is only added reason for such ardor.

Now let us see the "People's Front" as it labors to be born in the United States.

The Weimar Republic, they helped the bourgeoisie consolidate itself in power on the grounds that Fascism would thereby be warded off. Then, having demoralized and devitalized the proletariat, they stood by helplessly while Fascism rose to power quite legally and constitutionally and "democratically" on the basis of that very same Weimar Republic.

The intentions of Stalin and Co. may be of the noblest type, but we see no reason why the general run of the German Socialist bureaucracy should not be characterized similarly; in any case, it is not important. What is important, is the identity of their positions. The so-called "conditions" that Dimitroff sets for casting his vote for bourgeois democracy are essentially the same as those promulgated by the German Socialists in their time. The latter also demanded that the bourgeois democratic governments which it supported or "tolerated" should "disarm the Fascists" and do this, that and the other thing. Like the Stalinists, they too spoke of a "real struggle" against the Fascists. Like the Stalinists, they too said that "final salvation this government cannot bring." And like the Stalinists, they supported bourgeois democracy as the "lesser evil."

Lenin too made demands on the bourgeois democratic government of Kerensky in the struggle against the "Fascist" Kornilov. Quite true. But—and here lies the fundamental, unobliterable difference!—at no time did Lenin support the Kerensky regime, at no time did he put the social democratic-Stalinist alternative. In the very struggle against Kornilov he subjected the bourgeois "democracy" and its government to a pitiless criticism, organizing the masses independently, warning against the counterfeit "democracy," patiently explaining, and systematically mobilizing the masses for the struggle for power. The same policy is now denounced by the French Stalinists in terms lifted directly from the Russian Mensheviks of 1917: except that where the latter said "a Leninist-Trotskyist provocation," the former merely say "a Trotskyist provocation."

In its consequences, the policy of the German social democracy led to the victory of Fascism, despite the fact that it was calculated to prevent it. The "defense of bourgeois democracy," of the Weimar Republic, as the lesser evil, did not bring the workers to power, did not stop Hitler from taking power, and did not even save bourgeois democracy from inundation. Let that not be forgotten!

At the 7th Congress, the beloved Czech Stalinist spokesman, Gottwald, impudently plagiarizing Hitler, Wells and Loeb, declared: "If this bourgeois democratic republic is threatened by bloody Fascism, then we defend this republic against Fascism and call upon all real socialists, democrats and republicans to a united front for the joint fight so that this republic shall be spared the greatest disgrace of all, and the toiling people the greatest catastrophe of all, viz., bloody Fascist dictatorship." When this is followed by the Stalinist vote for Hindenburg-Benes for president of the Czechoslovakian Republic, one must ask (no answer will be forthcoming!): Where is the difference between the social democratic Iron Front in Germany, which was so mercilessly attacked by the revolutionists, and the Stalinist "People's Front"? And wherein will the consequences differ?

In the official textbook of the Stalinists, published only a few months ago—"Fascism and Social Revolution"—the author, Dutt, comments as follows on the resignation of Daladier after the February 6. Fascist demonstration in Paris:

"Therewith the whole card-castle of bourgeois democracy, of the 'democratic' defense against Fascism, of 'democracy' versus dictatorship, of the whole social democratic line, came tumbling down. The line of the 'Left Cartel,' of the French Socialist party, of the parliamentary-democratic defense against Fascism, was once again only to have smoothed the way for the advance of Fascism, for a government of the Right, for intensified dictatorship against the workers. . . ." (P. 275.)

The Farmer-Labor Party, and the "People's Front"

Like Theseus in the labyrinth of mythology, one would need a large ball of string to enable him to get to the center (and out again) of the maze through which the American Communist party has travelled in its futile search for a Farmer-Labor party in the course of the last dozen or more years. Shelled with a sigh of relief several years ago, it was taken down—not the party, but the hope—shortly before the 7th World Congress and dusted off. Now, a few months afterwards, it appears, considerably the worse for alteration, as the specific American form of the People's Front.

In the October 1935 issue of "The Communist," W. Z. Foster, who has also been taken off the shelf and dusted off, explains that unlike France, where the masses have "parties, of their own, which could serve as the basis of such a united front," the United States possesses no large mass party. If the decisions of the 7th Congress are to be carried out in this country—and God knows they must be—the C.P. must unite with somebody or something to form the "People's Front." If there is no somebody or something, it will have to be manufactured.

The fabled sculptor, Pygmalion, became enamored of the lovely but inanimate statue he had chiselled, and wished so ardently that it might come to life that the gods finally granted his request. The marble gave way to the flesh and blood of Galathea, whom Pygmalion espoused and lived happily with for a goodly period of time. Let us see what the Stalinist Pygmalions aim to infuse their marbleheaded ideas with in order that they may come to life as the American

And further: "To preach confidence in legalism, in constitutionalism, in bourgeois democracy, that is, in the capitalist state, means to invite and to guarantee the victory of Fascism. That is the lesson of Germany and Austria." (P. 299.)

Perfect! If anything is to be added to it, it is this: The place of the Left Cartel in France has now been taken by the Stalinist-organized "People's Front"; the Stalinists now cry for the same Daladier to take power! The line of the "People's Front," instead of averting Fascism, will, if continued—we are merely echoing the pre-7th Congress Dutt—smooth the way for the advance of Fascism, for a government of the Right, for intensified dictatorship against the workers. And not only in France.

People's Front.

In the resolution adopted by the Central Committee of the C. P. on January 18, 1935, upon Browder's return from Moscow with the straight information that the American masses were clamoring for a Labor party, four types of Labor parties are described, "reflecting the two chief political tendencies of this movement—the class struggle or class collaboration . . . : (a) a 'Popular' or 'progressive' party based on the LaFollette, Sinclair, Olson and Long movements, and typified by these leaders and their programs; (b) a 'Farmer-Labor' or 'Labor' party of the same character, differing only in name and the degree of its demagoguery; (c) a 'Labor party' with a predominantly trade union basis, with a program consisting of immediate demands (possibly with vague demagoguery) about the 'cooperative commonwealth,' a la Olson, dominated by a section of the trade union bureaucracy, assisted by the Socialist party and excluding the Communists; (d) a Labor party built up from below on a trade union basis but in conflict with the bureaucracy, putting forward a program of demands closely connected with mass struggles, strikes, etc., with the leading role played by the militant elements, including the Communists" (The Communist, Feb. 1935, p. 123).

Being, as they were, in a position to choose, the Stalinists decided only a year ago to having nothing to do with any of the variants except Type D. Anything less represented class collaboration. But that was before the 7th Congress. What does the "People's Front," anti-Fascist, mass Farmer-Labor

part look like now, in the Stalinist conception? "Les' und staun'!" as the Germans say; read and gasp.

"The anti-Fascist mass party," writes Foster in the October 1935 Communist, "should be based on the trade unions [What? Not from below?] and should include farmers' organizations, the Communist party, Socialist party, state Farmer-Labor parties, veterans' organizations, working women's organizations, workers' and farmers' cooperatives, workers' fraternal societies, tenants' leagues, anti-war societies, groups of intellectuals, etc." (p. 901.) One would think that these were enough, that everyone has been covered. But no, the "etc." impels us to read further and to gasp more:

"The new mass party of toilers should also strive to include sections of the sprouting Fascist or partly Fascist organizations and tendencies; such as company unions, American Legion posts, and groups of the Coughlin and Long movements, etc." (Ibid.)

If, after this stupefyingly comprehensive enumeration, there is still one man, woman, child or beast omitted from the roll call, he, she or it will undoubtedly be covered by the second, more ominous "etc."

What more pointed indication could the sager sections of the American bourgeoisie have of the fact that, as another installment on the price for Russian recognition, and as a promise of what greater gifts the Soviet bureaucracy is prepared to make to the "democratic" American rulers in return for an alliance against Japan, the Stalinists are working with might and main to blur all class lines, to soften the class struggle, to reduce themselves voluntarily to the position of an innocuous, all-embracing, national extension of LaFollette petty bourgeois "progressivism"? Or do we owe the LaFollette dynasty in Wisconsin an apology? If we are not mistaken, it draws the line at "sprouting Fascist or partly Fascist organizations and tendencies" in its ranks, and the trade unions which are part of the "progressive" movement, being uneducated in the precepts of overhauled Stalinism, would probably balk, in their unreasonably sectarian way, at sitting in the same party with company unions and Coughlin-Long groups.

Just read what is palmed off nowadays, without a smile, as Leninism: "The hour," reads the 1935 election platform of the Stalinists in New York, "demands the building of the broadest people's front, uniting workers, farmers, unemployed, professionals, small business men, Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Socialists, Communists, Democrats and Republicans, a people's front, fighting in the interests of the common people, the working people and the poor farmers."—"Every means and effort," reads a circular, dated August 26, 1935, sent to all C. P. units by the New York district literature department, "must be made to widen and broaden our united front among all classes of people in New York City. . . . The necessity for the widest distribution of this platform, as you can see, is very great, much greater than ordinarily, because of our attempt to unite all people in an anti-Fascist front."

Socialists, Communists, Republicans, Democrats, all classes of people, all people, fighting in the interests of the common people—where is there room for the class struggle in all this vulgar verbiage so adeptly lifted from the platform speeches of every capitalist demagogue in the history of modern politics?

The "People's Front" will embrace all parties and political views (except the revolutionary, to be sure!) and it will therefore be an appendage of the bourgeoisie just as unflinchingly as was the Iron Front, paralyzing the independent movement of the proletariat. The "People's Front" will embrace all classes of people and it will therefore represent none of them. Comprehensive in its scope and composition as it will be, it will have few to struggle against, just a few, like Mr. W. R. Hearst who—O knave impure in body and soul!—in addition to being a Fascist is further indicted by the Stalinists for his shocking habit of conjugal infidelity.

And in such a struggle, what more powerful, even if—how shall we put it?—not entirely reliable and not entirely consistent ally can the "People's Front" have than that distinguished paladin of bourgeois democracy versus autocratic dictatorship, Franklin D. Roosevelt? But this is an aspect of the question so central in importance that it requires and deserves more ample treatment than can be devoted to it in this article.

(Next week, Max Shachtman will deal with the question of the "Government of the People's Front" and the "People's Front and the War Danger."—Ed.)

Toledo W.P.A. Has Its Say

(Continued from Page 1)

the WPA here which has left thousands of qualified workers on the relief rolls, laid off thousands of others for varying periods of time that cut monthly pay from the \$55 minimum down to as little as \$20, delayed issuance of pay-checks for days and weeks, short-paid hundreds who have worked full time by a trick method of accountancy, and has provoked scores of other grievances. Schuhl, at the last minute the day before, attempted to evade speaking at the meeting, the date for which he himself had set. A little persuasion by a union committee forced from him an agreement to speak for "15 minutes."

When Schuhl put in his appearance at the meeting, the entire audience rose at the signal of the chairman, Art Preis, one of the first members of the Ohio Unemployed League in this territory and a leader of the big FERA strike here last spring, and sang lustily the words of a parody song to the tune of "Hinky-Dinky-Parley Vouz" especially written for the occasion as a greeting to the administrator: "Two verses of the song, printed on song-sheets issued to every worker, reflected the spirit of the meeting and had Schuhl's ears burning. They went:

"They promised us fifty-five bucks a month and said, 'This will do.' Then they laid us off for half the time, and it was cut in two. They give you hot air and bally-hoo. To warm up your house and make your stew. And say, 'That's good enough for you.' We workers are simply all fed up on bally-hoo. We're tired of all this passing-the-buck and parley-vouz. There's plenty here, as we all can see. We don't have to beg on bended knee. We'll get what we want, and to hell with you."

K.O.ed by Questions. The chairman then introduced Schuhl, and pointed out that the administrator was the WPA workers' servant, and that while the

union would extend every personal courtesy to him, he should not take this in any sense as a truce with the administration and that there would be no pulling of punches in questions or remarks addressed to him as a representative of the administration. The chairman then added that since Mr. Schuhl had indicated that he was a very busy man, and the union was a very busy organization, he wished to submit a printed list of nine questions drawn up by the union, copies of which were in the hands of every worker present, as the basis for the speaker's remarks.

For fifteen minutes Schuhl rambled and fumbled through the questions, passing the buck to the Federal WPA and to the local city and county governments. He ended up feebly by stating: "I know I haven't answered these questions very much to your satisfaction, but it's all I can say." When he turned to go, the chairman called upon him to answer direct questions from the workers. His 15 minutes stretched to an hour, as worker after worker speared Schuhl with sharp questions that tore his apologies apart, and exposed his false claims on many points by stating their own experiences. The chairman mercifully closed the question period to permit the groggy administrator to beat a hasty exit.

Stalinists Sabotage Unity

Great confusion, however, still exists among the WPA workers due to the refusal of the local W.A.A. to cooperate in joint action with the union in fighting for the WPA workers. Members of the Communist Party and the liquidated Unemployed Councils have taken practically complete control of the local W.A.A. These individuals have stopped at no vile tactic to prevent unity among the unemployed and project workers in the W.A.A. and Unemployed League. They have stooped to the basest type of personal slander against leading members of the union and League. At a meeting of the union last week, five members of the W.A.A., who incidentally had been among those for whom the union had secured back-pay and new jobs, inspired by Fred Voelker, former Unemployed Council organizer and now a leading light in the W.A.A., attempted to break up the union by a vague charge of "selling out." The rank and file union members took the floor and smashed their flimsy lies and laughed them out of the meeting.

NEW MILITANT

with which is merged
THE MILITANT

Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co.,
55 East 11th Street, New York City.

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 six months. Canada and foreign: \$1.50 per
year; \$1.00 six months. Bundle rates: 2c per copy.

Vol. 2 SATURDAY, JANUARY 11, 1936 No. 2

"Rally 'Round the Flag'"

IF WAR leaves room for only two tendencies in the labor movement—social-patriotism and revolutionary internationalism—the present period of an imminent new imperialist slaughter makes the attitude toward the coming war the decisive criterion by which to judge all parties, groups and tendencies in the ranks of the working class.

The tendency of the Stalinists in this regard—now clear enough to all who are able to read and observe—has been implicit all the time in their nationalistic policy. More than seven years ago, in his criticism of the program of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, Trotsky prophesied that the dogma of "Socialism in One Country" (and no other country!) would inevitably lead to degeneration along the lines of social-patriotism. The prediction is a reality already. The Stalinists in the impending war will take their place in the camp of the betrayers of 1914. But, unlike the social-democrats of 1914, who openly joined the imperialist camp only on August 4, after the declaration of war, the Stalinists are showing their hand in advance. Not only objectively as a result of false policy, but subjectively, consciously, deliberately, they are preparing to act as recruiting agents of American imperialism in the coming war under the pretext of "defending the Soviet Union." The main task at present is to entice the Socialists to rally round the flag.

Debating with Norman Thomas, Browder, who certainly "speaks with authority" as long as his commission is not revoked, explained the real motive of the excessive sentiments of love and unity for the Socialist workers and youth. He said:

"A situation can develop tomorrow when German and Japanese Fascism will proceed to attack the Soviet Union. . . . Will the militant Socialists adopt a position of neutrality? Will they advocate the slogan 'Keep America Out of War'?"

The meaning of these remarks is perhaps as clear as Browder could make them. Precision of thought and utterance was never one of the merits of the "leader." In one of his priceless essays in the Daily Worker of December 9, Michael Gold, one of the literary specialists who are hired to translate the "party line" into English, has explained what Browder meant. Said Gold:

"But if Fascist Germany and Japan unite against the Soviet Union Mr. Zam wants American Socialists to stand idly by, and to adopt the neutral policy of the Borahs, Hearsts and J. David Sterns."

"Will they do it? Anyone who went through the last World War knows that Socialists won't. 'If the line-up is such, THEY WILL FIGHT IN THE AMERICAN ARMY. If it is allied to the Soviet Union.' (Our emphasis)."

That is clear enough. That is what all the Browders have been hinting at in their cloudy formulations. Most damning of all was Gold's "correction" of this too-fanciful appeal for the "American Army." The Socialist workers are not yet ready for such blunt proposals, and Zam directed a withering fire against Gold in the Socialist Call. Sixteen days later, on Christmas day with all its cheer and good will, Gold admitted his error. Hidden in a cloud of verbiage which justified the essence of what he had written, the "admission" consisted of this: The reference to "fighting in the American army" was—what? A "bad formulation," and "to simplify a statement of a complicated situation." What Gold really meant is: "I spoke too frankly and let the cat out of the bag. Therefore I was instructed (after a delay of 16 days) to cover up without really retracting anything essential in what I had written. I am doing the best I can."

Gold simply ran ahead of himself a little. He explained the line as he understood it, and he understands it correctly. But the strategy of the Stalinists at the present time is not to speak out plainly. The game is to muddle and confuse the revolutionary workers, blur the issue, dope them by degrees and, in general, psychologize them for the call to "fight in the American army" which will surely come a little later. That explains the epidemic of indecent flag-waving, and the sickening "love of our country" which they profess now on all occasions with that ardent "patriotism" which Dr. Johnson said is the last refuge of a scoundrel—all to one end: to distort and corrupt the vanguard of the American workers and drag them as slaves of American imperialism in the coming war.

The Maritime Federation

FROM all indications another great labor struggle is impending on the Pacific Coast, and once again we see the old familiar combination—bosses, government and reactionary labor leaders—lining up against the rank and file of the workers. In this case, however, the collaboration of these three agencies of exploitation and betrayal, usually concealed and camouflaged, is conducted openly even before the outbreak of the struggle. This makes the real issue clearer.

It also shows the extreme tenseness of the relations between the marine workers and the employers and the imminence of an open, desperate struggle. The Maritime Federation has become a great power. The bosses feel obliged to mobilize all their forces in the endeavor to destroy it. On a showdown these always include the U. S. Department of Labor and the A. F. of L. bureaucracy.

Only a few days ago the press was filled with threats of the employers' representatives to smash the marine workers' organizations by "vigilante" terror. This was followed by the intervention of McGrady, Assistant Secretary of Labor. He called in the heads of the international unions of seamen and longshoremen; their meeting was a conspiracy against the Maritime Federation and the workers united under its banner. Now it is announced that the convention of the International Seamen's Union, to convene at Washington on Jan. 13, will attempt to "outlaw" and reorganize its Pacific Coast locals "as the first step toward breaking the hold of Harry Bridges, left wing leader in the Maritime Federation of the Pacific."

The urge and drive of the workers for industrial unionism and a militant policy is not confined to the conflict in the upper circles of the A. F. of L. officialdom. That is only a reflection of the real movement, and a distorted reflection at that. The authentic movement comes from below, and is beginning to express itself in formations and methods of struggle which in effect break out of the bonds and discard the obsolete tactics of craft unionism. That is what

happened at Minneapolis, at Detroit, and on the Pacific Coast.

Shrewdly enough, the reactionary labor leaders see in these movements the real challenge to their antiquated forms and methods, their treacherous policy, their power. Hence the expulsion and "Red Purge" aimed at Local 574, the sabotage of the independents' auto strike in Detroit and the move now to expel and "reorganize" the locals affiliated to the Maritime Federation on the Pacific Coast. Between such labor leaders and the employers, the vigilantes and the government agencies there is only a division of labor.

There is no way for the marine workers but to stand their ground and fight it out. Capitulation to the demands of the Scharrenbergs and the Tobins amounts to the same thing in the end as capitulation to the bosses. The latter strive to smash the unions from without. The former would blow them up from within, split them into fragments and deprive them of the right to choose their own leaders. Unions which submit to such invasions of their rights cannot conduct any effective struggle against the employers.

Affiliation to the A. F. of L. and its international unions is undoubtedly the correct policy for the militant local organizations. Even when suspended or expelled they should continue to fight for re-affiliation and to stand for trade union unity as Local 574 in Minneapolis does. But to purchase affiliation to the A. F. of L. at the price of capitulation to the union wreckers masquerading as labor leaders, to give up the right of autonomy and internal democracy and renounce the policy of militant struggle—that is fatal for the workers involved.

The marine unions on the Pacific Coast have become a great power precisely because they have discarded the old methods and, to a certain extent, the old forms and have banded themselves together into a Maritime Federation for common action. That is the right road for these times. We hope they stick to it. They are entitled to the warmest sympathy and solidarity of all progressive workers in their struggle against the employers, the vigilantes, the Assistant Secretary of Labor and the labor reactionaries—all birds of a feather.

Socialist Party Split

THE split in the Socialist Party, which began in New York City and was then extended to New York State at the Utica Conference, will now become national. Every state organization and virtually every local will soon witness a definitive separation of the Old Guardists and the official party headed by Norman Thomas. All doubt on this score was removed by the action of the National Executive Committee in revoking the charter of the Old Guard State Executive of New York at its Philadelphia meeting last Sunday, and the simultaneous announcement of an Eastern States conference under Old Guard auspices to be held in the middle of January. The split will be deepened at this conference; so it was frankly announced by its sponsors. In all probability a national organization of the right wing, rivaling the official party, will be set up even before the May convention. These are the clear indications of the trend of developments which culminated in the Philadelphia decisions of the N.E.C. and the reaction of the Old Guard to them.

From every point of view the definitive break of the party majority with the incorrigibly reactionary Old Guard is a step forward. The split is a progressive split. It creates a new situation in the workers' political movement and opens up new possibilities and prospects for the rapid development of a truly revolutionary movement in the United States. By the organizational break with the extreme right wing which represented an outright bourgeois, social-patriotic current in the party, the potential weight of the left Socialist workers, and especially of the Socialist youth, in the regroupment and unification of the vanguard on a revolutionary basis is automatically increased. It remains to be seen whether they will rise to the level of their opportunity and their task and develop the implications of the split in programmatic terms. That is the first real test of revolutionary seriousness.

In our opinion the weakest side of the strategy of the "Militant" group, fraught with the gravest dangers for the future, has been the subordination of programmatic questions to disputes of a purely organizational nature, the true merit of which is usually lost in a maze of quibbling, charges and counter-charges and personal acrimony. The Socialist workers can really learn something in the course of the bitter fight with the Old Guard, and draw inspiration from it, only if it is lifted onto a political basis, without camouflage and without pretense. The left wing will grow in strength and self-confidence not by pretending to represent a second edition of Old Guard reformism—the original article is always preferable to the substitute—but by irreconcilable political struggle against reformism and social-patriotism. That is in fact the real implication of the split, the heart of the conflict between revolutionary socialism on the one side and the Old Guard and its political twin, Stalinism, on the other.

Cahan, O'neal and Co. do not fight the official "Communism" of the C. P. on the ground of present day political realities but from old memories. On the most fundamental principle questions all differences between them have been obliterated; the Stalinists have gone completely over to the positions of reformist social democracy. The Old Guardists do not yet trust their "sincerity," but this skepticism will be dispelled, for the Stalinists are desperately sincere in their present line of reformist and social-patriotic betrayal of the masses. A rapprochement between them and the right wing Socialists is inevitable. (It is already taking place in certain unions.) Their strategy now is to drown the left Socialists in a wave of "unity" on the way to the broader people's front for patriotism in the coming war. Subordination of program questions facilitates this game. Such a policy, if persisted in, can only vitiate all the progressive features of the split with the Old Guard and end in debacle.

LENIN MEMORIAL MEETING

SUNDAY EVE.
JANUARY 9th

SPEAKER:

MAX SCHACHTMAN

IRVING PLAZA HALL
15 STREET at IRVING PLACE

Gen'lfang, Stalinist Hero,
& Kuo Min Tang Butcher

By LO SEN

On the front cover of a Stalinist publication called "China Today" is the picture of a Chinese general named Fang Chen-wu. Fang has been greeted by the Stalinists in this country as a "fighter against Japanese imperialism." He was sponsored by them at the recent "Anti-War Congress" in Cleveland. In an article by that other fighter against Japanese imperialism, Hansu Chan, in the same magazine, we are informed that "the Chinese people respect him (Gen. Fang) even more as a veteran revolutionist and the embodiment of the anti-Japanese tradition in North China." His influence "is bound to reach great proportions." He "has it in his power to play a great role in the remaking of China."

What does this mean? Who is Gen. Fang and what has been his role as a "veteran revolutionist"? Since the Seventh Congress the Stalinists have played soft pedal on the slogan of "Soviets" for China. What they want now is a "national defense government" to unite all "fighters against Japanese imperialism," fighters like Fang Chen-wu and Hansu Chan. What does this signify?

A Policy Dripping with Blood

It means that the Stalinists are reverting in China to the policy of the bloc of four classes.

That was the name given eight years ago, in China, to the policy that is now known as the "People's Front."

In France today and elsewhere for tomorrow, the monstrous betrayal represented by the whole class-collaborationist concept of the "People's Front" is being thrust upon workers to whom it is represented as something new. But in China the history of the People's Front idea was written eight years ago in letters of blood drawn from the veins of thousands of betrayed and massacred workers, peasants and intellectuals.

Without even an inner shudder (or perhaps with?) these people who still call themselves "Communists" are embarking upon exactly the same policy which eight years ago destroyed the tremendous Chinese mass movement of 1925-27, which handed the workers and peasants over to nearly a decade of unimaginable terror and black reaction under the Kuomintang. For the Kuomintang was in its day also a "fighter against imperialism."

Eight years ago, in the dim days before the Third Period, the Stalinists created in China the "national united front against imperialism." Eight years ago it was Chiang Kai-shek and Wang Ching-wei who were the "veteran revolutionists" who had it in their power "to play a great role in the remaking of China." It was the Chiangs and the Wangs who exorcised "imperialism" and whom the Stalinists told the workers they had to "respect" and follow. And it was the Chiang Kai-sheks and Wang Ching-weis and Hu Han-mins who in 1927 played out their "great role" by smashing the mass movement and launching the era of Kuomintang reaction.

After eight years out in the wilderness of ultra-leftism, after six years of new disasters with experiments in "soviets" without even an organized labor movement back of them or interested in them, the Stalinists are shamelessly returning to their old and dried vomit, nosing in it for morsels to chew. One of those morsels is—Fang Chen-wu.

Who Is General Fang?

There are others, General Chen Ming-shu, for example, who is now hailed as the leader of a non-existent Chinese "social democracy"; but of them another time. Let us ask now: Who is Gen. Fang Chen-wu? Who is this "veteran revolutionist"? Why are honest workers supposed to believe that he is capable of leading a real struggle against imperialism in China?

Fang was a subordinate of Feng Yu-hsiang, the one time "Christian General" who in 1927 upset all the predictions and hopes of Stalin-Bucharin-Borodin and Co. by joining forces with Chiang Kai-shek to smash the revolutionary movement. When Feng joined Chiang at the end of June, 1927, Fang was an officer in his army. Did this "veteran revolutionist," like Chu Teh, Mao Tse-tung, Peng Teh-huai (and other courageous, if completely demoralized, veteran revolutionists) join the ranks of the revolution against those of the reaction?

Hansu Chan gingerly skirts this cardinal question and then casually informs us:

"When in 1928 the Nanking government, which was born out of counter-revolution, resumed its northern advance under reactionary leadership, the expedition had lost all revolutionary significance (1) and degenerated into another militarist civil war. However, the revolutionary and anti-imperialist tradition in Gen. Fang reassured itself when his army, which was the first to advance northward, came into contact with Japanese troops."

A Kuomintang General

So, Fang was in the van of this "reactionary leadership"! In 1928 he was under the command of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, a general in the

army of Kuomintang reaction, a junior militarist in Chiang's militarist diadem, rewarded by Chiang for his services in 1927 with command of an army—a fitting place, indeed, for a "veteran revolutionist!"

Then follows an imaginative account (most of the article is pure fiction) of Fang fighting "the Japanese" at Tsinan in 1928 which is called "the first of a series of heroic events which have made Gen. Fang an outstanding champion of the anti-Japanese tradition in North China."

But the blood of the "heroic events" of only a few months back, blood which Fang Chen-wu helped to shed, was still warm! Of this Hansu Chan is treacherously silent. But this is not all.

In 1929, when black reaction under the Kuomintang was firmly in the saddle, when the workers groaned under the Kuomintang terror in the cities and the peasant armies under Chu Teh and the others fought back Kuomintang troops in the mountain fastnesses of Kiangsi and Hunan, in 1929, in March, the Kuomintang rewarded Fang Chen-wu for his "heroism" by electing him to its Central Executive Committee!

This is one of the facts Hansu Chan does not relate. Our "veteran revolutionist" established himself in the high council of the Kuomintang not in the period when the Stalinists were themselves calling that party "revolutionary" but at the time when even they had come to realize that it represented the party of the Chinese bourgeoisie, the party of black reaction, the party of terror. And at the height of this period, our "veteran revolutionist" joined its Central Executive Committee! Doesn't that qualify him to fight imperialism?

A Kuomintang Governor

But that is not yet all. Fang was so "heroic" and so "revolutionary" that three months later, in May, 1929, he was named governor of Anhwei province. Hansu Chan says casually that he "assumed the chairmanship." But under Fang,

workers' and peasants' blood flowed in Anhwei! Fang heroically justified the Kuomintang's faith in him by waging the terror with the best of Chiang's other underlings. But Fang was still faithful to Feng Yu-hsiang and when Feng and Chiang went to war in 1930 he decided to throw in his lot with Feng and therefore incurred Chiang's displeasure. According to Hansu Chan this meant a "refusal to be drawn into another militarist civil war!"

There can be no mystery about these facts to anyone who is willing to lick up a Chinese Who's Who and verify the dates. There can be no mistake about their significance. Fang Chen-wu is a "veteran revolutionist" in the tradition of Chiang Kai-shek and Feng Yu-hsiang. Like Chiang and Feng and the others he "embodies" the anti-imperialist tradition only by virtue of having batted off the shattered flesh of murdered workers and peasants and real anti-imperialist fighters. He feasted off the blood of the lamb with his superiors, the "veteran revolutionists" of yesterday (and who knows, of tomorrow?). This is what qualifies him in 1936 to "a great role in the remaking of China!"

Too Radical for Fang

Hansu Chan makes much of a supposed anti-Japanese movement in which Fang joined in 1933. What was it? It was an attempted revolt against Nanking by Feng Yu-hsiang, on a straight militarist-anti-imperialist basis. To do this, like every rival militarist today, Fang Yu-hsiang had to call himself anti-Japanese. To win popular sympathy he was even canny enough to close down the Kuomintang headquarters in his territory. Fang rejoined his old boss in that attempted revolt. We heard about "dissension" between Fang Chen-wu and Feng. Wasn't Feng "revolutionary" enough for his "revolutionary" lieutenant?

"General Fang . . ." we read, "is in favor of the restoration of the Chahar provincial Kuomintang headquarters which Marshal Feng sealed up after he took charge of

the situation last May. . . ." (China Press, July 29, 1933).

So in 1933 Fang was still the stalwart defender of the Kuomintang. He wasn't even as "daring" as Feng Yu-hsiang! And when the revolt failed? Like every other two-penny militarist, Fang bargained away his "ideals" for pieces of silver. "General Fang Chen-wu . . . has telegraphed . . . saying that he is willing to leave Chahar if the government provides him with \$30,000 to enable him to take a trip to foreign countries." (China Press, Sept. 18, 1933.) And presumably he got the 30,000 pieces of silver and they have kept him in cigarette money until the Stalinists lurched rightward in 1935 and caught up with—Fang Chen-wu.

The slogan of "soviets" is no more. It will go unsung to a grave laden with the bodies of the new victims of Stalinist betrayal which it claimed. Over its ashes is rising a new foul phoenix, a "national defense government" for China, a new "national united front" with the Fang Chen-wus, the Chen Ming-shus and other second-class Chiang Kai-sheks.

It is with anger and loathing that every true revolutionist in China and elsewhere will meet this new attempt to betray any hopes that remain for China's revolutionary future in the present epoch.

It is with renewed determination and resolution that every Chinese revolutionist will struggle to build a new revolutionary party and the Fourth International.

Rubber War

(Continued from Page 1)

ers every time. Since the rubber industry has been in a growing state of decline along with industry in general under capitalism, it has been wracked by fire price wars of increasing intensity in the past ten years.

That this war will continue in the future in even greater intensity is an indisputed fact as shown by the report from Detroit this week that DuPonts have ordered the United States Rubber Co. to break the temporary price agreement in an effort to take markets away from Goodyear, Goodrich and Firestone.

Facing these facts squarely and constantly explaining them to the rubber workers is an elementary duty of the United Rubber Workers officials for only as more workers realize that they can fight the companies best through the bonafide unions will the unions grow.

The ills of the rubber industry can be cured permanently only by removing the basic cause of them which is capitalist control for profit instead of workers' control of industry for use.

New York Theatre Party

"WINTER SET"

THURSDAY, JAN. 23, 8:30 P.M.

Martin Beck Theatre

45th Street, West of 8th Ave.

For tickets: See B. Wallace

Auspices: Branch 1, W. P.

"progressive" bloc headed by John L. Lewis, it is, in the light of general developments, definitely a part of the conflict between the reactionary and the progressive tendencies.

How Support Lewis?

The trend that gravitates in the direction of a uniform progressive movement is now showing some unmistakable signs. It is equally clear that the Lewis bloc provides an important stimulus in this direction. This does not mean that this bloc should be accepted uncritically as the already established authentic leadership to which the progressive movement must be subordinated. A good example of how not to approach this question is the attitude of a blanket endorsement given to this bloc by the Stalinists, adding only the plea that Lewis go on record for a labor party. However, the political position of Lewis is already very clearly expressed in his proposal to the recent anthracite miners' convention to get "100 percent behind President Roosevelt and his policies."

Leaving all other considerations aside, it is, of course, impossible to accept the supporters of Roosevelt's policies as leaders of a real progressive movement in the trade unions. Much is yet to be done toward the building up of this movement. But the important thing is to utilize every opportunity. The first step should be for the militants to get into the stream that is now in motion in the direction of progressive organization.

SUBSCRIBERS ATTENTION!

If the number following your name on the wrapper is

54

your subscription has EXPIRED. We urge you to send in your renewal by return mail, thus insuring the receipt of your copy without interruption.