

NEW MILITANT

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

VOL. 2, NO. 5 [WHOLE NO. 57]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1936

PRICE 3 CENTS

Powell Framed; Scottsboro Boys In Peril

"Tell the Workers the Truth About Stalin's Hounding of Revolutionists in the Soviet Union!" -- Trotsky Urges

Mass Protest Only Means For Freedom

Cablegram from Leon Trotsky Hits Hearst and Daily Worker Lies

Just before going to press we received the following radiogram from comrade Trotsky in reply to an inquiry from us:

PUBLICATION OF TAROV ARTICLE BY HEARST COMMON PRESS GANGSTERISM STOP BUT IMPUDENCE OF HEARST NO EXCUSE FOR CRIMES OF STALIN CLIQUE STOP GAVE STATEMENT TO ASSOCIATED PRESS UNDERSIGNED

TROTSKY

Pen Prostitute NO. 1

Louis F. Budenz has been rewarded for his craven capitulation to Stalin and Browder. Decorated with shame, he will be known to the revolutionary workers as Pen Prostitute Number One of the Daily Worker.

In the late edition of the Sunday Worker and in Monday's edition of the Daily Worker appears a "scoop" by this new convert to Stalinism and twice converted American patriot.

Its title reads: "Militant Gives Hearst Permission to Reprint Trotsky's Articles—New York American Is Non-Committal on Cash Payment."

And the proof: the word of Hearst's agent himself! Yes, the very institution the Stalinist rag never tires of denouncing for its lies about and against the working class movement.

Frenzy at Revolutionists
In their mad hatred of those who tell the truth to the working class, who exorcise the Stalinist recruiting sergeants of American imperialism, who throw a searchlight upon the crimes of the bloodhounds who persecute Lenin's co-workers, the hired liars of the Daily Worker achieve a touching confidence in the hired liars of William Randolph Hearst.

Budenz is shameless enough to write this scurrilous attack on Leon Trotsky and the NEW MILITANT on the basis of an alleged telephone conversation with a certain "Mr. Frank Cullen of the 'March of Events' section of the N. Y. American."

Mr. Cullen on the Phone
You see, the editor of the "March of Events" section, Mr. T. V. Ranck, was conveniently "out" when Budenz phoned!

And what is Cullen's position on the American?

Has he the authority to speak officially for the Hearst press?

Will he repeat his telephone answers to a court of law?

All this Mr. Budenz never troubled to find out. From the word "go" he trusted Mr. Cullen like a brother.

What does Budenz say that Cullen told him?

1. That the Trotsky articles were reprinted from the NEW MILITANT.

2. "Permission," Mr. Cullen is alleged to have said, "was given to reprint them from that paper... the New Militant, the Militant or whatever you call it."

(Continued on Page 4)

'Socialist Call' on "Hearst Trotsky & the Communists"

(Editor's Note: The following editorial is reprinted from the Socialist Call for Feb. 1, 1936.)

"HEARST, TROTSKY AND THE COMMUNISTS"
"It is no news to readers of the Call that William Randolph Hearst is a journalistic whore-monger who has not the slightest conception of honesty in publishing. His latest venture in the realm of larceny, stealing a series of articles by Leon Trotsky, first published in the columns of the American Trotskyite weekly organ, deserves universal condemnation."

"But it is quite as shocking to find the Daily Worker seizing upon this and interpreting it as evidence that Trotsky has sold out to Hearst. We are not concerned with the truth of the statements in these articles; but even the Daily Worker must recognize in Trotsky a man of high principles who has suffered personally for his loyalty to his revolutionary ideals."

"The Daily Worker owes Trotsky an apology. Or are we to assume that the Stalinists, too, have lost any idea of journalistic propriety?"

NEXT WEEK!

Another installment of comrade Anton Ciliga's searching exposure of Stalin's repression against revolutionists, dealing especially with the shambles made of the Yugoslav C.P. by the bureaucrats of the C.I. will appear in the next issue of the New Militant

By L. D. TROTSKY

The letters and documents recently published by comrades Tarov and Ciliga have served to stimulate highly the interest in the repressions of the Soviet bureaucracy against the revolutionary fighters. Eighteen years after the October revolution, at a time when, in accordance with the official doctrine, Socialism has conquered "finally and irrevocably" in the U.S.S.R., revolutionists who are unwaveringly devoted to the cause of communism but who do not recognize the dogma of the infallibility of the Stalinist clique, are clapped into jail for years; incarcerated in concentration camps; compelled to do forced labor; subjected, if they attempt to resist, to physical torture; shot in the event of real or fictitious attempt to escape; or deliberately driven to suicide. When hundreds of the prisoners, in protest against the intolerable hounding, resort to the terrible means of a hunger strike, they are subjected to forced feedings, only in order to be placed later under even worse conditions. When individual revolutionists, finding no other means of protest, cut their veins, the G.P.U. agents, i.e. the agents of Stalin, "save" the suicides only in order then to demonstrate with redoubled bestiality that there is no real salvation for them.

The Comintern—G.P.U. Terror

Into this horrible picture, comrade Ciliga's account introduces an element that is especially tragic. He was one of the former leaders of the Yugoslav section of the Comintern. Under any other conditions the differences of opinion between the leaders of this party would have been settled by means of discussion, by a Convention, and in extreme cases, by a split. But not in the Comintern. That section of the national C.E.C., which at any given moment executes the instructions of the Moscow clique, transmits a request to the latter to rid it of the opposition. Stalin orders the oppositionists to Moscow, where, after a brief attempt to "convince" them, they are placed under arrest, clapped into solitary confinement and subjected to other forms of physical extirpation. Among the hundreds who were killed, as "implicated" in the Kirov case, i.e. in the majority of cases those who are in no way involved in this case, a number of Bulgarian and other foreign oppositionists were shot. The right of asylum for revolutionary refugees is thus conditioned upon their blinding themselves to renounce all right to think independently. A call to Moscow "for a conference," implies (true and again a treacherous trap). If the "criminal" is beyond grasp, then his wife, daughter or son are seized. In these cases, the agents of Stalin utilize methods

(Continued on Page 3)

700 at Tampa Protest in N.Y.

R. P. Farriss, Tampa business man and an important witness in the Shoemaker police-vigilante murder case, is dead. The Tampa newspapers are frankly sceptical about the police claim that he was murdered. When found, he had in his pocket a receipt for a post-office box, which is the official box to the Ku Klux Klan, who had a hand in the murder of Shoemaker. Farriss was probably murdered by Klansmen in order to "cover up" their role in the murder of Shoemaker, unemployed organizer. Chief of Police Tittsworth and other members of the hooded gang are under indictment in the Shoemaker case. Tittsworth was bailed out by leading anti-union cigar manufacturers of Tampa.

Rogers and Poulnot, Socialist workers kidnapped and beaten with Shoemaker, will soon return to Tampa from the East to act as leading witnesses in the trial of the murderers. The Joint Committee for the Defense of Civil Rights in Tampa is keeping up its campaign.

(Continued on Page 2)

Bring the Slanderers Out Into the Open!

New Militant Editor Calls for Impartial Committee to Pass Judgement on the Stalinist Frame-up

The following letter, proposing the setting up of an impartial committee to investigate and pass judgment on the charges of the Stalinists has been sent to the American Civil Liberties Union by James P. Cannon, editor of the NEW MILITANT.

January 27, 1936
Mr. Roger Baldwin, Director, American Civil Liberties Union, 100 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Dear Comrade Baldwin:
The Daily and Sunday Worker have carried stories alleging that the articles by Comrades Trotsky and Tarov, relating to the situation of political prisoners in the Soviet Union, were reprinted in the Hearst press from the NEW MILITANT with our permission. It was further stated that Comrade Trotsky received money from Hearst for these articles.

There is not a word of truth in these allegations. The Hearst press neither solicited nor received permission from us to re-publish these articles, which appeared originally in the NEW MILITANT under dates of September 28 and October 19. I can further state authoritatively that the articles were also printed without the knowledge or consent

of Comrade Trotsky and were never destined by him for publication in the Hearst papers. The accusations against us and against Comrade Trotsky are a deliberate frame-up.

In order to establish the truth about this matter before labor and liberal public opinion, we herewith request your organization to set up an impartial committee to investigate the matter and make a public report of its findings. The fact that the A.C.L.U. has acted in a similar capacity in other disputes and has had its findings recognized by various factions in the labor movement as fair and impartial prompts us to turn to you with this request.

We are ready to appear before such a committee, to furnish all facts and information at our disposal, and to answer any questions whatever. We have no doubt whatever that the frame-up against us and against Comrade Trotsky will be thoroughly and completely discredited by an impartial investigation and that the violation of labor ethics involved in the controversy will be placed where it belongs.

Yours fraternally,
JAMES P. CANNON,
Editor, New Militant.

Bare Murder On WPA

Toledo Union Demands Federal Investigation Into Case

TOLEDO, O., Jan. 27.—The WPA Workers Union is continuing its aggressive campaign to organize all of the WPA workers in Lucas County into one solid, fighting organization. This last week it has lifted out of the obscurity which the WPA administration has attempted to place it, the cruel murder of Alonzo Walker, a Negro WPA worker, who was allowed to freeze to death out on an open ditch project. The union has already called upon Harry L. Hopkins to conduct a federal investigation on the matter and is planning a mass protest meeting and trial.

(Continued on Page 2)

Local Wins Recognition

Mpls Power House Union Forces Wage Rise and Seniority Rights

(Reprinted from the Northwest Organizer)
MINNEAPOLIS, Jan. 22.—General wage increases, seniority rights, recognition of the right of the employees to hold union membership, and representation by union committees in settling grievances are among the gains which have been won for the employees of the Northern States Power Co. by Local Union No. 160 of the I.B.E.W. These conditions are guaranteed in writing over the signature of Mr. R. F. Pack, president of the company.

The terms of settlement were accepted by unanimous vote of the members of Local 160 in a special meeting held on January 15. The meeting had been called, by a previous decision of the union, for the purpose of taking a strike vote after the negotiating committee reported that the company refused to discuss a written agreement. With the announcement of the impending strike vote, the Latimer Employer-Employee Board attempted to step into the controversy. Meyer Lewis, not bothering to discuss the problem with Local 160, issued a long statement to the press demanding Pack's resignation from the board—he seemed to consider that this action would render the board "neutral." But Local 160 objected, with considerable emphasis. Having no confidence in the board as such, they felt that Pack's influence, on or off the board, would still be felt and would render the board even less capable of making a fair decision.

A few days prior to the January 15 deadline contact was established between the union and the company by Attorney Fred A. Ossanna, acting as a special mediator. On January 14 the union committee,

The fourth Scottsboro trial ended with the conviction of Haywood Patterson. Judge and prosecutor worked hand in glove. No Negroes worked on the jury; the state went through the farce of putting Negroes on the panel, but none served on the jury. They were either challenged by the prosecution or evaded service through fear of reprisals.

Patterson was given a 75-year prison sentence. The attitude of Attorney S. S. Leibowitz, enemy of the mass defense movement, is that he has won a victory. The New York Times special correspondent comments that it may be a victory for Leibowitz but it is a defeat for Patterson.

Patterson himself is not deceived. He announced on hearing the verdict that he would rather die than spend another day in jail for something he did not do.

All other trials have been indefinitely postponed because of a material witness' sickness. The boys were returned to Birmingham jail, Patterson pending appeal of his case on the grounds that he was denied a change of venue and thus did not get a fair trial.

Powell Framed
On the road from Decatur, where the trial was held, to Birmingham, a guard shot Ozie Powell, one of the boys, who is now close to death. The state will prosecute Powell and two of the other boys for attempt to kill a guard. It appears that Powell, subjected to repeated and terrible provocation, scratched one of the guards with a knife.

The Workers Party at the request of the N.P.L.D. is circulating all branches urging them to rush resolutions against this new frame-up and the Patterson sentence. Protests should go to Gov. Bibb Graves and Lt.-Gov. Tom Knight at Montgomery.

...
The Scottsboro Defense Committee held its first public meeting Sunday in the Hotel Delano, New York City. The Daily Worker has admitted that the date was deliberately chosen so that the meeting would follow the trial. Thus it could bring no pressure on the prosecution in the fourth trial.

The meeting was given little publicity beforehand. After it was announced came the shooting of Ozie Powell. Hopefully, the Committee hired an extra hall, but there was no overflow. Not more than 1,500 people turned up. No resolutions of solidarity or protest were adopted.

The meeting was opened by an L. I. D. representative introducing the chairman, Colonel W. J. Schiefelin, head of the Citizens Union ("balanced budget" agitators) and a prominent Protestant layman. The speakers were Osmond Frankel, Angelo Herndon, a school teacher, Robert Minor of the I.L.D. and Roy Wilkins of the N.A.A.C.P. The last two, until recently, were calling each other lynchers, provocateurs and whatnot. Minor now calls Wilkins "an honest intellectual"; Wilkins says nothing about Minor. Norman Thomas, Charles Zimmerman of Local 22, and B. S. McLaurin of the Sleeping Car Porters were announced as speakers, but did not appear.

"The Best People of Alabama"
Herndon declared that the Scottsboro case shows "the slave-rulers" (Continued on Page 2)

SUBSCRIBERS ATTENTION!
If the number following your name on the wrapper is

57

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

C. P. PLOTS TO WRECK LOCAL 574

By CARL O'SHEA
MINNEAPOLIS, Minn., Jan. 27.—Recently there has come into our hands a set of directives drawn up by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist party for the Minnesota district, one of the most amazing documents in the recent history of the American labor movement.

In these directives is contained overwhelming proof, not only of the degeneration of the Communist party, but of its muddledheadedness.

No more shameful proposals have ever been made by a group calling itself a working class party, and masquerading under the banner of Lenin.

This exposure of the Communist party's schemes will be of absorbing interest, not only to Local 574 and the Northwest trade union movement, but to honest trade unionists, Socialist party members and Communist party members the country over.

Such is the nature of this document that it is little wonder that it proved too much for some of the Communist party members in Minnesota, also.

Page Mr. Meyer Lewis!

1. The C.E.C. orders the Minneapolis C.P. to "drive the trade union functionaries and membership further away from 574"—to colonize in General Drivers Local 574; to "negotiate" with Daniel Tobin; to "appeal" to the Minneapolis Central Labor Union, the locals, etc.

Page Mr. Meyer Lewis! Here are his allies! He has been seeking for four months now to find someone who would go along with him in his plan to isolate Local 574 and to smash it. And now the C.P. in Minnesota is ordered to do this very thing; to agitate among the local trade union officials and membership to drive them away from 574.

From the very beginning the Communist party has had only one

line regarding Local 574: No matter what service the General Drivers Union in Minneapolis renders the working class, SMASH IT, for the Trotskyites are in the leadership! During the 1934 strikes, the C.P. issued leaflet after leaflet repeating the same charges and slanders cooked up by the Citizens Alliance and Daniel Tobin. The 574 leaders were "yellow," they did not "permit expression from the floor by union members," they "deceived the workers with false promises"—the 574 leaders were "dishonest," they "did not pay the per capita tax, and so gave Tobin an excuse to revoke the charter," etc., etc.

At the height of Meyer Lewis' red scare directed against Local 574 in November, 1935, it was the C.P. who withdrew its support from the progressive union bloc which was fighting Meyer Lewis and William Green.

The Surrender-to-Tobin Plan
And now comes this latest un-

speakable scheme of these people. The directives cited below mean only one thing—that the Communist party means to do everything in its power to emasculate one of the finest and most militant and powerful unions in America, to isolate Local 574, to undermine the support the union receives from the rest of the movement, to break the union, to drag it back into Tobin's International Teamsters on Tobin's terms.

And this is really not so surprising. This follows out the current C. P. line: Back into the A. F. of L. at all costs. In effect the directives of the C. P., if they could be carried out, would mean to smash Local 574, the union that has won a nation-wide reputation for the services it has rendered the working class movement. This means the C. P. is preparing to make all sorts of behind-the-scenes deals with the worst gang of reactionary

(Continued on Page 3)

Social Security and the Class Struggle THE TOWNSEND PLAN

The Panacea of a Quack Doctor

The United States is a country of colossal social contradictions. Here exist side by side the greatest wealth and the direst poverty; the most advanced industrial techniques and the biggest army of unemployed; the most confident of ruling classes and the most restless of peoples; unsurpassed heights of technological development and an extremely low level of political life.

The friction and energy generated by the clash of these antagonistic conditions give a tremendous impetus to all social movements in this country. Utopian crusades to reform capitalism, like Technocracy, rise up overnight and sweep through the middle classes like prairie fires. The easily combustible social material distributed in large quantities among the middle classes, is however, quickly consumed. These middle-class reforms and Utopian movements have neither stamina nor stability. They fade away as speedily as they spring to life, leaving only the wreckage of ruined hopes behind.

The American workers are not wedded into political action on their own account so easily as the middle classes. (Their wrath burns more slowly but more surely.) They find their first field of organization and action on the industrial front. Strike after strike in the past period has demonstrated that when American workers are aroused and ready for combat, they spring into action with the power, ferocity, and agility of tigers. We can be confident that, once they take the road of independent political action, they will move as fast and as furiously in politics as they are doing today on the industrial arena.

The social reforms secured by the people under a capitalist regime are invariably by-products of the class struggle. They are exacted from the bourgeoisie by organized social force; and granted because of their fear of the consequences of refusal. The number of social reforms accorded to its citizens is an accurate gauge of the degree of development of the class struggle in any bourgeois democracy. The immaturity of the class struggle in the United States—thanks to the exceptionally fortunate position occupied by American capitalism in

world economy—is directly reflected in the absence of any national system of social insurance comparable to those which were established before and after the war in other democratic countries. Almost every European state (including Germany before Hitler discarded them wholesale) had been forced to institute some system of state provision for the aged, the unemployed, the industrially injured, etc., long before these questions acquired national political importance on this side of the Atlantic.

Until recently, the policy of laissez faire and the devil take the hindmost prevailed in regard to social services as in so many other spheres of American life. "Charity" was no concern of the Federal government; at most it might be the concern of the separate states; but it was better to leave such Christian duties to individuals, religious groups, or plutocratic philanthropy. The system of administering relief to the aged and the unemployed was long divided between petty public and private agencies—with the result that a majority of the needy were either completely neglected or supported by their families and friends.

This laissez-faire policy has been radically reversed since 1933. Hard on the heels of the granting of unemployment relief follows the demand for other forms of social relief, unemployment, disability, old-age, maternity, widows' and mothers' insurance. The most persistent of these has been the cry for old-age pensions. The prevailing insecurity, economic disintegration, and widespread unemployment, the tendency of American industry and business to discard all but the youngest and most vigorous workers; the ten-year increase in the average life-span of the American people, have given birth to a demand for old-age pensions which is being heard throughout the length of the land. "If military veterans are entitled to bonuses, medical care, and pensions from the government, why should not we social veterans receive as much," the old people are asking. And along comes Mr. Townsend with an answer to their prayers. Such is the social background out of which the Townsend movement has emerged.

The Townsend Crusade

The Townsend Old-Age Pension Plan, which was restricted a year ago to the West Coast, has today become a national crusade, embracing millions of people and counting thousands of clubs throughout the country. The Townsend Plan has made the idea of old-age pensions a political issue of the first magnitude. Not since the days of the temperance movement has there been anything quite like it. In fact, the organizational and political methods of the Townsend Clubs are modeled after those of the Anti-Saloon Leagues.

Some reactionaries are concentrating their heavy propaganda at-

tillery upon the movement in attempts to smash it. The conservative economists in the universities, the editorial writers in the metropolitan papers, the publicity men of the capitalist parties are busy issuing blasts against it. Meanwhile, the Townsend Clubs are becoming political powers in locality after locality. Peasant politicians of all parties from the Republican to the Communist find it necessary to come to terms with the Townsend vote in their districts. Feeling their strength, the Townsends are already boasting of taking over the government after the next election and ushering in the millennium.

The Townsend Panacea

What is this remarkable remedy that is going to cure all the ills of American capitalism at one gulp? The Townsend Plan has suffered many changes since it was first formulated by its genial parent and it will undoubtedly be modified many more times before it sinks into oblivion along with Technocracy. Like all Utopian panaceas, it is extremely simple in essence. In its very simplicity lies both its initial strength and its ultimate impotence.

The scheme has two major ingredients. The first is the bait by which the suckers are hooked. All Americans over sixty are to be paid \$200 a month for life by the government on condition that they withdraw from productive work and spend the pension within the month. According to Townsend, this flow of money will supply the extra purchasing power needed to keep the wheels of commerce turning without interruption. Anyone acquainted with the petty-bourgeois rentiers of Southern California will immediately recognize in this part of the plan the passport to paradise.

Two hundred dollars a month and no work is the wish-fulfillment of every retired Middle-Western farmer and his wife.

But there is a hook concealed within the bait—the method of financing the enterprise. The Townsend Plan proposes that the 24 billion dollars a year for the Plan be secured by a two-percent tax on all commercial transactions. To all the processing-taxes and sales-taxes that have plagued and impoverished the consuming masses in the past few years is to be added a monstrous sales-tax of two-percent!

All taxes, except taxes upon income, are ultimately paid for by the consuming masses, among whom the workers are in the majority. The effect of such taxes is always to force up the prices of the necessities of life. The Townsend two percent transaction tax would raise the cost of living to unheard-of heights. Ninety-nine percent of the

only dangerous in principle; it is hopeless in any practical sense. No capitalist country could conceivably afford the costs of administering and financing such a plan without going into bankruptcy. For this reason, if for no others, capitalist politicians will see to it that the plan is not adopted. However, the demand for old-age pensions is very powerful and cannot be easily allayed. If the movement becomes sufficiently threatening in the radical form of the Townsend Plan, it will become necessary to derail the movement by palming off some harmless substitute upon the people. Another thin plank will have to be added to Roosevelt's spurious social security program.

The Struggle for Social Insurance

A correct struggle for social insurance should possess three characteristics. First, it should be made an integral part of a broad campaign for workers' security, based upon a rounded program of immediate social demands: adequate cash relief; a coordinated plan of public works, unemployment insurance, the universal 30-hour week, etc. Such a rounded program is contained in the Workers' Security Bill of the National Unemployed League. Second, social services should be financed by income taxes upon the wealthy, not by sales taxes upon the poor. Third, the fight for these demands must be a class-struggle fight, not a class-collaboration lobby.

Neither the Townsend Plan nor the Roosevelt Social Security Act passes any of these tests. The unemployment provisions of the Social Security Act do not include the present unemployed; workers can enjoy its benefits only if the states enact unemployment insurance laws, and then only after reserves have been built up for two years (so far only nine states have passed the necessary legislation); agricultural, professional, and domestic workers are excluded from its application. The payroll method of financing unemployment insurance under the Act differs in only one respect from the sales-tax. While the sales-tax is levied at the point of purchase, the payroll tax is levied at the point of production. The result is the same. The consuming masses foot the bills in the form of higher prices.

The Frazier-Lundeen Bill, now before Congress, which is sponsored by the Communist party, avoids the first two of these errors but is guilty of the third. It provides for a comprehensive system of social insurance for six categories of the population, unemployment, self-employment, disability, old age, maternity, widow and mothers' insurance, and it proposes to "raise the

Reformism and Revolutionary Policy

Revolutionists cannot afford to turn their backs upon any movement, however Utopian it may be, which enlists wide strata of the people in an anti-capitalist and progressive struggle. On the other hand, they cannot allow themselves to endorse such Utopian schemes, or refrain from exposing their fallacies and reactionary features. Above all, they cannot unconditionally support movements which nourish illusions about the nature of the state or aid in the practical or theoretical suppression of the class struggle. To do so is to play the role of camp-follower of the petty bourgeoisie instead of fulfilling their function as independent leaders of the working class in their struggles.

It is important to the labor movement that the struggle for old-age pensions and social insurance be carried through to a successful conclusion. While such reforms are increasingly difficult to obtain under the present conditions of capitalist decline, they are by no means impossible of attainment. Whatever their ultimate success, the agitation for them serves to focus attention upon the inability of our present social system to care for its industrial veterans. Every social concession wrested from the capitalist masters of society heightens our morale and fighting spirit.

The revolutionist must constantly point out the following facts. First, that such reforms can only be obtained by independent labor action and militant policies. Second, that once gained, the workers must be on guard to see that the reactionaries do not rob them of the fruits

The petty-bourgeois Utopian character of the Townsend movement dooms it to disintegration and destruction. The Epic movement of Upton Sinclair, which aimed to conquer the country, is today crumbling to pieces. The Townsend old-age pension movement, which has an even narrower social and political basis, is sure to follow suit. The middle classes are pragmatic; they demand immediate results; and when these are not forthcoming, will desert a movement as quickly as they flocked to it. The Townsend movement can easily be divided, diverted, and disintegrated by wily politicians, who can steal Townsend's plank and whittle it down to a toothpick.

surplus funds required by suitable revenue legislation from high incomes, corporate surpluses, and other accumulated wealth."

Yet, though more comprehensive and realistic than the Townsend Plan, and less fraudulent than the Social Security Act, it nevertheless is essentially Utopian and reformist in character. This is apparent in the fourth clause of the "Declaration of Policy" prefacing the Bill, which reads: "The system must be administered democratically by workers, representative of local workers and familiar with local work conditions and opportunities, pursuant to rules and regulations in the social interest (!), to prevent administration against the interests of workers, and to insure administration in accordance with their needs and interests." The (Stalinist) Interprofessional Association for Social Insurance, which drafted the bill, confirms this in its own pronouncements. "The bill," they say, "does not ask one group to do something for another group who are unfortunate." Perish the thought! "On the contrary, it suggests that the people as a whole provide by legislation for the people as a whole."

Proposals that the working class and its organizations shall take over one of the official functions of the state have only one meaning. That it is possible for the workers to use the capitalist state for their own good, that they can improve their conditions not by struggling against the state and its agents but by working with it and becoming a part of it, that there is no necessity for overthrowing the state so long as an opportunity exists of accommodating themselves to it. The class nature of the capitalist state is ignored and the struggle for these demands is restricted entirely within parliamentary lines. Nothing is left but the most vulgar illusions of petty bourgeois reformism—and that is precisely what the bill is designed to foster.

of their victories. Third, that under the present conditions of capitalist decline, social reforms cannot be held simply by resting content with the conquests that have been made, but only by carrying forward the fight against capitalist misery and oppression another step toward the revolutionary goal.

Social security for the working masses is a Utopian dream in our present social order. Capitalist reforms are at best but palliatives on an incurably diseased system. These reforms are grudgingly given if finance capital can afford them. As soon as finance capital is forced to cut the national budget to the bone to avoid further taxation on their own wealth and enterprises, the masses are the first to feel the knife, as the Means Test imposed on the English workers by the Tory government proves—not to speak of Hitler! As finance capital plunges deeper into crisis, it can find no way to survive and rule in the highly competitive world market except by robbing the workers of all their hard-won democratic rights and social services and putting the Fascist knife to their throats.

There can be security for the workers only in a state where the workers rule and where all the wealth of the country is in the workers' hands. In a workers' republic like the Soviet Union, social services are an integral part of the social order, freely given to all useful citizens. There can be no real salvation and security for the masses until capitalism is overthrown and socialism succeeds it.

Bare Murder on Ohio WPA

(Continued from Page 1)

The new issue of its regular weekly paper, the "WPA Union News," is just off the press and is receiving the widest distribution. The leading article with its challenging headline, "Murder on the WPA," giving the full story of the death of Alonzo Walker, has already received wide comment and is arousing the indignation of all the WPA workers of this county. The union intends to bring the lesson home that unless the WPA program is changed through the power of the WPA workers themselves, the old conditions will inevitably bring about such catastrophes to the WPA workers involved.

At the regular membership meeting on Sunday, Jan. 26, the union voted to send a floral wreath with the inscription: "We Shall Not Forget—WPA Workers Union." All members not working pledged to attend the funeral. All the others would down tools on the job from 1:30 to 2 P.M. Monday, Jan. 27. About 20 union men attended the funeral services on Monday at the Basely Funeral Home.

Art Preis, chairman of the union, spoke briefly and gave the union's pledge over the body of Walker "to place the responsibility for his murder and erase the conditions which caused his death." The obituary stated as the cause of his death, "Murdered on the WPA." When the casket was carried out of the funeral parlor, Mrs. Walker walked behind it grief-stricken, "They murdered him on the WPA!"

The WPA union sent the following letter to Harry L. Hopkins:

January 27, 1936

Harry L. Hopkins
Federal WPA Administrator
Washington, D.C.
Dear Sir:

Enclosed please find a copy of the "WPA Union News" of Jan. 26, 1936, which presents in detail the story of the death of Alonzo Walker, a colored WPA worker, and the circumstances which caused the death.

The circumstances as described in the article are of such a character as to indicate absolute criminal negligence on the part of the responsible project officials involved.

On Tuesday morning, Jan. 21, Alonzo Walker reported for work at the Prairie Ditch project in Lucas County, Ohio. Sub-zero weather was blowing in from the north-west, and although this is an open project, no shelter houses were provided for the workers. Walker collapsed from exposure. Mr. Jack Hays and Kasimir Lewkowski, foreman and supervisor of the job respectively, were informed of the man's condition but took no steps to secure medical attention or to transport him to a hospital or his home.

Mr. Walker was permitted to lie out in the open for at least four hours unattended. He was finally taken home by a fellow WPA worker in the latter's car at the regular quitting time, 4:30 P.M. The administration issued no statement on the matter until the following Monday, January 2, when the WPA Workers Union publicly called upon the administration for an accounting and issued a press release to the Toledo papers. Thus a period of six days were allowed to elapse.

The man died on Wednesday, Jan. 22 of double pneumonia, as a result of freezing and over exposure, according to the attending physician, Dr. P. M. Johnson. Dr. Johnson stated that it was too late to save the man when he was finally brought home, as he was literally frozen to death.

We are firm in our belief, as a result of our investigation of the case, that Mr. Walker's death is solely the result of the criminal negligence on the part of the administration officials involved. The local WPA administration is not lacking in culpability, since it requested thousands of WPA workers in this district to report to work on open jobs with no protection during sub-zero weather.

We are demanding a federal investigation into the circumstances of Walker's death and the conditions on the WPA which led to such a tragedy.

Our union is continuing with its own investigation on the case and is securing affidavits from the individuals concerned. We will shortly hold a public meeting on the whole case and present the result of our findings.

We request immediate attention on this case and await your reply to same.

Very truly yours,
WPA WORKERS UNION
T. G. Selander, sec'y.

Labor Defense Front

(Continued from Page 1)

determination to suppress revolts. Col. Schieffelin suggested that if the audience would imagine itself in their place, it would understand the attitude of "the best people of Alabama." He declared, however, that the Negroes "are well-behaved." "The best people of Alabama wish the case had not come up," the Colonel said, and he undoubtedly knows because, as Minor said, he is "a man of high standing."

Not a word was said to contradict repeated statements that the case would be won "not on platitudes but in the Alabama courts." After the Colonel declared that "the best people of Alabama want justice done," Attorney Frankel of the I.L.D. proposed a means of appealing to them. He wants the case transferred to a Federal court, where the jurors are "people of standing . . . more likely to reach independent judgments because, unlike the Decatur jurors, they would not fear their neighbors." Herndon proposed pressure on Roosevelt to get into a Federal court, and demanded that Federal troops be sent to Alabama. He also demanded the electrocution of Sheriff Sandlin, who shot Powell, and the impeachment of Gov. Bibb Graves—by the Alabama legislature!

The meeting's immediate aim was not 100 percent clear. Herndon and Frankel declared the boys must go free. But the Colonel sounded less adamant. "Even at its worst," he said, "the life of this boy (Patterson) is saved, and that is something we ought to be thankful for."

"Fair Play and Justice"

The speakers, however, had further aims. Undoubtedly due to sentiments inspired by his military background, the Colonel wants to see "fair play and justice" vindicated. Herndon spoke of "the uplifting of humanity." The school teacher seeks for Negroes the same rights as are enjoyed by everybody else in America. Frankel seeks to preserve democratic government. And in general, everybody wants to protect the Stars and Stripes. For example:

Minor declared that he is "seeking to defend our nation by defending these boys," fighting for "our country's welfare—our America." Wilkins declared that he fights for "the salvation of all the people of the U. S., those on top as well as those suffering underneath," and thundered that this crime must be stopped "in the name of God and the United States!" Thereupon he asked who would give \$50 "for the elevation of his soul."

Herndon's call for Federal troops was supported by his demand for a return "to the traditions of our forefathers," who, it seems, always treated the Negroes properly. The Colonel, however, asked no "return" or other change: he declared that lynchings in America are not like those in Germany because here it is not done by the government. His hymn to America culminated in the following remark: "True, there were 20 lynchings last year, but in 80 cases people were saved from lynching by the authorities." It is clear what Minor meant when he called the Colonel "a man who has the courage and American manhood to speak out."

Quite honestly, the Scottsboro Defense Committee did not announce this as a protest meeting. It was called "to analyze" the present situation. It did that—but not from the viewpoint of those who believe in a militant struggle to save the Scottsboro boys.

HERNDON CASE AGAIN IN COURT

The appeal of the State of Georgia from the County Court decision which recently set Angelo Herndon free, was heard by the Georgia Supreme Court last week. It is not yet known whether the court will agree that the insurrection law under which Herndon had been sentenced to 20 years on the chain gang is unconstitutional, or whether it will send Herndon back to serve his sentence. If it does the latter, the defense will appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court.

Herndon was represented by Attorneys W. N. Seymour of New York and W. A. Sutherland of Atlanta, retained by the I.L.D. As in the county court hearing where Herndon upset the sentence, Seymour dealt with the legal questions involved in the case.

Sutherland again made a political speech, similar in character to the one he made in the county court. He complained that the case "has been used as a spearhead for the liberals throughout the country," and again urged the court to allow some freedom of speech in order to preserve the existing order. "When a man like Herndon is made a martyr," he said, "there is real danger to democracy."

The Joint Committee to Aid the Herndon Defense, an auxiliary body with no control over Sutherland or over the legal defense policy, is continuing to circulate petitions for Herndon's freedom through its constituents. Among the latter is the Non-Partisan Labor Defense, which urges all supporters with filled-out petitions to send them in to the nearest N.P.L.D. branch.

RUSSELL CASE

Because of the heavy load of work on the shoulders of the Minneapolis and St. Paul branches of the N.P.L.D., the National Executive Board of that organization is conducting a special national drive for funds to finance the appeal of Al Russell from a Federal contempt of court sentence.

Russell is now out on bail, obtained with the aid of Minneapolis locals of the A. F. of L. The St. Paul N.P.L.D. has just run a social affair to help provide funds to pay for the transcript of his trial, needed by Francis Heisler, N.P.L.D. attorney, for the preparation of the appeal brief.

The Russell case is important not simply to free this persecuted militant picket, but also in order to prevent the nullification of the Minnesota state anti-injunction law and the Federal anti-injunction law. Funds to appeal the Russell case should go to Adelaide Walker, Treasurer, N.P.L.D., 22 East 17th Street, New York City.

FERRERO AND SALLITO

The hearing on the deportations of Ferrero and Sallito which was to have been held Jan. 24, has been postponed to Feb. 4. These two anarchist workers are now on Ellis Island while the Ferrero-Sallito Defense Conference, among whose constituents is the N.P.L.D., is carrying on a fight to save them from deportation to Fascist Italy.

Attorney I. Shorr, representing the conference, is seeking a writ of habeas corpus. His associate, Carol King, is conducting a fight for bail. In all districts except that of Southern New York, Federal judges generally grant bail for prisoners held for deportation pending their appeal. The New York judges, however, have always refused to do so, and the fight on this case will set a precedent if victorious.

Continued protests against the deportation of these two workers, guilty of no crime except giving house-room to the editor of a San Francisco newspaper which William Randolph Hearst wants to suppress, should go to D. W. McCormack, Commissioner of Immigration, at Washington, D. C.

ROBINSON ON THE SPOT

Frederick B. Robinson, reactionary president of the College of the City of New York, who has hounded with Fascists, expelled anti-Fascist students, and terrorized many of his professors into giving him hypocritical praise, is on the spot. A committee of alumni has called on the Board of Education to remove him. They give as the reason the fact that he "lacks qualities of leadership." The committee has won the support of the Alumni Association by a vote of 519 to 217.

Back of this development is a long campaign by radical and liberal students to establish academic freedom in New York's leading public college. In this fight the Non-Partisan Labor Defense has played an active role.

A year ago its representative, Herbert Solow, speaking for the Columbus Day United Anti-Fascist Committee, turned the La Guardia-dominated city Board of Estimate on its ear by taking the floor during the hearings on the city budget and proposing to reduce Robinson's salary to \$1 per year. Aldermanic President Deutsch, recently deceased hero of the League Against War and Fascism, intervened on Robinson's behalf and had police drag the N.P.L.D. spokesman out of the chamber.

Now, however, it looks as though Robinson might lose his job altogether; a continued militant fight, which should be led by students and labor unions, can make this outcome certain.

MINI APPEAL

Attorney R. W. Henderson is continuing his legal fight to get copies of the transcript of trial proceedings for all the Sacramento criminal syndicalism defendants, according to an announcement by the National Sacramento Appeal Committee. In a short time if all these moves fail, he will demand a writ of habeas corpus since Norman Mini, Prisoner 57006 in San Quentin, is being denied the right of appeal.

Attorney Leo Gallagher of the I.L.D. recently sought a habeas corpus on the grounds that the other defendants, like Mini, had been denied bail pending appeal. The Appellate Court held that trial judge Dal M. Lemmon of Sacramento had the right to refuse bail.

Protests against the further incarceration of Mini, Caroline Decker, Pat Chambers and the other Sacramento trade unionists, should be sent at once to the Board of Parole, Sacramento, Calif. They should stress the fact that the defendants were convicted of no overt acts, and that one of the convicting jurors has confessed that the verdict was reached as a result of a horse-trade.

Funds are still needed by the N. S.A.C. and should be sent to Harry W. Laidler, Chairman, Room 707, 51 Union Square, New York City.

700 at Tampa Protest in NY

(Continued from Page 1)

paign of pressure for a real prosecution of the vigilantes; and for the protection of Polunot and Rogers when they return to Tampa.

Executive Council Backs Down
The A. F. of L. Executive Council, after first refusing to settle the

place of the next annual A. F. of L. convention—originally called for Tampa—has now given a half-hearted indication that they will not withdraw from Tampa. The president of the State Federation of Florida is working overtime to keep the business in his state, and will not help the fight against vigilantes.

The Joint Committee has sold 22,000 copies of its pamphlet, "Tampa—Tar and Terror," and is printing a new edition. Copies may be ordered from the Non-Partisan

Labor Defense, 22 East 17th Street. Contributions for the Committee's work should go to Mary Fox, treasurer, 112 East 19th Street.

At a mass meeting held in the Hotel Delano last week, New York workers pledged their support to the Committee. Among the speakers were Norman Thomas of the L.I.D., Sam Wiener of the G.D.C., George Novack of the N.P.L.D., Polunot and Rogers. A resolution of protest was adopted and sent to Tampa authorities.

READ THE NEW MILITANT

The Crime of Scottsboro

AN EDITORIAL

FOR the fourth time an Alabama jury has convicted Haywood Patterson of a crime neither he nor any of the Scottsboro boys committed. This time Patterson has been given a 75-year sentence. Living death in an Alabama jail, the Alabama authorities seem to feel, will be more difficult to fight than a death sentence. Patterson, on being sentenced, declared:

"I'd rather die than spend another day in jail for something I didn't do."

Attorney Samuel Leibowitz, however, "feels" that he has won a victory. And Colonel W. J. Schieffelin, treasurer of the Scottsboro Defense Committee, says that we should be thankful that Patterson's life has been saved!

We are not thankful. We do not agree with Leibowitz. We agree with Patterson. This sentence is worse than a death sentence.

It is a victory for the prosecution, not for the Scottsboro boys. The latter are in greater danger than ever.

On the way back to Birmingham, after all other trials had been postponed. Ozie Powell was framed and shot by a guard. Powell, subjected to extreme provocation, is said to have scratched the guard's face with a knife. Today Powell is close to death. For him, as well as for the two boys in the car with him, there must be an uncompromising defense against the charge of assault with intent to kill which the State is bringing in order to discredit the boys' fight for freedom.

The Scottsboro Defense Committee seems today to be concentrating on the idea of getting the case into a Federal court. A number of its spokesmen are arguing that Decatur juries convict because the jurors are afraid of their neighbors. They say that a Federal jury in Alabama will be made up of people unafraid of their neighbors. They say that these are "people of standing," "the best people of Alabama," who "want to see justice done."

We, too, think that a fight should be made to get the case into a Federal court. We support the appeal to higher courts, based on the fact that the lynch judge of Decatur refused a change of venue and a transference to a Federal court.

But not because we think "people of standing," "the best people of Alabama," will heed only the evidence in this case and free the boys. We do not support the appeal from the poor whites of the Alabama back-country, to the cold-blooded lynch-organizers of the Alabama ruling class. We put no more stock in the "fairness" of a Federal jury in Alabama than in that of the Decatur jury.

We favor going into a Federal Court only because it will then become possible to demand of the Federal judge a change of venue out of the Federal District of Northern Alabama into some other state, preferably a Northern state, where the Jim Crow system cannot influence the trial as it does in Alabama.

To the Scottsboro Defense Committee we give this word of advice:

Ask for a Federal trial on the grounds that fair juries are impossible in an Alabama state court on this case. Do not proclaim that in a Federal court you expect a "fair jury." Should you win the demand, you will get a jury which you will have approved in advance, and a Federal court conviction would then silence you forever.

There are other things to be said to the Committee. Elsewhere in these pages is a report of the Committee's "mass meeting" in New York last Sunday. The sort of thing which went on there will not build a militant mass protest movement, a fighting defense. It can only weaken the defense movement at a moment when Leibowitz, by refusing to recognize the defeat the boys suffered in the Patterson trial, is jeopardizing the future of the whole struggle.

Only a mighty mass movement, based primarily upon labor and Negro organizations, following an aggressive policy, can save the Scottsboro boys. This is as true today as it was when first the boys were snatched from death by the intervention of "radicals and damned Yankees."

It is time to stop making concessions to the red-baiting, Jew-baiting and Yankee-baiting of the prosecution. It is time to stop appealing to patriotism and God and "the best people of Alabama."

When he cried out against the 75-year verdict, Haywood Patterson showed that he still has fight left in him. When he resisted the brutal guard, Ozie Powell showed that he still has fight left in him. Today they are leading their own fight for freedom.

Victory will come only through a militant fight!

Zeller Pamphlet Out!

Previous announcements have given only a bare indication of this pamphlet at the time when it was on the way. It is now off the press. Of course, to get a complete view of what it contains, it is necessary to read this pamphlet. We on our part recommend it highly.

Fred Zeller is the acknowledged leader of the French Socialist youth. He was expelled from the Socialist youth organization by the agents of Leon Blum and his Old Guard some time ago, together with twelve other youth comrades. The young Socialists, however, remained supporters of the viewpoint represented by Fred Zeller and his co-workers. Fred Zeller represented the revolutionary position and he is continuing his struggle for that position. How this struggle has been pursued and how comrade Zeller and his co-workers came to a revolutionary position, and came to be supporters of the Fourth International, is described in this little pamphlet. The introduction is by Leon Trotsky.

We believe that the few words mentioned above is sufficient reason for our recommendation to all, and particularly to revolutionary Socialists, to read this pamphlet. It retails at 5c a copy; in lots of ten or more the price is 3c a copy. Send your order to the NEW MILITANT, 55 East 11th Street, New York, N. Y.

Dance

TO CELEBRATE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE W. P.

Friday Eve. Feb. 28

IRVING PLAZA HALL

15th Street at Irving Place

MUSIC BY

HARLEM RHYTHM MAKERS

PROFESSIONAL ENTERTAINMENT

REFRESHMENTS

TICKETS IN ADVANCE 75c, AT DOOR \$1

Needle Strike Impends

With unprecedented enthusiasm and solidarity 105,000 dressmakers organized in the I.L.G.W.U. are ready to go over the top on Saturday, Feb. 1, in a general strike that will close down every dress shop in Metropolitan New York. At the same time, expiring agreements and demands for union conditions may also bring out 18,000 furriers, the entire millinery trade, and all building service workers of the garment district in the largest general tie-up ever known in the needle industry.

Among the demands presented by the I.L.G.W.U. are the following: (1) the thirty-hour week, (2) establishment of a labor employment bureau, (3) higher minimum scales, (4) limitation of contractors, (5) price settlement on jobbers' premises, (6) the unit system of price settlement.

The union is strong both in morale and finances and for months has prepared carefully for the strike. Strike halls are ready. Hall committees, picket committees—the entire strike machine—has been prepared to handle the huge tie-up. Every member of the union, from the oldest member to the newest recruit, enters the strike with supreme confidence that a satisfactory agreement can be won. Last minute conferences called by Mayor LaGuardia have, up to the moment, given no indication that the bosses can be brought to their senses without a strike.

Demands put forward by the Furriers' Union are similar to those of the Dressmakers: 30-hour week, closed shop, division of labor, etc. As we write, furriers are jamming the streets in front of the Cooper Union and Labor Lyceum an hour

before the opening of the halls, eager to take part in a union rally in preparation for the strike.

In the millinery trade negotiations are still proceeding and it is not yet clear whether the strike will be called February 1 or later. The bosses are demanding the right of reorganization which would be ruinous to the union.

Trojanovsky Dodges Sergei Trotsky Issue

(Editor's Note: The International Committee for Political Prisoners sent out the following release to city editors on Jan. 29, 1936.)

This committee has been concerned over the disappearance in Soviet Russia of Leon Trotsky's son and daughter-in-law, Sergei Trotsky and his wife, both of whom are said to have been imprisoned in the Soviet Union for some time. Inquiry has been directed to the Soviet Embassy at Washington, but so far no information has been made available as to their whereabouts. Young Trotsky is twenty-seven years old and a professor. His wife is a librarian. Neither of them have ever engaged in political activity.

We have in our possession several interesting documents which we will be glad to release to the press concerning this case, and, if you care to get in touch with us in regard to the story, we will gladly show them to any reporter you care to send to our office.

Very truly yours,
ROGER BALDWIN,
Chairman.

Hired Liar Number One

(Continued from Page 1)

From whom was this permission received; from what person or persons?

When was this permission granted? What date?

(The Tarov article and Trotsky's comment appeared in the NEW MILITANT on Oct. 19, 1935.)

4. Where was this permission given? In the office of the New York American? In the office of the NEW MILITANT? Over the telephone? In a dark alley? Where?

Who Sent Hearst the New Militant?

5. Then Cullen is alleged to have said in reply to a question "as to the date of the NEW MILITANT from which the reprint was made": "I don't know the date. We have reproduced the masthead of the paper and you will find the date there. We have only a photostatic copy of the masthead. We returned the original to them."

No date appeared on the masthead of the NEW MILITANT as reproduced in the N. Y. American!

Why didn't Budenz inform Cullen of this? He knew this to be the fact otherwise why did he ask the question? There should be a little honor even among thieves. Or why doesn't Budenz inform the Daily Worker readers of this fact?

Or was the NEW MILITANT masthead reproduced from a copy of the paper (as is the actual fact) which can be purchased on innumerable newsstands in the city? Or did the Daily Worker, perhaps, send Hearst a copy?

But why trouble Budenz about such details. He earns good pay for every word of slander written against the revolutionary internationalists.

This creature loves the mud and before he gets through he wallows in it up to his neck, even attempting to besmirch the unsullied name of Leon Trotsky.

Did Trotsky Get Paid?

He blithely asks Cullen whether Trotsky will get paid for the articles and says he received the answer:

"That question you can't take up with me. I don't know. You will have to ask the auditor. We don't get anything for nothing. I assume the author will get paid for it—Mr. Trotsky."

Nothing daunted our inquiring reporter who judges everyone else by his own sordid standards goes to the auditing department of the N. Y. American and says he is told that "general orders for the payment of articles do not come through for about a month. We would not know at present if payment were to be made or not. Even if we did, we could not disclose this information, as it is confidential."

"Finally," (apparently in despair) says Budenz, "a secretary or other representative of Rank (Who was this representative? What was his name? Didn't you trouble to find out?) as to whether the articles had been paid for, he replied: 'I'm sorry. We don't discuss such information. It is of a confidential nature. We don't care to discuss it.'"

Stop Crawling, Budenz!

So you didn't get the goods on Trotsky, Mr. Budenz. You didn't get the goods because there aren't any!

Don't try to crawl out from under by saying that "for the American workers the vital thing is not

whether or not Trotsky was paid by Hearst for his attacks on the Workers Republic and on the Communist party."

Yes, that is the "vital issue." In last week's Sunday Worker you promised your readers the evidence.

You claim to know how much Lang, Beal, Walker, et al were paid for these articles. Was Trotsky paid by Hearst, and how much?

Produce the evidence or shut your lying mouths!

A Shameless Pair

You have no evidence, if the truth is told. You have no more evidence, Budenz, than did your brother-in-dishonor, Moissaye J. Olgin, editor of the Freiheit, when he accused Lenin and Trotsky of having been bought by German gold.

But your motives and Olgin's are the same as the latter's in 1918: recruit the workers for the army of American imperialism and defame the revolutionists for self-protection.

"Trotsky," says Budenz with his tongue in his cheek, "has already written for pay for equally reactionary publications—the Saturday Evening Post and the Liberty Magazine."

The Question is WHAT Not Where

Indeed! And what of that? Budenz in his ignorance doesn't know—he isn't paid to know such things—that all revolutionists, Marx and Engel, and even some who aren't revolutionists like Radek and Stalin have written in capitalist periodicals so that their views might receive broader publicity.

He doesn't know that Lenin used the Kaiser's "sealed train" to get into Russia!

The question is not where but what a revolutionist writes. The only time the Stalinists were able to "prove" that Trotsky wrote against the Soviet Union was in the case of a Polish paper which printed a forgery concocted by the G.P.U. On the other hand, every article written by Stalin or the smaller Stalinists, whether they appear in the capitalist press or the Daily Worker is a blow at the Workers' Fatherland and the working class. A blow because they trample on Marx and Lenin and reek with patriotism.

This latest frame-up by Budenz is hardly surprising. He once advised the revolutionary movement to learn from the methods of the Fascists.

Deny the Charges, Browder!

Once again we accuse Stalin of furnishing Hearst with ammunition against the Soviet Union by his anti-Bolshevik tirade.

In the case of the scoundrel Lang the Daily Worker took great pains to answer his assertions point by point.

Why not with Trotsky or Tarov? Why don't they deny the gruesome facts about Zinoviev, Kamenev, Medvediev, Shlyapnikov or the Hungarian Communists or the Jugoslav Communists?

They dare not because they know every word to be true.

They know from their own experience that to incur the slightest displeasure with the Stalin clique in Russia means expulsion, loss of party job, slander, etc.

The Stalinists are playing with fire when they resort to this frame-up against us.

Before the flames have died down they will be so deeply burned that every conscious worker will know that nothing distinguishes the Daily Worker from the Hearst press but a label—the cravens on both papers lie about revolutionists, blackmail them and frame them up, and in each case it is done for a price.

Will the A. F. of L. Split on the Issue of Industrial Unionism?

By ARNE SWABECK

Reports from the Executive Council sessions, at Miami, Fla., fully bear out the unmistakable rumblings of a conflict in the A.F. of L., more profound than any ever witnessed before and of far reaching consequences for its future. The A.F. of L. is approaching a crisis. Sooner than could have been expected it is coming to its crossroads and it must decide which way to go.

The industrial union issue is now a matter of intense dispute in the high council and may soon become the axis of active struggle throughout the ranks of the organization. On the surface only this issue appears to be involved; but the conflict that is developing goes much deeper. Forms of organization, or to be more exact, industrial unionism versus craft unionism, embrace, on the present-day basis of a highly developed industrial structure, the whole problem of which direction the movement shall take. Its attitude to the most burning questions of the class struggle and its own policies and methods will be vitally affected by whichever of these conflicting forms of organization become predominant.

Militants should, therefore, give the utmost attention to this present struggle in the A.F. of L. They should become its most active participants.

Lewis Central Issue

The Executive Council sessions, from beginning to end, were taken up almost exclusively with the question of the Committee for Industrial Organization, headed by John L. Lewis, and related questions. Other matters were simply put aside. This was natural. What could it do, for example, about the projected amendment to the United States constitution, so long as this all important question stared the craft union dignitaries in the face. The intensity of the debate was reflected in the threats of an imminent split with which the reports of the sessions are filled.

It is stated that the craft union officials, led by O. A. Wharton, W. D. Hutcheson and Dan Tobin, demanded aggressive action against the Lewis' committee. They are reported to have demanded the suspension of the eight unions whose representatives make up this committee. In the end, however, somewhat more moderate counsel prevailed. A committee was designated to confer with the industrial union bloc and report the results to the council sessions in May.

A Threat to the Old Guard

Yet, in view of the declaration adopted by the Executive Council, the selection of this committee is largely perfunctory. It will have to approach the industrial union bloc with a condemnation and a demand for its dissolution. The latter cannot be mistaken about the intent of the condemnation. Even if there had been no preceding conflict the wording of the declaration adopted leaves no room for doubt. The Executive Council declared that:

"...there is the growing conviction among an ever increasing number of affiliated unions and those outside of the labor movement that the activities of this committee (the Lewis' committee) constitutes a challenge to the supremacy of the American Federation of Labor and will ultimately become dual in purpose and character to the American Federation of Labor."

Further on it is stated that, "It is the opinion of the Executive Council that the committee for industrial organization should be immediately dissolved."

Bitter-Enders Dissent

This puts the question bluntly, but still not bluntly enough for some of the members of the Executive Council. In the voting five of the "bitter enders", which means the most conscious craft union reactionaries, dissented. They said the declaration was "not strong enough"; they wanted more drastic action. Open threats of secession by the unions they control, is reported to have been made by them, unless more drastic action is taken. And how deep-going this conflict really is, can perhaps best be illustrated by the orders that have gone out from Hutcheson's office instructing all carpenters local unions to withdraw from every city central labor body that indorses the objectives of the industrial union bloc.

NEW MILITANT

with which is merged
THE MILITANT

Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co., 55 East 11th St., N. Y. C. Phone: ALgon. 4-9068. Entered as second class mail matter at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879. JAMES P. CANNON, Editor

Subscription rates: In the United States \$1.00 per year; 65c per six months; Canada and foreign \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 six months. Bundle rates: Two cents per copy

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1936
Vol. 2, No. 5 (Whole No. 87)

Miami Meet Sharpens Cleavage Between Old Guard and Lewis

No doubt these most conscious craft union top officials fully comprehend what is involved. In the Lewis' committee they see a challenge not only to the control of what they consider their own special preserve, but also to their whole idea of trade unionism. No matter how stubbornly they insist on the superiority of the old forms of organization, they are aware of the dynamic forces that the industrial union issue may set into motion under present-day conditions. They may not be of the particularly old fashioned, corrupt type like Skinny Madden, Robert Brindell or "Umbrella" Mike Boyle. Nevertheless they are conscious supporters of the capitalist system. That mechanical skill ought to have a special reward they consider as established by tradition.

Organization as Special Privilege

In their opinion, organization is, therefore, to be a special privilege of the skilled workers and they feel that this can best be accomplished in cooperation with the employers, or, at least, on friendly relations with them. Beyond their social philosophy does not penetrate; their interest in organization does not embrace the workers as a class. They are perfectly contented to leave the great mass of production workers in the basic industries outside the unions. And, besides, the organization of these workers causes the sharpest conflict with the employers.

It is true that the bosses do not want any union at all in the big manufacturing plants. It is equally true that, if compelled to make concessions to union organization, they dislike to deal with a multitude of craft unions. But much less do they want unions with greater militant potentialities such as industrial unions, embracing all the workers in the plants, will have. On this basis the reactionary craft union top officials do not find it so difficult to cooperate with the employers. They also want to limit the unions to the skilled crafts. The right to represent the latter is the only concession that they demand from the employers. And so, harmonizing their position in the unions with their own basic concepts, they function essentially as agents of the employers.

Antagonism Will Grow

Out of this situation arises the great fear of the industrial union issue manifested by the reactionary bureaucrats; and out of this arises also their furious opposition to the Lewis committee. It should be easy to foresee that in further developments of union organization, this opposition will tend to increase rather than diminish. An encouragement given to industrial union organization will immediately inspire them to greater resistance against the onslaughts of the employer and equip the whole working class with a more effective weapon of resistance than the craft unions can give.

Out of this develops also the much more fundamental issues in the present cleavage in the A. F. of L. leadership. In every respect this will tend to increase and sharpen the present conflict. The dyed-in-the-wool craft union chiefs will be compelled to lean ever more upon the bosses and upon the instruments of the capitalist state for support to stem the tide.

Pressure on Lewis

On the other hand the leaders in the industrial union bloc will most likely find themselves compelled to lean ever more upon the workers who are actually set into motion for industrial unionism and who also demand democratic unions with an aggressive policy of organization. These workers who are in motion, and whose ranks are sure to increase, will press the issue forward and exert their pressure on the Committee for Industrial Organization. It will be increasingly more difficult for the latter to retreat at the same time as it will be extremely difficult for the reactionary bureaucrats to accept a compromise on this issue. What can be expected is, therefore, a sharpening of the present conflict all along the line.

John L. Lewis, in answer to the Executive Council condemnation, has already indicated that the Committee for Industrial Organization will continue with its program. With his characteristic scorn for the Council, he said: "The mountain has labored and brought forth a mouse." He added:

"After all the rumblings and convulsions at Miami for a week past, the unorganized workers of the country had a right to expect that the A. F. of L., in its own interest, would extend a sympathetic hand of assistance rather than a childish denunciation of these organizations in the federation which are trying constructively to help the cause of labor

and the common people in this country."

Deep Organizational Gulf

In questions of basic class ideology it would be difficult to find a real distinction between John L. Lewis and his official co-workers, on the one hand, and Green and company on the other. To foster illusions on this score would be pernicious and worthy only of the mealy-mouthed funkies. But in questions of organizational policy the gulf already appears to be an unbridgeable one. The very existence of the Committee for Industrial Organization, as inadvertently admitted by the Executive Council declaration, is a challenge to the rock-ribbed reactionary organizational policy of the A. F. of L. A continuation of this committee's work must of necessity deepen the present cleavage.

So far there has not been much concrete evidence of direct intervention by this committee for industrial organization in the mass production industries. Nevertheless, the raising of the issue is an important step in itself and, as could be expected, a powerful response followed immediately. The automobile workers' union wrote into its constitution, contrary to A. F. of L. decisions, a provision making the union industrial in character. In this field there is a definitely growing clamor for an all-inclusive industrial union in which the independent unions may merge. Representatives of the radio workers' federal locals intimated to the Executive Council meeting that secession from the A. F. of L. may follow rejection of their demand for an industrial union charter. Nevertheless it was rejected.

On the whole, there is ample evidence throughout the country that the demand for industrial unionism is beginning to take on the form of a movement. Such a movement will be distinctly progressive in character. It will give a stimulus to new and greater struggles and it will provide a fertile field for the advancement of revolutionary ideas of policy and methods of working class organization. This particular fact will undoubtedly exert its influence in a fundamental sense upon the present conflict in the A. F. of L.

The Possibilities of Split

It may be entirely premature to speak of the probability of a split in the A. F. of L. in the sense that the report from the Executive Council sessions do. While one cannot lose sight of the fact that the A. F. of L. is purely a voluntary federation of completely autonomous unions, and while secession of some of these unions, sometimes more than one at a time, have taken place before, they have occurred usually over purely jurisdictional disputes leading to a separation of a purely temporary nature. In such cases the secession did not carry the stigma of dual unionism; nor would the A. F. of L. undertake to organize rival unions in the place of those that withdrew from its ranks. An actual secession movement in this present situation, or a split arising out of this present conflict and around the present issues in dispute would be far more profound in its nature and in its implications for the future. Inevitably the result would be two rival movements struggling for supremacy.

Horse-and-Buggy Age Over

While a split of this nature in the A. F. of L. may not be an immediate probability, it cannot be denied that all the implications leading in this direction are already at hand. The choice, however, is essentially with the officials who are in control of affairs of the A. F. of L. They cannot help but see the handwriting on the wall. They have the choice of changing, and adjusting the federation to the requirements of modern conditions and to the needs of the masses or to give way to other forces capable of undertaking such a task.

The issue of industrial unionism is now of paramount importance. It grows out of the needs of the working class and once its real importance is fully appreciated it can become the vehicle for the revitalization of the whole labor movement. The moods of the masses are changing. The masses seek organization and they seek to utilize their organizations as instruments of struggle for their own class ends. In this respect there are now the most favorable opportunities available.

If the Committee for Industrial Organization stands its ground in this present conflict a first and most important step can be accomplished. It can become an instrument toward the creation of a genuinely progressive movement in the trade unions. This is today an imperative necessity and an absolute prerequisite. Once this genuine progressive movement is finally established there need be no fear of the consequences of any position taken by the reactionary A. F. of L. top leaders, be it ever so hostile.