

NEW MILITANT

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

VOL. 2, NO. 16 [WHOLE NO. 68]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 25, 1936

PRICE 3 CENTS

Down Tools May First! Demonstrate Against War and for Workers Republic

Seamens Struggle Settled

West Coast Unions Retreat, But Employers Aims are Spiked

By ARNE SWABECK

An intense struggle of wide ramifications, precipitated by the opulent national shipping companies and waterfront employers associations, and involving issues of life or death to the Pacific Coast maritime unions, has come to an end by joint agreement. The unions found themselves compelled to make a retreat; but the shipping companies were frustrated in their openly avowed aims to overturn the present militant leadership, which was to be only a preliminary to the complete smashing of the unions. One may be sure, however, that these waterfront employers have not at all abandoned their aims. They are biding their time for a new opportunity. This epic struggle has come to an end only for the time being.

It was long protracted, bitterly contested, at times smoldering, then out in the open and finally coming to a head during the last couple of weeks. Its wide ramifications involves many seemingly side issues which are nevertheless all interwoven to form one of the intense dramas so typical of the American labor movement. Leaving aside for the moment the great San Francisco general strike, which constitutes the background for the more recent events, it is necessary to mention only such outstanding questions as:

Five Outstanding Questions

Firstly: the hearings now taking place before Secretary of the Department of Commerce Roper and Secretary of the Dept. of Labor, Perkins, on the case of the sailors from the Panama Pacific liner California, whom Secretary Roper charged with insubordination and mutiny when they struck for their demands.

Secondly: the case of a crew re-

(Continued on Page 2)

Red Scare Is Raised In Tampa

Mimeograph Machine Becomes Threat to "Civilization"

By SIDNEY HERTZBERG

HARTOW, Fla., April 19 — A humble and somewhat dilapidated mimeograph machine with two important parts missing became the sinis or weapon with which "our Anglo-Saxon civilization" was to be destroyed when Pat Whitaker, chief counsel for the defense in the Tampa kidnapping murder trials, definitely revealed last week that he would use the cry of communism to justify the acts of the seven former Tampa policemen now on trial for the false arrest and kidnapping of Eugene F. Poulnot, Chairman of the Florida Workers Alliance.

The particular segment of civilization that Whitaker is striving to preserve is usually guarded by the Klu Klux Klan, an organization of torturers and executioners that exercises its civilizing influence on barbarians who try to organize exploited citrus workers, phosphate miners, longshoremen or unemployed.

The Klan was performing this function last November 30 when police raided a home in Tampa, arrested six men who were writing the by-laws of the Modern Democrats, a new progressive political coalition, and mercilessly flogged three of them. Joseph Shoemaker died of the flogging.

Through the combined efforts of labor, Socialist, religious and civil liberties organizations, this brutal power has been challenged; and now, for the first time in the history of Florida, the Klu Klux Klan is standing trial.

The questioning of veniemen and the first three days of testimony have clearly indicated the defense tactics Whitaker intends to follow.

He has revived a sedition law passed 70 years ago during recon-

(Continued on Page 2)

On the 50th Anniversary of May Day

AN EDITORIAL

THE tradition of May Day is a tradition of militant mass action. On this day the proletarian prisoners of capitalism assert their right to act as free men and women. Defying the discipline of their bosses, all class-conscious workers lay down their tools; quit their places at the machine; and emerge from factory and workshop to assemble in unified ranks with their comrades in the streets. The masses who march on May Day herald the time when they will storm the Bastille of capitalism; overthrow their exploiters and oppressors; and construct the socialist society that will usher in a new epoch of peace and progress for all mankind.

The holiday of workers the world over, May Day has a special significance for the American working class. Here the idea of setting aside the day as the workers' own was first proposed. Here on May Day, 1886 thousands of workers thronged the streets in a mighty demonstration for the eight-hour day, a warning flash of proletarian power so terrifying that it drove the magnates of capital to inflict their brutal retaliation upon the martyrs of Haymarket.

This May Day marks the fiftieth anniversary of that memorable demonstration. There could be no more appropriate occasion to review the results of labor's struggle for emancipation; to celebrate its victories; and, above all, to assimilate the lessons of its defeats.

"Proletarian revolutionists," wrote Marx, "criticize themselves ceaselessly and interrupt themselves constantly in their own course. They return to what has already been accomplished in order to begin it again and deride with ruthless thoroughness the half-heartedness, weakness, and wretchedness of their first attempts. They appear to throw their adversary to the ground only in order that he should draw renewed strength from the earth and rise again still more powerfully before them. They recoil again and again from the uncertain and tremendous nature of their own aims until a situation is created which makes retreat impossible and the circumstances themselves cry out: 'Hic Rhodus, hic salta!'"

The prophetic insight of these words, written in 1851, has been confirmed a hundred times over in the history of the revolutionary movement of the past fifty years. What a terribly steep and winding mountain road the proletariat has had to travel during that period! Every advance toward its goal of liberation from wage-slavery has been followed by a corresponding retreat; for every two steps forward the movement has been compelled to take one step backward. Whole generations have exhausted their energies and expended their blood in the struggle. Three international organizations, and now a fourth, have been needed to lead the working class in its campaign against the citadels of world capital.

And yet, tortuous and as the ascent has been, in spite of the severe setbacks suffered time and again, the labor movement has gone steadily forward. The ground lost after each defeat has been recovered in the next assault—and more added. Capitalist society is doomed!

Each of the three Internationals represents a landmark in the historical progress of the working class. Each has given its name and political program to a particular epoch. Each has in its turn lifted the revolutionary vanguard to a higher level of organization, theory, and struggle, and then collapsed—with the exception of the First—under the colossal burden of leadership imposed upon them.

The First International gave to the rising proletariat for the first time a scientific program of revolution and a world banner. The crushing of the Paris Commune, the immaturity of the working class, and its lack of a mass base led to its collapse. Its successor reunited the scattered sections of the working class during the Golden Age of imperialist expansion into a powerful international body, numbering millions of members, and prepared them for joint action against their exploiters.

But when the imperialist war exploded, the opportunism which had been ripening within the upper circles of the Second International bore its bitter fruit. Overnight the leaders of the Social Democracy turned into social-patriots and dragooned the disoriented masses of their respective countries into the imperialist slaughter on the side of their masters.

Only a handful of revolutionists with Lenin at their head resisted the patriotic torrent and remained true to the principles of revolutionary internationalism. In the first months of the war Lenin proclaimed the necessity of breaking with the betrayers of the Second International; of turning the imperialist war into civil war; of building the Third International. With these slogans as a guide, the Bolshevik party under Lenin and Trotsky led the Russian workers to victory over their own bourgeoisie; beat back the counter-revolution; and reconstituted the revolutionary vanguard under the banner of the Third International.

For five years the battalions of the Third International conducted an heroic struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. With the turn in the revolutionary tide following the defeat of the German workers in 1923, it fell victim to the post-war political reaction, which gave a new lease of life to the Social Democracy and found its consummate expression within the Soviet Union in Stalin's theory of "socialism in one country." The history of the Third International under Stalin is an unbroken record of retreat and defeat, culminating in Hitler's victory. The Third International has become nothing more than a pawn in the diplomatic deals of the Soviet bureaucracy with its imperialist allies.

Today the world trembles on the brink of a second world war. All the great powers are arming themselves to the teeth. Their statesmen no longer pretend that the conflict can be avoided; their only questions are when, where, and between whom will it break out? How soon will we be drawn in?

Its attitude toward the impending war is the acid test of every political party in the labor movement. The leaders of the Second International are prepared to repeat their traditional role and once again send the workers into slaughter at their masters' command. This time they have found worthy allies and disciples in the leaders of the Third International, who have already declared that the workers of France, Czechoslovakia, and the United States must suspend the class struggle and support their capitalist governments in case it is allied, or may be allied, with the Soviet Union.

The unconditional defense of the Soviet Union is the duty of every revolutionist. The only real defense of the Soviet Union is a revolutionary defense. This has nothing in common with the present policy of the Soviet Union in staking all upon its deals with its imperialist allies and nothing upon the power of the world proletariat. We say, on the contrary, that the only reliable ally of the Soviet Union is the international proletariat. Now as ever the task of the workers in every capitalist country is to overthrow its own ruling class. "The main enemy is in our own country."

To go forward it is necessary to return to the ideas of Marx and Lenin. The emancipation of the working class can be accomplished only through its own revolutionary action. The indispensable instrument for that action in our epoch is the Fourth International. Just as the red International of Lenin was forged in struggle against the social-patriots of the Second International, so its successor must be built in struggle against both the Second and Third.

Such is the meaning of May Day to those internationalists who remain loyal to the teachings of Marx and Lenin. Against the social-patriots of the Second and Third Internationals! For the regrouping of the revolutionary vanguard under the banner of the Fourth International!

New York Labor to Unite in Huge Parade

All Political Tendencies Combine for First Time in Years; Only Bankrupt Old Guard and Labor Bureaucrats Sabotage

By MARTIN ABERN

On Friday, May 1, 1936, New York City will witness and take part in the largest and greatest May Day celebration and demonstration in many a year. A far larger number and variety of labor and political organizations are participating in the vast parade that will march for many hours, with bands playing, floats and banners by the many thousands, through the streets of New York, hailing labor's solidarity.

For the first time in many years, since 1919 in fact, numerous political tendencies of labor will march together, proclaiming common cause against the capitalist system. The Communist Party (Stalinists), the Workers Party ("Trotskyist"), the Socialist Party (Militant Socialists) and other political bodies and large numbers of labor unions, fraternal and workers' organizations of varying kind, are among the participating bodies on this May Day.

The labor movement of New York as a whole, its official Central Labor body, etc., are not yet taking part directly or officially in a common May Day demonstration, but the more advanced and increasing class-conscious and radical forces of New York Labor have at last established a United Front for May Day, 1936. Hence, this May Day represents marked progress in the development of labor solidarity and the united front on specific issues and slogans.

The S.P. Old Guard

There are, nevertheless, important influences hampering the solidification of labor's ranks this May Day. The S.P. Old Guard, for one, vociferously attack the United Front May Day Committee and call upon workers not to participate in the parade and demonstration. But these elements only continue the reactionary role they have been playing in the labor movement for years. Today they try to divide labor's ranks on Labor's May Day. Today they attack the fundamental tenets of the great Russian Revolution and hail only the backward forces and processes which Stalin and his degenerated bureaucracy have set into motion against bona fide Bolshevism, as exemplified by Lenin and Trotsky.

Tomorrow these Old Guard Socialists (Oneal and Co.) and others of like ilk will demonstrate their extreme treachery by calling upon the American working class to support actively any war which American imperialism proclaims. But that is the function of the Old Guard or reactionary socialism as against the policies of revolutionary socialism; and against the Old Guard's treachery on May Day and all the time, there can only be war to the end.

The Old Guard's anti-Sovietism is expressed in their effort today to break the May Day United Front. Naturally, the slogan for the unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against any form of imperialist attack is a major slogan of the United Front May Day; this slogan represents a heart-felt desire of every militant and class-conscious worker, and on May Day they want to assert this widely and demonstratively. The Old Guard on this May Day hence concretely expresses its anti-Sovietism and anti-working class character by their sabotage of a united May Day demonstration.

But additional forces (Old Guard Socialists and others) also are trying to hold back the urge for united action and solidarity on May Day by the workers. It must be admitted that these elements are succeeding in some measure in blocking united ranks on May Day here, but more and more of their following hesitate or do not listen to their false counsel.

Three major unions of New York City, the International Ladies Garment Workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the Millinery Workers Unions, speaking through their officialdom, are also doing all they can to disrupt the forces of labor, to crack the growing numbers and unity of labor on May Day. These unions have organized a demonstration at the Polo Grounds for May Day and are opposed to the United Front or May Day achieved

(Continued on Page 2)

NEW ADDRESS
Comrades, friends and sympathizers are requested to take note of the new address of the New Militant, New International and the Workers Party which is now:
109 FIFTH AVENUE
ROOM 1010
NEW YORK CITY
Please address all correspondence to the above.

Donkey and Elephant Gird for Election Struggle

G.O.P. and Democrats Vie for Privilege to Represent Capitalist Class and for . . . the Gravy

By JOHN WEST

The Donkey and the Elephant are now getting their preliminary rub-downs in preparation for their formal entry into the world's greatest puppet show, the last act of which is scheduled for the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November. The Nominating Conventions will be held in June, and for the next six months the well paid publicists will use their energy and money in trying to persuade the citizens of this country that their lives, liberties, and general happiness depend on marking the cross on the appropriate side of the ballot.

The Election Campaign started this year earlier than usual. Its first big gun was fired by Roosevelt in the form of his Annual Message to Congress, a procedure which the Republicans felt was a distinctly unprincipled abuse of the privileges of his office. The Republicans managed, however, to follow up during the next six weeks with a barrage of grotesquely ghost-written speeches by Hoover, a studiously meaningless statement by Landon, Talmadge's ill-fated Grass Roots gathering, and a heavy offensive through their press. Neatly padded statistics were issued weekly to show that the people were ready to throw New Deal policies on the garbage pile.

Point, Counter-Point

Things quieted down, to be revived on both sides during the past months. The Republicans surprise

themselves by announcing a brand new Brain Trust all their own—naturally non-partisan in character, whose public-spirited function it will be merely to demonstrate in the most objective scientific manner conceivable how Roosevelt is leading the country to destruction. They continue to observe that Marx reigns as the guardian deity of New Deal Washington. The Democrats have more substantial weapons at hand for the counter-attack: they utilize the investigations of the Congressional Committees to secure front-page agitation against the Tories, and to show the public that the Republicans plan to turn the government over openly to Morgan and DuPont. Roosevelt mounted his white horse again at Baltimore to ride at the head of the nation's youth, and to promise once more security for all.

It is, of course, a foregone conclusion that Roosevelt will be re-nominated on the first ballot at the Democratic Convention. There will be a few squabbles over the wording of the platform, but in the end it will be worked out according to the Roosevelt pattern. The Annual Message and the Baltimore address make clear what this will be: Roosevelt will lean back on the New Deal slogans of his first campaign, and will appeal to the voters on the basis of the "left" promises which he is so gracious in formulating. The old melody needs little tuning up: denunciation of the

(Continued on Page 2)

Coast Unions Withstand Bosses Attack

(Continued from Page 1)

fusing to man the freighter Oregon at Los Angeles because it was laden with aviation gasoline destined for Italian Somaliland.

Thirdly: the organization of the Maritime Federation on the Pacific Coast, uniting all the maritime unions in common action and inspiring to a solidarity hitherto unknown. An organization justly feared by the shipping companies and whose example spread to the Gulf ports resulting in the setting up of a similar federation there.

Fourthly: the question of wages and working conditions established in the Pacific Coast ports, superior to those prevailing on the waterfronts anywhere else in the country. And most important in this connection, the union control of manning the ships and handling the cargo through joint "hiring halls", these representing the gains that resulted from the San Francisco general strike, enforced by the vigilance of an active leadership and by the unparalleled militancy of the rank and file.

Fifthly, and lastly, we have here a case of the most vicious, the most sinister and the most rotten connivance of corrupted high paid national officials with the shipping companies, sometimes using government agents as intermediaries, the former operating by the methods of circumventing strikes, threatening expulsions and actual expulsions of whole locals, herding scabs to man ships in Eastern ports and giving them union cards in order to help break the courage, the militancy and the very existence of the Pacific Coast unions.

Frisco Local Target for Attack

In these most recent events the San Francisco longshoremen's local 38-79, of which Harry Bridges is president, became the direct target. The Grace Company liner Santa Rosa had been picketed in New York for failure to comply with union conditions but it secured, with the help of the top union officials a crew from the Great Lakes which was spuriously supplied with union cards. Arriving at San Pedro it was again picketed by the Maritime Federation and subsequently diverted to the San Francisco port, which the avowed threat of the employers' "to force a showdown." The longshoremen's union considered the Santa Rosa as carrying "hot cargo," and therefore, not to be unloaded, and insisted on an examination of the crew's union cards.

Immediately the Waterfront Employers' Association countered by breaking off relations with local 38-79. The opportunity the bosses had waited for had come. All members of the Employers Association were advised not to order any men through the hiring halls. These hiring halls were made the center of the attack. Through them the unions were able to regulate the hiring of crews so that each received its proper share of the work available and the unions were also enabled to prevent any effective blacklisting by the employers. Naturally, such an institution became

a thorn in the sides of the latter and they were determined to move heaven and earth to have it smashed.

The Attack Fails

So far, however, this attempt has failed. All the carefully laid plans and all the dastardly connivance of the reactionary national officials with the employers could not break the maritime unions on the Pacific Coast. In the most splendid manner they all rallied to make common cause against the combined attack. The Central Labor Councils of Seattle, of San Francisco and smaller cities voted full support to the longshoremen, even local reactionaries did not dare oppose it. The Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast voted full support as did numerous local unions up and down the coast. Still the longshoremen's union had to make a retreat and consent to a stipulation being written into the agreement signed before the federal administrator, Judge M. C. Sloss, by which it gives up its right to job action and pledges itself to handle "hot cargo" while disputes are referred to the judge for settlement.

This is a serious retreat and it calls to mind the fact that Harry Bridges has once before caused strained relations with the other maritime unions when advising them to refrain from "job action."

It should be clearly understood, however, that the Pacific Coast unions were compelled to make this retreat essentially because of the conniving treachery between the employers and such officials as Joseph P. Ryan of the International Longshoremen's Union and Victor Olander, Paul Scharrenberg and Andrew Furuseth of the International Sailor's Union. The maritime unions of the Pacific Coast have attained an advanced position by their militant methods of struggle as well as in regard to conditions gained. For these reasons they had to bear the brunt of the attack and bear it alone. And it is a foregone conclusion that for them to maintain this position it is necessary that the maritime unions, particularly in the East, be similarly organized and establish a far greater degree of cohesion and solidarity.

The dramatic events of this protracted Pacific Coast struggle can best be understood when related in chronological order. At the same time each one of them contain lessons necessary for militant unionists to assimilate if they are to be on guard in future events. In practically every instance we see reflected the conflict between the old school of corrupted trade union leadership and the newly awakened rank and file militancy. But in its broader implications, it is the conflict of the capitalist owners of industry and their labor lieutenants pitted against an advanced section of the working class.

The Strike Award

Out of the San Francisco general strike grew the special award of the National Longshoremen's Board providing for the present working

conditions on the waterfront. The longshoremen gained the six-hour day with a wage scale of 95 cents per hour and \$1.40 for overtime. Subsequently all other maritime workers made gains. The sailors established a wage scale of \$62.50 per month, the stewards \$50.00 per month which compares to the lower rate on the East Coast of \$57.50 and \$45.00 for these two crafts respectively. According to the new award all cases of dispute were to be handled by the local Labor Relations Committee, and in the event of disagreement to be referred to Judge Sloss for arbitration. One of the important and at the same time one of the most bitterly contested gains for the workers, contained in this award, was the provision for all hiring of crews to take place through "hiring halls" jointly operated. Through this medium the unions were able to exercise almost complete control over hiring and firing of crews. Of course, it should be remembered, that all of these gains were made only after a whole series of struggles consciously aimed at an immediate goal.

Gains Consolidated

Following up these gains the unions further strengthened their position enormously by organizing the Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast, embracing all of the maritime unions and counting a total of 35,000 members. Ordinarily there would not be anything startling for A. F. of L. unions of related crafts within one industry to combine in the establishment of a federation. This has been a long established practice by the various departments already in existence, comprising the building trades, the metal trades, the printing trades and others. But after the lessons of the general strike, which had brought forward a determined leadership in the local maritime unions, and in fear of a rising tide of militancy, the top bureaucrats took an entirely different view of the matter.

The newly gained cohesiveness made the workers conscious of their organized power which they did not hesitate to use. Ships with non-union crews, or with cargo loaded anywhere by scabs, found difficulties in every Pacific port. While the federation is in no sense as fully effective as an industrial union it did inculcate a high degree of solidarity and unity of action all along the coast. Even as a mere step in that direction it became a splendid tribute to the idea of industrial unionism. From the point of view of the employers this situation appeared ever more desperate. The business revival began to make its way; profits showed new and excellent prospects, buttressed by the enormous government ship subsidies, and lo and behold, the workers on the waterfronts and on the ships insisted, through their unions, upon their modest share as specified by the federal award. They insisted on union control of working conditions. The maritime unions had become a powerful force.

Following their acceptance of the federal award the employers confined themselves to guerrilla warfare, but only in preparation for their day of the general offensive. This assumed varied forms. In one instance sailors were commanded to unload steam schooners at a scale of 95 cents an hour. The sailors refused, so the employers had to hire longshoremen, but they would subsequently tie up the schooners, leaving them lying idle in the ports; first dozens of them, later scores. Petty violations of the provisions of the award were common occurrences. Ships carrying "hot cargo" called at the ports right along while a hue and cry went up against the workers' refusal to unload them. But in all these situations the workers also learned how to resort to a special kind of job action through what was popularly called "quickie" strikes. They met the strategy of guerrilla warfare rather effectively.

All the time the employers prepared for the showdown. The local Chambers of Commerce, the Hearst Press and the radio loud speakers blared out their shouts for a showdown while an important part of the plans were concocted right in the international union offices.

Joseph P. Ryan, the president of the I.L.A., had bungled things for the bureaucrats during the coast-wide strike when he failed to carry a single vote for his outrageous settlement proposals. He was almost badly discredited on the Pacific Coast. So the gentlemen receiving the high salaries in the sailors' union, Paul Scharrenberg and Victor Olander, came to the rescue of the employers when help from these labor lieutenants was needed the most. Paul Scharrenberg, who was often denounced by Tom Mooney as one of his jailers, had himself been expelled from the sailors' union of the Pacific because of his treacherous activities during the tanker strike. Victor Olander, one of the left-overs of the old Gompers' regime, required a good deal of his training in the kind of politics where an opponent is never met openly until all the traps are secretly set. At the I.S.U. convention in January, when serious disputes on the Pacific Coast were in a deadlock, these two gentlemen appeared to administer their blow.

Union Charter Revoked

The sailors' union of the Pacific Coast was indicted for having refused to unload the steam schooners at 29 cents an hour, for having combined with other unions in the Maritime Federation and for having taken into its ranks members of the dissolved Marine Workers Industrial Union. The sailors' union on the Pacific Coast was expelled and its funds tied up in court litigation. What was the purpose of this action? Here we will let the New York Times, which carries "all the news fit to print," give the answer. In its issue of January 31, George P. West reported from San Francisco on the

"staggering blow to the hitherto victorious maritime unions" by the charter revocation. He added:

"Shipowners are jubilant as they abandon carefully laid plans to lay up all ships early in February and thereby lockout sailors and longshoremen as a final desperate expedient in combatting the militant leadership of Harry Bridges and his allies. Instead they now announce they will wait until the I.S.U. has organized a new Pacific Coast unit."

"If the local leadership refuses to recognize the new union and work cargo the responsibility will be transferred to the men and the issue fought out as a strike instead of a lockout."

"We've Got the Men!"

Matters did not work out entirely in this fashion, and chiefly because of the fact that the bureaucrats of the I.S.U. aided in their nefarious scheme. They did not rally any of the sailors on the Pacific Coast to their banner. It turned out to be as stated by Earl King, one of the leaders of the Maritime Federation: "They've got the charter, we've got the men." The Maritime Federation stood its ground and remained solid so the employers had to change their strategy and move for the showdown precipitated by them selves when they broke off relations with longshoremen's local 38-79 on April 14.

This long protracted struggle is now settled—at least for the time being. The shipping companies and the waterfront employers have once again experienced the power of labor when well organized and given militant leadership. They have also experienced a new lesson, namely that they cannot entirely depend upon the top bureaucrats, be they ever so corrupted, once the rank and file workers have become conscious of the despicable role these individuals play. To the workers it should have become increasingly clear that real gains are made only through conscious struggle and when their organizations are made a means for this purpose.

Significance of the Retreat

But the retreat embodied in the present agreement leaves the Pacific Coast maritime unions in a weakened position. The pledge to handle "hot cargo" can become extremely dangerous and can easily serve as a treacherous means toward the breaking up of the solidarity and the organization attained, not only on the Pacific Coast, but elsewhere. Under no conditions can the unions afford to agree to handle "hot cargo" of the kind that is actually loaded by scabs under the conditions of a strike in other ports. That would mean the giving up of the very right to an organization.

But, as stated at the outset in this article, the key to the problem remains the organization for common action in all the ports in the country. The establishment of the Maritime Federation of the Gulf Coast district embracing about 10,000 maritime workers is one important step in this direction. When followed up on the Eastern coast, regardless of the opposition of the reactionary bureaucrats, the retreat made can again be turned into a new advance.

New York Labor Unites for Monster Parade

(Continued from Page 1)

by the participating bodies. They stand opposed to the great parade that will take place on May Day with or without the official support of these powerful unions. It would be the greatest error to give up the street parade of hundreds of thousands of workers in order to have, instead, a polite gathering at the Polo Grounds, interspersed with a few innocuous or labor-dividing speeches and sporting events. The United Front May Day Committee has correctly rejected such a demand. The parade through the streets is the manner to emphasize and mobilize Labor's increasing solidarity and understanding of its problems on this historic day.

The officialdom and lackeys of the A.C.W., I.L.G.W., and Millinery Unions have endeavored in the local unions to have the membership declare for participation only in the Polo Grounds meeting and to declare against marching on May Day with the United Front. These attempts to sabotage the mobilization of labor's organized ranks have been sharply rejected by the large local sections of these unions. They will march in the United Front demonstration and also later take part in the Polo Grounds affair, thus trying, if possible, to cement labor unity on May Day despite the official edicts and aims of the union officialdom.

The leaders and sponsors of the Polo Grounds "celebration", the heads of three major New York unions, are allegedly progressive leaders of labor, even "socialists", who want a Labor Party; they are "class-conscious"—especially for Franklin D. Roosevelt. Yes, they are even outstanding leaders of a major movement for industrial unionism, the Committee for Industrial Organization—Dubinsky, Zaritsky, Hillman, et al. But they are playing a backward game in trying to divide the ranks of labor on May Day; by their hope and aim to diminish, if they cannot break up, the forthcoming gigantic United Front May Day demonstration. These sponsors of the Polo Grounds turn-out show their real "progressive" color by their open, declared support of Roosevelt, the Democratic president, for the 1936 national elections. These are the Judases of labor on May Day and every other day. It is even said by many that these progressive and "socialist" leaders in these unions may try to turn this allegedly May Day Affair at the Polo Grounds into a demonstration on behalf of Roosevelt.

The policy of the United Front May Day Committee is to endeavor

to prevent any "competition" between the Polo Ground and U.F. May Day parade and demonstrations. This is correct. The United Front May Day Committee calls upon the members of these unions and other organizations to give full support to both demonstrations and to endeavor to give to the Polo Grounds gathering a distinctly working class character. Many organizations have already signified their intention to take part in both gatherings—among them many unions and also the Socialist Party. The United Front May Day Committee is doing everything possible to unify labor's ranks on May Day; falling so far to get the I.L.G.W., A.C.W. and Millinery Workers Unions to call off the Polo Grounds get-together in favor of one gigantic, united May Day Parade, culminating at Union Square, the May Day Committee continues to call, with some success, upon workers' organizations to support both demonstrations. Nevertheless, it would be folly not to recognize that fundamentally the counter-Polo Ground demonstration has as the aim of its sponsors the sabotage of May Day solidarity, and cannot help but effect in some measure the size of the genuine May Day demonstration supported and organized by the United Front Committee.

The Stalinists

The Communist Party (Stalinists) are an important part of the United Front May Day Committee represented on all committees of the U.F. But this year the Stalinists are watching their step in this united front in order not to upset the apple cart as they have so often done in past years. Gone are their cries of "Social-Fascist!" against the Socialist workers; gone are their howls for the fictitious "united front from below"; gone their stupid, false setting-up, in all the circumstances then, of independent and dual trade unions; gone much of the inane tactics of the notorious "Third Period." The Stalinists have jumped out of their skins both in fright at their misdeeds, and in their desire to promote their opportunistic and social-patriotic line on the war question, in the unions, the 1936 elections, their ballyhoo for a third capitalist party, euphemistically called a Farmer-Labor Party, and similar objectives reflecting their somersault.

The Stalinists could, if they wished, easily dominate the May Day United Front Committee mechanically through their numerous stooge and duplicating auxiliary organizations. But they are refraining from so doing and are letting the S.P. Militants run the show, even though organizationally the "Militants" could stand more practical assistance on various aspects of the demonstration. But having gotten into the United Front, and with opportunity provided to proclaim their substitute—a Farmer-Labor Party for a genuine revolutionary party, they are content this time to let well enough alone and to act as primly and politely as a little Lord Fauntleroy.

The W.P. and the United Front

The Workers Party of New York is participating in the May Day united front and is represented on the Executive Committee. We are giving full support to the basic objectives of May Day. We, better than any other organization of labor, can aptly participate in and promote the United Front on May Day and on other specific issues and occasions. Our Party has always held a sound position on the tactic of the united front as a medium for the mobilization of wide masses of workers on specific matters. Our Party, unlike the social-patriotic Stalinists, never labeled Socialists as "Social-Fascists" even though the W.P. continued to make criticism of the inadequacies of the socialists and other bodies in respect to program, theory and action.

Among the main slogans are: for defense of the Soviet Union; for the class-war prisoners; against war and Fascism; for a farmer-labor party, etc. Our organization, the Workers Party, as per its official position, is against the slogan and formation of a "farmer-labor" or "Labor" Party. Under the circumstances, we regard it as a petty bourgeois combination, a bulwark, if formed, against a developing militant and revolutionary working class. Nor, for that matter, does a genuine base, rooted in the mass of labor unions, actually exist today. For the most part the existing "labor party" movements are fictitious organizations, or rather, paper bodies with some scattered individual support. But the complete position of the Workers Party on this issue is expressed essentially in its declaration of Principles and in other expressions of policy toward concrete manifestations of such a movement. Suffice that the Workers Party, while giving full support to the 1936 May Day and the arrangements thereof, states its separation from the advocacy of the Labor Party slogan in the parade.

Members and supporters of the Workers Party! March on May Day in the United Front! Workers! Out on the streets for May Day! Mobilize for Labor Solidarity against Capitalism!

Donkey and Elephant Gird for Election Spree

(Continued from Page 1)

Tories, of the selfish few, of those who would rob the people of their liberties; concern for the common man; the great aims of social security and neighborliness; protection and aid for agriculture; against the corruptions of the mighty; for a true peoples' government. An admirable program, in short, for a genuine People's Front. The Democrats are abandoning hope of toning down the attacks in the Republican press, since they find that every publicly avowed protestation of friendship for big business only spurs the Republicans to new heights. They are falling back, there are, into a purer form of demagoguery.

The Republican Scramble

The Republicans have a somewhat more difficult, and less rewarding task. They are confronted with a most undignified scramble for the Presidential nomination. Landon, Borah, Knox, and Hoover are now in the lead, with Landon out in front at the moment. Landon, however, is suffering from the too ardent kiss of Hearst, and none of these four seem to have sufficient support to secure nomination on an early ballot. The old-line politicians maintain tight control of the Convention through the device of having "uninstructed delegates" elected from most of the states; and it is not improbable that they will engineer the nomination of a compromise dark horse—perhaps Vandenberg of Michigan, or Stewer of Oregon, the latter of whom has been selected as the Keynote for the Convention.

The Republicans will have somewhat more trouble than the Democrats over the wording of their platform, particularly because of the strategic position in which Borah may find himself. As a concession to Borah, they will no doubt take care to point out that the Republican Party is the genuinely liberal party in terms of the true

American tradition, and that the great task before us is to prevent the tyranny of the state over the individual, to guard our cherished liberties from socialistic regimentation, and to oust the soviet from White House. They will then go on to show that this means a sound monetary system, balancing of the federal budget, ending of corruption and extravagance, and a cessation of interference with legitimate business.

Aim of the G. O. P. Struggle

It can hardly be thought, however, that the Republicans seriously believe that they have a chance in November. Every indication is for a decisive victory for Roosevelt. The struggle for Republican nomination, therefore, is largely a struggle for control of the Republican Party machinery and what this can bring apart from actual possession of the Federal Administration. And, apart from this, the Republican campaign will be run not so much to try to secure election as to put continuous pressure on Roosevelt to prevent him from getting too far out of line with the aims of the industrialists and financiers back of the Republican Party; an object which is not so difficult when it is remembered that these aims correspond in all important respects with the aims of the industrialists and financiers back of the Democratic Party.

It is hardly necessary to point out that, words and slogans aside, in their concrete significance, programs and activities, there is at the present time no important difference between the two parties. They both represent, from top to bottom, the fundamental social interests of the big bourgeoisie, of finance-capital. The axis of the aims of each is simply to keep capitalism going, with the largest possible percentage of its fruits going to the bourgeoisie.

On the central question confronting the United States (and every

other) government—the war question—there is no dispute even in words between the two parties. Both see the next war approaching rapidly and inevitably, and plan to have the United States in a position to enter it in its later stages to reap the largest reward from the re-division of the world. Roosevelt has successfully carried through the largest peace-time armament budget in the history of this or any other country; and no Republican cry for economy has ever mentioned the armament expenditures. Even the D. A. R. and Hearst have recently praised Roosevelt in public for his devotion to the "national defense," and on this subject there are no stricter judges.

Differences Superficial

Doubtless the two parties differ to some degree in the details of their schemes for managing the political aspect of the great bourgeois business of exploiting the masses. For example, there is more sentiment for direct relief as opposed to work relief in the Republican than in the Democratic Party. Nevertheless, the difference here also is largely on the surface. Both are agreed that relief should be kept as low as is compatible with the prevention of too much mass resentment. The Republicans talk more about a "balanced budget"; but they, like Roosevelt, are not willing to levy sufficient new taxation to attain it; and there are as many inflationists among the Republicans as among the Democrats. The differences in general tariff policy between the two parties have disappeared; and there remains only individual deals on tariffs involving individual backers of the respective parties. The Democrats have, it is true, a more aggressive farm policy; but this is largely an ideological difference—one of the differences in the means by which the two try to maintain their mass bases, rather than any fundamental cleavage.

There was once a day when these two parties faced each other with lines sharply drawn, when they presented themselves to the country as the political representatives of two mortally opposed classes together with their subordinate allies. Through them the slaveholders of

the South fought it out against the industrialists and merchants of the North. But this issue required a Civil War, not merely an election, to settle. And as a necessary part of that mighty struggle for state power, the Republican Party was led to wipe out utterly the class which opposed it, first in part by arms, and then by uprooting the social basis upon which it was constituted. In the succeeding years the bourgeoisie consolidated its victory, and finance-capital replaced the industrialists and merchants.

The Only Major Struggle

Henceforth the only major social struggle is between imperialist finance-capital and the proletariat. This struggle is not yet, however, reflected to any important extent in the parliamentary domain, and cannot be directly expressed in any possible contest between the Republican and Democratic parties. Consequently, the masses, in choosing between them, have only the question—as Marx expressed it—of which group of brigands they shall elect to take the lead for four years in exploiting them.

Nevertheless, even the electoral contest between these two parties is not without social significance. For one thing, the business of government has become the biggest of all businesses, and there is a genuine rivalry in determining who shall have the right to its profits. But much more important than this, the elections are a major means for spreading illusions among the masses, for preventing the masses from understanding what the true issues of modern society actually are. Exaggerating the appearance of differences between the two parties aids the bourgeoisie in sustaining the belief on the part of the masses that it is a vital question for them whether the next Administration is Republican or Democratic. Thus the masses are hindered from learning that the only political struggle of real importance for them is the struggle not against one or another of the parties, but against the bourgeoisie state itself in its entirety, is the struggle for the overthrow of the state.

But it is doubtful that this illusion can be sustained much longer

by the quadrennial electoral contest between Republicans and Democrats. The puppet show is becoming too unconvincing. Consequently, the bourgeoisie will have to turn to a new device to stave off the mass growth of revolutionary political struggle against the state. Two devices are possible: a mass Fascist movement—though the time for that has not yet come, and probably will not for some years; or a reformist party—a People's or Labor or Farmer-Labor or Progressive Party—whereby the beginnings of deep revolt can be channeled into safe directions. Preparations for the latter alternative are already under way. Indeed, Roosevelt himself has transformed the Democratic Party a considerable distance along the path, and, with the active help of the trade union bureaucracy, is making it into the "Labor Party of 1936." Labor's Non-Partisan League, supporting Roosevelt this year, is jockeying into a position where later it can gather up the leftward movement of the masses into an avowed Labor Party, under firm anti-revolutionary control.

Only one strategy can defeat this perspective: revolutionary strategy, revolutionary agitation and organization. The reformist distinctions between "friends" and "enemies" among the bourgeoisie, between the Liberty League and Farley, between the Supreme Court and Congress, between Hearst and The Times or Scripps-Howard, merely plays the game of Roosevelt this year, and the subtler game of the Third Party advocates in the years to come. Our attack must be against capitalism; our struggle must be for socialism. And for this attack and this struggle there is one, and only one, political weapon: the revolutionary party. Our task is to forge this weapon. There is no other that will serve.

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

Frame Negroes

(Continued from Page 1)

Vergie Terry, and her boy friend, were brought to "identify" them. The Terry woman declared that the prisoners had attacked her twice in five minutes, and that they had worn caps, overalls, and masks. Clayton does not possess a cap and has not worn overalls in five years. Nor did the state produce the masks during the drum-head trial of the boys.

The boy friend claimed that he had been thrown face downward in a ditch. Records of the United States Weather Bureau prove that it had rained three days and nights preceding the alleged date of attack. This pimp did not complain that his clothes were soiled, although he would have been drowned had he been thrown in a ditch.

Not a single Negro was impaneled on the jury which tried the boys, but the Supreme Court of Arkansas failed to reverse the death sentences on this score. Unless there is a wave of national protest, this Arkansas Scottsboro case will result in the deaths of two innocent Negroes. We must answer this stupid savagery of the Arkansas planters by funds and protests. Funds should be sent to the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, Box 5215, Memphis, Tenn., and protests to Governor Harvey Purnell, Little Rock, Ark.

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 \$900—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.

HUNGER STRIKE IN STALIN'S PRISONS

Heroic Struggle of Revolutionary Political Prisoners Against Despotic GPU Is Told by Dr. Ciliga in Fourth Installment of Series

By ANTON CILIGA

May 22, 1933 was the day on which our prison term expired. On March 21, we sent a declaration to the C. E. C. and the collegium of the G. P. U. demanding that we be given permission to depart unhindered from Russia upon the expiration of our sentence. We pointed out in our declaration that in the event of a refusal or failure to receive an answer we would begin a hunger strike on the day our sentence expired, and should the necessity arise, we would not refrain from resorting to the most extreme measures, sparing neither our health nor lives in the struggle.

A short time ago, I succeeded in obtaining permission to depart. Comrade Dragutich, a former member of the C. E. C. of the Yugoslav Communist Party, in his struggle to achieve this aim is still incarcerated in the secret dungeons of Soviet Guiana, the terrible Solovetski Islands, because he attempted to cross the frontiers illegally after permission to depart legally was denied him. Comrade Deditch, a well known trade union activist in Yugoslavia (Herzegovina) is sitting ill, famished, and without employment in distant Siberian exile.

Reasons for the Struggle

We were so stubborn in insisting upon permission to depart abroad for several reasons. First of all, we came to Russia in 1926, only for a temporary stay and were supposed to return home after accomplishing certain work. By 1933, our mission had long been fulfilled. Secondly, there were no possibilities in Russia for doing revolutionary work as we understood it, and besides we had infinitely greater possibilities abroad. Thirdly, after our harsh experience in Russia we want to become directly acquainted also with the experience and the ideas of the Western European and American labor movement. And, finally, we could not reconcile ourselves with the conduct of the present Soviet Government, which permits itself to treat foreign workers and revolutionists like slaves, turns, depriving them of their elementary human rights, seeking to strip them of all human dignity. Hundreds of foreign workers and revolutionists find themselves in Soviet Russia in the status of thinly veiled slavery and captivity. All this is being perpetrated by a Government that passes off its regime so persistently and falsely as the fatherland of the toilers of the entire world. It is this combination of the cynicism of infinite oppression with the cynicism of infinite lies to the foreign proletariat that most aroused our indignation at the Soviet bureaucratic customs.

Our demand for leave to depart was actively supported by the entire communist sector of the prison. In a special declaration to the Government, the Elder, in the name of all the imprisoned Communists supported our demand to depart, and placed the responsibility for our fate upon the Government. The universal and decisive support of the entire isolator (up to and including a hunger strike in solidarity) was a manifestation of international solidarity, and of a desire to make known through us to the international working class the position of the persecuted groups of the working class movement in the U. S. S. R.

A GPU Coup

When the GPU saw that matters were heading toward an extensive struggle, it executed a maneuver, deciding to remove us from Verkhne-Uralsk on a decorous pretext. A few days prior to the expiration of our prison term, on May 18, 1933 we were told to surrender our correspondence, and to get our things ready. To our inquiry as to our destination, Buzikov, the warden, replied—Moscow. To the question as to the purpose of the journey, we received the answer: "Can't say. Apparently, in order to discuss the matter you raised in your declaration."

We were taken away. The isolator sent us off with the warmest wishes, but also with some doubts as to whether we were not being simply removed to another prison. Our possessions were examined, our persons were searched. We were placed in two autos, comrades Deditch and Dragutich in one, myself in the other. The machines started together, but on the road, the auto with my comrades pulled ahead, and disappeared in a cloud of dust. I never saw my comrades again. They had separated us. We rode the entire day, and toward evening we arrived in the city of Chelyabinsk. I was taken to the Chelyabinsk political prison, which held at that time from 50 to 80 people (S. R. S., social democrats, Zionists, anarchists, and a few communists).

Chelyabinsk and Hunger Strike

When I announced in the prison office that in view of the trick with regard to my alleged journey to Moscow, and my being separated from my comrades, I would immediately begin a hunger strike, the head of the Chelyabinsk isolator,

the GPU agent Dupnis told me that in that case he refused to accept me, and would send me back to Verkhne-Uralsk. Once again I was placed in an automobile and carried off. But not to Verkhne-Uralsk. They threw me into the cellar of the jail for criminals under the Chelyabinsk militia. I was locked into a damp, cold and dark cell. The electric light burned night and day. I spent three months in this cellar without ever leaving it for a minute, without even seeing the prison yard or the sun.

I immediately began my hunger strike here. I knew that my comrades were also on a hunger strike somewhere, because we had taken into consideration all the possibilities beforehand, and had planned how to meet them. We had agreed that in the event of our being separated, or being taken to some other place than Moscow, we would begin a hunger strike immediately. A G. P. U. guard was placed over me: I was enrolled under the G. P. U. in the isolator although I was being kept in the jail under the militia. On the day of my transfer from Verkhne-Uralsk to Chelyabinsk I had received a rotten meal, and I therefore began the hunger strike under inauspicious conditions. For this reason I began to vomit on the second or the third day, but afterwards I began feeling better. I did not feel hungry. When a man's consciousness is really profoundly permeated with the conviction that he must not touch food, he absolutely does not feel the pangs of hunger. He only feels weak. I had already had the experience of the great hunger strike of 1931. Of course, the hunger strike in this place was made more difficult by the cold and the dampness. Half-dressed, wrapped in a blanket I lay the whole time, night and day, on the wooden bench. On the tenth day, after midnight a group of G. P. U. agents stamped into the cell. Night time is the favorite time of the G. P. U. for its work.

A Nocturnal Visit

I was already quite spent physically, and even more so mentally. Eight days had already elapsed since my demands. Suspense tends without any answer from the G. P. U. to strain and weaken spiritual resistance more than anything else. The G. P. U. is well aware of this, and therefore makes systematic use of this weapon. When the G. P. U. agents rushed in, I was dozing, and in the semi-darkness of the cell did not at first recognize the intruders. Then I perceived that in addition to Dupnis and six G. P. U. agents, there was also present the "Commission

from Moscow", the representatives of the collegium of the G. P. U. My old "acquaintances": citizenship Andrejev, Agranov's assistant, who is in charge of all matters relating to the persecuted communist, socialist and anarchist groups. There was also the head of the All-Union Department of Prisons under the collegium of the G. P. U., citizen Popov, whose appearance alone bespoke of his functions. The third member of the commission—the representative of the prosecutor's office—was absent, although, as I learned later, he was present on the spot in Chelyabinsk, and used to make the rounds of the isolator during the day, together with Andrejev and Popov.

The Execution of the Poles

But inasmuch as my case, coupled with what the commission had to tell me, was such a shocking instance of lawlessness, such a cynical breach of even formal rights and proletarian morals, the prosecutor's office decided, quite reasonably, that it should best be done "without its knowledge". All the more so since the representative of the prosecutor's office was himself a foreign communist, a former Polish worker. One should imagine that this former Polish worker is today already so "Stalinized" as to be able to now assume upon himself quite openly and brazenly what he undertook only shamelessly in 1933. That is to say, unless he happened to be among those fifty important Polish communists who were recently shot in Russia without a trial, upon the unverified and all-embracing charge of "Pilsudskism, espionage and provocation. (In the opinion of the most competent and authoritative representatives of the Polish labor movement, the great majority of the executed, among them a former deputy to the Polish Sejm, were above all suspicion; and that upon investigation, any impartial international committee would have provided criminal light-mindedness on the part of the Soviet ruling organs, if not something worse.

In the eyes of the present Stalinist leadership, which is conducting a nationalist policy, every Pole and German must be held suspect, if not directly considered as a "spy". I am personally inclined to consider this psychology as the underlying reason for the monstrous crime of shooting fifty Polish communists. Being somewhat acquainted with the department and methods of the G. P. U. I can say with certainty that it would not be so bad if among the executed there were ten or even five real agents of Pilsudsky.

"Citizen Ciliga", said Dupnis, "the representatives of the collegium have something to communicate to you."

"Well, what is it?" I said rubbing my eyes, fumbling for my glasses, and half-raising myself on the bench.

"Citizen Ciliga", continued citizenship Andrejev, "I have the following to communicate to you: the collegium of the G. P. U. and the C. E. C. of the U. S. S. R. have rejected your demand for permission to depart from the U. S. S. R. . . . By the order of the collegium of the G. P. U. your prison term has been extended for an additional two years. . . . The G. P. U. refuses to recognize your hunger strike and beginning tomorrow you will be fed artificially. . . ."

"The question of the hunger strike and of artificial feeding has already become a secondary question", I began coldly and deliberately. In answer to the unheard-of decision of the G. P. U. and of the Soviet Government, and the refusal to allow me to return home although I have already served the prison sentence which you yourselves imposed upon me in 1930, to the automatic addition of a new prison term which transforms me into your perpetual slave and captive. I will resort to the extreme measure left me—suicide. If necessary let my death be the price paid for informing the foreign proletariat into what a position you put those foreign revolutionists who refuse to become your lackeys. I will also inform Moscow of my decision."

"A man who decides to commit suicide does not give notice of it," objected citizenship Andrejev. "Yes", I said smiling at her, "you would like to see me dead, provided you do not bear any responsibility for it. I am engaged in a political struggle against you, and you bear full political responsibility for everything you have done and will do to me and my comrades. My official declaration is precisely intended to place the responsibility upon you in the event of my protest-suicide."

"We Will Not Permit. . ."

If the death could have been hushed up, the GPU would have not at all feared my demise, whether by suicide, firing squad, or as a result of an "unfortunate incident". But after our declarations in the Verkhne-Uralsk isolator, and after the declaration of the Elder of the collective of the imprisoned com-

munist, our fate could not be kept secret any longer. This imposed upon the GPU the necessity of employing more cautious tactics.

"We will not permit you to commit suicide," said citizenship Andrejev. "We will assign two GPU agents to your cell, and all your things will be immediately removed."

And she proceeded to issue the necessary orders. I was left only with a few toilet articles. But in them was secreted a new sharp blade, already smuggled out of the isolator. . . . I was triumphant. I came to "that", I would show them. . . . For this reason I told citizenship Andrejev ironically that a man who finds it necessary to do away with himself would not be restrained either by soldiers or any other obstacle.

The next morning I sent a telegram to the Moscow collegium of the GPU and the C. E. C. of the U. S. S. R. containing a declaration similar to the one I had made to Andrejev.

No attempt was made to feed me artificially, but instead I was officially told the following:

An "Official" Decree

"The Political Bureau of the C. P. of Yugoslavia has passed a resolution approving the decision of the GPU to extend your term of imprisonment. This decision of the Political Bureau of the Yugoslav Communist Party will be given to you in writing."

"This is not my Political Bureau," I interrupted the orator. "These are your manekins and their decisions are not binding upon me. I do not recognize this Political Bureau. I do not belong to any of your communist parties, nor have I any intention of belonging to them. Therefore I do not recognize their discipline and refuse to submit to it."

Four days later, Dupnis appeared and informed me that a telegram had arrived from Moscow stating that the additional two year prison term had been changed to three years exile in Irkutsk.

"Irkutsk is a large city not like Chelyabinsk, and you will be able to arrange there the matter of your departure more quickly," the head of the Chelyabinsk political prison diplomatized.

A New Columbus Itinerary

"You mean to say that since Columbus' route from the Mediterranean to India was via America, therefore my itinerary from the Urals to Europe is via Irkutsk and Kamchatka," I said to him in a similar tone. "But no," I said. "I want to go from the Urals due West to Europe. Taking into consideration the withdrawal of an additional prison term, I withdraw the question of the protest-suicide. But I continue with the hunger strike for permission to depart home to Europe."

This occurred on the 14th day of the hunger strike. I struck for 9 more days. Again Dupnis arrived, and told me that a new telegram was received from Moscow with instructions for me to go there. I demanded that I be given an official written notice to this effect, otherwise I would continue the hunger strike. Within half an hour the written statement I had demanded was delivered.

I called the hunger strike off; and in two weeks I was over its effects. (Dupnis really fed me quite well. He obviously thought that he was thus fulfilling his "revolutionary and international" duty; and, besides, he was trying to "bribe" me so that I would agree to depart for exile.)

Still, I was not taken to Moscow. I became nervous again. Finally I learned the answer. The typist "had made a mistake". The communication from Moscow, it seems, read that I would be called, and not that I am being called there. A couple of days later, I was told that I must leave for Irkutsk.

En Route to Irkutsk

I declared a hunger strike. After these abominations, the question of the protest-suicide was again on the order of the day. But a few days later, shortly after I began the strike, again in the middle of the night, a group of GPU agents burst into my cell and informed me of the decision to remove me to exile by force. They packed my things, loaded them into an auto, shoved me in, and drove to the Chelyabinsk railway station. Thus, toward the end of July, accompanied by a convoy of four GPU agents I was taken to Irkutsk.

What to do? After pondering a while, I decided that the first stage of my struggle for departure must be considered as closed. The battle would have to be resumed in exile, after I had gathered and utilized all the possibilities it offered. Having made this decision, I called off the hunger strike and began to take note of everything new around me. For the first time after three years segregation from society, from life, I was on a train, "among human beings"

(To Be Continued)

MARCH OF EVENTS

By JACK WEBER

Decline of the British Empire

Of all the great powers Britain is today the most vulnerable, the one that has most to fear from the inevitable changes that an unstable capitalism will bring forth. The end of Great Britain's world domination was foreshadowed even before the war, with the rise of those colossal industrial rivals, the United States and Germany. The World War and the changes wrought since have emphasized the processes of decay rotting the foundations of Empire—and simultaneously threatening the very existence of the capitalist system as a whole. Viewed from any criterion of imperialist power—the decline of its capital export, the loss of naval supremacy, the threat of the new weapons of warfare that shift England's "boundaries" from the Channel to the Rhine, the economic development of the colonies with the creation of a colonial proletariat capable of leading the movement for independence, the internal economic crisis at home—Britannia feels the sceptre slipping from her grasp.

Threatened in every direction and on every front, British imperialism is engaged in utilizing every means to stave off the evil day, to prolong its rule and with this rule the entire system of exploitation at home and colonial oppression abroad. Under these circumstances, it becomes the task and the duty of the class conscious workers to utilize every means to strengthen their forces and their organization, to unite the struggle of the British proletariat and the oppressed masses in the colonies so as to prepare to wrest power from their brutal imperialist masters. Otherwise the fragments of empire can only fall into the greedy hands of other imperialist powers, even more powerful than the present rulers and the masses now under the British whip will suffer new lashes from the new slave-drivers.

RADEK AND CONSERVATION OF THE EMPIRE

Radek, playing the Stalinist game, proposes to advise the English bourgeoisie in their frantic efforts at self-preservation as a ruling class. This is the inevitable outcome of a policy which places sole reliance on imperialist combinations to maintain the status quo. To the Stalinist bureaucracy that status quo includes the one concern that lies nearest to their heart's desire, the maintenance of their own uncontrolled power in the Soviet Union. If the British bourgeoisie feel keenly the threat to their power in any major disturbance of the present world relation of forces, the Stalinists are no less

chilled to the marrow by the specter of future wars—and revolutions. Tremendous unleashed mass forces, even when aimed at capitalist overthrow, are not to the liking of men whose sole claim to power rests on the stifling of mass forces.

Writing in "Current History" on "Britain's Way in World Politics," Radek bids the "wiser" conservatives in England to take the better of two courses in order to safeguard their system. At the present time the ruling section of the bourgeoisie is playing the game of balance of power once more. In order to preserve the empire intact, and yet allow for the expansion of a stranglehold Germany, the Tories propose to tie Germany's hands in the West and permit Hitler complete freedom in the East. Britain proposes to survive at the expense of the Soviet Union. This is a time-honored policy of "perfidious Albion,"—to make a deal with a possible aggressor at the expense of other powers. How does Radek propose to bring about a change of heart among the slave-drivers? By addressing himself to those "conservatives" who are shrewder and hope to preserve the status quo by means of "collective security" through the League of Nations. Radek warns that any breach of peace, despite any hope of the English that they can remain isolated and become the source of supplies for a warring Germany, can only result in a general world-wide war which would threaten the entire structure of the Empire. Far better for them to rely, in accordance with the sentiment of the British masses, on that preserver of peace, the League. And please note, my English friends, says Radek, if war should nevertheless break out, you would through this policy obtain the whole-hearted support of your masses.

"But if war becomes inevitable owing to the imperialist policy of Japan, Germany and Italy (not France or Great Britain, of course!) then the British masses, as was shown by the trade union congress and the Labor Party, will be all for the defensive measures adopted by the League (!!). Particularly since the entry of the Soviet Union into the League, those masses see in the League a guarantee that defense against German, Italian and Japanese aggression will not degenerate into a policy of imperialist deals at the expense of other peoples."

In other words, Radek promises to cover British imperialism with the mantle of the Soviet Union if Britain will turn away from Germany. With the aid of Stalin, the masses will be led into thinking that defense of the empire is "defense of peace in general."

British Imperialism Faces Dilemma As Line - Up in Europe Changes

By MAURICE SPECTOR

Galvanized by the Blackshirt successes in Ethiopia, British moral indignation is running high. At the League Council, Anthony Eden virtuously denouncing the bombings and use of poison gas, called for the application of fresh sanctions. But if we refrain from boiling over in sympathy, it is because our memory has not failed us. It is fairly modern history that British bombers, and under a "Labor" Government, persuaded Irak villagers to pay their back taxes more promptly. Less than a year ago, British planes rained bombs on the restless natives of India's North-Western Frontier. . . . Lulled for a time by the habitual miscalculations of the military experts who dwell soothingly on impossible terrain and coming rains, the British moral sense received and gave full bay with the Italian capture of Dessive.

But when it met, the dearly beloved League did little else than cluck its tongue and register its own failure. What sanctions have been imposed doubtless created economic difficulties for the Fascist regime, and depleted its gold reserves. But they have not brought about its collapse. On the contrary, Mussolini has been able to turn the sanctions policy of the League (read English) to his own advantage. This he has done by picturing Italy as a poor "proletarian" state whose road to a place in the sun was being barred by the fat imperialist powers. Incidentally statistics of the value of Italian imports and exports for the first four months after sanctions "went into effect" reveal that the USSR of Stalin actually increased its trade with Italy. We should be interested to have an explanation of this phenomenon from the Daily Worker or the League Against War and Fascism.

British Cabinet Quarrel

The British Cabinet is in a quandary. The gorged Empire is caught between the pincers of more dynamic imperialisms in the East and West. The Italian conquest of Ethiopia would spell more than merely a diplomatic defeat of Eden. Mussolini would bestir the Mediterranean and challenge the British pickings in Egypt, Palestine and the Near East generally. It is this

realization that shifts British attention swiftly from the banks of the Rhine to the headwaters of the Nile.

An Anglo-French alliance would bring the Italian upstart's threat to the Empire and its communications, to a halt. But the price that Baldwin-Eden would have to pay—sanctions and military action against Germany—is so high and the consequences so perilous, that British policy is momentarily in a state of confusion. The ideal and traditional British course is to hold the scales of the balance of power, to act as conciliator. This policy is harder to apply when the Channel has ceased to be the effective barrier to an attack from the continent. This is what Baldwin meant when he talked of the British frontier now being on the Rhine.

The Pro-German Orientation

The Cabinet is prepared to give the French General Staff the required guarantees against a German invasion of either Belgium or France. But the section of the Cabinet which is hostile to Eden's pro-French orientation, and sympathetic to Hitler's offer of a twenty-five year truce, points out that France is tied up with pacts in the East, (USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia). They ask why Great Britain should be involved in a war, or the defence of France in the West, which would be precipitated by French commitments to her Allies in the East.

The politicians of this viewpoint reason that Hitler is no longer as isolated as he was a couple of years ago, and that Germany must be afforded a safety-valve for expansion, which is not at the expense of the British Empire or of the status quo in the West. The British desire to reduce the specific gravity of French supremacy on the continent facilitated German rearmament. That altered the whole political landscape and the impending fortification of the Rhineland further enhances Nazi power.

The smaller states now within the orbit of French protection will have to reconsider their position when French forces will likely find themselves immobilized by German rearmament on the Rhine. Rumania and Yugoslavia have already given clear indications of dissatisfaction;

others may follow. . . . The great political risk of giving Germany a free hand in the East is, however, that a challenge to British interests would follow at a later stage.

These pre-occupations of British Imperialism, the most vocal recent supporter of the League, strikingly manifest the humbug of the sanctions policy as a means of struggle against imperialism. The usefulness of the sanctions argument so far has been limited to lining up the liberals, social-democrats and Stalinists to fight for the interests of British or French imperialism against German or Italian imperialism, under the somewhat tarnished banner of the struggle to preserve democracy.

"Power Politics"

The "Nations" and "New Republics" are all engaged intoning that "collective security goes, power politics return. . . . If international law is to be effective, agreements must be uniformly respected." These liberal formulas are among the great contemporary "democratic" lies. Power politics, the politics of imperialism, of the struggle for markets, have never ceased to rule since the peace of Versailles. Or are we to be treated to a fresh dose of Wilsonian diplomacy. When did this "collective security" come in? The liberal twaddle about warring "political ideals" and "international law" only serves to obscure the basic causes of the imperialist struggle.

The greatest of all crimes is that committed by the leaders of the Second and Third Internationals who have turned their organizations into official supporters of the aims and slogans of such "democratic" imperialism as the British or French. But their struggle against Fascism and War was always shadow-boxing.

Neither war nor fascism can be overthrown without a revolutionary struggle against the capitalist-imperialist order that breeds them. The most powerful force for the destruction of both Hitler and Mussolini, and for the creation of the Soviet United States of Europe, would be the French Revolution. That, and not the Popular Front of class peace.

NEW MILITANT

with which is merged
THE MILITANT

Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co., 100 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C.
Entered as second class mail matter at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

JAMES P. CANNON: Editor

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

Vol. 2, No. 16 (Whole No. 68)
SATURDAY, APRIL 25, 1936

BOOKS

OPENING SPECIALS

Until April 31 the LABOR BOOK SHOP is offering special low prices on hundreds of books and pamphlets. Visit our shop or send postcard for booklist. Open every day (except Sunday) from 9 A.M. to 9 P.M.

WHAT:	Published Price	Our Price
Why We Fought—by C. H. Harker—Grattan.....	2.50	\$.49
ECONOMICS:		
Decline of American Capitalism—by L. Corey.....	4.00	3.00
The Power Age—by Walter N. Polakov.....	2.00	.69
Crisis of Capitalism in America—by M. J. Bom.....	2.00	.35
The American Adventure—by M. J. Bom.....	2.50	.35
LABOR HISTORY:		
Labor Movement in the U.S. (1839-1895)—by Norman J. Ware.....	3.00	.69
SOCIAL DEMOCRACY:		
Memoirs of Scheidemann (2 Vols.).....	10.00	1.95
FRENCH REVOLUTION:		
French Revolution—by Albert Mathiez.....	3.00	1.69
After Robespierre: The Thermidorian Reaction.....	2.75	1.09
Special Combination Price for Both.....		2.50
LEON TROTSKY:		
In Defense of Terrorism (with new introduction by author—1935).....	English	1.25
My Life.....	5.00	2.50
ON GERMAN FASCISM:		
What Next? (65c); Only Road (65c); cloth bound.....	Special Price for both	.98
BOUND VOLUMES OF NEW MILITANT:		
1933.....	Reg. Price \$1.50; Our Price \$1.00	
1934.....	Reg. Price 1.50; Our Price 1.00	

And hundreds of other books and pamphlets of all publishers at reduced prices during the sale.

LABOR BOOK SHOP
28 East 12th Street, New York City Near University Place
Tel. STuyvesant 9-0567

France at the Crossroads

In Lieu of an Introduction to the Second Edition of
"In Defense of Terrorism"
By LEON TROTSKY

Editor's Note: Following is an excerpt from the third section of Leon Trotsky's work, "Whither France," which is to be published in book form by Pioneer Publishers. Only the second section of "Whither France" has been published in the English language, in The New Internationalist.

This book is devoted to the elucidation of the methods of the revolutionary policies of the proletariat in our epoch. The presentation is polemical in nature, like the revolutionary policy itself. Once the masses have been won, the polemic against the ruling class turns, at a certain stage, into revolution.

Revolutionary policy has its theoretical basis in a clear understanding of the class nature of modern society, of its state, its laws, and its ideology. The bourgeoisie organizes with abstractions ("nation," "fatherland," "democracy") in order to cover up thereby the exploiting character of its rule. **Le Temps**, one of the most vernal newspapers on the terrestrial globe, gives daily instructions to the popular masses of France in patriotism and altruism. Meanwhile, it is a secret to nobody that the altruism of **Le Temps** itself is on the market at fixed international rates.

The first step of revolutionary politics is the exposure of bourgeois fictions which poison the consciousness of the masses. These fictions acquire a particularly malignant character when amalgamated with the ideas of "socialism" and "revolution." Today, more than ever before, the tone in the workers' organizations of France is being set by the manufacturers of such amalgams.

Between Editions

The first edition of this book played a certain role in the formative stage of the French Communist Party. At that considerable evidence of this came to the author's notice, and, incidentally, it is not difficult to find traces of it in **L'Humanite** up to the year 1924. During the twelve years that have since elapsed, a radical revaluation of values took place in the Communist International—after a number of feverish zigzags. Suffice to mention that this work is listed today among the proscribed books. In their ideas and methods, the present leaders of the French Communist Party (we are compelled to retain this name which is in complete variance with reality) do not differ in any principle from Kautsky, against whom our work was originally directed. They are only infinitely more ignorant and cynical.

The relapse into reformism and patriotism that Cachin and Co. are now living through might itself have served as a sufficient justification for a new edition of this book. However, more serious motives exist: they are rooted in the profound pre-revolutionary crisis which is convulsing the regime of the Third Republic.

A Significant Incident

For a lapse of 18 years, the author of this book has had the occasion to spend two years in France (1923-1925); to be sure, only as an observer in the provinces, who, moreover, found himself under constant police surveillance. During this time, in the Isere Department, where the writer had to live, a minor and quite banal routine episode occurred, which however, provides the key to French politics as a whole.

In a hospital, owned by the **Comite des Forges**, (steel trust—ed) a young worker, about to undergo a serious operation, took the liberty to read the revolutionary press (or, to be more precise, the press which he innocently accepted as revolutionary, namely: **L'Humanite**). The hospital put an ultimatum to the careless patient, and later, to four others who shared his sympathies: either they renounce receiving the undesirable publications or they would be immediately thrown out into the street. Of course it availed the patients nothing to argue that clerical-reactionary propaganda was being carried on quite openly in the hospital. Inasmuch as only ordinary workers were concerned, who had to risk neither mandates as deputies nor ministerial portfolios, but only their health and lives, the ultimatum had no effect. Five sick men, one of whom was scheduled for an operation, were ejected from the hospital. Grenoble at that time was a socialist municipality, headed by Doctor Martin, one of those conservative bourgeois, who generally set the tone in the Socialist Party, and whose consummate representative is Leon Blum.

The ejected workers tried to find a defender in the Mayor. In vain. Despite all entreaties, letters, and intercessions they failed to obtain an interview. They then turned to the local left newspaper "Depeche", in which Radicals and Socialists compose an indivisible cartel. Upon learning that the matter involved the hospital of **Comite des Forges**,

the director of the newspaper refused point-blank to intervene: anything you heart desires, except that! For, a previous indiscretion in connection with this mighty organization, "Depeche" had already been deprived of an advertisement, and suffered a loss of 20,000 francs. In contrast to the proletarians, the director of the "left" newspaper like the mayor stood to lose something. They therefore refused to engage in an unequal struggle, leaving the workers with their diseased intestines and kidneys to their fate.

A "Democratic Republic"

Once every week or every fortnight, the socialist mayor disturbs the dim recollections of his youth by delivering a speech about the superiorities of socialism over capitalism. During elections, "Depeche" supports the mayor and his party. Everything is in order. **Comite des Forges** maintains an attitude of liberal tolerance towards socialism of this sort, which does not harm in the least the material interests of capitalism. By means of an advertisement of 20,000 francs per year (so cheaply are these gentlemen priced!), the feudalists of the heavy industry and banks keep a large cartel newspaper in actual subjection. And not the newspaper alone. **Comite des Forges** apparently has arguments, both direct and indirect, weighty enough for Messrs. Mayors, Senators, Deputies, including the Socialists. Entire official France is under the dictatorship of finance capital. In the **La Rousse** dictionary this system is called a "democratic republic".

It seemed to the Messrs. left deputies and journalists not only in the Isere, but in all the departments of France that there would be no end to their peaceful cohabitation with capitalist reaction. They were mistaken. Long corroded by dry rot, democracy suddenly felt the barrel of a gun at its temple. Just as the states, laying bare the vain and illogical fact—brought about a real armament of Hitler—a coarse upheaval in the relations between the two nations of the so-called "international law", just so did the arming of the gangs of Colonel de la Rocque result in convulsing the internal relations of France, compelling all parties without exception to reform their ranks, assume a different coloration, and effect regroupments.

Friedrich Engels once wrote that the state, including the democratic republic, consists of detachments of armed men in defense of property; everything else serves only to embellish or camouflage this fact. Eloquent champions of "Law" like Herriot or Blum always became incensed at such cynicism. But both Hitler, and de la Rocque, each in his own domain, have once again demonstrated that Engels was correct.

More Vital than Statistics

Early in 1934, Daladier was the Minister-in-Chief by will of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage: he went around carrying national sovereignty in his pocket alongside of his handkerchief. But the moment that the detachments of de la Rocque, Maurras and Co. showed that they dared to shoot and to slash the tendons of the police horses, sovereign Daladier surrendered his post to a political invalid who was designated by the leaders of the armed detachments. This fact is of considerably greater importance than all the electoral statistics, and it cannot be erased from the pages of the most recent history of France, for it forecasts the future.

Assuredly, the course of the political life of a country cannot be altered by every group armed with revolvers, at any time. Only those armed detachments which are the organs of specific classes can play a decisive role under certain conditions. Colonel de la Rocque and his henchmen seek to insure "law and order" against convulsions. And inasmuch as law and order in France signify the rule of finance capital over the middle and petty bourgeoisie, and the rule of the bourgeoisie as a whole over the proletariat and the social strata closest to it, the detachments of de la Rocque are simply the armed pickets of finance capital.

Two Agencies of Finance-Capital
This idea is not new. One can often run across it even in the pages of **Le Populaire** and **L'Humanite**, although, of course, they were not the original formulators of it. These publications, however, speak only half of the truth. The second and equally important half consists in the fact that Herriot and Daladier with their followers are also an agency of finance capital; otherwise the Radicals could not have been the ruling party in France for a period of decades.

If we are not to play the game of hide and seek, we must say that de la Rocque and Daladier both serve one and the same master. This does not mean to say that either they themselves or their methods are identical. Quite the contrary. They fiercely war against each other, like two specialized agencies each of whom has its own special secret of salvation. Daladier promises to maintain order through the exercise of the self-same tri-color democracy. De la Rocque holds that outlived parliamentarianism must be swept away and replaced by an open military police dictatorship. The political methods are antagonistic but the social aims they serve are identical.

The Decline of Capitalism

The historical basis of the antagonism between de la Rocque and Daladier—we use these names merely for the sake of simplicity in our presentation—is the decline of the capitalist system, its incurable crisis, its decay. Despite the constant triumphs of technology and the explosive successes achieved by individual branches of industry, capitalism as a whole is a

brake upon the development of the productive forces, engendering an extreme instability in social and international relations. Parliamentary democracy is indissolubly bound up with the epoch of free competition and free international trade. The bourgeoisie was able to tolerate the freedom of strikes, of assembly and of the press only so long as the productive forces were mounting upwards, so long as the sales markets were being extended, the welfare of the popular masses, even if only partially, was rising and the capitalist nations were able to live and let live.

It is otherwise now. If we exclude the Soviet Union, the imperialist epoch is characterized by the stagnation or decline of the national income, a chronic agrarian crisis and organic unemployment. These phenomena pertain internally to the present phase of capitalism just as gout and arterio-sclerosis pertain to certain ages of man. To explain the world economic chaos by the consequences of the last war is to lay bare a hopeless superficiality in the spirit of Cailaux, Comte Sforza and the like. The war itself was nothing else than an attempt on the part of capitalist countries to unload the already impending crash upon the backs of the enemy. The attempt failed. The war only deepened the manifestations of collapse, which in its subsequent development prepares a new war.

Social Disintegration in France
Bad as French economic statistics are, though they deliberately evade the problems of class contradictions, even these statistics are unable to cover up the manifestations of a direct social disintegration. Amid the general decline of the national income, amid the truly horrifying fall in the income of the peasants, amid the ruin of the little men in the cities and the growth of unemployment, the gigantic enterprises with a turn-over above 100-200 millions a year are doing a brilliant business. Finance capital is sucking the lifeblood from the veins of the French people, in the full sense of the term. Such is the social basis for the ideology and politics of "national unity".

Mitigations and flickers of better times are possible in the process of decline; they are even inevitable. They remain, however, purely conjunctural in character. The general tendency of our epoch imperiously drives France, in the wake of a number of other countries, to the alternative: either the proletariat must overthrow the utterly decayed bourgeois order, or capitalism, in the interests of self-preservation, must replace democracy with Fascism. How long can Fascism last? The answer to this question will be provided by the fate of Mussolini and Hitler.

The Fascists fired their guns on February 6, 1934 upon the direct orders of the Bourse, the banks and the trusts. From the self-same ruling summits, Daladier received the instruction to hand over power to Doumergue. And if the Radical Premier capitulated—with the pusillanimity that is generally characteristic in other words: sovereign Daladier surrendered power to Doumergue for the self-same reason: the Radical Premier recognized his own master in the gangs of de la Rocque, the director of "Depeche" and the Mayor of Grenoble refused to expose the abominable cruelty of the agents of **Comite des Forges**.

An Unsolved Question
The transition from democracy to Fascism carries with it, however, the danger of social upheavals. Thence arise the tactical vacillations and differences among the summits of the bourgeoisie. All the magnates of capital are in favor of further strengthening the armed detachments, which can serve as safety reserves in the hour of danger. But what place should be allotted to these detachments even today? Should they be permitted immediately to assume the offensive or should they still be held in reserve as a threat?—These questions remain unsolved as yet.

Finance capital no longer believes in the ability of the Radicals to lead the petty bourgeois masses behind them, and by means of the pressure exercised by these masses to restrain the proletariat within the framework of "democratic" discipline. But finance capital is likewise uncertain of the ability of the Fascist organizations, which still lack a real mass base, to seize power and establish firm order.

An Unstable Situation
The behind-the-scenes leaders have been instilled with the need for caution not by parliamentary rhetoric, but by the rage of the workers, by the attempt of the General Strike, which, to be sure, was stifled at its very inception by the bureaucracy of Jouhaux, and, later by the local uprisings (Toulon, Brest, . . .). A slight curb was placed on the Fascists, and the Radicals breathed thus a bit easier. **Le Temps**, which had already rushed to offer its hand and heart, in a number of articles, to the "young generation" discovered anew the superior merits of a liberal regime, as the one most in harmony with French genius. Thus, the unstable, transitional, bastard regime was established, which harmonizes not with the genius of France but with the decline of the Third Republic.

What stands out most sharply in this regime are its Bonapartist traits: the independence of power from parties and programs, the liquidation of the parliamentary legislation by means of emergency powers, the rising of the Government in the guise of an "arbitrator" above the struggling camps, i.e. factually above the nation. The Ministries of Doumergue, Flaudin, Laval, all three with the invariable participation of the compromised and abject Radicals, represented minor variations of one and the same theme.

Leon Blum's Wisdom

Upon the inauguration of the Sarraut ministry, Leon Blum, whose perspicacity possesses two dimensions instead of three, proclaimed that: "The final effects of February 6th have been destroyed on the parliamentary plane" (**Le Populaire**, Feb. 2, 1936). This is commonly known as cleaning the shadow of a carriage with the shadow of a brush. As if it is possible, in general, to abolish "on the parliamentary plane" the pressure of the armed detachments of finance capital! As if Sarraut can escape feeling this pressure and not quake before it! In point of fact, the Sarraut-Flaudin Government represents another variation of the self-same semi-parliamentary "Bonapartism", only somewhat inclined to the "left". Sarraut, himself, in replying to the charge of his having resorted to arbitrary measures, gave the Chamber the best answer possible. Said Sarraut: "If my measures are arbitrary, it is because I aim to be an arbitrator. This aphorism would not have sounded badly even on the lips of Napoleon III. Sarraut feels himself to be not the plenipotentiary of a certain party or a bloc of parties in power, as is proper in accordance with the rules of parliamentarianism, but an arbitrator over classes and parties, as is in accordance with the laws of Bonapartism.

ors, Whitaker will have another obstacle to overcome in proving that the Modern Democrats were Communists.
Hot in pursuit of the reds, Whitaker questioned Jensen closely about the finances of the local Committee for the Defense of Civil Liberties in Tampa of which Jensen is treasurer. A subpoena was issued for the books of the committee, but Jensen will probably refuse to turn them over to Whitaker because it will mean that those who gave money to fight Klan terrorism will become marked victims of it.

Hot in pursuit of the reds, Whitaker questioned Jensen closely about the finances of the local Committee for the Defense of Civil Liberties in Tampa of which Jensen is treasurer. A subpoena was issued for the books of the committee, but Jensen will probably refuse to turn them over to Whitaker because it will mean that those who gave money to fight Klan terrorism will become marked victims of it.

Hot in pursuit of the reds, Whitaker questioned Jensen closely about the finances of the local Committee for the Defense of Civil Liberties in Tampa of which Jensen is treasurer. A subpoena was issued for the books of the committee, but Jensen will probably refuse to turn them over to Whitaker because it will mean that those who gave money to fight Klan terrorism will become marked victims of it.

Hot in pursuit of the reds, Whitaker questioned Jensen closely about the finances of the local Committee for the Defense of Civil Liberties in Tampa of which Jensen is treasurer. A subpoena was issued for the books of the committee, but Jensen will probably refuse to turn them over to Whitaker because it will mean that those who gave money to fight Klan terrorism will become marked victims of it.

General Strike Marks New Left Trend in Spain

Azana Directs Shafts at "Communism" in Reply to Provocation from Fascists But Workers Action Makes Them Run for Cover

By ALFREDO ROJAS

The extraordinarily successful 24-hour general strike in Madrid on Friday, April 17, called in protest against Fascist murders and attacks on workers, is the most significant event since the February 16 election. It has thrown back the rising tide of rightist moves. Its full significance can only be understood when one realizes that it came, suddenly, after a period of proletarian retreat and growing asphyxiation by the rightists.

Premier Azana's speeches in the Cortes have been a sensitive barometer of the move to the right. Six weeks after the masses had pushed him into power, Azana gave a speech which was hailed by the Catholics and Monarchists (reported in the **NEW MILITANT**, April 11). The Communist Party hailed his speech, and even the "left" Socialist, Largo Caballero, contented himself with being cautiously non-committal. Azana became more bold, and called off the municipal elections scheduled for April 12. The proletarian parties submitted. On April 15, with many economic strikes going on in all parts of Spain, the rightist deputies called upon the government to put an end to "the state of anarchy." "The troublemakers and fomenters will be exterminated," answered cabinet minister Salvador, on behalf of the government.

Robles Threat of Civil War

The farthest right was achieved the same day by Azana himself. Under the guise of interpellating the government as to what measures were being taken to stop disorder, Gil Robles, Catholic chief of the rightist forces, delivered a threat of civil war. "The civil war, if it breaks out, will be caused by the government's negligence. We declare now, that it is preferable to die fighting in the streets than to wait in our homes to be assassinated by our enemies." Spain, declared Gil Robles—who was only thwarted from creating a Fascist regime by the revolt of Asturias in October, 1934—is divided into two camps and the hostile actions against the rightists are intolerable and will inevitably end in civil war.

What was Azana's answer to this threat? Did the "Man of the Republic" pillory the rightists for refusing to abide by the democratic results of the February elections? Not at all! Azana's "answer" was a rabid attack on revolutionary Marxism.

Azana Attacks Communism

"Communism," shouted Azana, "would signify the death of Spain!" He sharply denied that his government was permitting the gradual implanting of revolutionary Marxism. The government will work incessantly to maintain order, "revising, if necessary, the whole system of defense, in order to put an end to the reign of violence."

The socialists and communists remained silent when Azana finished, but the left republicans, the center and the right, cheered him noisily. Deputy Ventosa, spokesman of the rightist Catalan League, declared that Azana "is the only man capable of offering the country security and defense of all legal rights."

Yet, on the vote of confidence the next day, the socialists and communists voted for Azana! So, too, did many rightists. This was the atmosphere on the very eve of the general strike. So emboldened were the rightists, in fact, that while the proletarian deputies were voting for Azana, young Fascists in Madrid were joined by officers of the Civil Guard in a revolver attack on workers who shouted replies against the "Vive el fascismo" of a funeral cortege of an army officer. But this provocation—the workers fought back and killed four fascists—proved to be the turning point.

The General Strike

The next day came the general strike. Despite the fact that it was called by the anarchist-controlled Confederation of Labor without any attempt to secure united action from the Socialist-controlled U. G. T., the strike met with powerful responses. Early in the day the "whole commercial life of the capital was completely paralyzed", according to the Associated Press. Though the workers of Madrid are largely in the Socialist unions, and though they have always ignored the usually ill-prepared and irresponsible strike calls of the anarchists, proletarian Madrid came out on the streets.

The splendid response of the masses demonstrated the bankruptcy of the policy of the Socialists and Communists, who had not even attacked Azana, let alone considered a protest strike. Late in the day, they came out in support of the strike and secured an agreement with the anarchists to limit it to twenty-four hours. (The anarchists, as usual, set no time-limit to the protest.)

Azana Compelled to Act

Before the strike was over, Azana had promised to take steps against

the fascist provocations. The Civil Guards who had participated in the firing on the workers were arrested, high officers in the Guard were removed from their posts, and mass arrests of Fascists took place in many cities, and in one or two the officials of the Catholic and Monarchist parties were also arrested and jailed. The Cortes remained in session throughout the night of the general strike, passing a law prohibiting all army officers, including retired, from participating in politics.

The recent experiences in France demonstrate, however, the worthlessness of governmental measures against Fascism. No bourgeois government will seriously attempt to destroy the Fascist legions on which it may have to depend tomorrow. Only the workers' own defense forces can smash the Fascists; corps.

Far more important than the government's assurances is the inspiration that the general strike has given to the proletariat.

Over a hundred thousand workers were out on strike a few days after, according to such a hostile source as the Associated Press. The same source reports strike victories in Huelva, involving 40,000 miners and in Aleria, where a general strike forced the discharge of the government's labor officer. The government hastily sent ten million pesetas to Asturias for unemployment relief. The arrival in Gibraltar of many big landowners indicated new seizures of land by the peasantry.

Leftward Development in S. P.

Even more significant than the peasant and workers' struggles, which can have no successful issue unless led by a revolutionary party, is the latest news of leftward developments in the Socialist Party, which is by far the largest party of the masses. The Madrid organization, strongest unit of the party, has voted to seek revision of the party program at the June congress. Madrid's Socialists will present a program which adopts as its perspective the immediate struggle for proletarian dictatorship. Declaring that Spain's present crisis is not cyclical but permanent, the program declares that "the only definite solution of the national problem is revolutionary socialism," and that "in the period of the transition from capitalist society to the socialist regime, the form of government shall be a dictatorship of the proletariat with the aim of assuring the changes in social, economic and political organization and to prevent any attempts at capitalist restoration, as well as to consummate the destruction of the whole present social order."

It appears likely that this program will be adopted in June. The right and moderate wings, led by Besteiro and Indalecio Prieto, both closely identified with Azana, are fast losing ground.

If Caballero, head of the Madrid organization and chief of the U. G. T. were to take this program seriously, the first step would be repudiation of the "Popular Front" alliance with Azana. Dispatches early this week indicated that the U. G. T. would make the break by insisting on voting for Socialist candidates in the presidential election on April 26, instead of voting for a bourgeois-republican as Azana insists. According to the A. P., however, Caballero has agreed to support Don Alvaro Albornoz, bourgeois-republican candidate. If this is true, the Socialists will have no opportunity of estimating their strength among the masses by the outcome of Sunday's election.

Announce New Lecture Series

"Trotskyism or Stalinism?"—this is the general theme of a special lecture organized by the New York District of the Workers Party, to be held on Sunday, May 17. The speaker, Max Shachtman, who is well-known to New York labor audiences, will deal in his lecture principally with the struggle between the two tendencies, one led by Trotsky and the other by Stalin, in the period between the rise of the Left Opposition and its expulsion from the Communist International at the end of 1927. This will cover the struggle for party democracy, the dispute around the British general strike and the Chinese Revolution, industrialization and collectivization in the Soviet Union, etc., etc., together with the famous "Third Period" and the course towards nationalist degeneration which followed it.

The lecture will be held in the Irving Plaza hall, 15th Street and Irving Place. Admission will be followed by questions and discussion from the floor. Further details about it will be contained in coming issues of the **NEW MILITANT**.

Red Scare Is Raised in Tampa

(Continued from Page 1)

struction days which make it a felony to incite an insurrection. On the basis of this statute, he intends to establish that the advocacy of communism is a felony.

He will then try to prove that the Modern Democrats were Communists and that the police therefore had a right to arrest them. With the arrests justified and with Penland painted as a red seeking to destroy the home, the church and white supremacy, Whitaker can rely on the normal prejudices of the jury to take care of the kidnapping indictment.

Whitaker used this approach with Charles E. Jensen, State Secretary of the Socialist Party of Florida and first witness for the prosecution. Jensen, one of the six arrested in the raid, told a damaging story which could not be altered in the slightest detail by Whitaker's tricky cross-examination.

The defense attorney then began a series of questions about the mimeograph machine Jensen had used to run off copies of the program of the Modern Democrats. It devel-

oped that Jensen had loaned the machine to your correspondent, the present writer, who is covering the trial for The Nation, the Milwaukee Leader and a group of labor papers. From then on, Sidney Hertzberg became the defendant.

Whitaker's Mysterious Evidence
Whitaker claimed to have mysterious evidence that this writer was in reality the correspondent for the Daily Worker, that he was a Communist; that he might be cranking out secret instructions on the mimeograph machine for an armed uprising. Jensen, he was sure, must be a Communist because he had loaned his mimeograph to such a person.

Despite the fact that Judge Robert T. Dewell sustained the state's constant objections, Whitaker again and again came back to the mimeograph machine and what your correspondent was doing with it.

"I Mr. Hertzberg is on trial here, let's arraign him, plead him not guilty and try him now," State Attorney J. Rex Farrior suggested. Finally, Jensen was given a chance to deny categorically that this writer was a correspondent for the Daily Worker and Whitaker stopped his play-acting. His insinuations, however, probably had their effect on the jury.

Whitaker added race prejudice to red-baiting while questioning Jensen about the setup of the Modern Democrats.

"Wasn't provision made for the affiliation of the New York civil liberties league with the Modern Democrats?" Whitaker demanded.

Lost independent state in Africa succumbs under the fire of Fascist armies. Mussolini aided by diplomatic game of Litvinov, Eden and Flaudin. League of Nations promises . . . but uses Ethiopia as a pawn of imperialist struggles. Bankruptcy of Second and Third Internationals again revealed. Questions and Discussion

ETHIOPIA BETRAYED!

SPEAKER:
MAURICE SPECTOR
Former Member E.C.C.I.
Auspices: Workers Party U.S.
New York District

Lost independent state in Africa succumbs under the fire of Fascist armies. Mussolini aided by diplomatic game of Litvinov, Eden and Flaudin. League of Nations promises . . . but uses Ethiopia as a pawn of imperialist struggles. Bankruptcy of Second and Third Internationals again revealed. Questions and Discussion

IRVING PLAZA
Irving Place & 15th St.
SUNDAY MAY 3rd