

NEW MILITANT

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

VOL. 2, NO. 18 [WHOLE NO. 70]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 9, 1936

PRICE 3 CENTS

Radicals Hold Whip Hand In French People's Front

The Meaning of the French Elections

By JOHN WEST

COLD and sober analysis is necessary in order to estimate at their true value the results of the French elections. Demagogues, liberals, and reformists are at liberty to spin out dreams and illusions; it is the business of Marxists to base their theoretical and practical conclusions on an understanding of reality. If we were to accept the Stalinist account of the French elections, we would now believe that the danger of Fascism in France has passed, that the crisis in France is in a position to be solved rapidly and tranquilly under the benign aegis of the People's Front majority. Unfortunately, we remember other Stalinist accounts of other events: We remember how, in the autumn of 1932, the decline in the Nazi vote in Germany proved to the satisfaction of the Comintern analysts that the power of Hitler was broken and would soon disappear; and how, in March, 1933, it was so stirring prophecy by these same brave augurs that Hitler could not remain in power longer than a bare six months.

A glance at the bourgeois press during the past few days might alone be enough to cause a doubt or two to begin with. The Wall Street Journal records itself as well satisfied with the outcome. The Times notes that little difficulty is to be expected from sudden changes in French foreign policy, since all of the French political parties have based their programs on solid proposals for strong national defense. The New York Evening Post, in a long editorial, notes that the elections were a great blow both at fascism "and at communism." Ludwig Lore, in his Post column, in the midst of his song of victory, pauses parenthetically to observe that the program of the People's Front is no more radical than Roosevelt's New Deal. In France itself, the "repudiated" premier, Sarraut, was so overwhelmed—as not to find it necessary even to resign.

What has changed in France? What is the significance of these elections?

Without doubt, the elections record the movement further to the left of large sections of the French proletariat and the lower peasantry. This is marked sufficiently by the spectacular increase in the Communist vote, and the substantial increase in the Socialist vote, making the representation of the latter party the largest in the new Chamber. This, in turn, is a symbol of the deeper process which has been unfolding in France during the past three years: the gradual cleavage of the French population into the two mighty divisions of the basically opposing class forces.

But, first and last in commenting upon these elections, it must be observed that the increase in the votes of the working-class parties occurred at the expense not of the Right but of the Center—of the Radical Socialist and the lesser petty-bourgeois parties. The parties of the Right, far from losing strength, actually gained more than twenty seats in the new Chamber. Thus, even on the electoral field, we find on examination that the "mighty blow to reaction" turns out to be the hallucination of bureaucratic minds: the Right emerges from the elections not weaker but stronger.

The increase in the votes of the working-class parties, as well as the increase on the Right was, then, accomplished at the expense of the parties of the Center, above all of the Radical Socialists. The Radical Socialist Party, for many years the largest parliamentary party in France, will enter the new Chamber with approximately twenty fewer representatives than the Socialist Party. Thus these elections demonstrate incontrovertibly the truth of the Marxist prediction that under the impact of the process of basic class differentiation the petty-bourgeois parties of the Center must necessarily disintegrate, their following sifting out into one class division or the other. The relations in the Chamber do not, however, indicate by any means the full extent of the disintegration of the Radical Socialists. Further evidence is provided by the fact that many of the most popular traditional leaders of the Radical Socialists—including Herriot himself—failed to secure election in the first day of voting, and were returned on the second ballot only with the support of the Communists and Socialists; and in a number of cases lost out altogether.

The disintegration of the Radical Socialists is both symbol and proof of the fact that the crisis in France is too deep to permit of solution along the customary lines of modern French politics. For decades the French bourgeoisie has maintained its social and economic dictatorship through the utilization of the Radical Socialists as its chief governmental agents. The Radical Socialist leaders, in turn, maintained the support of their mass petty-bourgeois following for French imperialism. But today the results of the profound and continuing economic depression and the approach of the new war demand a sterner answer. The alternative is posed to France: Fascism or Socialism; and the alternative is inescapable. Thus the voice of the Radical Socialist preachers of "the middle way" is lost in the rising social tumult. And their following slips out of their hands, to the right and to the left.

It is in the light of this process of differentiation that the strategy of the People's Front policy must be judged. And, so judged, it is seen to be precisely the betrayal of the revolutionary struggle which the realities of French society places on the order of the day. Nothing could make this clearer than the recent elections. The Radical Socialist Party, its policies and its leadership, stand discredited before the French masses. Its policies have led to nothing but disaster; its leaders have been openly shown to be shot through with every form of corruption and venality. And, at just the time when this is becoming apparent to the consciousness of the masses, the working-class

(Continued on page 4)

Their Aid is Vital to S. P. and C. P. Plans

Social Patriotic Policies Hold Sway in New Left Coalition

The final results of the run-offs in the French elections gave 380 seats out of a total of 618 to the parties participating in the so-called People's Front. In the old Chamber these same parties held 304 seats out of 611.

The Communist Party scored the largest and seemingly most sensational gains, adding 62 seats, and increasing its total in the Chamber to 72. The Socialist Party gained 53 seats, increasing its representation to 146, and replacing the Radical Socialists, who dropped from 151 to 116, as the largest single party in the Chamber. Of the remaining "left" parties, Paul Boncour's Socialist and Republican Union received 26 seats (losing 13); the Independent Socialists received 9 seats (a loss of 2); and the dissident communists kept the 10 seats they had in the previous Chamber.

What the Gains Mean
It should be noted that the sevenfold increase in the Communist representation does not correctly reflect the gains of this party on the electoral arena. Its popular vote was about double that of the 1932 elections. The reason for the small C. P. delegation in the old Chamber was largely due to the refusal of the Stalinists to make any sort of electoral agreements with either the Socialists or the Radicals in 1932. As a result, the vote in many cases was split three ways, to the advantage of the Right and the Center parties.

Nor is the rise of the Socialist Party to supersede the Radicals properly speaking a surprise. The French general elections have been going "left" since 1924; and in

(Continued on Page 4)

Rubber Co's Grant Wage Increases

AKRON, Ohio, May 5.—Goodyear, Firestone, and Goodrich, the three titans of the world's rubber industry, early this week announced wage increases of from five to ten percent for all production workers. It need not be imagined that these increases came from the compassionate hearts of the rubber barons whose capacity for good works and kind deeds is well known. They came because the big boys are quaking in their rubber boots before the demon of rampant unionism which the Goodyear strike has unleashed.

The full extent of this victory can be savored only by those persons acquainted with one of the most ruthlessly competitive of American industries. Traditionally at daggers drawn, the rubber barons sat down around a table and agreed universally to the present increases.

Lingering Doubts Dispelled
If any lingering doubts existed in the skulls of the local barons, they had only to stand in their office windows last Sunday and watch phalanx after phalanx of Akron union labor parade through the downtown section. When the parade ended, 20,000 union workers had passed in review.

Heading the procession was the victorious Goodyear local of the United Rubber Workers. Marching in close order, with their yellow caps brilliant in the May sunshine, they stretched out for three full city blocks. Cries of derision broke constantly from the ranks, "Here's Litchfield's 600 union members!"

Each of the large rubber locals headed a division of the parade. At the front of the Goodrich local marched 300 members of the rifle club and drill team. Cheering little cries of "When you gonna use them guns, boys" came from the sidewalks. As the crack tire division marched by, the good-natured crowd yelled, "Sit down! Sit down!" This local also had a car towing a trailer piled with old tires

(Continued on Page 4)

Solidarity with Cuban Comrades!

Widespread Support Needed Against Reaction

On the first day of the General Strike of 1935 in Cuba, our comrade, Crescencio Freyre, leader of the Bakers' Union of Cuba, was seized by Batista's gunmen. They took him through all Havana and attempted to force him to pick out his comrades from among the strikers. He refused; and the gunmen took him to an open field and machine-gunned him to death, and left him there to rot.

Since then other comrades have been murdered; and others have died in Batista's dungeons. The restrained news report from Cuba, published in this issue, takes for granted a knowledge of the depth of the Cuban terror. Unfortunately, few American workers have any idea of the concrete conditions under which the Cuban working class struggles today. The NEW MILITANT has published what news has seeped out. The vigorous protest to President Roosevelt, circulated by the Non-Partisan Labor Defense, gave a succinct picture of the Cuban terror—the smashed unions, the outlawed political parties, the labor and progressive leaders assassinated or imprisoned, the dread rule of the "law of flight." Since we published the full text of that protest in our issue of January 11, the terror has gone on systematically.

The political prisoners and their families who are under the charge of the petty-bourgeois liberals and the I.L.D. receive financial aid from their international connections. So far, however, there has been almost no international aid for the prisoners adhering to the Havana Federation of Labor, the So-corro Obrero, and the Bolshevik-Leninist party. Every class-conscious worker is duty-bound to give financial aid to these victims and their families. Here it is not merely a case of international solidarity. It is a case of supporting the struggles of workers who bear far more than we do the common yoke of American imperialism.

We ask all our readers to send funds for Cuban political prisoners, in care of the Non-Partisan Labor Defense, 22 East 17 Street, New York City.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Max Shachtman's lecture has been postponed from Sun., May 17th, to Wed. May 20th at 8 P.M. The subject will be, "Earl Browder, the Man and His Books," the place, Irving Plaza Hall, Irving Place and 15th St.

Terror Reigns In F.D.'s Cuba

Progressives Triumph at Auto Workers Convention

Dillon-Green Machine Receive Smashing Defeat; Plan of Action Drafted

By JACK WILSON

SOUTH BEND, Ind., May 2.—A resurgence of the labor movement in the auto industry that has wide possibilities can be expected following the progressive actions taken here this week at the second convention of the United Automobile Workers of America.

Similar in many respects to the rubber workers' convention of last fall, the sessions brought forth many manifestations of what the thousands of auto workers are thinking, what unrest is sweeping through the factories and what course might be traveled in the coming period.

A decisive victory against the stupid and criminal policies of William Green, A. F. of L. president, who defended craft unionism at the convention, marked the opening session.

So well remembered were the two years of splitting, betrayal, autocratic control, and the other policies which nearly destroyed the labor movement in the auto industry for which Green and the majority of the executive board of the A. F. of L. were responsible, that the 215 delegates were unanimously opposed to Green's appointed president, Francis J. Dillon.

Green and Dillon Trowned

A lame defense by both Dillon and Green of their policies met with no sympathy or response. Every delegate was prepared to battle at any cost a continuation of the antiquated craft union policies. In face of such bitter opposition, Dillon and Green withdrew while the delegates cheered and cheered. The two men left repudiated, disgraced, failures in their effort to organize the auto industry because of their false policies.

It was highly significant that Green and Dillon made such a serious retreat, one that further impairs the already badly damaged reputation of the craft union dominated executive board of the A. F. of L. It indicates that their position has become so weak among workers in basic industry that they fear to make a fight for it!

Jubilant progressives and the other delegates shouted and cheered in a wild scene of enthusiasm as

Homer Martin, vice-president, took the platform to act as temporary chairman. The union had won its autonomy!

Tasks Before the Convention

Two major tasks confronted the convention after the retreat of Green and Dillon; adoption of a progressive program which would afford a basis for building a powerful union and the selection of good leaders to carry out that program.

A program had been drawn up by a caucus of 140 delegates held a month previous to the convention. A steering committee of 12 was chosen at that time to lead the fight for its approval.

The program of this essentially progressive bloc who were advised by the Committee for Industrial Organization included: (1) the ending of the probationary period of the union with Dillon as president; (2) establishment of an industrial union within the confines of the A. F. of L. with the jurisdictional question to be carried to the A. F. of L. convention; (3) amalgamation of the independent unions such as the M.E.S.A. and the former Coughlinite-influenced union with the United Automobile Workers; (4) approval of a democratic constitution allowing all political liberties to membership; (5) and the Gorman Labor Party resolution which the Stalinists naturally had foisted upon the delegates; (6) an immediate organization drive.

The program carried in its entirety. Without an understanding of how each issue was carried, however, the program lacks much content in so far as accurate analysis is concerned.

The seating of the 37 militant Toledo delegates was the first question considered. Since the Dillon opposition was the main problem and he had left the convention, these delegates had little difficulty in obtaining recognition. Dillon had claimed Toledo had no charter and was an outlaw union since it refused last fall to bust the powerful union of 16 plants into separate locals. It had paid up its delinquent per-capita tax.

Although nearly all the delegates acted in a progressive manner by

(Continued on Page 4)

Hundreds Jailed and Tortured

Batista Attempts to Cover Up by Investigation

(Special to New Militant)

HAVANA, April 30.—The action of the Cuban Supreme Court and of the Congress, calling for an investigation of recent murders of bourgeois opponents of the Batista dictatorship, signals an effort by Batista to broaden the base of his support.

Any investigation made will be a farce, for the murders were committed by Batista's own gunmen. Batista hopes, however, to make peace with his bourgeois opponents. Having outlawed all the labor organizations and imprisoned nearly five thousand workers, sharecroppers and intellectuals, Batista wants to unite all the "respectable elements" of the population to maintain the status quo.

Conciliation and White Terror
Batista's conciliatory gestures toward the opposition bourgeoisie go hand in hand with systematic continuance of the white terror. No day passes without someone being murdered. New hundreds are imprisoned for no other offense than attending labor meetings. Scores are tortured. Only strong young men can survive imprisonment in Cabana Fortress; older men die soon.

What is needed here, above all is a powerful defense movement. The kind of defense work known in America is a physical impossibility under the Batista dictatorship. For example, we used to employ lawyers for courtroom fights before the general strike of 1935; now there is not a lawyer left in the whole of Cuba who will accept the defense of a worker or radical for fear of government reprisal.

The real work of a defense movement, then, cannot be in the courtroom, but must begin with mass pressure on the authorities. This means meetings, lightning demonstrations, leaflets, underground literature, systematic diffusion of news to other countries, especially to the United States, a militant policy of mobilizing the ranks of the shattered unions and outlawed labor parties—all of which has been conspicuously absent for the past seven months or more.

Amnesty Committee Ineffective

The National Committee for Amnesty for Social and Political Prisoners has failed to act as the center for such a defense movement. In the past eight months, it has met but once, and then it came together at the call of the Bishop of Havana. Who called the Bishop of Havana? Who but the Stalinists? In all its months of existence, the Amnesty Committee has not issued a single leaflet. It has not called a single demonstration or even adopted a militant resolution. Its appeal has been mainly to the charitable mind of the bourgeoisie, the Catholic Church, the Masons and the Odd Fellows.

In other words, it has tried to immunize itself by spreading a cloak of respectability and legality about its actions. But the Bishop of Havana has long ago dropped away, as have the few Masons, Odd Fellows and other "good bourgeois." Despite all its respectability, it has felt Batista's fist. His soldiers broke up a meeting of the central committee held in a private home; twenty-two of the twenty-seven members were arrested, hauled to army posts and beaten with swords. Most of them were then sentenced (on a morals charge!) to prison sentences of six months and more.

Organizations Represented

Neither the Auténticos (party of former President Grau San Martín), or Young Cuba, ever joined the Amnesty Committee, although both were formally invited. The organizations comprising the Amnesty Committee fall into three groups:

(Continued on Page 4)

THE NEW CONSTITUTION OF THE U.S.S.R.

By Leon Trotsky

Behind the Kremlin walls work is going on to replace the Soviet constitution by a new one, which, according to the declarations of Stalin, Molotov and others, will be the "most democratic in the world." To be sure, doubts might be aroused by the procedure in which the constitution is being elaborated. Up to recently, there has been no mention of this great reform either in the press or at meetings. No one is acquainted with the draft of the constitution as yet. In the meantime, Stalin told the American interviewer Roy Howard, on March 1, 1936 that, "We shall probably adopt our new constitution at the end of this year." Thus Stalin is informed exactly as to the date when this constitution will be adopted, about which the people still has practically no information. It is impossible not to conclude that the "most democratic" constitution in the world is being elaborated and introduced in a manner that is not entirely democratic.

Stalin confirmed to Howard, and through him also to the peoples of the U.S.S.R., that "according to the new constitution, the suffrage will be universal, equal, direct and secret."

The inequalities in suffrage rights in favor of the workers as against the peasants are to be abolished. Henceforth, obviously, not factories but citizens will vote: each one for himself. Once there are "no classes," then all members of society are equal. Individuals can

store their privileges. In proportion as the objective possibility for the exploitation of man by man disappears, all necessity for these temporary measures will likewise disappear, and the party will strive to narrow them down, and to completely abolish them" (our emphasis). These lines can no doubt serve to justify the refusal to "disenfranchise" in a society in which the possibility for exploitation has disappeared. But along with this the program demands the simultaneous abolition of "any restrictions whatsoever upon liberty." For the entry into socialist society is characterized not by the peasants being made equal with the workers, and not by returning the franchise to 3-5 percent of the citizens of bourgeois origin, but by the establishment of true liberty for 100 per cent of the population. With the abolition of classes, according to Lenin, and according to Marx, not only the dictatorship but also the state itself withers away. Stalin, however, has said nothing as yet about removing "restrictions upon liberty" either to Howard or to the peoples of the U.S.S.R.

Molotov hastened to Stalin's assistance, sad to say, not very patriotically. In replying to a question of the Editor-in-Chief of *le Temps*, Molotov said, "Now not infrequently (?) there is already no need for those administrative measures which were employed formerly," but "the Soviet power must of the exploiters to maintain or to re-

(Continued on Page 3)

France at the Crossroads

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

By LEON TROTSKY

(Concluded in last issue)

To pretend that Herriot-Daladier are capable of proclaiming war against the "200 families" that rule France is to dupe the people shamelessly. The 200 families do not hang suspended in mid-air but are the crown of the system of finance-capital. To cope with the 200 families it is necessary to overthrow the economic and political regime, in the maintenance of which Herriot and Daladier are just as interested as Flandin and de la Rocque. The issue here is not a struggle of the "nation" against a handful of magnates as L'Humanité pictures it but the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. It is a question of the class struggle which can be resolved only by revolution. The strikebreaking conspiracy of the People's Front has become the chief obstacle on this road.

It is impossible to say in advance how much longer the semi-parliamentary, semi-Bonapartist ministries will continue to succeed one another in France and in general through what concrete stages the country will pass in the next period. This depends upon the world and national economic conjuncture, upon the degree of strategy of Italian and German fascism, upon the course of events in Spain, and last—but not least in importance—upon the awareness and the activity of the advanced elements of the French proletariat. The denouement can be brought closer by the convulsions of the franc. A closer collaboration between France and England can postpone it. In any case the death-throes of "democracy" may drag out for a much longer period than the duration in Germany of the pre-fascist period of Brüner-Papen-Schleicher; but this does not stop it from being the death-throes. Democracy will be swept away. The only question is: by whom?

The struggle against the "200 families", against fascism and war, for peace, bread and liberty, and other beautiful things is either a

lie, or the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. The toilers of France are faced with the problem of the revolutionary conquest of power not as a distant goal but as the task of the unfolding period. Meanwhile, the socialist and communist leaders not only renounce the revolutionary mobilization of the proletariat, but resist it with all their strength. Fraternizing with the bourgeoisie, they hound and expel the Bolsheviks. So greatly do they hate the revolution and dread it! Under these conditions, the worst role is played by those pseudo-revolutionaries of the type of Marceau Pivert who promise to overthrow the bourgeoisie, but only with the permission of Leon Blum! The entire course of the French labor movement for the last twelve years has placed the task of creating a new revolutionary party on the order of the day.

The question whether events will allow "sufficient" time for its formation is to engage in the most fruitless of all occupations. History has absolutely inexhaustible resources in the domain of different variants, historical forms, stages, accelerations, and retardations. Under the influence of economic difficulties fascism may venture prematurely and suffer a defeat. This would imply a long respite. Contrariwise, it may occupy a temporizing position too long and thereby increase the chances in favor of the revolutionary organizations. The People's Front may go to smash against its own contradictions before fascism is able to engage in a general battle: this would signify a period of regroupments and splits in the parties of the working class, and a rapid fusion of the revolutionary vanguard. Spontaneous mass movements as in Toulon and Brest may attain a wide sweep and create a reliable fulcrum for the revolutionary lever. Finally, even the victory of fascism in France, which is theoretically not excluded, does not mean that it will reign for 1,000 years as Hitler prophesies, or

that it is even assured to endure as long as Mussolini has been able to maintain himself. Beginning with Italy or Germany, the twilight of fascism would quickly spread into France as well. To build a revolutionary party in this, the least favorable variant, is to bring nearer the hour of vengeance. The wise-ones who shy away from the unpostponable task with the words, "the conditions are not mature", merely reveal that they themselves have not matured for the conditions.

Building the Cadres

The Marxists of France, as well as those of the entire world, must, in a certain sense, begin at the beginning, but on an infinitely higher historical level than their predecessors. Progress is at first rendered extremely difficult by the fall of the Communist International, more infamous than the fall of the social democracy in 1914. The new cadres are being recruited slowly, in a cruel struggle against the united front against the reactionary and patriotic bureaucracy in the working class. On the other hand, these very difficulties, which did not descend upon the proletariat accidentally, constitute an important condition for the correct selection and the firm tempering of the first detachments of the new party and the new International.

Only a very tiny section of the cadres of the Comintern began its revolutionary education from the outset of the war, prior to the October Revolution. Almost all these elements, without a single exception, are now outside the Communist International. The next oldest stratum joined the already victorious October Revolution. This was much easier. But only an insignificant portion has remained even of this second draft. The overwhelming majority of the present cadres of the Comintern adhered not to the Bolshevik program, not to the revolutionary banner, but to the Soviet bureaucracy. These are not

fighters but docile functionaries, adjutants, errand boys. It is by reason of this that the Third International is putrefying so infamously amid the historical situation so rich in great revolutionary possibilities.

The Inevitable Regroupment

The Fourth International rises on the shoulders of its three predecessors. It is subjected to blows from the front, the sides and the rear. Careerists, cowards, philistines have nothing to seek in our ranks. The percentage of sectarians and adventurists, inevitable at the beginning, is winnowed away as the movement grows. Let pedants and sceptics shrug their shoulders about "small" organizations that issue "small" papers and fling a challenge to the entire world. Serious revolutionists will pass contemptuously by the pedants and sceptics. The October Revolution also once began with its swaddling clothes.

The mighty Russian parties of Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks who made up the "People's Front" with the Cadets, crumbled into dust, in the course of a few months, under the blows of a "handful of fanatics" of Bolshevism. Subsequently the German social democracy, the German Communist party and the Austrian social democracy died an ignoble death under the blows of fascism. The epoch which is drawing close for the European peoples will sweep out of the working class without leaving a trace all that is equivocal and rotten. All the Journaux, Citrines, Blums, Cachins, Vanderveldes and Caballeros are only phantoms. The sections of the 2nd and 3rd Internationals will ingloriously leave the stage one after another. A new regroupment in the workers' ranks is inevitable. Young revolutionary cadres will gain flesh and blood. Victory is conceivable only on the basis of the methods of Bolshevism, to the defense of which this volume is dedicated.

March 26, 1936.

In the Dark of Night the C.I. Prepares The New Betrayal for China

Members of CP Are Kept in Ignorance

By LI FU-JEN
(Translated from "Struggle," Organ of Communist League of China)

SHANGHAI.—Conversations between some of our comrades and five Stalinists here recently showed that at least some of the rank-and-file of the Chinese Communist Party are not finding it easy to swallow the "new line" for China—the re-establishment of the "bloc of four classes" which led to the catastrophic defeat of the Chinese revolution in 1925-27.

They cannot stomach the idea of being harnessed once again to Chiang Kai-shek's chariot. The bureaucrats at the top, it seems, are trying to comfort the dissenters by the well-known method of deception. But to do this they have had to conceal from the membership of the party large portions of the Seventh Comintern congress documents!

Our comrades quoted to the young Stalinists Wan Min's offer to give Chiang Kai-shek an opportunity to "atone for his crimes" against the Chinese people. ("Bolshevik," Moscow, November, 1935.)

Only a "Maneuver"

"Ah," they retorted, "that's only a maneuver." That is what the bureaucrats are telling them, that the new offer of a "united front" is being made "only to expose Chiang as a traitor who is not prepared to fight for China's independence."

We asked them if they had seen the documents of the Seventh Congress. They had not! The leadership, we learned, hands down to the rank and file only carefully selected excerpts. So we quoted to them from Manuilsky's speech, which has been used by Wan Min abroad in several of his recent articles elaborating the "new line," notably the following:

"The setting up of such a program for a broad anti-imperialist fighting front of the Chinese people is not a maneuver on the part of the Communist Party. It would be a crime to maneuver with such a serious matter as the defense of the people against imperialist robbery. One may maneuver with and against the enemy but not at the expense of the people whose national liberty and freedom the Communists defend selflessly."

To which Wan Min added: "Moreover, if you say that our policy is a maneuver, then why do you not try to expose our maneuver by your honest participation in the anti-imperialist united front?"

Staggered by True Facts

Our young Stalinist auditors gasped at these quotations. They were at first so incredulous that they thought we had cooked them up—(cooking up quotations being part of every Stalinist's education!)—but we showed them exact sources, chapter and verse. They were visibly staggered. No, they did not think we were counter-revolutionaries, but they did not yet fully grasp our views or agree with them. They asked for more discussion and of course we readily assented.

We showed them our paper, "Struggle." This impressed them greatly. It seems that the Stalinists are publishing absolutely nothing here now, except occasional leaflets containing simple slogans. And here, our small group, without the financial aid of Moscow, was bringing out an excellent, printed, four-page bi-weekly. Our first meeting ended with all five digging into their pockets and collectively contributing five dollars for the paper.

Thus it has fallen to the Chinese Bolshevik-Leninists to inform the ranks of the C.P. of the Seventh Congress speeches and reports in all their full glory! The Stalinist bureaucrats here interpret the new policy as a "maneuver" in order to get their followers to swallow it, while the Comintern pundits in Moscow (Wan Min, Manuilsky) designate such a conception as a "crime."

Wan Min's Crooked Calculations

Wan Min's exegesis in justification of the "new line" proceed, with characteristic contempt for revolutionary cadres, on the two assumptions which have become the common yardstick for all the Stalinist falsifiers. First, he assumes that the older generation of Chinese revolutionists is for the most part dead, while those who remain have fallen into passivity and no longer participate in the revolutionary struggle. He expects no challenge from that quarter. Second, he knows that the younger generation of revolutionists did not participate in the events of 1925-27, any more than Wan Min himself did. (Wan Min was a young student at Sun Yat-sen University in Moscow from 1926 to 1929. He went there originally as a Kuomintang member, not a Communist.) He banks on the fact that the present-day Communists have no personal recollections of that period and Stalinist

An Unnoticed May Day Funeral

A funeral, unnoticed and unremarked, marched with the May Day parade. It was the funeral of the myth of "Soviet China."

The "Friends of the Chinese People" who have been the foremost "defenders" of Soviet China on the American Stalinist-liberal front, marched on May Day without a single placard for the Chinese Soviets, not a single placard that even mentioned the workers and peasants of China, nor a single placard against the Kuomintang!

"Support the liberation movement of the Chinese people," "Support the patriotic movement of the Chinese students," "Support the People's Republic of Outer Mongolia," "Withdraw the American forces from China," these were the slogans under which the "Friends" marched. The "Soviets," which are now to give way to a new "bloc of four classes" were silently interred. With what contempt Chinese workers would regard these "friends" if they knew anything about them!

literature has not enlightened them, to be sure, as to the true character of the policies pursued and the reasons why a great revolutionary movement ended in one of the most vicious and destructive counter-revolutions in modern history.

Wan Min therefore feels quite safe in perpetrating the most blatant falsehoods, in poisoning the political atmosphere and thereby preparing the destruction of the third Chinese revolution. Between Wan Min and the accomplishment of his rotten aim stand the Bolshevik-Leninists, organized in the Communist League of China. We shall teach the workers to turn their backs on this lying traitor and the corrupt masters whom he serves.

Covering Their Criminal Past

The Stalinists can only cover their shameful present by covering their criminal past. Thus, in referring to the criminally false line pursued in 1925-27, Wan Min ascribes full responsibility to the "opportunists in the leadership" of the Chinese Communist Party, "headed by Chen Tu-hsiu." Wan Min is careful to point out that in 1927 "it was not the anti-imperialist united front tactics themselves that were at fault . . . the opportunists who were incorrect."

But Wan Min prefers not to turn back to Stalin's famous Theses on the "Problems of the Chinese Revolution" in which he declared, among many other similar remarks: "The student youth (revolutionary youth), the working youth, the peasant youth—all these are a force which can advance the revolution with seven league boots, if it should be subordinated to the ideological and political influence of the Kuomintang."

Does it appear from this that it was Chen Tu-hsiu who "renounced the revolutionary struggle of the working class"? On the contrary, it is not abundantly clear that Chen Tu-hsiu was faithfully carrying out the class collaborationist policy formulated by Stalin and the Comintern?

For Wan Min and his similars to state this fact and all the other

Bolshevik Leninists Point The Way

verifiable facts concerning the subordination of the interests of the proletariat to those of the bourgeoisie under the direct aegis of the Comintern would indict the real authors of the catastrophe and strike a blow at the Stalinist cult of infallibility. Hence the blame was placed on the C.P. leadership, especially Chen Tu-hsiu, who today stands in the ranks of the Fourth Internationalists, and is a prisoner of the Kuomintang.

Comrade Chen Tu-hsiu has for years been hounded and defamed by all the hacks of Stalinism because he refused to become a silent scapegoat, because he insisted on analyzing openly the reasons for the great catastrophe and drawing lessons from it for the future. He was and is traduced and vilified and slandered, not because he committed mistakes fatal for the revolution, but because he would not agree to deceive the workers and act as a cover for Stalin and Co.

The facts of history cannot forever be concealed. In the interests of the Chinese toilers we shall drag them out into the light of day and warn all honest revolutionaries to be on their guard against the Stalinist falsifiers. We shall neglect no means to expose their lies and their slanders.

The Real Culprit: Then and Now

For Bolshevik-Leninists have nothing in common with the methods of Stalinism. It is our policy to tell the whole truth, concealing nothing. Only this way can past experiences become useful lessons for a victorious future. For the Stalinists, truth is dangerous. They were prepared to forgive Chen Tu-hsiu "his" opportunist errors and even invited him to Moscow "to talk things over." They defended Chen Tu-hsiu against the Opposition during the revolution precisely because Chen was carrying out Stalin's instructions. His real crime in the eyes of the Stalinists consisted in his refusal afterward to cover up the role of the Comintern in the catastrophe of 1927, his refusal to bend the knee and take the rap.

The "new" opportunist line of Stalinism in China will lead to new disasters. It runs counter in every line and syllable to the interests of the Chinese revolution. The Moscow bureaucrats think they will "defend the Soviet Union" by having the Chinese Communists renounce the revolutionary struggle and join Chiang Kai-shek in a "People's Government." But this would be disastrous not only for the Chinese revolution but for the Soviet Union, for such a government not only will be unable to stem the tide of Japanese imperialism but will, on the contrary, compromise with it and drown in blood the third Chinese revolution, in which the real defense of the Soviet Union resides.

Against this perfidious attempt at betrayal every Chinese revolutionist must be on guard. Down with Stalinism! Build the new revolutionary party of the Fourth International, the only guarantee of triumph for a revolutionary China!

From Pacifism to Social - Patriotism BRITISH WORKERS AND WAR Stalinism: Yesterday and Today

By T. C. (London)

When the workers of Britain abandoned their rifles in the year 1918, a tremendous peace psychology seized hold of the British working class movement. Old jingoists like Blatchford and Hyndman were pushed to the back of the stage and the pacifist elements came to the front. Year after year, at Labor Party Conferences and Trade Union Congresses, resolutions against war were endorsed to the accompaniment of long, windy speeches usually delivered by MacDonald, Snowden, or Lansbury. The League of Nations was extolled as an instrument of peace and security. The wicked Russian Bolsheviks were rebuked for their abuse of the League and their refusal to join the imperialist robbers.

On their left flank, the Laborites were attacked by the Communist Party and other left wing groups who declared that the policy of the Labor Party was a betrayal of the working class, while on the right, the young Tory die-hards sneered at the Socialist pacifists and alleged that they were seeking cushy jobs at Geneva.

Pledge to Support Gov't

As the years rolled on and from time to time the war danger threatened to explode the reformist paradise, the speeches grew longer, louder, and more fiery, but so long as it was only Russia, China, or South America that was threatened then the usual protests to the League were made and that was all. Hints of a general strike were sometimes made but by 1934 this proposition was definitely scrapped and the Trade Unions and the Labor Party were pledged to "unflinchingly support our government in all risks and consequences of fulfilling its duty to take part in collective action against a peace-breaker."

This line was followed up a year later, when the Italian-Ethiopian war crisis was debated, by a steam-rollered resolution at both the Trade Union Congress and Labor Party Conference calling for sanctions against Italy to be operated through the League of Nations. These decisions went far to assure the return of the National Government at the General Election and they also produced a tumult inside and outside the ranks of the Labor Party.

There are three main groups at work inside the Labor Party upon the question of sanctions, and many of their members are also against the League as being a sham and a fake. The Christian Socialists, personified by Lansbury are against sanctions but not against the

League while the Trade Union bloc, which is the backbone of the Labor Party, is wholehearted in its support of the League and Sanctions and only criticises the policy of the National Government because it does not go far enough to satisfy Sir Walter Citrine, Bevin, and company. Outside the Labor Party all the Socialist groups are against the League and sanctions with the exception of the Communist Party.

Stalinist Policy

The latter body is now pushing for affiliation to the Labor Party under cover of a policy that approximates to that of the Labor and Trade Union bureaucracy so far as the League and sanctions are concerned. This remarkable position is worth studying. Whatever fault could be found in the propaganda of the British Communist Party between the years 1920 and 1935 none could be found in their rigid denunciation of the League of Nations as a "League of Baudits."

The propaganda organization of the League, known as the League of Nations Union was declared to be "an excellent Agit. Prop. department for the Imperialists." (Communist Review, July, 1927.) Even the revised programme of the Communist International, produced in 1928 and still circulating in Britain as the Communist Programme refers to the League as "a counter-revolutionary Holy Alliance of imperialist powers." Stalin, himself, in "Leninism" describes the League as "an organization designed to mask war preparations" and as late as August, 1934, the Young Communist League at a Youth Conference held at Sheffield issued a Manifesto in which they state that "the League of Nations is not an instrument for stopping war but is a means of preparation for war." But the last blow for the Lenin line was struck by no less a person than R. Palme Dutt, leading theorist of the British Communist Party. In his editorial notes in the "Labor Monthly" for January, 1935, Dutt criticises the Southport Conference decisions of the Labor Party. In the light of what has happened since, these comments are worth quoting in full.

Dutt Answers Dutt

"The greatest danger lies in the pacifist and imperialist confusionist maneuvers and its channels of influence in the working-class movement to disrupt the united working-class front and replace it by support of rival imperialist policies. It is here that lies the whole significance of the role of the Labor Party Executive, not only in its international fight against the united front, but in its whole Southport line of sup-

port of imperialist war in certain contingencies, in the case of war against an aggressor, in the case of war for the 'collective system' of imperialism, in the case of war to preserve the nation and its democratic institutions. It is here that lies the significance of the attempt to exploit the fact of Soviet participation in the League of Nations in order to revive the weakening illusions in the League of Nations as a guarantee of peace, or to preach the obligation of the working class to subordinate itself to the leadership of the League of Nations. It is here that lies the significance of the preaching of a hypothetical war of 'democratic defense' against Fascism. It is here that lies the significance of the spreading trust in a future Labor Government as an instrument of peace. What is our answer to these 'left', 'pacifist', 'democratic', 'anti-fascist', arguments in support of future imperialist war. Our answer remains the Leninist line, the line of international Socialism from Marx and Engels, from Stuttgart and Basle up to to-day. (We need more than ever to warn the workers never to become entangled in the line of imperialist policies, but to judge every question of war solely from the standpoint of the working-class revolution. The workers under capitalism have no Fatherland. Must we not defend our country against Fascism? Is not pacifism in such conditions equivalent to surrender to Fascism? The revolutionary answer is clear. We hold nothing

in common with the pacifist line. We do not for a moment exclude military defence against Fascism—on one condition—and one condition only, namely, that we have a country to defend. We shall defend Workers Britain, as an integral part of the World Worker's Republic, of the future World Soviet Union, against Fascism with every means in our power. But until then we shall fight our own exploiting class; we shall not let ourselves be dragged into warring for one set of masters against another. This is the Leninist line."

Last of Leninist Line

That was the last of the Leninist line so far as the British Communist Party is concerned. Within a few months, Dutt and his party were in full cry for the League of Nations, for sanctions against Fascist Italy, for a Labor government as an instrument of peace, for one set of masters in France against another set of masters in Germany, for the democratic capitalists against the Fascist capitalists. The British Communists have found new allies in the Christian organizations, the Liberals and even the Tories, with whom they have now a united front functioning through alleged Peace Councils. The Communist member of parliament, Gallacher, in his maiden speech, called for "a People's Government composed of the best elements in all parties," and in the struggle with the Labor Party and Trade Unions, honest left-wing workers have to fight against the reformist bureaucracy but also against the new line of the Stalinists who are even more enthusiastic for the League and sanctions than the old timers themselves. All this confusion favors the war-makers but despite desperate efforts on the part of the social-patriots, the British working class is still against war.

- BOOKS -

Biographies of Revolutionists.

FREDERICK ENGELS: A Biography by Gustav Mayer. . . \$2.50
The long awaited study of the life of Karl Marx's close co-worker by his official biographer. The first and only study of Engels in English.

KARL MARX: The Story of His Life by Franz Mehring. . . \$2.95
Completed in 1918, this book has long been considered the most exhaustive study of Marx' life and words. It appears now for the first time in English with an appendix by an old co-worker of Mehring, Eduard Fuchs, which summarizes the findings of D. Riazonov and the Marx-Engels Institute since 1918.

VIE DE LENINE: Jeunesse by Leon Trotsky. . . \$1.75
The first volume of Trotsky's biography of Lenin. Not available in English.

MY LIFE: An Attempt at an Autobiography by Leon Trotsky. . . Published Price \$5.00; Our Price \$2.50
The political biography of the great revolutionist written five years ago and recently subjected to a "psychological" treatment by Malcolm Cowley.

JOHN REED: The Making of a Revolutionary by Granville Hicks. . . \$2.50
The only study of the life of the brilliant author of "Ten Days That Shook the World."

LABOR BOOK SHOP
23 East 12th Street, New York City

Milwaukee Labor Council Urges Unions Aid News Strike

MILWAUKEE, Wis. Apr. 27.—Calling upon the whole labor movement to support the strike of Hearst's Wisconsin News editorial workers, on the ground that the right to organize and bargain collectively is its main issue, the Milwaukee Federated Trades Council today issued a formal statement for the information and guidance of union members and friends.

The statement is signed by members of a committee appointed by the Council to investigate and report on the strike of the Milwaukee Newspaper Guild against the Wisconsin News. The committee members are J. F. Fredrick, general organizer of the Council; Herman Solde, general secretary of the Council; and Otto Jirlikow, member of the executive board.

The report states flatly that the Wisconsin News has assumed an "open-shop" anti-union attitude toward its editorial employees. The local management of the paper, evidently acting under the instructions of the head management of the Hearst Publications, has taken the position that editorial workers shall not organize and that the management will not recognize or officially deal with any organizations of such workers, the statement continues.

Refutes Hearst Charges

Convinced by its investigation that "the management has consistently endeavored to beloud this main issue" and "mislead the public" the committee takes up point by point the management's statements and its own conclusions, as

follows: "First: While wages, hours and working conditions are involved, differences on these points are not so great that they would stand in the way of a settlement, especially in view of the fact that the Guild has assumed a very reasonable attitude of compromise on these points.

"Second: As to the statement of the management that it has not interfered with its employees' joining the Guild, the fact is that while they may not in so many words have stated that its employees should not join the Guild, it has let it be generally known that it does not favor the organization of the editorial workers.

"Third: As to the statement that it has met with representatives of the Guild to discuss demands and grievances, the fact remains that it has refused to carry such meetings to a logical conclusion by refusing to consider entering into any sort of agreement. Such an attitude is a denial of the principle of collective bargaining.

"Fourth: While it is true that the Wisconsin News has a union shop agreement with local unions covering employees in its mechanical departments, such agreements constitute a distinct discrimination against other categories."

In supporting the strike, the statement concludes, it is complying with the request of William Green, president of A. F. of L. Affiliated local unions are urged to give moral and financial support, and to participate in picketing before the Wisconsin News building.

The New Constitution of the U.S.S.R.

BY LEON TROTSKY

(Continued from Page 1)

course be strong and consistent in the struggle against terrorists and wreckers of public property. . . . "Argo: 'A Soviet power'—without Soviets; a proletarian dictatorship—without the proletariat, and, in addition to that, a dictatorship not against the bourgeoisie, but against . . . terrorists and thieves. At all events, the party program never foresaw such a type of state. . . ."

Molotov's promise to do "not infrequently" without those extreme measures which might prove unnecessary is not worth much, and is self-evident; but it loses all its value alongside of the reference to the enemies of law and order, who are precisely the ones that make it impossible to renounce emergency measures. Whence, however, arise these enemies of law and order, these terrorists and thieves, and, moreover, in such threatening numbers as would justify the preservation of a dictatorship in a classless society? Here we must come to the assistance of Molotov. At the dawn of the Soviet power the terrorist acts were perpetrated by the S. R.'s and the Whites in the atmosphere of the still unfinished civil war. When the former ruling classes lost all their hopes, terrorism disappeared as well. Kulak terror, traces of which are observable even now, was always local in character, and supplemented the partisan war against the Soviet regime. This is not what Molotov has in mind. The new terror does not lean upon either the old ruling classes or the kulak. The terrorists of recent years are recruited exclusively from among the Soviet youth, from the ranks of the Y.C.L. and of the party. While utterly impotent to solve those tasks which it sets itself, individual terror is, however, of the greatest symptomatic impor-

tance because it characterizes the sharpness of the antagonism between the bureaucracy and the wide masses of the people, especially, the younger generation. Terrorism is the tragic supplement of Bonapartism. Each individual bureaucrat is afraid of the terror; but the bureaucracy as a whole successfully exploits it for the justification of its political monopoly. Stalin and Molotov did not discover any gunpowder in this field either.

Worst of all, however, is the fact, that it is absolutely impossible to gather, either from the interviews or from the commentaries, the social nature of the state for which the new constitution is being prepared. The Soviet system used to be officially considered as the expression of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But if the classes have been destroyed, then by reason of this very fact the social basis of the dictatorship has likewise been destroyed. Who, then, is its carrier now? Obviously the population as a whole. But when the entire people, emancipated from class contradictions, becomes the carrier of the dictatorship, this implies nothing else than the dissolution of the dictatorship in the socialist society, and consequently the liquidation of the state. The logic of Marxism is invulnerable. The liquidation of the state in its turn begins with the liquidation of the bureaucracy. Does the new constitution, perhaps, imply at least the liquidation of the G.P.U.? Should any one venture to express this idea in the U.S.S.R., the G.P.U. would immediately find convincing counter-arguments. The classes have been destroyed, the Soviets are being abolished, the class theory of society is reduced to dust, but the bureaucracy remains. Q.E.D.

The Whip Against the Bureaucracy

We shall return later to the question as to the extent to which the universal equal and direct suffrage corresponds to the alleged social equality of all citizens that has been attained. But if we accept this premise on faith, we become all the more perplexed by the following question: Why, if that be the case, must the elections be secret henceforth? Just whom does the populace in the socialist country fear? Against whose attempts in particular is it necessary to provide a defense? The child's fear of darkness has a purely biological foundation; but when grown up people dare not express their opinions openly, their fear is political in character. And for the Marxist, politics is always a function of the class struggle. In capitalist society the secret ballot is intended to provide a defense for the exploited against the terror of the exploiters. That the bourgeoisie did finally agree to such a reform—of course, under the pressure of the masses—was only because the bourgeoisie itself was interested in protecting its state at least partially against the demoralization of its own making. But in the U.S.S.R. there obviously cannot be any pressure of the exploiters upon the toilers. Against whom, then, is it necessary to protect the Soviet citizens by means of the secret ballot?

Under the old Soviet constitution, the *viva voce* vote was introduced as a weapon in the hands of the revolutionary class against bourgeois and petty bourgeois enemies. The same purpose was served by the restrictions in the franchise itself. Now, at the end of the second decade after the Revolution, no longer the class enemies but the toilers themselves are so frightened that they cannot vote except under the shield of secrecy. This touches precisely the masses of the people, the overwhelming majority, for it is impossible to allow that the secret ballot is being specially introduced for the convenience of the counter-revolutionary minority!

But who is terrorizing the peo-

ple? The answer is clear—the bureaucracy. The latter is preparing to protect the toilers against itself by means of the secret ballot. Stalin made this admission openly. To the question, *Why the secret ballot?* his reply was verbatim as follows: "Because we want to give the Soviet people complete freedom to vote for those they want to elect." Thus we learn from Stalin that the "Soviet people" cannot vote today for those they want to elect. "We" are only getting ready to provide them with such an opportunity. Who are these "we" who can give or refuse the freedom to vote? The stratum in whose name Stalin speaks and acts: the bureaucracy. Stalin need only have added that his important admission applies as much to the party as to the State, and that, in particular, he himself, occupies the post of General Secretary by means of a system which does not permit party members to elect those they desire. The phrase "we want to give the Soviet people" is in itself infinitely more important than all the constitutions Stalin has yet to write, for this brief phrase is a ready constitution, and, moreover, very real, and not a myth.

As the European bourgeoisie in its time, so the Soviet Bureaucracy is compelled today to resort to the secret ballot in order at least partially to purge its state apparatus which it exploits "as the rightful owner" from the corruption of its own making. Stalin was compelled to give an inkling of this motive for the reform. Said he to Howard, "There are not a few institutions in our country which work badly . . . Secret suffrage in the U.S.S.R. will be a whip in the hands of the population against the organs of government which work badly." A second noteworthy admission! After the bureaucracy has created, with its own hands the socialist society, it feels the need . . . of a whip—not only because the organs of government "work badly" but above all because they are corroded through and through with the vices of uncontrolled cliques.

As far back as 1928, Rakovsky wrote the following with regard to a number of horrible cases of bur-

eaucratic demoralization that broke out into the open, "The most characteristic and most dangerous feature in the tidal wave of scandals, is the passivity of the masses, among the Communists even more than among the non-party men, toward the manifestations of unheard-of self-will, of which the workers themselves were witnesses. Out of fear of those who wield power, or simply out of political indifference, they passed by without a protest, or confined themselves merely to grumbling." More than eight years have elapsed since that time, and

Democracy Without Politics

Turning to the people for the salutary whip, the bureaucracy, however, lays down one ultimatum: condition: **that there be no politics.** This holy function must remain as hitherto the monopoly of the "leader." To the ticklish question of the American interlocutor relative to other parties, Stalin replied: "Since there are no classes, since the dividing lines between classes are being obliterated ['there are no classes'—the dividing lines between classes (which do not exist!) are being obliterated"—L. T.] there remains only a slight, but not a fundamental difference between various strata in socialist society, and there can be no fertile soil for the creation of contending parties. Where there are not several classes there cannot be several parties, for a party is a part of a class." Every word a mistake, sometimes even two!

According to Stalin, it seems that the dividing lines between classes are rigidly described, and that in every given period only one party corresponds to each class. The Marxist doctrine of the class nature of parties is transformed into a ludicrous bureaucratic caricature: political dynamics is entirely excluded from the historical process—in the interests of administrative order. In point of fact not a single instance can be found throughout the entire extent of political history of only one party corresponding to one class! Classes are not homogeneous, they are torn by internal antagonisms, and they arrive even at the solution of common tasks only through an internal struggle of tendencies, groupings and parties. Within certain limits it may be allowed that "the party is a part of a class." But inasmuch as a class has many "parts"—some facing forward, others backwards—one and the same class can put forth several parties. For the self-same reason, a single party can lean upon the parts of several classes.

Remarkably enough, this scandalous mistake of Stalin is absolutely disinterested in character, for, you see, in relation to the U.S.S.R. he proceeds from the assertion that no classes at all exist there. Of what class is the C.P.S.U., a part—after the abolition of all classes? Carelessly straying into the field of theory, Stalin proves more than he intended. From his reasoning it follows not that there cannot be different parties in the U.S.S.R. but that there cannot be even a single party. Where there are no classes there can be no room for politics in general. Stalin, however, makes a gracious exception from this law in the case of the party of which he is General Secretary.

The history of the working class reveals best of all the bankruptcy of the Stalinist theory of parties. Despite the fact that the working class is in its social structure indubitably the least heterogeneous of all classes in capitalist society, the existence of such a "stratum" as the labor aristocracy, and as labor bureaucracy bound up with it leads to the creation of reformist parties, which inevitably turn into one of the instruments of bourgeois rule. It matters nothing from the standpoint of Stalinist sociology whether the difference between the labor aristocracy and the proletarian mass is "fundamental" or only "slight"; but it was precisely by reason of this difference that the necessity to create the Third International arose in its time. On the other hand, it is indubitable that the structure of Soviet society is infinitely more heterogeneous and complex than that of the proletariat in capitalist countries. For this very reason, it can provide a sufficiently fertile soil for several parties.

Stalin is interested, as a matter of fact, not in the sociology of Marx but in the monopoly of the bureaucracy. These are two entirely different things. Every labor bureaucracy, even one that does not wield state power, inclines to the view that there is no "fertile soil" in the working class for the opposition. The leaders of the British Labour Party drive the revolutionists out of the trade unions on the grounds that there is no room for the struggle between parties within the framework of a "united" working class. Messrs. Vandervelde, Leon Blum, Jouhaux etc., act in a similar manner. Their conduct is dictated not by the

the situation has become infinitely worse. Stalin's autocratic rule has erected nepotism, self-will, profligacy, pillage and bribery into a system of administration. The decay of the apparatus, cropping out at every step, has begun to threaten the very existence of the state as the source of power, income and privileges of the ruling stratum. A reform became necessary. Taking fright at their own handiwork the summits of the Kremlin turn to the population with a plea to help it cleanse and straighten out the apparatus of administration.

metaphysics of unity but by the egoistic interests of the privileged cliques. Soviet bureaucracy is infinitely more powerful, wealthy and self-reliant than the labor bureaucracy in bourgeois countries. Highly skilled workers in the Soviet Union enjoy privileges unknown to the highest categories of labor in Europe and America. This two-fold stratum—the bureaucracy—which leans upon the labor aristocracy—is the ruler of the country. The present ruling party of the U.S.S.R. is nothing else than the political machine of a privileged stratum. The Stalinist bureaucracy has something to lose and nothing more to conquer. It is not inclined to share what it holds. For the future as well, it intends to reserve the "fertile soil" for itself.

To be sure, the Bolshevik party also occupied a monopoly position in the state during the first period of the Soviet era. However, to identify these two phenomena is to mistake appearances for reality. During the years of civil war, under extremely difficult historical conditions, the party of the Bolsheviks found itself compelled temporarily to prohibit other parties, not because the latter lacked a "fertile soil"—in that case it would not have been necessary even to prohibit them—but on the contrary, precisely because fertile soil existed: this is what made them dangerous. The party explained openly to the masses what it was doing, for it was clear to everybody that at stake was the defense of the isolated revolution against mortal dangers. Today, the more the bureaucracy embellishes the social reality, the more shamelessly it exploits it for its own benefit. If it be true that the kingdom of

Socialism has already come, and the fertile soil for political parties has disappeared, there would be no need to prohibit them. It would only remain, in accordance with the program, to abolish "any restrictions whatsoever upon liberty." But the bureaucracy will not allow so much as to peep about such a constitution. The internal falseness of the whole construction is all too apparent!

Seeking to dispel normal doubts on the part of his interlocutor, Stalin offered a new thought: "Candidates will be put forward not only by the Communist Party but by all sorts of public, non-party organizations. And we have hundreds of these." . . . "Each of these strata (of Soviet society) may have its special interests and express them through our numerous existing organizations." Evidently, it is for this reason that the new Soviet constitution will be the "most democratic constitution in the world."

This piece of sophistry is no better than the rest. The most important "strata" in Soviet society are: the summits of the bureaucracy and its middle and nethermost layers, the labor aristocracy, the kolkhoz aristocracy, the common run of workers, the middle layers of the kolkhozes, the peasant proprietors, the labor strata of workers and peasants, and beyond them the lumpenproletariat, the homeless, the prostitutes and so on. As to the Soviet public organizations—trade union, cooperative, cultural, sport, etc.—they do not at all represent the interests of different "strata" because they all have one and the same hierarchic structure: Even in those cases, when the organizations are based upon the privileged circles, as for instance the trade unions and cooperatives, the active role in them is played exclusively by the representatives of the privileged summits, while the "party," i.e., the political organization of the ruling stratum, has the last word. The participation of non-political organizations in the electoral struggle will consequently lead to nothing else than the rivalry between the different cliques of the bureaucracy within the limits set by the Kremlin. The ruling summit calculates to learn in this manner some secrets hidden from it and to refurbish its regime, without at the same time permitting a political struggle to take place which must inevitably be directed against itself.

The Historical Meaning of the New Constitution

In the person of its most authoritative leader, the bureaucracy again demonstrates how little it understands those historical tendencies which determine its movement. When Stalin remarks that the difference between various strata in Soviet society is "slight but not fundamental," he obviously has in mind the fact that exclusive of the individual peasant proprietors, who are sufficiently numerous even today to populate Czechoslovakia, all other "strata" depend upon the stratified or collectivized means of production. This is beyond dispute. But a "fundamental" difference still remains between the collective, i.e. group property in agriculture and the nationalized property in industry: it can still make itself felt in the future. We shall not, however, enter into a discussion of this important question. Of considerably more immediate importance is the difference between the "strata" which is determined by their relation not to the means of production but to the articles of consumption. The sphere of distribution is, of course, only a "superstructure" in relation to the sphere of production. However, it is precisely the sphere of distribution that is of decisive importance in the everyday life of the people. From the standpoint of the ownership of the means of production, the difference between a Marshall and a street cleaner, between the head of a trust and an unskilled laborer, between the son of a people's Commissar and a homeless waif is not "fundamental." But some occupy lordly apartments, enjoy several dachas (summer homes) in various parts of the country, have the best automobiles at their disposal, and have long forgotten others not infrequently live in wooden barracks, without any partitions for privacy, lead a half-starved existence, and do not clean their own boots only because they are barefoot. To a high dignitary this difference seems to be only "slight," i.e., one that does not merit attention. To the unskilled laborer it appears, not without reason, to be "fundamental."

In addition to the terrorists, according to Molotov, the object of the dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. is the thief. But the very abundance of people of such a profession is a true sign manual of the want that reigns in society. Where the material level of the overwhelming ma-

jority is so low that the ownership of bread and boots must be protected by firing squads, there the speeches about the alleged achievement of socialism sound like an infamous mockery of human beings!

In a truly homogeneous society, in which the normal wants of the citizens are satisfied without rancor and brawls, not only Bonapartist absolutism, but bureaucracy in general would be inconceivable. The bureaucracy is not a technical but a social category. Every single bureaucracy originates in and maintains itself upon the heterogeneous nature of society, upon the antagonism of interests and the internal struggle. It regulates the social antagonisms in the interests of the privileged classes or layers, and exacts an enormous tribute for this from the toilers. This very same function, despite the great revolution in the property relations, is being fulfilled, with cynicism and not without success, by the Soviet bureaucracy.

The latter raised itself on the NEP, exploiting the antagonism between the kulak and the Nepman, on the one hand, and the workers and peasants, on the other. When the kulak, grown strong, raised his hand against the bureaucracy itself, the latter, in the interests of self-defense, was compelled to lean directly upon the nethermost rank and file. The bureaucracy was weakest of all during the years of the struggle against the kulak (1929-1932). Precisely for this reason, it set with great zeal to the formation of a labor and kolkhoz aristocracy: instituting a shocking difference in wage scales, premiums, badges, and other similar measures which are called forth one-third by economic necessity, and two-thirds by the political interests of the bureaucracy. Upon this new and ever deepening social antagonism, the ruling caste has exalted itself to its present Bonapartist heights.

In a country in which the lava of revolution has not yet cooled, the privileged are often very much afraid of their own privileges, especially against the background of general want. The topmost Soviet strata stand in dread of the masses, with a fear that is purely bourgeois. Stalin supplies the growing privileges of the ruling stratum with a "theoretical" justification by means of the Comintern, and he defends the Soviet aristocracy against dissatisfaction by means of con-

centration camps. Stalin is the indisputable leader of the bureaucracy and of the labor aristocracy. He keeps in constant touch only with these "strata." A sincere "worship" of the leader emanates only from these circles. Such is the essence of the present political system of the U.S.S.R.

But to maintain this mechanism, Stalin is compelled from time to time to side with the "people" as against the bureaucracy, naturally, with the latter's silent consent. He is even compelled to seek for a whip from below against the abuses from above. As we have already said, this is one of the motives for the constitutional reform. There is another and no less important motive.

The new constitution abolishes the Soviets, dissolving the workers in the general mass of the population. The Soviets, it is true, have long lost meaning politically. But they might have revived with the growth of new social antagonisms and with the awakening of the new generation. Above all, of course, are to be feared the city Soviets, with the growing participation of green and exacting Y.C.L.'ers. In the cities the contrast between luxury and dire want is all too glaring. The first care of the Soviet aristocracy is to get rid of the Workers' and Red Army Soviets.

Despite the collectivization, the material and cultural contradiction between the city and the village has hardly been touched. The peasantry is still very backward and atomized. Social antagonisms also exist within the kolkhozes and between the kolkhozes. The bureaucracy finds it much easier to cope with the dissatisfaction in the village. It is able to use the kolkhozniks not without success against the

city workers. To smother the protest of the workers against the growing social inequality by the weight of the more backward masses of the village—this is the chief aim of the new constitution, about which neither Stalin nor Molotov naturally have communicated anything to the world. Bonapartism, incidentally, always leans upon the village as against the city. In this, too, Stalin remains true to tradition.

Learned philistines like the Webbs failed to see any great difference between Bolshevism and Czarism prior to 1923, but, in return, they have completely recognized the "democracy" of Stalin's regime. Small wonder: these people have all their lives been the ideologists of a labor bureaucracy. In point of fact, Soviet Bonapartism bears the same relation to Soviet democracy that bourgeois Bonapartism or even Fascism bears to bourgeois democracy. Both arise equally from the frightful defeats of the world proletariat. Both will crash with its first victory.

Bonapartism as history testifies is able to abide very well with universal and even secret suffrage. The democratic ritual of Bonapartism is the plebiscite. From time to time the question is put to the citizens: **For or against the Leader?** The leader, on his part, takes precautions so that the voter is able to feel the barrel of a gun at his temple. Since the days of Napoleon III, who now appears as a provincial dilettante, this technique has attained an unprecedented development, as witness, say, the latest spectacle by Goebbels. The new constitution is thus intended to liquidate juridically the outworn Soviet regime, replacing it by Bonapartism on the plebiscitary basis.

Tasks of the Vanguard

Drawing profounder conclusions from Stalin, Molotov told the editor of *Le Temps* that the question of parties in the U.S.S.R. is "not a vital question in the U.S.S.R., inasmuch as we are closely approaching the complete liquidation of . . . classes." What precision in ideas and terminology! In the year 1931, they liquidated the "last capitalist class, that of the kulaks," and in the year 1936 they are "closely approaching" the liquidation of classes. For better or for worse, the question of parties is not a "vital" one to Molotov. Entirely different, however, are the views held upon this matter by those workers who know that the bureaucracy while suppressing the exploiting classes with one hand, prepares for their rebirth with the other. For these advanced workers the question of their own party, independent of the bureaucracy, is the most vital of all questions. Stalin and Molotov understand this very well indeed: not for nothing have they expelled during the last few months from the so-called Communist Party of the Soviet Union several tens of thousands of Bolshevik-Leninists, i.e., in reality, an entire revolutionary party.

When the editor of *Le Temps* politely put the question about factions and their possible transformation into independent parties, Molotov replied, with the quick wit for which he is so noted: "In the party . . . attempts were made to create special factions . . . but now several years since the situation in this respect has fundamentally changed and the Communist Party is truly united." Best of all, he might have added, this is proved by the interminable purges and concentration camps. However, the illegal existence of an opposition party is not non-existence, but only a difficult form of existence. Arrests may prove very effective against the parties of a class that is departing from the historical stage: the revolutionary dictatorship of the years 1917-1923 has proved this fully. But the arrests aimed against the revolutionary vanguard will not save the outlived bureaucracy, which according to its own admission requires a "whip."

It is a lie and a triple lie to allege that socialism has been realized in the U.S.S.R. The flowering of bureaucracy is barbaric proof that socialism is still far removed. So long as the productivity of labor in the U.S.S.R. is several times below that of the advanced capitalist countries; so long as the people have not emerged from want; so long as a cruel struggle continues to be waged for articles of consumption; so long as the individualistic bureaucracy can thrum with impunity upon social antagonisms—just so long will the danger of bourgeois restoration retain its full force. At the present time, with the growth of inequality on the basis of economic successes, the danger has even been increased. In this and in this alone lies the justification for the need of state power. But the bureaucratically degenerated state has itself become the chief danger to the socialist future. The inequality can be reduced to its economically inevitable limits at the given stage, and a road can be cut to socialist equality only by the active political control of the toilers, be-

ginning with their vanguard. The regeneration of the party of the Bolsheviks in counterpoise to the party of the Bonapartists is the key to all other difficulties and tasks.

On the road towards a goal, one must be able to utilize the real possibilities which arise on every stage. Any illusions about the Stalinist constitution would of course be unreasonable. But it is equally impermissible to wave it aside as an insignificant trifle. The bureaucracy assumes the risk of a reform not at its own whim but out of necessity. History tells of many cases of a bureaucratic dictatorship resorting for its salvation to "liberal" reforms, and still further weakening itself. By laying bare Bonapartism, the new constitution creates a semi-legal cover for the struggle against it. The rivalry between the bureaucratic cliques can become the vent-hole for a much wider political struggle. The whip against the "government institutions that work badly" can be turned into a whip against Bonapartism. Everything depends upon the degree of activity of the advanced elements of the working class.

The Bolshevik-Leninists must henceforth follow attentively all the twists and windings of the constitutional reform, painstakingly taking into consideration the experience of the first coming elections. We must learn how to utilize the rivalry between the various "public organizations" in the interests of socialism. We must learn how to engage in battles on the soil of the plebiscites as well. The bureaucracy is afraid of the workers, we must unfold our work among them more audaciously and on a more extensive scale. Bonapartism is afraid of the youth, we must rally it to the banner of Marx and Lenin. From the adventures of individual terrorism, the method of those who are desperate we must lead the vanguard of the young generation onto the broad road of the world revolution. It is necessary to train new Bolshevik cadres which will come to replace the decaying bureaucratic regime. April 16, 1936.

LUMEN CLUB CAMP EXCURSION

Sunday, May 10, 10:15 A.M.
Starting out from the Bus Terminal at 181 St. and Amsterdam Ave. The bus will take you to Riverdale, N. J. You will have a good time and see the location of your coming summer vacation.

Lunch will be served at the camp.
Price for round trip ticket, 70c.

APRIL ISSUE OF THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Articles by Trotsky, Sidney Hook and many others. A criticism by George Soule, editor of the *New Republic*, and a reply by George Novack. "Will Roosevelt be Re-elected?" by John West; "What Is This Business Revival?" by Arne Swabeck; and much other material.
Order from The New International, 100 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

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 \$400—to men and women, according to classes.

Monthly assessments from 45c to \$2.10.

For further information apply to Main Office:

714 Second Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

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

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. Single rates: Two cents per copy.

SATURDAY, MAY 9, 1936
Vol. 2, No. 18 (Whole No. 70)

French Radicals Hold Whip Hand

The Meaning of the Elections in France

(Continued from Page 1)

parties form a bloc with the Radical Socialists—which puts forward as its program exactly the program of the Radical Socialists; which accepts as its outstanding leaders, both in and out of Parliament, these same repudiated Radical Socialist chiefs; and which in the elections throws the working-class vote over to the Radical Socialist candidates.

When every demand of history and every teaching of Marxism called for an open and intransigent revolutionary proletarian policy, for the hastening of the dissolution of the Radical Socialist party by resolutely drawing the lower strata of its following behind the proletarian ranks under the banner of a revolutionary program, the Stalinists and Socialists of France have, through the People's Front, been engaged in exhausting the energies of the proletariat for the sake of—slowing down the dissolution of the Radical Socialists, bolstering up their credit and prestige with the masses, salvaging their bankrupt program, and aiding them in their loyal task of preventing the preparations for revolutionary struggle.

The disillusionment of the petty-bourgeois masses with Radical Socialism will not be permanently altered by changing the name of Radical Socialism to the People's Front. Why should they pick up again what they have discarded merely for the sake of a pretty new label? Already, the elections show, they are in large numbers turning not to the left but to the right, where at least there are confident leaders to speak out boldly for a new road and a new solution. The continuation of the People's Front policy means that this trend of the petty bourgeoisie will necessarily continue and increase. When the blows of history strip off the new clothes of the People's Front to show more obviously the Radical Socialist skeleton beneath, it will lose what attractive power it now has for the petty bourgeoisie, and they will drift faster toward the fascist camp. The proletariat can win and hold the petty bourgeois masses only by drawing them in under its own revolutionary banner, never by creeping in under the tattered petty-bourgeois tent.

What has been changed in France by these elections, hailed by the swarm of liberals, reformists, and social-patriots as the dawn of France's salvation? Essentially, nothing. Even in the Chamber of Deputies, in spite of the electoral shift, the basic relations are unaltered. The Communist and Socialist parties together have only about 35% of the votes in the Chamber. Thus they can control legislation and governmental policy only with the assistance of the Radical Socialists, who have about 20%. But this means that all measures actually taken will have to be Radical Socialist measures, and that any type or variation of a People's Front government could be in practice only another Radical Socialist government. The Radical Socialists keep the same relative position which they held in the last Chamber.

In many important respects, the nominal majority of the People's Front taken together with the minority position of the working-class parties is an added danger rather than an improvement. For example, it enables the French bourgeoisie to carry through any social and economic measures which they see fit, from wage reductions to devaluation to war, and at the same time to slough off all responsibility for such measures on to the People's Front. In this way, the bourgeoisie can convincingly maintain before the French masses that the continuing and increasing ills from which they suffer are actually due to the People's Front and its inspirers, the working-class parties. Thus the basis is laid for unanswerable propaganda to weaken the mass standing and authority of Socialism and Communism, and to draw the petty bourgeoisie and even many layers of the working class to the only other road—to Fascism. It will be observed that it is the policy of the People's Front which has placed the working class parties in this equivocal and possibly fatal position. To date, in drawing up the balance sheet of the People's Front, the Socialist and Communist parties have paid out: revolutionary theory, revolutionary policies, revolutionary strategy; and have received: a paper majority for the People's Front—which is either no majority at all, or a majority for the Radical Socialists, since the majority can be maintained only at the whim and pleasure of the Radical Socialists. But such a majority, far from representing an asset, is only an additional liability, burdening the working class parties with all the heavy debts and crimes of Radical Socialism.

The election results do not alter by a hair's breadth the underlying causes of the French crisis. Unemployment, low wages, high costs, the increasing misery of the lower strata of the peasantry, high taxes, the threat of devaluation, the approach of war: these remain now as they were a month ago. And every year of modern history, especially every year since the last War, proves that the reformist schemes of the People's Front cannot change materially for the better a single one of them. Every lesson of our times teaches that they demand as the single possible answer: the workers' revolution and socialism.

And the French Fascists? Defeated by the parliamentary warriors of the People's Front? Buried beneath the clouds of ballots? The very conception is sufficiently ludicrous. The Fascists participated only to a small degree in the elections. For the most part, they swung their votes to the traditional Right parties, many of the leaders of which are more openly moving toward a Fascist position in recent months. Meanwhile, the ranks of the Fascists are intact. Their knives and revolvers and machine guns and armored cars and tanks and airplanes are safe and growing in number. Their influence in the army is mounting. They prepare systematically, in their own fashion, for the struggle ahead. And French finance-capital directs their progress, holding them temporarily in check from too precipitous action before it is needed. Finance-capital makes it its business to learn from history: and the lessons of Italy, Germany and Austria were not taught it in vain. It knows that crucial political issues are not settled by ballots.

The proletariat of France will do well to follow such an example. Its basic struggle must be transferred from parliament to the streets and the countryside. The subordination of the proletariat to the program and tactics of the petty bourgeoisie through the People's Front must be resolutely broken. The People's Front itself must be smashed through, and in its place, to secure concerted and coordinated action, must be built the fighting united front of the workers, which will draw behind it the lower ranks of the petty bourgeoisie. The revolutionary slogans must be brought before the masses, and made concrete

(Continued from Page 1)

1932, the Socialists polled a popular vote almost equal to that of the Radicals. The electoral agreement between the Socialists and the Radicals on the second ballot worked to the advantage of the latter, and this cut down the Socialist representation in the Chamber, in 1932.

In commenting upon the results of the election, the Daily Worker remarks that the victory was "even greater than was expected." The Stalinists seem generally at a loss for superlatives to acclaim their "triumph." Thus, Gannes says shyly that the "tremendous, even smashing gains" scored in France are "comparable only to the Spanish election victory."

Comparison with Spanish Vote

From the standpoint of what the Stalinists acclaim as the "great gains for the French masses," to compare the Spanish election with the French is to hold a candle up to the sun. While it is true that proportionately the People's Front gained approximately the same majority in each country (56% of the total seats in Spain; 90% in France), the Spanish S.P. and C.U. combined obtained only a little over one-third of the seats carried by the People's Front as against almost two-thirds for the French S.P. and C.P. The combined popular vote of these two parties totaled 4,500,000 out of 10,000,000 votes cast. Then, too, the Spanish C.P. received less than 6% of the seats in the bloc as against almost 20% for the C.P. in France.

It is not difficult to prove that the results of the election came almost as a shock to the tub-thumpers for the People's Front.

Results Come as Shock

Leon Blum, in an interview issued to the French press, on the eve of the first ballot, "modestly foretold a gain of 20 seats for his own party, while giving the Communists 25, and the Radicals 15. . . . He is convinced that the Radical group, the great middle class party, will remain the largest in the Chamber." (The Manchester Guardian Weekly, April 24.)

In the Daily Worker analysis of the results of the first ballot we find: first, a boast of the "great victory"; secondly, a forecast of "from at least 40 and possibly 60 deputies" for the C.P.; and, finally, the following astounding prognosis:

"It is estimated that the French Socialist Party will obtain 80 seats in the next Chamber and the Radical Socialists will hold about 70." (D.W., April 28.)

We can either accept this news dispatch (allegedly from Paris) at its face value and conclude that the Daily Worker was merely insuring itself against all eventualities by howling victory on the first ballot and predicting a disastrous defeat for the People's Front in the run-offs; or we may assume that the bewildered hack who concocted the "Paris dispatch" had intended to give the Radicals, that "great middle class party" not 70 but 170 seats. The latter figure is the one prophesied for the Radicals by Blum, and also ventured as an estimate in the pages of *L'Humanite*.

Even after the run offs, the Daily Worker tended to be restrained almost to the verge of suspicion. Thus, under its screaming headline of May 4 which proclaimed "victory," the Stalinists carried the most conservative U.P. dispatch which gave the Communists "between 45 and 55 seats in the next parliament", and did not breathe a word about the possibility of the Radicals losing their dominant position to the Socialists.

Distressed at New Set-Up

The Stalinists get the jitters at the very thought of themselves or the Socialists, i.e. the "working class parties" having to oppose the Fascists face to face even on the parliamentary arena. According to the theory and practice of the People's Front, France can be saved from Fascism only provided that the "great party of the middle class" be interposed in power between the lawless Fascists and the law-abiding workers. The program of the People's Front is acceptable to Herriot-Daladier because it is the program of Herriot-Daladier. The banner of the People's Front is the tricolor: its hymn, the Marseillaise. That is why P. J. Philly can report with satisfaction the following:

"In estimating the degree of readiness of the new majority, it should be noted that at nearly all the electoral meetings, even the Communist ones, the Tricolor flag of the French Republic was used to form the centerpiece over the platform. . . . The Marseillaise was sung as lustily as the 'Internationale', and these small mat-

ters are significant" (N.Y. Times, May 5).

The victory proved "unexpected" and even embarrassing to the Stalinists because they were anxious that the Radicals should be stronger in the new Chamber than the Socialists. But, as it turned out, "everybody" won except the true banner-bearers of the People's Front, the Radical Socialists.

The Daily Worker pretends it is pleased at the outcome, and explains the defeat of the Radicals as the defeat of the enemies of the People's Front. "The defeated Radical Socialists were the doubtful friends of democracy within the People's Front."

"The forces within the People's Front who dared flirt with the reactionaries, who voted for some of the pro-Fascist measures of ex-Radical Premier Pierre Laval, were decisively rebuked and rejected." (D. W., May 5).

Defeated Despite People's Front

The Stalinists conveniently forget to mention that those Radicals who went down to defeat, did so despite the support of the People's Front, i.e. of the Socialists and of the Communists. Far from "rebuking or rejecting" any Radical, even one openly hostile to the People's Front, the Stalinists sought to placate and elect every single one of them. As reported by M. E. Ravage in the Nation (April 29) the Stalinists rejected the proposal made by a Socialist member of the People's Front Committee that every candidate supported by the bloc be asked to pledge his approval of the program and his support of the government formed to execute it. "Surprisingly enough the Communists, eager not to alienate the Radicals by seeming to dictate to them, rejected the proposal."

The Daily Worker carefully avoids any editorial mention of Herriot's case. Yet it is a secret to no one that Herriot is not at all friendly to the People's Front, and if anyone can be charged with supporting the "pro-Fascist measures" of Laval it is certainly Herriot who participated in Laval's cabinet.

Blum Prophecies Collapse

Daladier is the titular leader of the Radicals, but the decisive influence is wielded by Herriot. Regardless of whether or not the Radicals received the largest delegation it was obvious from the outset that the next French Government would once again depend upon this party, which is plainly divided in its views toward the People's Front. Leon Blum, for example prophesied in his interview to the press shortly before the elections that the People's Front would collapse in the next Chamber: "About 60 Radicals with right-wing tendencies will leave the People's Front organization under the pretext that they cannot associate with a majority which includes Communists."

None other than Herriot is the leader of this group. One might have innocently imagined that when Herriot, for 31 years the mayor of Lyons ("Lyons and Herriot—the two names are inseparable") failed of election on the first ballot, the Stalinists would have taken the lead in administering a rebuke and a defeat in the run-offs to the man who so obviously endangers their entire political planning. Just the contrary occurred. Herriot received the support of the Socialists and the Communists and nosed out his reactionary opponent.

The salient aspects of the election have been already outlined by us in last week's article. It remains only to add that the results of the second ballot provided a striking verification of the manner in which the People's Front salvages the utterly bankrupt party of the Radicals.

The disintegration of this traditional party of French "democracy," which is so marked in the face of the joint support of both the Socialists and the Communists, and which must continue at an ever increasing rate, has already established a relationship of forces in the Chamber which places the greatest strain upon the structure of the People's Front. The collapse of the People's Front would signify a tremendous acceleration in the process of regroupment within the French working class as a whole, within the Socialist Party, and even among the Stalinists. Its collapse at this juncture when the Fascists are as yet unprepared to launch a general offensive would come as a great boon to the French working class which can expect no counsel from Blum-Daladier-Cachin except betrayal and no action except capitulation.

The first serious test, and the resulting disintegration of the "victors" may come even prior to the convocation of the new Chamber over the question of the devaluation of the franc.

in action; and to meet the armed hands of the Fascists, the workers' defense must be armed and organized. The answer to the crisis of France must be given boldly: the workers' revolution.

But each of these tasks, without the accomplishment of which the workers of France are doomed to the fate of their German comrades, demands as its first and decisive pre-condition the reassembling of the revolutionary forces of the French proletariat, the forging of the revolutionary party, which can alone achieve the victory.

Progressives Beat Dillon Machine At the Auto Workers Convention

(Continued from Page 1)

opposing the previous craft union minded administration, the second test of their development showed definite weaknesses which can not be ignored.

Election of Officials

So strong was the desire of many delegates including the progressives to obtain offices that instead of fighting out differences on basic issues and then electing men on their stand, it was decided by the steering committee that election of officers should come first.

Martin, a compromise selection of the progressives, was chosen president. Previously Wyndham Mortimer, of Cleveland, one of the strongest leaders of the progressives, was favored as candidate. Ed Hall, secretary-treasurer, although bitterly opposed by progressives from his own territory, Wisconsin, was given second vice-presidency. In a deal, Wells, of Detroit, known as a middle-of-the-road man, became third vice president, and George Adde, of Toledo, by no means a thorough progressive, was chosen secretary-treasurer.

The caliber of the officers is very reminiscent of the rubber workers' officials selected last fall. Only the test of a class struggle will show clearly where each stands. Some of the rubber worker progressives turned reactionary in the Goodyear strike.

The Red Scare

A company-inspired red scare through issuance of a fake leaflet branding Martin and Mortimer as "communists" did not affect the elections.

In bitterness over the election results, reactionary delegates introduced a resolution to expel all known "communists" from the convention.

A two-hour debate ensued with militant Socialist delegates taking the best stand and putting up the strongest opposition to the resolution.

Instead of fighting the battle to

a finish and defeating the resolution once and for all, the progressive forces passed a motion to refer it back to the constitutional committee where it was forgotten.

In that connection, a speech by Rose Pesotta, of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, speaking as a guest that afternoon, spiked the reactionaries on the red scare. She gave an eloquent plea for political democracy in unions which was cheered by virtually everyone. After her talk the issue never came to the surface again.

Plays Craft Union Regime

Then came the memorable speech of Richard Frankenstein, an observer for the Independent Industrial Union which Coughlin had influenced. He scathingly denounced the craft union policies of the Green regime. He criticized the ignorant attacks of many labor papers against his union pointing out that at no time in the past two years had any attempt been made by the A. F. of L. or any group to bring them into the federation. He declared the A. F. of L. conduct in the Motor Products strike where Dillon led scabs into the factory under the A. F. of L. banner a disgrace to unionism. Then he made a stirring plea for unity and pledged to bring the union into the autonomous United Automobile Workers while the delegates gave him a tremendous ovation. Anderson of the M.E.S.A. likewise took a similar stand in his talk.

It was clearly established that two main ideas were in the auto workers' minds—an expression of what the thousands of workers in the huge factories think. Those were UNITY of all unions under the banner of INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM.

Unity Probable Soon

Immediate plans for amalgamation including the seating of an independent union leader on the general executive board were made. It is therefore highly probable that unity will be established among the auto workers.

In this matter the Committee for Industrial Organization was praised by Frankenstein and Anderson. Frankenstein openly declared that the discussions with the C.I.O. representatives, Adolph Germer and others, had brought them to the unity position.

It can be said generally that the C.I.O., because of the very nature of the problems confronting the auto workers, played a more progressive role than in the Goodyear strike where more basic questions were confronted.

Labor Party Resolution

However, the credit for much of the progress made must be given to the active group of young militant Socialists. They supported and fought for every point of the program previously mentioned both in numerous caucus meetings and on the convention floor, except the Labor Party resolution and that deserves special mention.

Although Stalinist-influenced progressives expected a bitter fight and considerable doubt was entertained about the passing of the Gorman resolution, the resolution was supported without any voice of opposition, without any debate.

(Since the writing of this article the press reported the carrying of a resolution endorsing Roosevelt for re-election. This motion was put and passed as a rider to the resolution urging the formation of a Farmer-Labor party following a speech by President Homer Martin, who appealed to the delegates not to cross the C.I.O. which is definitely committed to back Roosevelt in 1936.—Ed.)

It seemed that no one except the Stalinists took the resolution seriously. The S.P. delegates appeared confused in their position and some voted for and others apparently abstained from voting.

A Significant Observation

As a Toledo delegate remarked after the vote, "What we are vitally interested in is building a powerful progressive industrial union. The Labor Party isn't going to help. If we can bring in 450,000 auto workers after a real struggle against the auto magnates that will mean something to the workers."

As a matter of fact, a careful survey led this writer to the opinion expressed above that the auto workers are a hundred-fold more interested in building a union by direct class struggle than in any Labor Party.

It hardly need be pointed out that such a struggle for elementary rights will necessarily take on revolutionary aspects because of the

forces against which the workers battle. Many of the militants appeared to realize this too, and expressed that opinion.

The delegates have no illusions about the ferocity of the struggle that will be waged against them. Speaker after speaker told of the spy-systems, the intimidation, the blacklists and other weapons brought into play to crush unionism. But the great advance of the United Rubber Workers left a definite impression and built up a new determination in the auto workers. "If the Goodyear strikers did that much, we can do the same," a Detroit delegate said.

It was in that temper that the delegates adjourned, returning to the 40,000 workers they represent to begin an intensive organization drive backed by the C.I.O. to unionize the 450,000 auto workers.

However a speech by Charles P. Howard, secretary of the C.I.O., and president of the Typographical union, indicated the limitations such aid would take.

"We believe that the worker should obtain more of a share of the product produced. The automobile workers deserve higher wages. We must fight to maintain the American standard of living to give us continued life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The employer must learn it is good business to pay higher wages. . . ." Howard said, at a mass meeting.

Support of Roosevelt also was urged. In other words, a class collaboration policy will be pursued by the C.I.O. when obviously only the most militant struggle can bring any victory, as the Goodyear strike proved.

In conclusion, it must be said that the number of young militants at the convention offered real hope that the United Automobile Workers would base their fight for unionism on a class struggle policy. In clashing with the powerful auto magnates only such a policy offers the correct program for victory.

As in the rubber strike, irrespective of any particular leader or groups of leaders, future battles in the auto industry will assume such magnitude and the auto workers such a militancy that one can safely predict the development of cadres of class-conscious, revolutionary-minded militants by the very nature of the struggle.

Grant Wage Rise in Akron

(Continued from Page 1)

and boxes, and embellished with a sign, "Moving Goodrich to Oak Park, Pa.," a slap at the decentralization announcements of the past month.

With Goodrich marched its uniformed baseball team, and members—believe it or not—of the riding club, gallantly bearing signs, "Goodrich Riding Club—the Horses are Resting."

Splendid Fraternal Delegations

Throughout the parade were signs demanding the repeal of the sales tax, condemning the "Law and Order League," and attacking the Bedaux system. Fraternal delegates from Canton bore a large sign, "BLACKLISTED!—Republic Steel Workers," and served as a reminder that labor solidarity reaches everywhere. The Palmer match workers, carrying a sign, "LOCKED OUT!" and bearing on their shoulders what were obviously huge imitation matches, but which, curiously enough, would probably serve as fine picnic clubs, were applauded constantly.

An encouraging sign, especially when it is remembered that Akron recruits largely from southern labor, was the large number of Negroes parading with the Pittsburgh Valve local.

After the parade, a mass meeting was held in Grace Park. Joseph Schlossberg of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers spoke, as did the C.P. stooge, Maurice Sugar of Detroit.

As a whole, however, the parade was a wonderful exhibition of the Akron trade unions' fresh, young strength. Naturally the barons of the rubber industry have not been napping. While throwing a sop to the workers, they have been busy solidifying the forces of reaction. At Goodyear the police force is being augmented, the "Law and Order League" is initiating a low dues paying union, and it is entering the political arena.

Everything points to new and glorious struggles ahead!

A Political Book-Review of "What Is Communism?" and "Communism in the United States", By Earl Browder.

With a Few Side-Remarks on "Towards Soviet America," by William Z. Foster and Why his Book Was Suppressed.

How Browder Became the "Beloved Leader" and his Career Under Two Flags.

EARL BROWDER
THE MAN AND HIS BOOKS
SPEAKER

MAX SHACHTMAN
Editor of the New International

IRVING PLAZA HALL
15th ST. and IRVING PLACE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20th 8p. m.