

NEW MILITANT

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

VOL. 2, NO. 19 [WHOLE NO. 71]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 16, 1936

PRICE 3 CENTS

Communist Party Trails F.D. Bandwagon

Aid the Russian Bolshevik Exiles!

Stalin Plans Wholesale Persecution

New Decree Directs Violence of Regime Against Revolutionists

By L. TROTSKY

The March 15th issue of Pravda carries a semi-official order that emanates from a high source, obviously from Stalin, and that deals with the treatment to be accorded the expelled party members. The question is not a simple one because, as we have only to recall, from the second half of last year to the present day more than 300,000 have been expelled, perhaps, even half a million. The smallest percentage of the party members expelled is 7%, but in several instances over one-third have been expelled. At the present time the purge is continuing under the guise of "exchanging the party cards", or, as Stalin's order states, the party continues to rid itself of "Trotskyists, Zinovievists, White Guards, and other filth." This list and the order of naming the categories of the expelled have become very firmly established, and, moreover, in all the lists, both local and general, the "Trotskyists" invariably occupy the first place. This means that the heaviest blows are directed against them.

Stalin's order leaves no room for doubt on this score. On the surface the order seems to be intended as a check upon the excessive zeal of local organizations who are depriving all the expelled of work. With unexampled bureaucratic jesuitism, Stalin intervenes in behalf of certain categories of the expelled. Thus, the order remarks that certain communists have been expelled as passive elements, for breaches of discipline or of party ethics. Harshness toward them is unwarranted. If they are to be compromised for their old work, they must be given new work. One should not needlessly breed enemies. "Unfortunately, this simple truth is not understood everywhere." A man who has committed "some sort of a grave breach of party ethics" may nevertheless remain a "useful individual for our socialist country." Under one condition: that he is not an "enemy," i.e., the enemy of the bureaucracy. If a man has embezzled, given or taken bribes, beat up an underling, or raped a girl, in short, committed a "grave breach of party ethics" but has in the meantime remained loyal to the powers that be, then this "useful individual" must be given other work. The chief quality that the order demands from the party leaders is: "the ability to distinguish between the enemy and the non-enemy." Ruthlessness is recommended only with regard to the political opponent. A docile grafter is not an enemy. The mortal enemy is the honest oppositionist who must be deprived of work of every kind.

The only employer in the U.S.S.R. is the bureaucracy. Stalin's order implies in practice the doom of tens of thousands of Oppositionists to the tortures of unemployment and homelessness, even when they are exiled. To be sure, this used to be done before too, but not in every case. Today, this has been erected into a system.

This order of Stalin which bears the caption "On Bolshevik Vigilance" must be brought to the attention of the workers the world over. Not a single appropriate occasion should be missed to raise this question at workers' meetings. Wherever possible, it is necessary to penetrate into the trade union press. Everything must be done to prevent Stalin from physically exterminating tens of thousands of irreproachable young fighters.

March 25, 1936.

ATTENTION

Max Shachtman, editor of the New Internationalist will speak on "Browder: the Man and His Books," Wed., May 20th, 8 P.M. at Irving Plaza, Irving Place and 15th Street.

Report Death, Suffering In Stalin's Siberian Jail

The following information on our prisoners in the U.S.S.R. has been received from an absolutely trustworthy source. For obvious reasons we cannot disclose the name of our informant:

1) Our comrade SOLNTSEV, imprisoned in 1929 after his return from America served three years in prison and then an additional two. Released at the beginning of 1935, he was deported to the Siberian frontier—I do not know the name of the locality, but I was in indirect communication with him—in a village where it was impossible for him to find work and where he therefore suffered the greatest physical privation. At the end of 1935, he was arrested again, without any conceivable legal reason, and soon condemned to 3 or 5 years in prison. He refused to undergo this punishment and carried through a hunger strike lasting about 20 days in defense of his "freedom" of exile. He won his point; the N.K.W.D. consented to send him to Minoussinsk where his exiled wife and son awaited him. On route, travelling by stages with other prisoners, he fell ill with exhaustion (inflammation of the internal ear), was operated on immediately in the hospital at Novosibirsk where he died last January (1936).

2) All the Trotskyist exiles of Tara, a dozen comrades among whom is Guertstein, were arrested in January-February. This means that a "case" is being cooked up against them which can only end by their removal to concentration camps for long terms.

3) LADO DOUMBADZE must be saved. Wounded in the civil war, seriously bruised besides, he is paralyzed in both arms. Imprisoned, in 1934-35 he was moved from Souzdal to Boutirky, from Boutirky to exile, from exile again to Souzdal, rapidly transferred from prison to prison, from city to city, without obtaining any real care, he becomes more seriously ill. They ended by exiling him to Sarapoul, where he is alone, an invalid, receiving an allowance of 50 roubles a month. It is almost impossible for him to dress and undress himself; he has no one to care for him, letters seldom reach him, it is only with the greatest pain that he succeeds in writing a few lines and then after hours of painful travail—I read one of these letters, it is a tragic document; but if we do not obtain care for him or other living conditions, LADO DOUMBADZE is lost; his heroism can now serve him only to go under like a man.

I believe it necessary to broadcast widely the sufferings and death of Solntsev, the danger to Doumbadze. My information is quite reliable and for my part I will do everything in my power. . . .

I have read Tarov and Chlign: they are, on the whole, understating the case. The truth is much worse.

Pressure Forces Victor Serge's Release from S.U.

After three years of exile in Stalin's Siberia, Victor Serge, author of "The Year One of the Russian Revolution" and many other working class books, and a life-long and devoted militant in the revolutionary movement, has been released and returned to Belgium.

He was arrested in 1933 by an administrative order to the G.P.U. and exiled without the slightest semblance of a trial in violation of the Soviet laws for his continued refusal to give up his revolutionary views and prostitute himself to the task of liquidating the October Revolution.

He was deprived of all communication with the outside world, and blacklisted so that he was unable to obtain employment in Orenburg, where he was exiled. For three years he tried to support a sick wife and child on the meagre returns from the publication of his works in France. During this time the Stalinist bureaucrats constantly harassed him for a capitulation.

On April 1 of this year the growing wave of protest against the treatment of Serge, especially in France where a committee of prominent authors carried on a long fight for his release, finally forced the Stalinist bureaucrats to let him go. But they took their revenge by holding his former secretary, a young French stenographer, who was completely inactive in politics, as a "hostage." At the same time all

Serge's papers, notes and manuscripts for books, in which the authorities vainly searched for "counter-revolutionary" statements were confiscated.

The release of Serge is the second victory of this year in the struggle to free the thousands of revolutionists who are rotting in the jails and in exile in the Soviet Union, jailed and exiled by administrative decrees without trial, and unknown even to the population of the U.S.S.R. itself.

Union Blooms Out of Their Own Mouths

By BLAKE LEAR

AKRON, Ohio, May 12.—Seven workers were slightly wounded on May 7th when a company gunman shot into a crowd of several hundred Goodyear workers milling about a company weasel who was distributing an anti-union pamphlet, "The Real Facts!"

So eager were the workers to receive the pamphlet that the company weasel had to pull a black-jack to repress the importunate crowd. It was an unfortunate tactical error, for he was immediately hurled to the ground. The special deputy, one of those commissioned during the late unlamented strike, then fired into the crowd.

The pamphlet, cleverly signed "A Goodyear Worker," portrays the Goodyear as a veritable Garden of Eden before the snake of unionism arrived. The ugly lynch spirit pervading the scene is well shown in the following quotation: "There is another condition in the shop today and that is there are some very

(Continued on Page 4)

It is not often that the capitalist press draws aside the curtains that conceal the real forces at work in maintaining "social order" under the present system. All the more remarkable, therefore, is the following article on the Tampa flogging case that appeared in the New York Times of May 11. The killing of Joseph Shoemaker was so callous a crime, the national protest against its perpetrators so powerful, political and economic conditions in Tampa as brought out during the trials are so thoroughly rotten that even this ultra-conservative Journal has been driven to expose them after its own fashion.

"By JUNIUS B. WOOD

"BARTOW, Fla., May 10.—An unanswerable question to persons in this part of the country is why the mere flogging and tar and feathering of three men, one of them so severely that he died, should attract such widespread attention in the United States.

(Continued on Page 4)

C.I.O. Faces Challenge Of Steel

Drive to Organize Industry Major Problem Before American Labor

By ARNE SWABECK

Will the half million workers, whose fortune and misfortune is harnessed to the brutal and capricious dominance of the gigantic steel empire, finally be organized?

The Committee for Industrial Organization considers this question to be a challenge. It passed the challenge on to the A. F. of L. But, it attached also an offer to contribute a half million dollars and a staff of experienced organizers for an organization campaign, stipulating that conditions necessary really to produce results would require assurance that "all steel workers organized will be granted the permanent right to remain united in one industrial union," and that "the leadership of the campaign must be such as to inspire confidence of success." Certainly, more reasonable conditions could not be stipulated.

However, the A. F. of L. Executive Council, now meeting in Washington, D.C., wrathfully spurned the offer and refused to accept its conditions.

Wm. Green declared that the Executive Council would act only if it were "free from the interference on the part of any group or groups either within or outside the jurisdiction of the A. F. of L." In other words, these distinguished elders flatly rejected the whole idea presented by the C.I.O.

A. F. of L. Decision Remains Paper

Convention resolutions of 1934 and 1935 put the A. F. of L. on record to organize the steel industry. Nevertheless, the net results to date falls below zero. The steel workers' union has even lost the gains it made during the early NRA period. To establish the responsibility for this failure should not be difficult. It is a well known fact that the leadership of the steel workers' union, headed by Mike Tighe, is even considered by Wm. Green to be so incompetent as not to merit the confidence necessary to direct a campaign of organization. Self-complacent bureaucrats, when irritated by demands for action, usually need a scapegoat, and truly, a better one than Mike Tighe could hardly be found. But this means nothing more than the old proverb of the pot calling the kettle black. The sluggishness of Wm. Green and company would also seem to mirror a consciousness of their own incompetence. And no doubt, the stubborn insistence on craft union prerogatives has very likely led them into a position that they themselves cannot think through to the end when considering organization of the steel industry.

Lewis Flays Wretched Policy

Still, the real reason for the dismal failure so far is a much more fundamental one. Unwittingly John L. Lewis touched its very nerve center when he addressed himself the other day, on behalf of the C.I.O., directly to the convention of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers.

With withering scorn he condemned the A. F. of L. policy as "inadequate, futile and conceived in a mood of humiliated desperation on the part of men who have for years past trifled with the destinies of 500,000 men employed by your industry and have materially stayed the progress of the American labor movement." Lewis also addressed his offer directly to the steel workers' convention. But chances were rather scant for a better response from this gathering than that received from Green.

A direct descendant from the proud Sons of Vulcan, and itself antedating the formation of the A. F. of L. by several years, the Amalgamated Association is again re-

(Continued on Page 2)

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

71

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

Browder Borrows Farley Campaign Slogans; New Deal Demagoguery Aided as 'Labor Party' Flops

EARL BROWDER, like a good father, always has a new surprise up his sleeve for his political children. The surprises, no doubt, seem often a bit flat and stale to those outside the family circle; but when accompanied so gracefully with that warm and well-known smile of the leader, the family itself is always ready with a happy round of applause and a shout or two of delight.

Think of that beautiful surprise he brought back from Moscow a year ago January, personally wrapped up and sealed by the hand of the master. Browder himself was so excited about it that he couldn't even stop in New York to show it first to the Central Committee. He didn't want it spoiled by being talked about beforehand. He jumped on the first train to Washington, hurried up to the platform of the Social Security Convention, and presented it there to the delegates, entirely prepaid. How they all gasped and cheered! A wonderful, new, mass-class Farmer-Labor Party! The delegates could hardly wait to hurry home, and spread the glad tidings to farm and countryside. Gone were the days of harsh words and bitter theses. Gone the lone and austere super-revolutionary struggle. Now comrades could be found at every glance, and the broad embrace of the people's movement could draw within its arms Church and school, Y.M.C.A. and Salvation Army, clubs and sororities, the bitter with the sweet.

And what a campaign it was, spurred on by Dimitroff's stirring realism at the Seventh Congress. The Daily Worker was hardly large enough to contain all the reports of the Farmer-Labor gatherings throughout the country, to list the thousands of resolutions adopted for a Farmer-Labor Party every time two honest persons got together. The sweep, the Daily Worker informed us (that is, up to a week ago) was irresistible. The Farmer-Labor party was assured for 1936. Only cowards, lagging behind the masses, could fail to see it. Long editorials in large type scolded the Socialists, grew indignant at Norman Thomas, denounced the Militants, because these cynics suggested that a Farmer-Labor party in 1936 was not going to be.

UNION CHIEFS FOLLOW DAILY WORKER . . . TO ROOSEVELT

Somehow, Lewis and Hillman and Dubinsky and Green and Olson and Rieve failed to follow the Daily Worker as closely as they should have. Somehow, they began to issue public statements and form propaganda leagues and put pressure on unions to support Roosevelt. Or was it that they had read the Daily Worker, not too little, but too well? Had they noticed in the Daily Worker that the main enemy of the masses was Hearst and Hoover and the Liberty League, that the force which blocked the people's legislation was the Supreme Court, that the agency making for fascism and war was the Dupont family, Morgan and Hearst and the organizations which these subsidized? Perhaps they had noticed these things, and observed that this was precisely Roosevelt's position, and that Roosevelt seemed a more imposing advocate than a hypothetical and non-existent Farmer-Labor Party which would advocate, in fundamentals, that same position.

For this is the truth of the matter: the Stalinist campaign for the Farmer-Labor Party has been and continues to be a campaign for Roosevelt.

This, then, makes Browder's latest surprise perhaps not so surprising. Last week-end, at the Conference of the Youth Congress held in New York, Browder disclosed it: There is not going to be a Farmer-Labor presidential ticket in 1936. Again the short gasp (after all, the Daily Worker had been explaining that there would be all during the week before), and then again the applause and even the excited shout or two. No, explained Browder, realistic politicians understand (everyone else having already come to the conclusion) that the idea that there can be a Farmer-Labor presidential ticket in 1936 is utopian and romantic. But of course that does not mean that we won't have a Farmer-Labor party in 1936. Of course not. We will organize a national party to run local tickets. And meantime we will understand that "the main slogan of the Communist Party in the election campaign will be: 'Keep the Hoovers, Landons and Hearsts out of power.'"

The Daily Worker theoreticians hurried to their desks, tore up their back copy, and prepared a deluge of new articles explaining the full meaning of the new surprise. Olson's call for a conference at Chicago showed it off to full advantage. Here was just what answered. A Farmer-Labor Conference called by a State Farmer-Labor party, disavowing any thought of putting forward a presidential candidate, and keeping clear of any inconvenient democracy in its arrangements. The Stalinists, under banner heads, hail the Conference, appropriately, as the greatest step yet taken toward the mass-class Farmer-Labor movement.

THE MAIN ENEMY!

And what is the purpose of this Conference? Its meaning stares us in the face. It is called to mobilize further and more solidly the confused and cloudy Farmer-Labor sentiment behind the Roosevelt chariot. Again, it somehow turns out,—the Farmer-Labor campaign is a campaign for Roosevelt.

What libel! Is it suggested that the Communist Party is betraying its class interests and lending aid and comfort to the political agent of the enemy? The infamous notion seems to have occurred even to the minds of some of the following, for we find the Question and Answer Box of Thursday's Daily Worker dealing with it. The Question is put backwards: a "simple worker" signing himself modestly "D. H." wants to know whether we shouldn't stop criticizing Roosevelt and concentrate our fire on "the fight against reaction as represented by Hearst and the Liberty League." The Answer is stern, but friendly. Of course, "the main emphasis . . . must be by all means laid on the necessity of combatting the Republican-Liberty League-Hearst combination, which is

leading the drive toward fascism. This ultra-reactionary alliance is today the chief enemy of the common people of the country, and all efforts must be made to defeat it in the November elections."

All efforts! . . . How, then, do we vote? But this question Browder and the Daily Worker have seen fit not yet to answer.

But, naturally, the Answer goes on: "However, in order to defeat reaction, it is necessary to criticize all those who, by retreating before it, are helping to pave the way for its victory. This is the role of Roosevelt." And, after outlining why local Farmer-Labor parties must be built: "Moreover, only such a militant people's front could exert real pressure on Roosevelt and slow down to some extent his retreat before reaction." The leading editorial in the same issue amplifies further the same ideas, under the heading, "Roosevelt, on Taxes, is Giving New Concessions to Reactionaries."

CONFUSION VERSUS MARXISM

A moment's pause is necessary. Let us stop to consider for a moment these quotations from the Answer. This, no doubt, is the realistic Marxism modelled after the new helmsman of the Comintern. But it seems, at least at a superficial glance, somewhat removed from the Marxism associated with the founder of the principles which bear his name. Indeed, if it were two years ago, we might believe that we were reading an account of Roosevelt in The Nation or The New Republic. These two Quixotic periodicals likewise analyze in the same manner the "tragedy of Roosevelt." Roosevelt, they have been telling us for some time now, an honest man with good ideas, "retreated before reaction." He was too weak to stand up before the attacks of Wall Street and the industrialists.

Revolutionary Marxists (that is, of the non-Dimitroff variety) make a different analysis. They state that Roosevelt is the political executive of finance-capital, that he stepped into the government to use the resources of the state to help pull capitalism out of the depths of crisis, to restore profits and maintain the rule of the bourgeoisie and of private property. Far from "retreating before reaction," they say that Roosevelt is precisely the agent of reaction—the agent of the bourgeoisie, the reactionary class in modern society. They grant that his methods differ from the methods of the Liberty League, that indeed he has conflicts with many of the bankers and industrialists. But in basic class content and allegiance, they are (these unrealistic Marxists) unable to find any difference between Roosevelt and the Liberty League, between Jim Farley and Hoover or Landon. It is their view—a view they share with Marx and Lenin but unfortunately not with Browder and Dimitroff and Stalin—that the "chief enemy" of the common people of the country is not "the Republican-Liberty League-Hearst combination," but—the class enemy, the bourgeoisie, capitalism as a whole. They declare that the business of Marxists in the 1936 campaign is to agitate, not against the bogey-man of the Liberty League, but against capitalism and for socialism, to utilize the ferment of the election year to draw the masses toward a revolutionary program and a revolutionary party, not toward reformist illusions and a third-party to patch up the holes and wash the dirty linen of a rotted social order.

A CAMPAIGN AGAINST SOCIALISM

The Stalinist campaign, the whole false, hypocritical, degraded, cynical campaign of their mass-class Farmer-Labor hocus pocus, is a campaign for Roosevelt, a campaign against socialism, the ideas of socialism, and the revolutionary struggle for socialism. This is true whether or not the Communist Party comes out openly to call for votes for Roosevelt. This latter possibility, as we have repeatedly pointed out in recent months, is by no means excluded; it is, on the contrary, entirely consistent with their present position, as well as with the international orientation of Stalinism. The ground has been carefully laid, and it is significant that the past weeks Daily Workers nowhere carry a categorical denial. The latest dodge is that "the Communist party will seek a joint presidential ticket with the Socialist party." This can hardly be meant seriously. And, they go on, "if unsuccessful" (the party) will place in the field its own independent candidates." The statement that these candidates will include a presidential candidate is studiously avoided. Moreover, candidates can always be withdrawn. The actual election tactic, however, depends upon certain factors other than the logical consequences of their position: upon the stage of the crisis in the Far East, the developments in Roosevelt's foreign policy between now and November, and a purely opportunistic judgment as to the effect upon its mass following which electoral support of Roosevelt would have. The Stalinists have a hard job in their strivings for respectability: Roosevelt will naturally be the first to repudiate their votes; and besides Roosevelt is sure to be elected in any case.

ROOSEVELT IS THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

But the specific electoral move is unimportant. The political significance remains the same in either case. The Stalinist propaganda plays into the hands of Roosevelt because of the basic political perspective which directs it. There is nothing strange in this, nor would there be in their voting for Roosevelt, no more than there was in the vote for Benes in Czechoslovakia. Does not their international position call for the support of democracy against fascism? Are they not prepared to support democratic countries in wars against fascist countries? Do they not call for a broad people's front of minimum reform on non-class lines, against the "200 families" in France, against Wall Street and the Liberty League in this country? Do they not call for neutrality legislation, social security, an end to the control of the Tories, a people's government? Wherein, therefore, does their program distinguish itself from

(Continued on Page 2)

C. I. O. Faces Challenge Of Steel Industry

(Continued from Page 1)

It was meant to be understood. This is one of the reasons for the fact that the organization he leads has only 4,800 members.

The Challenge of Steel

Meanwhile modern conditions of production has forged ahead to constantly greater improvement of machinery and efficiency of output, constantly also subordinating the conditions of labor to the control of the capitalist ownership of industry. Under these conditions the whole trade union movement is in danger of utter ineffectiveness, if not actual extinction, unless the steel industry is organized. Even Green, Tighe and company cannot possibly be entirely unaware of this fact, though they may not comprehend its real meaning—or for that matter, care much. But they do know that the tackling of the steel empire is a serious campaign of organization, leaves no room for compromise or for bargaining. Besides it is such a gigantic task and may result in serious bruises because the feudal rulers of this empire believe in fighting it out to the end.

This is the challenge to the whole trade union movement. What the A. F. of L. Executive Council will do about it is now perfectly clear. It will do exactly nothing of any serious consequence.

The A. A. Convention

The Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers has just ended its sixty-first annual convention. For days on end it gave consideration to the offer made by the C. I. O., only by a scant majority was a conditional acceptance achieved. Mike Tighe, however, succeeded in maintaining his stranglehold upon the union and making his bid for the friendship of both Lewis and Green. The final decision adopted affirms the charter rights of the Amalgamated Association, which are the rights of sole jurisdiction as an industrial union. Outside of that the conditional acceptance of the C. I. O. offer will have real meaning only provided the industrial union forces take hold of it and carry it into life.

Company Unions Stampede

Last year company union representatives from a number of plants held a convention in Newcastle, Pa. at which demands were formulated for wage increases and improved working conditions while the delegates refused to grant admission to management representatives. Shortly thereafter a similar company union convention in Gary, Indiana, considered a proposal for a final breakaway from company control with the vote unanimously in favor of taking independent measures to defend the interests of the workers. These are important signs of a new trend and of a new vitality displayed in an original way. Real possibilities of organization in the steel industry are unquestionably available.

The organization of these workers has now become imperative. But the challenge has been thrown right back into the lap of the industrial union bloc. What will these unions do about it? Trifling with this problem or nibbling at it will not do. A rich opportunity awaits these unions. A spark of new life was manifested at the steel workers' convention nourished by the pressure for action made by the progressive elements. New unions are growing and gaining ground in several mass production industries from which forces for further extension can be recruited. Practically all of these new unions appear to be ready to continue an aggressive fight for the building of a truly powerful industrial union movement; but its future is bound up with progress in steel.

The organization of the steel industry is a gigantic task. Enormous difficulties will have to be faced and the minimum requirement is nothing less than a gigantic movement capable of surrounding this feudal empire, capable of invading it and executing the necessary tactical flank maneuvers together with the head-on frontal attack. This is the next big job for American labor. Success in this field will no doubt depend much more directly upon the ability, courage and tenacity of the developing genuinely progressive trade union forces than upon the good-will of any leaders.

After Fifty Years

To Mike Tighe the secret rituals and mummerly left over from old days of trade union illegality remain a sacred union heritage, more dear to him than activity and progress. And so well did he discharge his obligation to the inviolability of his contract with the steel manufacturers that the union, after more than a half century of existence, counts a paid up membership of not more than 4,800. Needless to say this contract which Mike Tighe holds as sacred, is not meant to embrace more than a scattering of workers here and there is a few mills. It is a contract designed essentially to restrict and to prevent organization.

From this description it would be difficult for any reader to note any real distinction between Mike Tighe and Wm. Green, except the difference of age. Outward differences there are none. In essence the former has carried out the policy of the latter and both are more or less equal partners in the policy and methods of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy. And thus the real reason for the dismal failure of organization in the steel industry—aside from the devastating gross incompetence—can be found only in the position of this bureaucracy.

Wm. Green and his allies do not think of coming to grips with the problem and undertaking a campaign of organization in the only way that it could actually succeed. Such ideas are alien and repugnant to them. Their own role is determined by their attitude to the capitalist system to which they swear allegiance. They naturally become champions of the rights of collective bargaining for labor with themselves, however, occupying the position of agents who are privileged to bargain both ways. In this role they will endeavor to gain concessions for the unions but simultaneously they consider themselves to be the custodians of the interests of capital against aggression from the rank and file members.

The Empire of U. S. Steel

In the steel industry, however, no alternatives are offered. The United States Steel Corporation, is the absolute and despotic ruler. It is in itself an empire within an empire. Only 23 American cities had a greater population than the population of the U. S. Steel Corporation in 1920. Not less than 196,000 workers and their families are dependent for their livelihood upon this corporation. This is America's largest employer of labor. The directors of this corporation do not at all fancy any ideas of sitting down at conference tables with representatives of labor. Their policy in this respect was laid down in a resolution of June 17, 1901, when J. P. Morgan the Elder organized the United States Steel Corporation. It says:

"We are unalterably opposed to any extension of union labor, and advise subsidiary companies to take a firm position when these questions come up, and say that they are not going to recognize it."

Every word here is meant just exactly as it is written. Moreover, the U. S. Steel executives have never deviated from this resolution. Nor has Mike Tighe ever deviated from his respect for the inviolability of his contract with the steel companies. He has understood it and interpreted it just exactly as

it was meant to be understood. This is one of the reasons for the fact that the organization he leads has only 4,800 members.

The Challenge of Steel

Meanwhile modern conditions of production has forged ahead to constantly greater improvement of machinery and efficiency of output, constantly also subordinating the conditions of labor to the control of the capitalist ownership of industry. Under these conditions the whole trade union movement is in danger of utter ineffectiveness, if not actual extinction, unless the steel industry is organized. Even Green, Tighe and company cannot possibly be entirely unaware of this fact, though they may not comprehend its real meaning—or for that matter, care much. But they do know that the tackling of the steel empire is a serious campaign of organization, leaves no room for compromise or for bargaining. Besides it is such a gigantic task and may result in serious bruises because the feudal rulers of this empire believe in fighting it out to the end.

This is the challenge to the whole trade union movement. What the A. F. of L. Executive Council will do about it is now perfectly clear. It will do exactly nothing of any serious consequence.

The A. A. Convention

The Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers has just ended its sixty-first annual convention. For days on end it gave consideration to the offer made by the C. I. O., only by a scant majority was a conditional acceptance achieved. Mike Tighe, however, succeeded in maintaining his stranglehold upon the union and making his bid for the friendship of both Lewis and Green. The final decision adopted affirms the charter rights of the Amalgamated Association, which are the rights of sole jurisdiction as an industrial union. Outside of that the conditional acceptance of the C. I. O. offer will have real meaning only provided the industrial union forces take hold of it and carry it into life.

Company Unions Stampede

Last year company union representatives from a number of plants held a convention in Newcastle, Pa. at which demands were formulated for wage increases and improved working conditions while the delegates refused to grant admission to management representatives. Shortly thereafter a similar company union convention in Gary, Indiana, considered a proposal for a final breakaway from company control with the vote unanimously in favor of taking independent measures to defend the interests of the workers. These are important signs of a new trend and of a new vitality displayed in an original way. Real possibilities of organization in the steel industry are unquestionably available.

The organization of these workers has now become imperative. But the challenge has been thrown right back into the lap of the industrial union bloc. What will these unions do about it? Trifling with this problem or nibbling at it will not do. A rich opportunity awaits these unions. A spark of new life was manifested at the steel workers' convention nourished by the pressure for action made by the progressive elements. New unions are growing and gaining ground in several mass production industries from which forces for further extension can be recruited. Practically all of these new unions appear to be ready to continue an aggressive fight for the building of a truly powerful industrial union movement; but its future is bound up with progress in steel.

The organization of the steel industry is a gigantic task. Enormous difficulties will have to be faced and the minimum requirement is nothing less than a gigantic movement capable of surrounding this feudal empire, capable of invading it and executing the necessary tactical flank maneuvers together with the head-on frontal attack. This is the next big job for American labor. Success in this field will no doubt depend much more directly upon the ability, courage and tenacity of the developing genuinely progressive trade union forces than upon the good-will of any leaders.

Every word here is meant just exactly as it is written. Moreover, the U. S. Steel executives have never deviated from this resolution. Nor has Mike Tighe ever deviated from his respect for the inviolability of his contract with the steel companies. He has understood it and interpreted it just exactly as

C. P. Trails Roosevelt

(Continued from Page 1)

Roosevelt's: this entire perspective was outlined in Roosevelt's annual message to Congress. In actuality, the Democratic Party in this country this year, under Roosevelt's leadership, constitutes the ultimate in the People's Front as defined by and called for by the Communist Party. It comprises, in its main social composition, just what the Stalinists ask: the bulk of the trades unions, the organized farmers, the Townsends, the Epic Clubs, the disoriented middle classes, the bulk of the unemployed; with the majority of "Wall Street and the industrialists" howling against it from the outside. And its program is a completely typical People's Front program, with the standard People's Front demands, closely similar to and in many cases to the left of the program, for example, of the French People's Front.

Thus the Roosevelt demagoguery, ably assisted by

Roosevelt Steals Labor Party Thunder

Labor Chiefs Use New Deal as Safety-Valve

By ARNE SWABECK

During the last few weeks the plea for Roosevelt's re-election has gained new converts and new adherents with amazing speed from the trade union movement. It is taking on the character of a clean sweep. By the manner in which the plea is presented, and in view of the present objective conditions, it is not at all surprising that the labor party question fades into the background with the same ease that this sweep gains in momentum. Or, perhaps it would be more correct to say that the labor perambulator is being hooked onto the Roosevelt bandwagon.

This stampede started last January when John L. Lewis whooped through the United Mine Workers convention a unanimous resolution for Roosevelt's re-election. Following this lead Labor's Non-Partisan League came into being. It was sponsored by the Lewis-Hillman forces. The American Federation of Hosiery Workers convention and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers General Executive Board next fell in line. Two international union presidents, David Dubinsky and Emil Kieve quickly deserted the Socialist Party for their new and real allegiance. Wm. Green, on the opening day of the A. F. of L. Executive Council second quarterly meeting, advocated the President's re-election. And two days before this the delegates to the United Automobile Workers convention voted without a dissenting voice to support the Roosevelt candidacy.

Raw Deal for Auto Workers

Nobody will suspect that the automobile workers harbored feelings of special gratitude to Roosevelt. They cannot possibly have forgotten his infamous automobile agreement which was foisted upon them during the spring of 1934. This agreement they looked upon then as a definite setback to their aims and efforts; and such it proved to be. It brought about the hated Automobile Labor Relations Board headed by Wollman. It strengthened, for the time being the stranglehold of Wm. Green and Collins, later supplanted by Dillon, and postponed the organization of the autonomous international union so much desired by the organized automobile workers.

No, these are not the reasons for their endorsement of Roosevelt. The decision of the auto workers convention simply means that it follows the lead of the Committee for Industrial Organization. This is of double significance when viewed in relation to the labor party question. It must be remembered that on the whole the unions of the C. I. O. and its supporting unions, like the auto workers, represents the section of organized labor which is traveling in a progressive direction. This is indisputable. It is also the section of organized labor that has shown the greatest vitality and growth, and particularly so when a comparison is made with a number of unions, distinctly craft in make-up and in spirit, which have remained

stagnant for some time, or actually lost ground.

No Serious Labor Party Swing

These facts only lend so much more emphasis to what has been stated in these columns more than once: There is not a serious movement on foot, nor are there any serious forces available for a national labor party, or farmer-labor party or third party in 1936. Those who still attempt to create the impression that there are, like the Stalinists do, are simply up to their old pernicious game of deception. An editorial in the May 7 Daily Worker finally acknowledges that, "A Farmer-Labor Presidential ticket in 1936 is now out of the question," but it maintains that the prospects are as good as ever for a farmer-labor party this year. This is equally pernicious and deceptive.

Superficially it may seem as if the fervent desires nurtured by the Stalinists were to be realized through the conference call sent out by the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party. However, the appearance in this case is also deceptive. The conference call is issued only to individuals, not to organizations. Obviously these individuals are expected to do nothing more than to explore the possibilities for a labor party. But what they are to explore becomes further clear in the announcement that a farmer-labor presidential ticket is not to be considered at this conference. In other words, the sponsors of the conference consider the presidential ticket to be a matter settled by the Roosevelt reelection endorsements. Nothing further remains to be explored but how to swing the labor party sentiment successfully into this reelection campaign.

Local Bodies Powerless

A labor party sentiment has been recorded in a number of local unions. Much of it is motivated on progressive grounds. To an extent it arises out of disappointment with promised New Deal measures which were not realized; to an extent also out of disappointment with conditions under the "New Deal blessings." Above all it arises out of fears of reaction and an instinctive but unclear fear of Fascism. But, in view of the general lack of understanding of what the requirements of a party of the workers must be, it is particularly these fears that help to drive the organized workers in marching formation into the Roosevelt camp.

his subordinates and Secretary of Labor Perkins!

This unprompted harmony between Lewis and Giannini and their common allegiance to the Democratic Party not only illuminates the political landscape for 1936. It also provides us with an insight into the character of the Democratic Party, the sources of its support, and in general the political mechanism by which capital keeps labor enchained and maintains its hold upon the American masses.

Could the picture be more perfect or the symmetry more complete? Roosevelt in the center embraces Giannini with his right hand and Lewis with his left. The instructions that Giannini and his colleagues whisper in his ears, Roosevelt with his incandescent smile passes on to Lewis, while Lewis in turn hands them down to his rank and file. Each is a necessary link in the chain whereby organized labor is kept in subjection to the domination of organized capital.

The orders transmitted from financial headquarters do not, of course, always reach their destinations, nor are they always needed when they do. Both Roosevelt and Lewis must reckon with the demands of their supporters as well as the wishes of their masters. They must mediate between the two antagonistic forces and find a formula for the solution of their conflicting interests. This is easier said than done. But in general this is the way in which the system operates, this the methods by which the working class is lined up on all important questions affecting the social interests of their oppressors.

Certain naive people have been surprised and shocked at the spectacle of Lewis and his associates in the C. I. O., whom they have been taught to regard as the hope of the working class, so ardently embracing Roosevelt. But such conduct should surprise no one who understands the real character of these leaders and cherishes no illusions concerning their progressiveness.

Differ in Method Not Ideology

It cannot be too often stressed that Lewis, Hillman, and their like are no less committed to class collaboration than their craft-unionist laborers in the A. F. of L. The two factions differ not in their fundamental allegiances but only in the forms and methods by which this policy should be carried out under the present conditions. In this respect the two factions serve the same purposes within the labor movement that the Republican and Democratic parties serve within the nation as a whole. Resting upon different social bases, they carry out the same policies by different methods.

Lewis and his associates did not become aggressive advocates of industrial unionism out of any profound inner convictions or class consciousness but as a result of the pressure exerted from below upon them by their rank and file and of their own thirst for power. They realized that in order to maintain their position in their unions and extend their influence among the masses of industrial workers that the horse-and-buggy methods of the Gompers-Green regime had to be modernized. Craft unionism had been rendered obsolete and impotent by the development of industry; the workers in the mass production industries could only be organized along industrial lines. In so far as they have struggled for industrial unionism and aided the organization of the unorganized in these industries, (and so far that aid has been more nominal than real), they play a progressive role

to soak the rich, the need of curbing Wall Street and the need of preventing the invasion of the people's rights by the courts. Roosevelt declares himself to be against war and Fascist tyrannies and for a "people's government." By these ingenious campaign devices, the Rooseveltians aimed, and rather successfully to forestall the emergence of a labor party, or a third party, in 1936.

The adept pupils of these demagogic cunning devices, who are holding high posts in the progressive union bloc, follow up the campaign in the same high key. They are for aggressive unionization, for industrial unionism and against reaction. John L. Lewis started the ball rolling at the U. M. W. convention with a mighty attack on the Liberty League. An easy target. These leaders are now all against war and Fascist tyrannies and they also have broad views on the people's front. It is therefore not at all unnatural they should direct the genuine fears of reaction and the fears of war and Fascism into the safe channels in support of Roosevelt's reelection. With a little manipulation that can easily be interpreted, and even in the prevailing labor party and people's front jargon if necessary, as symbolizing the fight against reaction.

No Labor Party Wanted Now

Of course, the truth is that these "progressive" leaders, in harmony with Roosevelt, do not want a labor party, or a third party and certainly not before their own preparations are well done; not until they are sure that they can keep it within the proper reformist bounds. Even then they can be expected to yield only to pressure. Their aim can then be expected to be to utilize such a development to counterpose the growth of a revolutionary movement. As solid converts to the New Deal, they aim to lay out the line of march with Roosevelt today and perpetuate his program tomorrow—if need be, by means of a third party.

Today they attempt to make a distinction between Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. How can any real distinction be possible? Roosevelt is the standard bearer of his party—one of the two capitalist parties. From this party he receives his mandate and this carries with it the duty to serve finance capital. Need there be any doubt that this is the responsibility to which he will remain loyal even more decisively and unequivocally after his reelection.

The trade union support of Roosevelt could not be unexpected. It is destined to go down in history as one of the great illusions of 1936. It has become possible primarily due to the lack of revolutionary education of the working class. After 1936 new disillusionments are sure to begin. Will a third party carrying on the New Deal tradition and program then prove a solution? Most decisively not! And it is well to remember that this is the only kind of a labor party that can reasonably be expected. Hence there remains one main conclusion to draw. Today and tomorrow the struggle for Socialism must go on.

What a flood of light this little coincidence casts upon the political lineup behind the Democratic party for 1936! On the one hand, Roosevelt will secure the support of the liberal wing of finance capital, including those captains of industry and finance who are bound to the Democratic party by their special interests. While they will contribute as usual to the campaign funds of both parties, the conservative section of the big bourgeoisie, organized around the Liberty League and the United States Chamber of Commerce, will rally behind the Republican Party, not in the hope of defeating Roosevelt but for the purpose of exerting pressure upon him to keep his liberalism within moderate limits.

On the other hand, thanks to the activities of John L. Lewis and his associates, Roosevelt will be assured of the support of the vast majority of organized labor. A few days ago Lewis and Major George L. Berry visited Roosevelt at the White House and informed him that 30,000 union officials in various states had already sponsored Labor's Non-Partisan League; 4,000 speakers in every state of the union were warming up for the campaign; and that, in addition to the international unions that have declared themselves for Roosevelt, six state Labor Federations had endorsed the President and the League itself.

An Act of Betrayal

What can it mean when one of the foremost bankers and the most powerful captain of organized labor in the country combine to set their seal of approval on Roosevelt's policies and vie with each other in soliciting support for his reelection? It can mean but one thing. That this "labor lieutenant of capital" is delivering the workers into the hands of the political servant of their masters and is engaged in an act of outright betrayal of the interests of the working class.

There is no need to look further than one's nose to prove this point. For at the very moment when the coryphée of capital and the captain of labor joined in a chorus of praise for Roosevelt, the notorious open-shop Industrial Association of San Francisco, backed and financed by Giannini and his friends, was engaged in a conspiracy to smash the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, one of the most militant and progressive organizations in the American labor movement. And it was doing so with the active connivance of such administration officials as Secretary of Commerce Roper and

to soak the rich, the need of curbing Wall Street and the need of preventing the invasion of the people's rights by the courts. Roosevelt declares himself to be against war and Fascist tyrannies and for a "people's government." By these ingenious campaign devices, the Rooseveltians aimed, and rather successfully to forestall the emergence of a labor party, or a third party, in 1936.

The adept pupils of these demagogic cunning devices, who are holding high posts in the progressive union bloc, follow up the campaign in the same high key. They are for aggressive unionization, for industrial unionism and against reaction. John L. Lewis started the ball rolling at the U. M. W. convention with a mighty attack on the Liberty League. An easy target. These leaders are now all against war and Fascist tyrannies and they also have broad views on the people's front. It is therefore not at all unnatural they should direct the genuine fears of reaction and the fears of war and Fascism into the safe channels in support of Roosevelt's reelection. With a little manipulation that can easily be interpreted, and even in the prevailing labor party and people's front jargon if necessary, as symbolizing the fight against reaction.

No Labor Party Wanted Now

Of course, the truth is that these "progressive" leaders, in harmony with Roosevelt, do not want a labor party, or a third party and certainly not before their own preparations are well done; not until they are sure that they can keep it within the proper reformist bounds. Even then they can be expected to yield only to pressure. Their aim can then be expected to be to utilize such a development to counterpose the growth of a revolutionary movement. As solid converts to the New Deal, they aim to lay out the line of march with Roosevelt today and perpetuate his program tomorrow—if need be, by means of a third party.

Today they attempt to make a distinction between Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. How can any real distinction be possible? Roosevelt is the standard bearer of his party—one of the two capitalist parties. From this party he receives his mandate and this carries with it the duty to serve finance capital. Need there be any doubt that this is the responsibility to which he will remain loyal even more decisively and unequivocally after his reelection.

The trade union support of Roosevelt could not be unexpected. It is destined to go down in history as one of the great illusions of 1936. It has become possible primarily due to the lack of revolutionary education of the working class. After 1936 new disillusionments are sure to begin. Will a third party carrying on the New Deal tradition and program then prove a solution? Most decisively not! And it is well to remember that this is the only kind of a labor party that can reasonably be expected. Hence there remains one main conclusion to draw. Today and tomorrow the struggle for Socialism must go on.

LUMEN CAMP COOPERATIVE
Rivervale, N. J.
OPENING MAY 30

Round Trip \$.75

TENNIS

SWIMMING

Band and Entertainment Every Saturday

\$14 a Week

For Information Call Labor Bookshop

28 East 12th Street

Modern Facilities

SHOWERS

\$12 for Members

STuy. 9-0567

the Hillmans and Dubinskys and Olsons, is in a position to sweep to itself the great majority of those who have been infected by the Stalinist agitation, and tie them to Roosevelt's machine, whatever the Communist Party publicly declares about voting, since the Stalinist agitation leads necessarily in the Roosevelt direction, and provides no political barrier to bring about a differentiation along class lines.

Browder is too modest in asking for a joint ticket with the Socialists. In all conscience, his name should be presented to the Democratic Convention as the logical and fit running mate for Roosevelt.

The international betrayal of Stalinism manifests itself in every country in the betrayal of the revolutionary struggle within that country. The fight for socialism is the fight not against this or that individual capitalist or group of capitalists, but against capitalism itself. And this fight is no longer conceivable apart from the fight against Stalinism, whose historical function is now only the search for new forms in the betrayal of the struggle for socialism.

John L. Lewis and Industrialist Serve Same Master in 1936 Elections

The day after May Day two news items appeared side by side in the press. The first reported a speech by A. P. Giannini, financial titan of the Bank of America, and a director of the National City Bank. Bubbling with optimism and brimful of praise for the President, he declared, "As a result of President Roosevelt's fiscal policies, our financial structure rests on a solid foundation than at any time within our memory."

The second was an announcement by John L. Lewis that the State Federations of Labor of Kentucky and Alabama had followed the precedent set by the United Mine Workers and recorded themselves in favor of Roosevelt's return to office.

Banker Giannini spoke under the auspices of the Good Neighbor, a non-partisan organization of liberals formed to campaign for Roosevelt's reelection. Labor leader Lewis spoke for Labor's Non-Partisan League, a non-partisan organization of union officials also formed to campaign for Roosevelt.

Striking Coincidence

What a flood of light this little coincidence casts upon the political lineup behind the Democratic party for 1936! On the one hand, Roosevelt will secure the support of the liberal wing of finance capital, including those captains of industry and finance who are bound to the Democratic party by their special interests. While they will contribute as usual to the campaign funds of both parties, the conservative section of the big bourgeoisie, organized around the Liberty League and the United States Chamber of Commerce, will rally behind the Republican Party, not in the hope of defeating Roosevelt but for the purpose of exerting pressure upon him to keep his liberalism within moderate limits.

On the other hand, thanks to the activities of John L. Lewis and his associates, Roosevelt will be assured of the support of the vast majority of organized labor. A few days ago Lewis and Major George L. Berry visited Roosevelt at the White House and informed him that 30,000 union officials in various states had already sponsored Labor's Non-Partisan League; 4,000 speakers in every state of the union were warming up for the campaign; and that, in addition to the international unions that have declared themselves for Roosevelt, six state Labor Federations had endorsed the President and the League itself.

An Act of Betrayal

What can it mean when one of the foremost bankers and the most powerful captain of organized labor in the country combine to set their seal of approval on Roosevelt's policies and vie with each other in soliciting support for his reelection? It can mean but one thing. That this "labor lieutenant of capital" is delivering the workers into the hands of the political servant of their masters and is engaged in an act of outright betrayal of the interests of the working class.

There is no need to look further than one's nose to prove this point. For at the very moment when the coryphée of capital and the captain of labor joined in a chorus of praise for Roosevelt, the notorious open-shop Industrial Association of San Francisco, backed and financed by Giannini and his friends, was engaged in a conspiracy to smash the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, one of the most militant and progressive organizations in the American labor movement. And it was doing so with the active connivance of such administration officials as Secretary of Commerce Roper and

to soak the rich, the need of curbing Wall Street and the need of preventing the invasion of the people's rights by the courts. Roosevelt declares himself to be against war and Fascist tyrannies and for a "people's government." By these ingenious campaign devices, the Rooseveltians aimed, and rather successfully to forestall the emergence of a labor party, or a third party, in 1936.

The adept pupils of these demagogic cunning devices, who are holding high posts in the progressive union bloc, follow up the campaign in the same high key. They are for aggressive unionization, for industrial unionism and against reaction. John L. Lewis started the ball rolling at the U. M. W. convention with a mighty attack on the Liberty League. An easy target. These leaders are now all against war and Fascist tyrannies and they also have broad views on the people's front. It is therefore not at all unnatural they should direct the genuine fears of reaction and the fears of war and Fascism into the safe channels in support of Roosevelt's reelection. With a little manipulation that can easily be interpreted, and even in the prevailing labor party and people's front jargon if necessary, as symbolizing the fight against reaction.

No Labor Party Wanted Now

Of course, the truth is that these "progressive" leaders, in harmony with Roosevelt, do not want a labor party, or a third party and certainly not before their own preparations are well done; not until they are sure that they can keep it within the proper reformist bounds. Even then they can be expected to yield only to pressure. Their aim can then be expected to be to utilize such a development to counterpose the growth of a revolutionary movement. As solid converts to the New Deal, they aim to lay out the line of march with Roosevelt today and perpetuate his program tomorrow—if need be, by means of a third party.

Today they attempt to make a distinction between Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. How can any real distinction be possible? Roosevelt is the standard bearer of his party—one of the two capitalist parties. From this party he receives his mandate and this carries with it the duty to serve finance capital. Need there be any doubt that this is the responsibility to which he will remain loyal even more decisively and unequivocally after his reelection.

The trade union support of Roosevelt could not be unexpected. It is destined to go down in history as one of the great illusions of 1936. It has become possible primarily due to the lack of revolutionary education of the working class. After 1936 new disillusionments are sure to begin. Will a third party carrying on the New Deal tradition and program then prove a solution? Most decisively not! And it is well to remember that this is the only kind of a labor party that can reasonably be expected. Hence there remains one main conclusion to draw. Today and tomorrow the struggle for Socialism must go on.

to soak the rich, the need of curbing Wall Street and the need of preventing the invasion of the people's rights by the courts. Roosevelt declares himself to be against war and Fascist tyrannies and for a "people's government." By these ingenious campaign devices, the Rooseveltians aimed, and rather successfully to forestall the emergence of a labor party, or a third party, in 1936.

The adept pupils of these demagogic cunning devices, who are holding high posts in the progressive union bloc, follow up the campaign in the same high key. They are for aggressive unionization, for industrial unionism and against reaction. John L. Lewis started the ball rolling at the U. M. W. convention with a mighty attack on the Liberty League. An easy target. These leaders are now all against war and Fascist tyrannies and they also have broad views on the people's front. It is therefore not at all unnatural they should direct the genuine fears of reaction and the fears of war and Fascism into the safe channels in support of Roosevelt's reelection. With a little manipulation that can easily be interpreted, and even in the prevailing labor party and people's front jargon if necessary, as symbolizing the fight against reaction.

No Labor Party Wanted Now

Of course, the truth is that these "progressive" leaders, in harmony with Roosevelt, do not want a labor party, or a third party and certainly not before their own preparations are well done; not until they are sure that they can keep it within the proper reformist bounds. Even then they can be expected to yield only to pressure. Their aim can then be expected to be to utilize such a development to counterpose the growth of a revolutionary movement. As solid converts to the New Deal, they aim to lay out the line of march with Roosevelt today and perpetuate his program tomorrow—if need be, by means of a third party.

Today they attempt to make a distinction between Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. How can any real distinction be possible? Roosevelt is the standard bearer of his party—one of the two capitalist parties. From this party he receives his mandate and this carries with it the duty to serve finance capital. Need there be any doubt that this is the responsibility to which he will remain loyal even more decisively and unequivocally after his reelection.

The trade union support of Roosevelt could not be unexpected. It is destined to go down in history as one of the great illusions of 1936. It has become possible primarily due to the lack of revolutionary education of the working class. After 1936 new disillusionments are sure to begin. Will a third party carrying on the New Deal tradition and program then prove a solution? Most decisively not! And it is well to remember that this is the only kind of a labor party that can reasonably be expected. Hence there remains one main conclusion to draw. Today and tomorrow the struggle for Socialism must go on.

to soak the rich, the need of curbing Wall Street and the need of preventing the invasion of the people's rights by the courts. Roosevelt declares himself to be against war and Fascist tyrannies and for a "people's government." By these ingenious campaign devices, the Rooseveltians aimed, and rather successfully to forestall the emergence of a labor party, or a third party, in 1936.

The adept pupils of these demagogic cunning devices, who are holding high posts in the progressive union bloc, follow up the campaign in the same high key. They are for aggressive unionization, for industrial unionism and against reaction. John L. Lewis started the ball rolling at the U. M. W. convention with a mighty attack on the Liberty League. An easy target. These leaders are now all against war and Fascist tyrannies and they also have broad views on the people's front. It is therefore not at all unnatural they should direct the genuine fears of reaction and the fears of war and Fascism into the safe channels in support of Roosevelt's reelection. With a little manipulation that can easily be interpreted, and even in the prevailing labor party and people's front jargon if necessary, as symbolizing the fight against reaction.

No Labor Party Wanted Now

Of course, the truth is that these "progressive" leaders, in harmony with Roosevelt, do not want a labor party, or a third party and certainly not before their own preparations are well done; not until they are sure that they can keep it within the proper reformist bounds. Even then they can be expected to yield only to pressure. Their aim can then be expected to be to utilize such a development to counterpose the growth of a revolutionary movement. As solid converts to the New Deal, they aim to lay out the line of march with Roosevelt today and perpetuate his program tomorrow—if need be, by means of a third party.

Today they attempt to make a distinction between Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. How can any real distinction be possible? Roosevelt is the standard bearer of his party—one of the two capitalist parties. From this party he receives his mandate and this carries with it the duty to serve finance capital. Need there be any doubt that this is the responsibility to which he will remain loyal even more decisively and unequivocally after his reelection.

The trade union support of Roosevelt could not be unexpected. It is destined to go down in history as one of the great illusions of 1936. It has become possible primarily due to the lack of revolutionary education of the working class. After 1936 new disillusionments are sure to begin. Will a third party carrying on the New Deal tradition and program then prove a solution? Most decisively not! And it is well to remember that this is the only kind of a labor party that can reasonably be expected. Hence there remains one main conclusion to draw. Today and tomorrow the struggle for Socialism must go on.

to soak the rich, the need of curbing Wall Street and the need of preventing the invasion of the people's rights by the courts. Roosevelt declares himself to be against war and Fascist tyrannies and for a "people's government." By these ingenious campaign devices, the Rooseveltians aimed, and rather successfully to forestall the emergence of a labor party, or a third party, in 1936.

The adept pupils of these demagogic cunning devices, who are holding high posts in the progressive union bloc, follow up the campaign in the same high key. They are for aggressive unionization, for industrial unionism and against reaction. John L. Lewis started the ball rolling at the U. M. W. convention with a mighty attack on the Liberty League. An easy target. These leaders are now all against war and Fascist tyrannies and they also have broad views on the people's front. It is therefore not at all unnatural they should direct the genuine fears of reaction and the fears of war and Fascism into the safe channels in support of Roosevelt's reelection. With a little manipulation that can easily be interpreted, and even in the prevailing labor party and people's front jargon if necessary, as symbolizing the fight against reaction.

No Labor Party Wanted Now

Of course, the truth is that these "progressive" leaders, in harmony with Roosevelt, do not want a labor party, or a third party and certainly not before their own preparations are well done; not until they are sure that they can keep it within the proper reformist bounds. Even then they can be expected to yield only to pressure. Their aim can then be expected to be to utilize such a development to counterpose the growth of a revolutionary movement. As solid converts to the New Deal, they aim to lay out the line of march with Roosevelt today and perpetuate his program tomorrow—if need be, by means of a third party.

Today they attempt to make a distinction between Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. How can any real distinction be possible? Roosevelt is the standard bearer of his party—one of the two capitalist parties. From this party he receives his mandate and this carries with it the duty to serve finance capital. Need there be any doubt that this is the responsibility to which he will remain loyal even more decisively and unequivocally after his reelection.

The trade union support of Roosevelt could not be unexpected. It is destined to go down in history as one of the great illusions of 1936. It has become possible primarily due to the lack of revolutionary education of the working class. After 1936 new disillusionments are sure to begin. Will a third party carrying on the New Deal tradition and program then prove a solution? Most decisively not! And it is well to remember that this is the only kind of a labor party that can reasonably be expected. Hence there remains one main conclusion to draw. Today and tomorrow the struggle for Socialism must go on.

to soak the rich, the need of curbing Wall Street and the need of preventing the invasion of the people's rights by the courts. Roosevelt declares himself to be against war and Fascist tyrannies and for a "people's government." By these ingenious campaign devices, the Rooseveltians aimed, and rather successfully to forestall the emergence of a labor party, or a third party, in 1936.

The adept pupils of these demagogic cunning devices, who are holding high posts in the progressive union bloc, follow up the campaign in the same high key. They are for aggressive unionization, for industrial unionism and against reaction. John L. Lewis started the ball rolling at the U. M. W. convention with a mighty attack on the Liberty League. An easy target. These leaders are now all against war and Fascist tyrannies and they also have broad views on the people's front. It is therefore not at all unnatural they should direct the genuine fears of reaction and the fears of war and Fascism into the safe channels in support of Roosevelt's reelection. With a little manipulation that can easily be interpreted, and even in the prevailing labor party and people's front jargon if necessary, as symbolizing the fight against reaction.

No Labor Party Wanted Now

Of course, the truth is that these "progressive" leaders, in harmony with Roosevelt, do not want a labor party, or a third party and certainly not before their own preparations are well done; not until they are sure that they can keep it within the proper reformist bounds. Even then they can be expected to yield only to pressure. Their aim can then be expected to be to utilize such a development to counterpose the growth of a revolutionary movement. As solid converts to the New Deal, they aim to lay out the line of march with Roosevelt today and perpetuate his program tomorrow—if need be, by means of a third party.

Today they attempt to make a distinction between Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. How can any real distinction be possible? Roosevelt is the standard bearer of his party—one of the two capitalist parties. From this party he receives his mandate and this carries with it the duty to serve finance capital. Need there be any doubt that this is the responsibility to which he will remain loyal even more decisively and unequivocally after his reelection.

The trade union support of Roosevelt could not be unexpected. It is destined to go down in history as one of the great illusions of 1936. It has become possible primarily due to the lack of revolutionary education of the working class. After 1936 new disillusionments are sure to begin. Will a third party carrying on the New Deal tradition and program then prove a solution? Most decisively not! And it is well to remember that this is the only kind of a labor party that can reasonably be expected. Hence there remains one main conclusion to draw. Today and tomorrow the struggle for Socialism must go on.

NEW MILITANT

with which merged
THE MILITANT
Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co., 100 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C.
Entered as second class mail matter at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.
JAMES P. CANNON: Editor
Subscription rates: In the United States \$1.00 per year; 65c per six months; Canada and foreign \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 six months. Bundle rates: Two cents per copy
SATURDAY, MAY 16, 1936
Vol. 2, No. 19 (Whole No. 71)

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

WORKERS

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

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

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

Death benefit graded according to age at entry. Sick benefit payments from \$225 to \$900—to men and women, according to classes.

Monthly assessments from 45c to \$2.10.

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

WORLD OF LABOR

The Liquidation of the Russian Komsoml (Y.C.L.) as a Political Organization

After a lapse of almost six years, the Tenth Congress of the All-Union Leninist (read: Stalinist) Komsomol, originally scheduled to open on March 20, was finally convened on April 11. The Tenth Congress met for 10 days in the Great Hall of the Kremlin to take up the following agenda:

- 1) Report of the C.E.C. (reporter, Kossarev). Co-report of the C.E.C. (co-reporter, Kozlov).
- 2) Report of the Delegation of the Komsomol and the Y.C.L. (reporter, Chemozanov).
- 3) Adoption of the Program and Statutes of the Y.C.L.
- 4) On the Work of the Komsomol in the Schools.
- 5) Elections.

At its last session the Congress unanimously adopted a new program and a new constitution which set the seal of approval upon the already achieved transformation of the Y.C.L. into a non-party, non-class, non-political organization for the propagation of culture.

The draft program of the newly constituted Young Culture League is rather brief, occupying about 5 columns of Pravda's six column page (March 27).

Three-fifths of this new program is devoted to a preamble which sets forth five theses.

The New Catechism

Thesis 1: The October Revolution took place in 1917, overthrew the rule of the bourgeoisie and established the dictatorship of the proletariat. (Two quotations from Stalin).

Thesis 2: A description of capitalism with particular stress on the plight of the youth, in capitalist countries.

Thesis 3: A lyrical description of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., and the fortunate position of the youth there.

This is the longest "thesis" of all, and it begins with the affirmation that the proletariat not only overthrew the bourgeoisie in Russia but also "transformed the formerly backward, poverty-ridden, bankrupt country into an advanced, powerful Socialist power." It concludes by declaring that: "Socialism has become a reality for the many millions of peoples of the Great U.S.S.R. . . . The conditions are being prepared for the transition from socialism—the first stage of communist society—to complete communism." In short, a socialism is in full bloom; communism is just around the corner.

Thesis 4: This thesis is very brief and to the point. It informs us that in addition to overthrowing the bourgeoisie and building socialism, the working class has established a workers' state which does not give the slightest signs of withering away although "all the classes have been completely destroyed," and although "socialism has irrevocably triumphed." Among other things, Soviet power is necessary as a great cultural and moral institution which "plants discipline and respect for socialist laws and the rules of communal living, and imbues all the toilers with an honest attitude toward labor and social duty without which the complete victory of socialism cannot be realized."

Thesis 5: Sums up the situation. The C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government are busy "organizing the communist system," while the role of the Y.C.L. must be that of a "mass, non-party organization . . . embracing in its ranks . . . wide strata of the advanced and politically educated toiling youth of the city and country." Its task is to aid the Bolshevik Party "in the cause of educating the youth and children in the spirit of Communism."

The preamble ends with a quotation from Stalin to the effect that all this is according to Marx and Lenin.

The remaining two-fifths of the program is devoted to the enumeration of the "tasks" of the Stalinist Y.C.L., which fall under six general headings.

Six "Heroic" Tasks

I. In the Sphere of the Political Education of the Youth. The Y.C.L. organizes the study of the "basic ideas of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin," publishes its own papers, magazines, etc., both political and literary, organizes clubs, libraries, and reading rooms, and carries on a "patient" campaign against . . . "superstition" and "religious prejudices" as well as against the "remnants of chauvinism."

With socialism blooming, the youth must be agitated against superstitions and religion!

We append the verbatim translation of the "anti-religious propaganda" clause:

"The Y.C.L. patiently explains to the youth the harm of superstition and religious prejudices, organizing with this aim in view special circles and lectures on anti-religious propaganda."

II. In the Sphere of the Education of the Youth. Amplifies the

immortal statement of Stalin that the youth "must study, study, study in the most stubborn way." Pledges the youth to liquidate illiteracy and to organize clubs, etc. to raise the cultural level of the socialist masses, and so on.

III. In the Sphere of Work in the School and among Children. Particular stress laid on the Y.C.L. taking the lead in supplying children with good toys.

IV. In the Sphere of the Physical Development of the Youth.

V. In the Sphere of Participating in the Socialist Construction. The youth is instructed to take the lead in Stakhanovism (although the name Stakhanovism is not mentioned in the draft), and is asked to assist the Soviet State in "strengthening the family."

VI. In the Sphere of the Defense of the Socialist Fatherland. The Y.C.L. is turned into a reserve force of the Red Army. The new constitution provides that: "Every member of the Komsomol shall study military technique, be supremely devoted to the great Socialist fatherland and be ready to give all his strength and if necessary his life itself."

From a political organization of the youth, the Y.C.L. has been transformed into a "non-party mass organization" for "political and cultural education," with a particular stress upon the mobilization of the youth for the "patriotic defense of the U.S.S.R."

The age limit has been changed from 14-23 years to 15-28, and the Komsomol will admit into its ranks every boy and girl, who is "politically fit" without any regard to his or her social origin.

Stalin Contradicts Scriptures

To put the full weight of authority behind this decision the following little scene was staged at one of the meetings of the Stakhanovists in the Kremlin: young Tliba, a combine operator rose to his feet and said: "Although I am the son of a kulak I will go on struggling to improve the life of the workers and peasants. I will go on building Socialism." Thereupon, Stalin arose and declared to a wildly cheering gathering, "A son is not responsible for the sins of his father." Young Tliba's photograph was reprinted in every paper in the country.

The Commissariat of Education issued a decree admitting the sons and daughters of deceased people to Soviet universities and colleges. And the Komsomol now incorporates Stalin's pronouncement into its statutes.

The document we shall make about the changes effected in the constitution and statutes of the Y.C.L. will be to quote from the Program of the Young Communist International, adopted at the Fifth World Congress of the Y.C.I. confirmed by the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. on March 10, 1935. In other words, we shall quote against Stalin.

Before the New Dispensation

"There are fundamental differences in the conceptions of the Communists on the one hand, and the social democrats on the other as to the role of the youth and the youth organization in general. There are some unessential shadings between the bourgeoisie and the social democracy, but the fundamental conception of both is the same. Social democracy for the most part declares the role of the youth organizations to be 'purely' educational or cultural. . . . The Y.C.L. is a political organization. . . . It must strive to gain the majority of the working youth, and the other decisive sections of the toiling youth. . . . The Y.C.L. repudiates the theory of Y.C.L. 'neutrality' in political struggles within the party. . . . Political activity must not be confined to the higher bodies of the Y.C.L., but must permeate the entire organization. . . . In accordance with its political role and social character as an organization of the working youth, the Y.C.L. ensures that the working class membership plays the leading role. . . ." (Program of the Y.C.L., pp. 33-34-40.)

To repeat these words today in the U.S.S.R. (approved by Stalin himself in 1929) is to lay oneself open to indictment as a counter-revolutionary "Trotskyist" and to run the danger of imprisonment and exile.

Not All Is Roses

While the leadership of the Komsomol has accepted the changes without so much as a stutter, there has been considerable opposition from the rank and file. Thus, P. Vershkov, secretary of the C.E.C. of the Komsomol, expresses his astonishment over the fact that "among the Komsomol membership there are people who consider such a definition of the Komsomol (i.e., as a non-party, etc. organization) to be incorrect in principle."

Speaking at the session of the Ukrainian Komsomol P. Postyshev said, "Individual activists here and there are not pleased with the draft of the new constitution. . . . is precisely the position of Trotskyists and other 'Leftists.'"

Daily Worker Performs Sleight-of-Hand on Elections in France

The Stalinists are mobilizing their "specialists" to interpret the facts relating to the French general elections. In other words facts and figures must be twisted and falsified to suit their boasts and claims.

The results of the French election indicate first of all the process of differentiation of France into two camps. This fact is so obvious that even Harry Gannes was able dimly to take note of it. Commenting in his column upon the results of the election, Gannes says: "Not only was there a smashing People's Front victory, but side by side with that there was a polarization of forces: on the one hand, a massing of the forces of democracy and socialism; on the other of reaction and Fascism."

"Democratic" Regime Falls

At whose expense is this "polarization" taking place? A clear answer to this question cuts the ground from under the policy and practice of the People's Front. This differentiation is proceeding at the expense of the parties of the so-called "democracy," that is to say, those parties of the Center that have served as the balance wheels of the parliamentary regime in France.

Their disintegration is only symptomatic of the disintegration of the "democratic regime" as a whole. This fact above all must be denied and "disproved" by the Stalinists. And so, the statistical "expert," Theodore Repard has been assigned to prove by "facts and figures" that the gains of the People's Front in general and of the Communist Party in particular were made at the expense of the Right wing, of the reactionary parties supported in the election by the French Fascists, who did not run their own candidates.

And so Repard "proves" (D.W. May 14) that it is not the Center with its traditional leading party of the Radicals that is disintegrating in France, but the parties of reaction. His proofs?

He first performs a delicate political operation and causes all the parties of the so-called Center to disappear entirely. This accomplished, Repard is able to operate only with two wings. The left wing is composed of those parties that adhere to the People's Front, while all others are assigned by him to

the Right wing. Says Repard, "party names are not at all descriptive in France." From a general pile of such Right wing parties Repard is able to produce a combination showing a staggering loss of almost 500,000 for the right wing. But the newspapers reported a considerable gain for the Right wing which was recognized even by Gannes. How then was Repard able to establish a loss? Very simply. He included among the Rights, such parties for example, as the Popular Democrats, a Catholic Centrist party, and the party of the Independent Radicals. The only difference between them and the Radical Socialists is that the latter are members of the People's Front, while the former refused to join it, although invited.

In the 1932 elections these two parties received:

Popular Democrats (Catholic)	309,336
Independent Radicals	955,990
Total	1,265,326

In 1936 they obtained:

Popular Democrats	246,129
Independent Radicals	690,557
Total	936,686

Making Gains from Losses

The loss that these two Center parties alone suffered amounts to over 325,000; the rest of the "losses," Repard supplied by means of his "Democratic Alliance and Left Republicans." Thus, he was able not only to mask a gain of more than one-third of a million votes scored by such a truly reactionary party as the Republican Union but to emerge with a "loss" of 455,696 votes. Similarly, he was able to screen the loss of more than one-third of a million votes suffered by the party of Radicals by "totaling" it in with the gains scored by the parties that lean upon the working class for support, in particular by the Stalinists.

After this juggling with gains and losses, Repard adds what the "Rights" lost what the "Left" gained and draws the following conclusions: (1) "The left parties gained 168,370 votes"; (2) "The total number of votes which were transferred from right to left amounted to 624,069"; (3) "The

French Communists gained a total of 667,293 votes on this first ballot."

And to clinch his brilliant statistical demonstration he then proceeds to quote from the Socialist party organ, *Populaire* to the effect that the Communists made their gains "mostly from the right."

Thus, the Stalinists are growing at the expense of the rights or the Fascists, the Socialists are maintaining their own . . . to whom did the Radical Socialists lose their one third of a million votes? Statistics may be made to lie, but in this case his own statistics give the lie to Repard.

Blum Follows Bruening

If any proof were needed that Fascism is not disintegrating in France and that the parliamentary regime cannot be restored to its former equilibrium by any sort of juggling on the parliamentary arena, we need only turn to the latest reports from France relating to the position advanced by Blum, the "next French Premier" As P.J. Philip remarks, in his May 10 dispatch (N. Y. Times) from Paris, "Leon Blum today assumed leadership of the democratic majority in France in terms that implied that leadership would be not far removed from the dictatorial." In other words, Blum is preparing to follow in the footsteps of Doumergue, Laval, Flandin, Sarraut. We are to have a semi-Donatist, semi-parliamentary regime in France, headed by Leon Blum, who will attempt to introduce a solution by a way of a mild Rooseveltian public works program. Could any clearer proof be adduced of the utter bankruptcy of parliamentarism in France, than the fact that the "victors," instead of restoring the "democratic" rule are obliged to follow in the footsteps of those who had acted in accordance with the demands of the Fascists, like Doumergue, Laval and Co.

Blum as dictator will reveal the very same inability to solve any of the pressing and fundamental problems in France as did all of his dictatorial predecessors. The People's Front will in the end only reveal most sharply the utter collapse of "democracy" in France.

People's Front Boosts Azana into Presidency

By ALFREDO ROJAS

Azana has been inducted as the new president of Spain, to the tune of the "International" sung with clenched fists by the Stalinist deputies. Stalinists and Socialists joined with conservatives and Catalan rightists in the vote for Azana in the electoral college; there was no opposing candidate and only a group of die-hard monarchists and Catholics did not vote for Azana but instead cast blank ballots.

Azana's first act as president was to call in for consultation about the new cabinet, representatives of all the leading parties, including the Stalinists. This was followed by his invitation to Indalecio Prieto, Right Wing Socialist leader, to become premier and form a cabinet. Unexpectedly, Prieto declined; so certain were the press services that he would accept that advance stories predicted it. One can only conclude that the Right Wing Socialists did not dare enter the government on the eve of the June congress of the Socialist Party.

The new cabinet formed by Casares Quiroga, a member of Azana's party, is an undistinguished one, and undoubtedly represents a stop-gap until after the Socialist convention when the Right Wing Socialists will enter it. There have been several recent reports of threats by Prieto to split the party and make a fusion with Azana if the Right Wing perspectives are not accepted.

Indalecio Prieto, Besteiro and Fernando de los Rios, Right Wing Socialist leaders, have wished to enter the cabinet since the February elections. The opposition of Left Socialists has so far prevented them from doing so, although the Rights, who control the Socialist daily and the party executive, have been warm supporters of Azana.

Caballero, who was Minister of Labor in the coalition cabinet of 1931, has been opposed to coalition cabinets since the October 1934 revolt. But his recent conduct in the events connected with the presidential election provide little hope that he will lead a firm struggle against the coalition proposals.

A Significant Index

The election of presidential electors, equal in number to Cortes deputies, the two groups constituting an electoral college to name the new Spanish president, provided a significant index to the lack of an independent proletarian policy.

Equivalent in form to an election of deputies, the election provided a magnificent opportunity for the Socialist Party to gauge its strength among the masses. There was not even present the problem of com-

peting with the reactionaries, for except in a few places, the reactionaries were boycotting the elections. The Socialists could have run their independent slate, polled a vote for Socialism, and then made whatever bloc may have been deemed necessary in the electoral college.

Caballero's Cogitations

Naturally, the Azana government did not want such an election, for it would have exposed their lack of support among the people. And the Right Wing Socialists were more than willing to cover the nakedness of the republican bourgeoisie. These two groups, therefore, agreed to run a Popular Front slate, with the understanding that Azana would be elected president. And Caballero? He immediately gave way on the fundamental issue—the independent slate—but exhibited "stubbornness" on the candidate. Not that he proposed a Socialist candidate! He merely wanted Albornoz, another bourgeois republican, instead of Azana. When the executive committee of the S.P. announced its support of Azana, a spokesman for Caballero complained to the press that he had not been consulted but in the same breath declared he would not oppose Azana. The real issue—that the election should be a tabulation of Socialist strength—was thus completely obscured.

The Stalinists were as eager as Azana for the joint slate. Here is the Daily Worker's description of the problem (May 3):

"The Fascists and foreign reaction had hoped that the Socialist Party would insist on their own candidate and thus split the People's Front, and the A.P. had gleefully sent out that prophecy. But the important Madrid section of the Socialist Party firmly refused to carry water for Fascism by such a split."

Refuse to Join Capitalator

Madrid is Caballero's stronghold and still considered the center of the Left Socialists, so that when Caballero capitulated on this question, there was no concerted action by the Left Wing.

But it is enormously significant that in spite of Caballero, a number of Socialist sections—Almeria, scene of many recent strikes and street fights with the Fascists, Ciudad Real and Albacete, and other provinces—refused to join the government parties in a joint slate and instead elected a straight Socialist slate. This is the first definite breakaway from Caballero's temporizing tactics of talking left and acting right.

Only thirty percent of the twelve million qualified voters took part

In the Columns of Pravda...by Alpha

Ever drawing newer and newer balances of the so-called "check-up of party documents," Pravda is convinced that the behind-the-scenes purge takes the palm over the open purge. It turns out that "many of the disguised enemies were able to fool the purging Committee, and in some places they even passed through the purge with applause."

In other words, this to say that many of those suspect of being oppositionists had the sympathies of their organizations with them and the Committees, appointed from above, had no pretext for expulsion. But, in the behind-the-scenes check-up "the study of the party personnel was much deeper and many-sided than during the purges" (Pravda, March 22). This is hardly to be wondered at, the searchlight here was the apparatus of the G.P.U.

We learn from Pravda, in passing, that in one of the Chelyabinsk factories "to 103 communists there are 318 of those who were expelled from the party at one time or another." In other words three times as many have been expelled as have remained. The Chelyabinsk factory is hardly a rare exception. At all events, it illustrated the manner in which this sorry ruling "party" is living!

Pravda carries an exposure of the secretary of the Uspensk District Committee of the Azov-Black sea region. "His motions during the session of the District Committee—and he introduces them on every question—do not meet with any objections, because he does not tolerate any objections." How awful! What a shocking breach of democracy! Saltykov once wrote a history of the city of Gouptov (Dunecvile) in which he portrayed the customs of the entire Czarist autocracy. The piece about the Uspensk District Committee rings like an involuntary satire on the regime. The name of the Uspensk secretary is Saut. But if one were to put down the U.S.S.R. in place of the district and replace Saut with Stalin, one could leave unaltered everything else remaining in the text.

Molotov has succeeded in completely straightening out the front. Since the liquidation of the "Third Period" Molotov, as is well known, has been in semi-disgrace. His name, it is true, was to be found among the inborn leaders but not on every occasion. His name was commonly put after Kaganovich and Voroshilov, and he was often deprived of his initials. In Soviet ritual all these are signs of paramount importance. Whenever a delegation arrived to see Molotov he was allowed to receive them only by having Rudzutak as his left wheel horse, and Chubar as his right wheel horse. On his part, Molotov, though he did give necessary praise to the leader, would do so only two or three times throughout an entire speech, which in the atmosphere of the Kremlin sounded almost like a call for the overthrow of Stalin. But, with God's help, since the end of last year, a turn for the better has been noticed. Molotov was straightening out the front. In re-

Mass Action Broadens

While the proletarian parties continue to support the bourgeois government, the mass action in the factories and streets offers a stirring contrast. We list only a few of the events of the last few days.

On April 28, "El Aguila," biggest brewery in Spain, was seized by its employees and held for days until the bosses granted all the demands. The same day the venders of vegetables and fish in Madrid declared a protest strike because police had injured seven of their members in an encounter—how deep the ferment when these lower petty-bourgeois elements are drawn into political life!

Since April 30 a general strike of all maritime workers has stopped all ships and closed all ports.

The iron mines of Penarroya have been occupied by the miners, declaring they will operate them on a "communist basis," because the employers have refused to re-employ the workers dismissed after the October, 1934 revolt.

Twelve church buildings were destroyed by Madrid masses when a rumor spread through the city that the monks and nuns had poisoned some children. The same day (May 4) three churches and two convents were burned in Cadiz, and several churches in other provinces.

In Cadiz and Algar, the priests were expelled and sentenced to death if they returned. General strike declared in Malaga, with shooting encounters between strikers and police.

On May 6 a general strike in Cadiz, to support the demands of striking arsenal workers, closed city and port; not a single store was permitted to open.

The same day general strikes began in Santander and Huelva, miners and dock workers paralyzing the city in sympathy strikes supporting railroad workers' demands.

Madrid cafe workers have closed their places of work, with the demand that all Fascist sympathizers among the employees be discharged.

Significant agrarian strikes are now in progress. In the province of Teruel all land workers are out demanding higher wages. In Baguena striking agrarians forced the parish priest out of the municipal office, notifying him he would be shot if he returned. An agrarian strike in Valencia developed a series of anti-religious demonstrations, resulting in the destruction of twelve church buildings.

Rigorous Censorship in Spain

Suspiciously little news is printed in the Spanish press—which is under rigorous censorship—about events on the land. One must not forget that of the twenty-four millions of Spain, nearly twenty live on the land. Six weeks ago reports indicated widespread seizures of estates by the landworkers. Undoubtedly they remain in possession of the land, and are seizing more estates.

At least one armed encounter between workers and rightists or fascists is reported every day, almost invariably involving some deaths. Many municipalities in control of workers report mass arrests of monarchists and fascists.

(Continued on Page 4)

cent weeks he has delivered several panegyrics to Stalin which made Mikoyan himself turn green with envy. In reward Molotov has received his initials. His name figures in the second place, and he bears the title of the "closest companion-in-arms."

All's well that ends well. But in all decency it must be admitted that Molotov didn't find it easy. After all he knows Stalin for too many years to place him on the same plane with Lenin, as he did in his debased speech to the delegates from Soviet Georgia. But, after all, it is not for us to be concerned about Molotov's dignity as a man. We have other concerns.

During the school term in Kremchoug, on the initiative of a propagandist named Poteliako, a discussion was instituted on the "possibility of building Communism in one country," during which Poteliako "advanced Trotskyist formulations." Despite the protests of several communists, (obviously, the Pravda correspondent himself) "Poteliako was left on his post and continues to give his lectures."

But, after the correspondent's notice in Pravda, we have reason to believe, Poteliako was not only removed as lecturer but also given all the necessary inspiration by the well known theorist Yagoda.

Novoselski, who received the "degree of the best newspaperman" at the Ukrainian Communist Institute of Journalism, on arriving at his new post printed in the newspaper edited by him a "Trotskyist counter-revolutionary article," for which he was expelled from the party (and, of course, arrested). This episode is a clear testimony to the influx of Oppositionist audacity. We note it with satisfaction.

In explaining the need for vigilance with respect to "Trotskyists," Pravda unburies itself of a brilliant image which is worthy of reprinting: "the class enemy in his deathbed refuses to surrender. He resorts to all sorts of snares and dirty devices, especially when there is a lull in vigilance." Thus the class enemy is terrible not when he defended his privileged positions with arms in hand at the height of his strength—no! He is particularly now "in his death-bed death-throes" His most serene Excellence Prince Potemkin once remarked on a similar occasion to the literature Potemkin: "You might as well die, Denis, you will never write anything better."

On December 30, 1935, Pravda indignantly reported that revolutionaries were being subjected to tortures in Yugoslav jails. Pravda forgets to mention that Yugoslav revolutionaries are subjected to tortures also in the jails of Stalin.

From a Conversation with a Soviet Dignitary.

(Not from Pravda (Truth), but forsooth the truth).

"Why do you flatter him so shamelessly?"

"What can one do? He loves it so."

On December 30, 1935, Pravda indignantly reported that revolutionaries were being subjected to tortures in Yugoslav jails. Pravda forgets to mention that Yugoslav revolutionaries are subjected to tortures also in the jails of Stalin.

From a Conversation with a Soviet Dignitary.

(Not from Pravda (Truth), but forsooth the truth).

"Why do you flatter him so shamelessly?"

"What can one do? He loves it so."

BROWDER: THE MAN AND HIS BOOK

2. THE WOOING OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY

Out of Their Own Mouths

Union Blooms In Akron

By MAX SHACHTMAN

Whatever else a critic may say about Mr. Browder, he cannot justly accuse him of the vice popularly known as "author's pride." Quite the contrary. If Browder errs on any side in the evaluation of his past writings, it is to the side of humility. What are we saying—humility? No, downright self-effacement. In any case, so it appears.

Three of his works are before us. The earliest one, "The Meaning of Social Fascism," we will call No. I, to simplify all references to it. His book late last year, "Communism in the United States," we will call No. II and his latest volume, "What Is Communism?"—No. III.

If you look through No. III you will find no gratified reference to the ideas so recently developed in No. II, both of which simply fail even to mention No. I. The latest volume shyly notes the fact that "his previous book, 'Communism in the United States,' was a collection of official reports, articles, speeches and pamphlets, brought together over a period of three years. It had all the shortcomings inevitable with such a form. The present book is, in contrast, a single work" (p. vii). Not another word: what was defective in No. II was merely its form—a candid confession which meets the strictest requirements of that "Bolshevik self-criticism" so vehemently insisted on in Browder's encyclicals to the flock.

Abandoning the Old Mistress

A closer comparison of the two, however, reveals that Browder has done more than simply abandoned an old form. Indeed, it requires a high degree of nonchalance to designate what he did abandon as just a "form." For Browder's joy with his new book is really of the kind described by the old Restoration playwright, William Wycherley: "Next to the pleasure of making a new mistress is that of being rid of an old one, and of all old debts." In the brief few months between No. II and No. III Browder has effaced everything he wrote and stood for a year ago. And in putting forward his latest ideas, he places himself essentially upon the discredited platform of the Second International which, fortunately, the best Socialist elements are now abandoning.

What Browder has succeeded in doing in his latest volume is to give up entirely internationalism for the sake of national patriotism, the Leninist position on the struggle against war for the social-patriotic position, the Marxian concept of the class struggle for the reformist concept of class collaboration. In passing, he has dumped overboard a dozen other views which he held virtually until yesterday. Let us compare notes!

The United Front Mood

The principal stress in the tactics of the Stalinists, especially since the Seventh Congress of the C.I., is now laid on the united front with the Socialist Party, to the point where the C.P. even proposes the fusion of the two organizations into one party. A united front with the S.P. even at the price of completely recasting the American League Against War and Fascism. A united front with the S.P. for the purpose of launching a Farmer-Labor Party. A united front with the S.P. on any and every question.

Now, the united working class front against capitalism is neither a new idea nor a poor one, and we who were not among the last to discover its merits will not be found among its opponents today. But in all the years during which we found it necessary to combat Stalinist opposition to the united front, we never forgot that such a front has meaning and value to the working class only if these questions are answered: with whom? against whom? for what? till when?

Browder doesn't always say quite clearly just what the united front will really look like and do. But for that he makes it entirely clear that he wants the united front with the S.P. like a dying man wants life. He falls all over himself in his anxiety; he fawns on the S.P.; he praises it and especially its Left wing; he cozens and wheedles it in every key on the scale; he means it no harm but is interested only in its welfare. A few quotations from No. III will suffice to indicate his position.

"The differences between us are growing smaller," p. 103. "Communists, when they propose the united front, do not desire the defeat of the Socialist Party, as the

Old Guard claims. Communists do not want a weak Socialist Party which is no asset to the working class. They urge Socialists to join the struggle for the united front because it will strengthen both the S.P. and the C.P. and thus strengthen the working class." (p. 111.)

The Keeper and the Nurse

Can nobler sentiments be found in any contemporary political work? Browder, who, you might imagine, has work enough building his own party, is nevertheless concerned also with building the S.P. Unlike Cain, he not only wants to be his brother's keeper, but his nurse as well. Weaken the S.P.? Perish the thought! Nothing but a powerful and mighty Socialist Party will satisfy him, and he is determined to help build it despite any reluctance or suspicion it may display. And he not only wants to strengthen the S.P. in general, but its leadership in particular. "If the militant Socialists come out boldly for the united front, then their party, which deeply desires the united front, will rally around them, and they will be able to multiply the strength of the S.P. many-fold." (p. 110.)

Only the strongest physical effort enables us to overcome the emotions stirred in a reader by this touching sign of selfishness and prodigality. But the recollection of what Browder said not so long ago is enough to restore the pulse and heart-beat to normal. For Browder not only wrote on the same subject before, but wrote words of a diametrically opposite kind.

What Happened to Social-Fascism?

"When we speak of the Socialists as Social-Fascists," he wrote in Work No. I—in No. III, as the reader will surmise, the phrase Social-Fascism simply cannot be found, "we are not merely abusing them [not merely!], we are giving the scientific description, the name of the political role which they are performing. . . . Socialists in words, Fascists in deeds! That is what Social-Fascism means. It is an accurate, scientific, descriptive term applied to the Socialist Party." (p. 14f.)

At that time Browder was not so worried about the S.P. not being strong. In fact, his worries were of a different order altogether, because, thought he, the S.P. was being built up. And by whom? "The bourgeoisie is definitely building up the Socialist Party because it knows that in the coming great class struggles in America it is going to need the S.P. . . . When the S.P. does not exist, the capitalist class has to bring it into existence and that is what is going on in the United States today. . . . the building of the S.P. is so directly the business of the capitalists and not of the workers, this is the determining reason why the Socialist Party has such leaders as Norman Thomas. The capitalists, if they are going to build the party, are going to be sure they have a reliable man at the head of it. . . . Especially will it grow and become a menace in this country if we Communists are not active and well armed in the struggle against it." (p. 40f.)

One can only conclude, from comparing Browder's two positions, that the C.P. decided to pick up the job of building the S.P. where the capitalist class left off. Once, the bourgeoisie knew that "in the coming great class struggles in America it is going to need the S.P.," now, the C.P. needs it.

United "Against the Leaders"

Objection may be raised that because in 1933, when Work No. I was presented, the S.P. was different from the S.P. of today, a different analysis was warranted. Granted. But Work No. II was presented in 1935, and a second printing of it appeared as late as September of that year, without a single word or footnote to qualify its contents. That is, it appeared more than a year after the Detroit convention of the S.P. where the Left wing gained control. And here is what No. II has to say about what it calls the "crisis among the social-Fascists."

"In this crisis," wrote Browder a brief few months ago, "the social-Fascist leadership finds it necessary to invent new means to keep the workers fooled and under their control. For this purpose, they are beginning, wherever the situation gets too hot for them, to establish a division of labor—one part of them becomes the 'Right wing,' which carries through the dirty work of the direct sell-out; the other part becomes a 'Left wing' which mildly deplores the necessity

of submitting to the sell-out. . . ." (p. 62.) And again: "No, it is clear, unity behind these gentlemen [Norman Thomas and S.P. leaders] means a united surrender to the capitalist attacks. That is not the kind of unity the workers need. We need a united fighting front of the workers against the capitalists and all their agents. But that means that unity must be built up, not with these leaders on their present policies, but against them. That means not a united front from the top, but a united front built up by the workers from below in the organization and struggle for their immediate needs." (p. 52.)

How Black Becomes White

Enough has been quoted to indicate that Mr. Browder has slightly modified his views about the Socialist Party. A few months ago, mention of the S.P. was enough to make him rage like Vesuvius on a rampage; now you'd think that but-ter wouldn't melt in his mouth. Not so long ago, the bourgeoisie didn't want a weak S.P.; now Browder doesn't want one. Not so long ago, the split in the S.P. represented a clever trick, a division of labor among the social-Fascists to facilitate the selling out of the workers; now Browder lies awake nights thinking of how best to help the Left wing strengthen itself with its followers in the S.P. A few months ago, he wanted nothing less than a united front from below against Norman Thomas and the other leaders of the S.P.; now only a united front with them will do.

Why does Browder gush with honey like the rock in Horeb that gushed with water when Moses struck it with his rod? Because he has been instructed to cajole the S.P. into cooperating with the Stalinists to organize the American "People's Front" which, according to Browder, is to be accomplished by "federating the trade unions and all other mass organizations of the toilers into a wide Farmer-Labor Party representing a coalition of all the people prepared to resist the attacks of capitalism." (p. 114f.) "Such a party cannot arise spontaneously. It must be led and organized by a united front coalition of the most advanced sections of the toiling masses." (p. 114f.) The most advanced sections means: S.P. and C.P. And for the Stalinists, as we shall see even more clearly further on, the S.P. is an indispensable ingredient of this "united front coalition" which is to lead and organize the "coalition of all the people."

"We Communists," Browder writes, still on the same page, "would be delighted if we could bring millions immediately behind our own program and our party. But we are realists. [Hear, hear!] We know that these masses have as yet not had that necessary experience which will bring them solidly behind our leadership." Therefore, the Farmer-Labor Party. Let us dwell a moment on the sense of these few lines.

Why the Farmer Labor Party?

What experience is, logically, necessary for the masses before they come solidly behind a (presumably) correct program and a (presumably) communist party? An experience that would be tantamount to disillusionment with all other parties and all other programs. What Browder is saying, therefore, is this: We have the correct program and party. The masses don't yet support our party and won't for some time to come. They must first find out that the other parties and their programs are worthless. Consequently, let us build a Farmer-Labor party for these inexperienced masses. Its conduct, its record—

we know—will be such that it will provide the masses with that "necessary experience" required before they "delight" in us with support of the C.P. and its program. To put the matter thus bluntly, would reveal the ludicrousness of any attempt made nowadays by revolutionists to initiate a reformist party. Browder, who cannot put the matter so plainly, is therefore compelled to paint a glowing picture of what his "People's Front" Farmer-Labor party would be capable of doing. The picture glows because it has so many colors; and all of them clash so harshly that it is impossible to achieve the slightest bit of clarity.

"We Communists have proposed a Farmer-Labor Party, which will fight for all the necessary demands of the toilers." (p. 107.) "It must be emphasized that only one thing can stop the advance of Fascism in our country, and that is, the build-

ing of a powerful people's anti-Fascist front, given an organized expression in a Farmer-Labor Party." (p. 107f.) Through the united front of a fighting Farmer-Labor Party, we will protect our rights now and prepare the workers for socialism." (p. 111.) "It is the only bulwark against economic catastrophe, against political reaction and Fascism, against the growing danger of another war." (p. 125.) "It [a F.-L. P. government] could fight against the economic chaos of the capitalist system." (p. 125.) "Our perspective of a united front government is one of an instrument of struggle against capitalism, of the collaboration of all anti-Fascist parties and groups, against reaction and Fascism, and for the interests of the entire working population." (p. 126f.) (Our emphasis throughout, M.S.)

99.44 Percent Pure

Now, it is our contention that any party possessing the properties and virtues that Browder attributed to his Farmer-Labor Party, is good enough for the working class. Its existence would obviate the need of any other working class political organization. Browder does say that the government of this party "will not be able to introduce socialism, which can only be done through a real revolutionary government" (p. 125); but he doesn't bother to say or show why the F.L.P. government could not meet the final test. According to him, the party of his heart's desire could fight for "all the necessary demands" of the toilers; it can stop Fascism—the only thing that can stop it; it is the only bulwark against imperialist war; it can contend against the economic chaos of capitalism; it can protect our rights now.

If it can accomplish all these things—and they are hardly trifles—then why in heaven's name can't it also usher in socialism itself? Is there one single example in the history of the international labor movement of a political party that was able to defend the daily interests and rights of the masses as successfully as Browder says his Farmer-Labor Party will, that was not equally able to emancipate the masses from all bondage? We know of none and we are ready for enlightenment. We do, however, know something about the British Labour Party. . . .

The Mystery Grows

Let us try the Browder puzzle from another angle. "Such a [Farmer-Labor] party, while not having the program of the proletarian revolution and of socialism, would necessarily have to fight on the most important issues of the day." (p. 121.) Assuming that it would not be "neutral" in the fight between the two classes in modern society, we conclude that it would fight out these issues on the side of the workers. Yet, Browder points out, "such a party could be neither Socialist nor Communist, but it also could be neither anti-Socialist nor anti-Communist; it could be a genuine anti-capitalist party" (p. 107); and, remember, it "will not be able to introduce socialism." Well, it will "fight for all the necessary demands of the toilers."

And when it comes to power and forms a government, as Browder says it should and will? Then the "communists will support such a united front government so long as it really uses its powers to protect and extend the economic and political rights of the masses. We are even prepared under certain conditions [which?] for practical participation in such a government" (p. 125). But a few pages back we are informed that among the other virtues of the F.-L.P. is the fact that it "would bring the masses face to face with the problem of state power, and therefore with all the problems of revolution" (p. 120f). Very good, very commendable.

Now picture the situation in the concrete, however distressing this may be for the many-volumed author. The F.-L.P. takes over the government, legally and peacefully. The C.P. supports the government—even enters it "under certain conditions." The government brings the masses face to face with the problem of state power and all the problems of revolution. It cannot solve any of these problems because Browder forbids it the right or ability to provide the only solution of such a problem: "to introduce socialism." The problems of state power and revolution can (may we assume?) be solved only by the Communist Party when (may we further assume?) it gains the support of that "majority [who] were preparing themselves for a final decision as between capitalism and socialism" (p. 126). Now, when the C.P. gains this majority and is ready for the revolutionary solution, is the "united people's front Farmer-Labor Party government" to be overthrown and its place by what Browder calls the "real revolutionary government, a Soviet government of workers and other

toilers"? If this is the idea, how will the C.P. overthrow a government which "communists will support"? Enlightenment, please!

Paging Abo Cahan!

Or perhaps the Browder idea is a different one. The F.-L.P. government is not Socialist, not Communist, nor can it introduce socialism. A "real revolutionary government" can. Is the latter, then, to come into power without the violent overthrow of the "united front" government? The only other way known to man is to come to power by voting the preceding regime out of power. Consequently, the transference of power from a non-socialist regime to a socialist regime, of the means of production and exchange from the hands of its present possessors into the hands of the proletariat, would occur peacefully and legally. Thus would be realized the most dearly cherished dream of Karl Kautsky, Ramsay MacDonald and Abraham Cahan. But a few pages further, our happiness at the prospect of so entrancing and painless a solution of the class struggle is discourteously shattered by the same Browder: "History does not show a single example in which state power was transferred from one class to another by peaceful means, whether in the form of voting or some other method of formal democracy." (p. 165f.) Again, enlightenment, please!

Let us try one last time. The "people's government" would come out of a "coalition movement of all liberals, progressives, Socialists and Communists" (p. 123). But this government "should not be confused with the Soviet government of the victorious proletarian revolution, composed of an alliance of Communists, left-Socialists and other groups which had jointly participated in the overthrow of the capitalists" (p. 126). If the composition of the two governments (the latter would directly follow the former) is compared, the only visible difference seems to be that the "Soviet government" would be identical with the "people's government" except that it would not contain the "liberals and progressives"—unless (God knows!) they are to be included among the "other groups." Now, is it the idea of Browder, who does not know a single example of the peaceful transference of power, that a violent revolution will have to be undertaken to get a few liberals and progressives out of the "people's government" in order to convert it into a "Soviet government"? Isn't it much more likely that no violence at all would be needed? Then, faced with Browder's fascinating scheme, all the liberals and progressives and Socialists and Communists would laugh themselves to death, thus leaving the General Secretary in such complete control of state power that he would not even have to shoot off a water pistol?

History Has Already Spoken

We can hardly wait to see Browder's "People's Front" come to full bloom. But then, we really don't need to wait. In what essential respect could it differ from the late "Iron Front" in Germany, or the People's Fronts in France and Spain? In the lands mentioned, they served and serve as dikes against the proletarian revolution. In the United States, it could serve only as a hindrance to the rising class consciousness and class independence of the workers. Browder has, of course, no illusions about the imminence of a "People's Front Government" in the United States, however wistfully he may yearn for the role of a respectable statesman. He is interested in more tangible and immediate matters. His "government" may have to wait; the formation of his "People's Front Farmer-Labor Party" and the coralling of the Socialist Party into it, cannot wait. And it cannot wait because the Stalinists cannot afford to let the S.P. continue further along the road of revolutionary proletarian socialism which it has begun to tread.

The "People's Front" is the Stalinist formula for subordinating the working class movement to capitalist democracy in the name of a "struggle against Fascism" and "defense of the Soviet Union." It is the formula which sanctifies the most despicable practices of social-patriotism and class-collaboration. Neither of these is fully realizable if any appreciable section of the working class movement retains its class independence and revolutionary integrity. It is for the purpose of eradicating every particle of these qualities in the Socialist Party that Browder woos it so ardently.

What Browder hopes to achieve by his courtship in concrete terms of American working class policies, is clearly enough revealed in other sections of his book. The anxiety to get the support of the S.P., to consummate a "united front" with it, can be fully understood only in connection with Browder's views on such questions as bourgeois democracy, the contest between Roosevelt and the Liberty League, patriotism, the "defense of the Soviet Union," and the approaching world war. These questions require the detailed treatment which only another article will allow.

(Continued from Page 1)

"At the same time, those in other parts of the United States are puzzled that a court trial where the issues seem so clear and evident should drag along as the present trial here in the Shoemaker case has done, with the State's case taking three weeks and just now reaching its conclusion.

"The two points of view show the wide differences in thought, customs, life and politics in the country.

"Flogging, tar and feathering and even death are not unusual here as a means of disposing of persons who are disturbing to certain interests, or to what is vaguely called 'social order.' They are not carried out under any law in Florida statutes but by persons who believe such methods are for their own or for the public good, and their political influence is so great that court trials, or even arrests, rarely follow.

"At the same time, the great majority of citizens in Florida, numerous but not influential, express the hope that the outcome of the present case will put an end to such methods.

"Citrus growing is a \$100,000,000 industry in Florida, and, as it cannot afford to pay higher wages, labor organizers must be discouraged. It would be undignified for members of the organization to do it, and outsiders are used, one man explained, adding that he himself had helped consign a dozen such 'disturbers' to abandoned and water-filled phosphate mines and swamps.

"Enough has been produced in court and openly talked outside . . . to involve the citrus growers."

Azana Boosted to Presidency

(Continued from Page 3)

What is the Azana government doing? Two things: its civil guards daily murder workers in attacks on strikes and demonstrations; while the government makes demagogic gestures to which the Stalinists and Right Wing Socialists can point as proof of the "progressivism" of Azana. A law is passed announcing fines of employers who refuse to re-employ workers fired after the October revolt, many announcements of plans for public works, etc.

The reactionaries are openly threatening and preparing for civil war. "Ya," rightist paper, declares: "A civilization, a culture and a religion cannot be made to flee in the night by savage hordes manipulated from foreign countries. The fight is now inevitable. The critical moment approaches, but with

(Continued from Page 1)

radical people who thrive from the cause of tearing down something decent and who enjoy causing trouble. . . . Those persons should be singled out and dealt with accordingly."

Five Sit-Downs in Night

This early morning episode followed a night during which there were no less than five sit-downs at Goodyear and several at Firestone, where they were protesting the introduction of pace-setters in the tire departments. The companies are trying to take advantage of the recent wage increases to speed up production. This is proving a notable failure.

The gears in the machinery of the anti-union forces are slowly meshing. One of the latest evidences of this is the formation of an "Akron Civic Justice Association," a fit companion to that other pillar of Akron society, "The Law and Order League." The former is now specializing in full page ads, the chain of reasoning being that now since the rubber companies out of the bounty of their hearts have raised wages, this union monkey business ought to be stopped.

Centralization on Increase

More of this type of propaganda was the recent hullabaloo about decentralization, spread by the rubber barons. Outside sources seem a bit sceptical, somehow, James McMullen in his New York column pointed out that United States Rubber, currently one of the most successful plants in the country, far from decentralizing is pursuing a directly opposite course, and the "Annalist" openly stating that the rubber companies (beyond being afflicted with the incurable disease of capitalism) are the victims of their own merciless price cutting.

How little all this guff fazes the Akron gum miners was well demonstrated last Sunday when 4,000 rubber workers celebrating the advent of Spring in Akron, Ohio (The Rubber Center of the World), descended upon the amazed town of Kent, a suburb of Akron, and demonstrated before the Black and Decker Electric Company, where scabs remained in the plant, closed recently by striking workers.

Yes, summer is i-cumen in. But it looks like a union summer this time.

a will to conquer, we shall succeed and Spain will not be a Russian colony." Almost daily, Gil Robles, Catholic leader, declares himself ready for civil war. On April 26 he offered Azana one of two choices: "Anarchy or a government of national concentration." In a speech in the Cortes on May 5, Gil Robles declared his followers were becoming Fascists and that he was not opposing the tendency, "because Spain is now divided into two groups irrevocably opposed to each other."

Now Ready!

LEON TROTSKY

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AFTER LENIN

Considerable confusion exists as to the cause of the split in the Communist International which drove Trotsky into exile from the Soviet Union which he helped to create.

Was it—as certain commentators have sought to make it appear—a personal feud between Stalin and Trotsky? Was the issue a mere squabble for power—a purely organizational fight for the control of the Russian Communist Party and the Soviet Union?

This book explodes such a superficial interpretation of the struggle in the Soviet Union between the forces led respectively by Stalin and Trotsky—a struggle in which Stalin was the victor and the cause of the world revolution the loser.

Which course for the Soviet Union and the Comintern—nationalism or internationalism? This was the issue, and around it the battle has raged.

This volume, written in Trotsky's customary brilliant style, makes plain the issues that brought about the split. It is basically, his criticism of the official program of the Communist International adopted at its Sixth World Congress. It was around the counter-program put forth in this criticism that the Trotskyist Opposition rallied. The movement for the Fourth International is based upon it essentially.

It is impossible to understand "Trotskyism" without a reading of this volume. No one interested in the history of the modern working class movement can afford to be without this volume.

Its stress upon internationalism as against nationalism acquires particular significance at the present moment when world war threatens to engulf the labor movement again in a wave of nationalism and chauvinism.

416 Pages—Cloth Bound Regular Edition—\$3.00 Popular Edition—\$2.00

ORDER FROM
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
28 EAST 12th STREET, N. Y. C.

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.