

NEW MILITANT

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

VOL. 2, NO. 22 [WHOLE NO. 74]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 1936

PRICE 3 CENTS

Workers Party Calls All Revolutionary Workers to Join the Socialist Party

THE Cleveland convention of the Socialist Party finally smashed the Old Guard domination, and the Old Guard withdrew. By rejecting the Old Guard, the convention ratified the slogan of an inclusive, democratic party, open to all who stand for the goal of socialism and who are willing to work loyally within the framework of the party.

From these two significant developments we draw two conclusions:

1. By breaking with the Old Guard and by opening its doors to revolutionary workers, the Socialist Party becomes the best rallying ground for the revolutionary forces in building the party of the American proletarian revolution.

2. Taking the militant Socialists at their word, the revolutionary workers outside the Socialist Party should immediately join it.

Acting on these conclusions, the National Committee of the Workers Party, exercising the authority expressly given to it by the party convention, has formally dissolved the organization and all its members are joining the Socialist Party. The Spartacus Youth League has taken similar action to join the Young People's Socialist League.

These conclusions, and the actions proceeding from them, are the result of a careful and concrete analysis of the course of development of the Socialist Party during the last two years.

Turning Point at Detroit

The Detroit convention of the Socialist Party in 1934 marked a decisive turning point in the history of the movement. The Declaration of Principles then adopted, despite the ambiguity and confusion of its formulations, made a sharp break with the classical reformism of the post-war Social Democracy, and gave evidence of a determination not to repeat the terrible mistakes and crimes of the parties which had led the Austrian and German masses to the yoke of Fascism. The Waldmans, Pankens and Oneals rightly characterized the document as a break with "democratic Socialism," i.e., the cowardly and treacherous Social-Democratic reformism of the war and post-war years.

Though the leftward tendency of the Socialist Party has not achieved programmatic clarity and, in some respects, retrogressive steps were taken at Cleveland, nevertheless the general trend of the party, as measured by the activities of its membership and the increasing violence of its collisions with the extreme right wing of the party, is undoubtedly progressive. This is to be seen, for example, in the fruitful work of the Socialist militants among the unemployed—a field completely neglected in the past; in the tendency to coordinate the work of Socialists in the trade unions, despite the resistance of party reactionaries allied with the trade union bureaucracy; in the firm stand of the Left Wing in breaking with the hidebound reactionary opposition to the United Front; and in the steadily increasing interest of the party membership in the fundamental questions of the revolutionary program, above all in the consistent development within the Socialist Party on the question of the struggle against war.

The Question of War

War is the most crucial issue of this epoch. On this question the Social Democracy founded and collapsed in 1914. On this question, today, both the international Social Democracy and the degenerate Third International reveal their ideological bankruptcy and their readiness to betray the working class to the imperialists. It is this question that divides the proletariat today into the two camps: those who will and those who will not fight against imperialist war.

Alone of all the important parties in the Second International, the Socialist Party of America took a firm and courageous stand against capitalist government "sanctions." Alone of all these parties, the American party repudiated the fictitious distinction between "peaceful" and "aggressive" capitalist nations. In spite of the terrific barrage of Stalinist pressure, the Socialist Party has continued to develop more clearly and decisively toward a genuinely revolutionary

Statement of National Committee

The Cleveland convention of the Socialist Party has brought to an organizational climax the internal struggle which had arisen out of the Leftward development in the party. The break with the Old Guard shifts the center of gravity to the Left and facilitates the growth and activity of the party. This, as well as the militant position the party has taken on the crucial question of imperialist war, confronts revolutionary workers throughout the country with a new situation. The composition of the Socialist Party today is no longer what it was under the domination of the Old Guard. Into its ranks have entered a new generation of class-conscious militants, inspired by the spirit of the class struggle, who want to make the party a party of revolutionary Marxism. They represent a movement of great potentialities for the cause of a mass party of socialist revolution in the United States.

The Workers Party, formed to advance the interests of revolutionary internationalism, cannot stand apart from this movement. It is fully conscious of the tremendous importance of this movement for the future of the American and international working class and of the fact that this movement can be advanced more speedily and consistently in the direction in which it has traveled only by the closest, most loyal and direct contact with it.

Unlike the Communist (Stalinist) Party, which has sunk deeper and deeper into the mire of reformism and social-patriotism, the Socialist Party has freed itself from the strangulating domination of the Right wing and has advanced towards the position of revolutionary Marxism on a number of basic questions, notably on the question of war, the central question of our time.

Unlike the Communist Party, in which the bureaucracy has stifled every last remnant of party democracy, outlawing all views contrary to those imposed upon the ranks by an appointed officialdom, the Socialist Party openly takes a stand for internal democracy, welcomes revolutionists into its ranks and offers the possibility of putting forward in its

midst the rounded views of consistent revolutionary Marxism.

At its last convention, the National Committee of the Workers Party was instructed to follow closely the developments within the Socialist Party and was given full power to take appropriate action in the event of a favorable outcome of the internal struggle. By virtue of this authority, the National Committee herewith decides to dissolve the Workers Party as a separate organization and calls upon all its members to enter the ranks of the Socialist Party of America. It appeals to all revolutionary workers to follow this example.

The comrades who have been grouped in the Workers Party join not as a separate faction, and take their places side by side with the militant fighters in the ranks of the S.P. with the aim of building it into a mass party of revolutionary socialism. We aim to work loyally and devotedly in the ranks of the Socialist Party and to observe discipline in action. We enter the Socialist Party as we are, with our ideas. We assume all the obligations and duties of party membership and ask no special privileges. On the basis of equal duties and equal rights we obligate ourselves to work loyally and devotedly to build the Socialist Party into a powerful, united organization in the revolutionary struggle for socialism.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
WORKERS PARTY OF THE U. S.

The National Committee of the Spartacus Youth League endorses the declaration of the Workers Party. By the authority of the last convention, the National Committee hereby formally dissolves the Spartacus Youth League and calls upon all its members and sympathizers to take their place in the ranks of the Young People's Socialist League.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
SPARTACUS YOUTH LEAGUE.

lutionary conception of the nature of the proletarian struggle against war. In this field the Cleveland convention made its most important theoretical contribution, adopting a detailed resolution which goes further in the direction of a Leninist position against war than any Socialist party has ever done.

Naturally, it remains to be seen to what extent this developing position on war has been and will be assimilated by the party membership. Undoubtedly, this position will not become fully integrated into the actions of the Socialist Party without a systematic educational campaign. Such an educational campaign will scarcely be complete unless it involves all the basic questions which are inextricably involved in the war question—the international nature of the class struggle, the road to power, the nature of the workers' state, etc.—questions on which clarity in the Socialist ranks lags considerably behind the development of the war issue.

The Break With the Old Guard

Indeed, the most basic and far-reaching gains made by the Socialist Party do not yet lie in the realm of theoretical clarification. The revolutionary potentialities in the Socialist Party have been best-expressed by

Roosevelt camp; comfortable, aging Philistines, stern and implacable only against revolutionists and militants,—for a decade and a half these traitors poured their poison into the minds and hearts of Socialist workers. The socialist worker, seeking a way out from capitalism, could find guidance, in all those years, only in the venal and corrupt Jewish Forward or its English version, the New Leader. The worker or student seeking to learn something of scientific socialism was delivered into the hands of the Algernon Lees and the Rand School! Groups of workers engaged in struggle against repressive administration in their unions, if they were naive enough to bring their problems to the Julius Gerbers, were betrayed to the bureaucrats not only by being restrained from struggle, but also by the direct process of stool-pigeoning. The Old Guard gave aid to not a single one of the important struggles for democratic rights on behalf of political prisoners! They did not lift a finger to aid the organization of the millions of unemployed. Under their regime, the Socialist Party had all the vices of the European Social Democracy without even the advantage of being the party of the masses.

Degeneration of the Communist Party

Now the Socialist workers are freed of this horrible, parasitic excrescence. At first thought, indeed, it appears incredible that thousands of militant workers and youth could have joined the Socialist movement while the Old Guard ruled the party. They joined, of course in spite of the Old Guard. The main influx has come since 1928. That influx was only possible because of the degeneration of the Communist Party.

The revolutionary workers have been joining the Socialist Party since 1928 because the relative autonomy of state and local organizations made it possible for them to function in it, even though under fearful handicaps. In the Communist Party, they could not function at all. It is no mere coincidence that the Socialist Party has grown precisely in the years since the Communist Party, yoked to the "national Socialism" of Stalin, ceased in actual fact to be a party. It is no accident that the growth of the Socialist Party began in the same year that we, then the Left Opposition, were expelled from the Communist Party. The C. P. became nothing more than a rigid apparatus-clique; even the memory of party democracy disappeared; scoundrels and nonentities were appointed by Stalin and consecrated overnight as "beloved leaders"; party policies are infinitely closer to those of the Old Guard than to those of militant Socialism. From this repellent caricature of a revolutionary organization, an organization neither revolutionary nor a party, thousands of revolutionary workers recoiled. Instead, they joined the Socialist Party. From the first they chafed at the Philistine passivity imposed by the Old Guard, and now they have smashed through the Old Guard.

It is extraordinary, indeed, to contemplate the dialectics of this swift development. The Socialist Party is left an empty shell by the surge of revolutionists to the Communist Party in 1919. But the Communist Party becomes a stifling apparatus. Workers recoil and enter the Socialist Party and give it new life. But in the process they have also transformed the party and driven out the Old Guard Democrats who controlled it. Thus the drive of the proletariat to revolutionary organization asserts itself in spite of all obstacles.

Party Democracy

That drive is, of course, not completed. It is just beginning and will not end this side of the American proletarian revolution. The Socialist workers are now in a state of evolution toward a consistent Marxist conception of their tasks. Not the least of the forms that dialectics takes is the conflict, the give and take, of ideas about theory, strategy and tactics. Only that which is dead—like the prison regime of the Old Guard and the caricature of monolithism which is the Communist Party—provides no arena for ideological differentiation. The mature revolutionist seasoned in the front lines of the class struggle, conscious of the manifold practical problems of the party and the signifi-

(Continued on Page 8)

WHY WE ARE JOINING THE SOCIALIST PARTY

SPEAKERS: (JAMES P. CANNON
(A. J. MUSTE
MAX SHACHTMAN, CHAIRMAN

Friday Evening, June 12, 1936
at 8 o'clock

IRVING PLAZA HALL
15th STREET & IRVING PLACE
NEW YORK, N. Y.

ON THE FLYING TRAPEZE AGAIN

(Concluded in this issue)
By KARANDASH

One year after Hitler's assumption of power in Germany, the gangs of reaction raised their razors and guns in Paris on February 6, 1934 against the "corrupt" Daladier government. On this day, l'Humanite, the central organ of the French Communist Party, appealed for a demonstration in the very midst of the reactionary gangs, and with practically the self-same slogans, against the "corrupt" and "Fascist" Daladier. This was a repetition on a minor scale of the Red Referendum in Germany, where the Stalinists appealed to the workers to cast their votes against the Socialist (social-fascist) government of Braun and Severing together with the Nazis. In France the Stalinists did not mix their votes with the Fascists, instead they staged a demonstration which could not be distinguished from that of the Fascists, thus sowing confusion among the workers.

On February 7 and 8 the French working class was treated to the spectacle of a Socialist Party proposing a united front to the C.P., and the latter refusing the proposal. L'Humanite replied to the S.P. in substance as follows: If you want to struggle against fascism, you should apply to the Amsterdam-Playel Committee whose particular specialty this is. A few months later the "line" was changed.

That is why in 1936, Bittelman has to write, "It is strange that the Left elements . . . should have allowed this Old Guard and Trotskyite slander to creep into the draft program" (p. 20).

Bittelman devotes fully two-fifths of his pamphlet to a "criticism" of the draft program on the question of Fascism and War. On these central questions the Left Socialists have moved closest to the revolutionary Marxist position. On the other hand, the degeneration and betrayal of the Third International stand out most sharply precisely in the struggle against Fascism and War. The Stalinist record and policy in this sphere are only too clear. It is hardly surprising therefore that the Stalinists should concentrate their efforts upon trying to check any further clarification or evolution of the Socialists on these burning questions of our epoch.

The draft expresses the fundamental thesis of the Marxian position on war: only the overthrow of capitalism can put an end to war. Unable to criticize the Left Social-

Bittleman Takes the Swing this Time in Pamphlet "Going Left"

ists for what they say, Bittleman attacks them for what they allegedly fail to say. According to Bittleman, they are guilty of failing to mention the central task of the anti-war struggle. A serious charge, indeed!

In the school of Marx and Lenin we have been taught that history has put the following alternative to the advanced capitalist countries: Either socialism—or a new series of imperialist wars. And that therefore the central task of the struggle against war is the proletarian revolution, the only means of overthrowing the bourgeoisie.

But Bittleman wants to instill in the minds of the Left Socialists the idea that "the central task in the anti-war struggle today is the struggle for peace" (p. 27). Offering the foreign policy of Stalin-Litvinoff in place of revolutionary Marxism, Bittleman insists that: "The Communists propose to fight against imperialist war under the central slogan of the struggle for peace" (p. 28). This is the central slogan not of Marxism but of Austro-Marxism. Bittleman, whether he knows or not, is a true disciple of Max Adler.

Back in 1915, Max Adler wrote a pamphlet *Prinzip oder Romanik* (also in criticism of "sectarians") in which he advanced the idea that socialism after the war must make peace its central slogan, otherwise socialism will cease to exist. Zinoviev, at that time closely collaborating with Lenin, replied to Adler as follows:

Zinoviev on Adler and Bittleman
"For those Socialists who see no other perspective—the revolutionary perspective of the transformation of the imperialist wars into civil wars—for them there is really no other way out. . . . 'Die Friedensidee zum Mittelpunkt.' 'The idea of peace must be made our central slogan' . . . This is what the events have taught them. . . . 'Not a Friedensidee but the Buergerkriegsidee, one feels like shouting to these great utopians who are running around with such a petty utopia. Not the idea of peace—but the idea of civil war, citizen Adler! That is what must become the central point of our program. . . . We say to you: either socialism will become the organizer of civil war

or it will cease to exist (Against the Stream, pp. 145-146 Russian edition. Emphasis in original).

One need change only a few names, places, and incidental remarks to have practically everything that Lenin and the Bolsheviks wrote on this subject apply directly to citizen Bittleman, and his associates. The Marxists never approached the question of peace in the abstract. Writing in the darkest days of the war (at a time when the workers were certainly "vitally interested in the maintenance of peace," to use Bittleman's terminology), Lenin and Zinoviev kept stressing that peace under capitalism "today" as well as tomorrow can only mean an interval between two imperialist wars. Peace under capitalism is an imperialist peace. Anyone who is for peace under capitalism is in reality for peace with the bourgeoisie. Those who today cry, Long live imperialist peace, will tomorrow cry, Long live imperialist war! This is the position of revolutionary Marxism.

It was Karl Kautsky who insisted that the International was "in the nature of things an instrument of peace. . . . The struggle for peace is the international organization of the working class." This is the position of the social-patriots whom Lenin and the Bolsheviks attacked. From the instrument of the world proletarian revolution, the Third International has been transformed by Stalin into an "instrument for peace," that is, of betrayal.

New Converts for the League
Every day, almost every hour, brings added proof of the Stalinist treachery, over which the Stalinists unflinchingly throw the usurped banner of the October revolution. In his pamphlet, Bittleman patronizingly compliments the Socialists for breaking with the "traditional Socialist Party attitude on the League of Nations." He forebears to mention that he and his colleagues have now taken over this "traditional" attitude. Thus, in the June 5 issue of the Daily Worker, Gabriel Peri, while on the subject of the "Fight for the Defense of Peace" has the following to say:

"It seems to us that France must now declare: It is not the League of Nations that was defeated but the inadequacies and shortcomings

of the League. It is not that sanctions were defeated, but their sabotage and betrayal." This is printed in bold type, as the "revolutionary" position on the League of Nations!

In the Camp of Revisionism
In every sphere the Stalinists have taken over the views of the revisionists of Marxism, their precursors in betrayal. As is well known, Bernstein and his associates proceeded by subtly altering the Marxian theory of the State. How do the Stalinists stand with regard to this mainspring of revisionism? The Stalinist theory of the state is a rehash of the views of revisionists, not to be distinguished from them, except in ignorance and clumsiness.

The essence of the revisionist theory of the state does not lie in the denial that the state is an instrument of class rule but in the assertion that there are stages in the evolution of the state. At a certain stage the state can lose its specific class character, cease to serve as the instrument of class oppression, and therefore can be utilized to advance the interests of other classes. The revisionists never denied that the state was an instrument of class oppression, or even that the democratic state could be utilized by the bourgeoisie for its rule. But, said they, once the state has evolved to a democracy, then it has reached that stage when a transition is possible, when the state need no longer serve as the instrument of bourgeois rule. The machinery of the state can be taken over by the majority of the people, and legislation introduced to inaugurate a different social system.

The Capitalist Transition
The Stalinists do not deny that the democratic state is an instrument of bourgeois rule either. But, they say, under certain conditions (as laid down by Dimitroff) it is possible to have extraordinary governments which can serve not the interests of the bourgeoisie, but those of its class enemies. Such a "transitional" government on coming into power would carry through "a number of fundamental revolutionary measures (control of production and of the banks, disarmament of the police and its replacement by an armed workers' militia) . . . It would so weaken the bourgeoisie and so strengthen the working class and its allies, that the working class would become ready to make the proletarian revolution" (p. 8).

This remarkable government, according to Bittleman, would not be the government that is set up by the proletarian revolution, but a different kind of a "workers' and farmers' government"—the kind which is set up within the framework of capitalism, a government of "the united and people's front against fascism and war . . . a united front government, a people's front government, a workers' and farmers' government." Whose class interests would such a "workers' and farmers' government" serve? Certainly not those of the bourgeoisie. How else could it introduce "a number of fundamental revolutionary measures, and 'weaken' the bourgeoisie while 'strengthening' the working class and its allies!"

At a time when the bourgeoisie is no longer able to maintain a stable parliamentary regime and must resort to Fascism because the ruling class is no longer able to provide the most miserly concessions to the oppressed classes in society, the Stalinists propose to set up under capitalism a government that would pass fundamental revolutionary measures, etc. . . . What have we here if not the revisionist myth that the machinery of bourgeois oppression can be utilized by the working class for its emancipation?

Left Is Anti-Stalinist
The only difference between the above formulation of Bittleman and the classic formulation of the revisionists is that Bernstein would have insisted that such a government could proceed to "build a socialist society" instead of to "make a proletarian revolution." But Bernstein could afford to be much more logical and consistent: He did labor under the necessity of palming off his revisionist garbage as "revolutionary Marxism."

Bittleman and the other finkies of Stalin must resort to their shabby "revolutionary" subterfuges to be able to continue using the prestige and the traditions of the October revolution in order to bulldoze workers away from the revolutionary traditions and policies of the October revolution. To go left is in the first instance to go away from Stalinism. To be charged with being a counter-revolutionist by a Stalinist is a well high infallible proof that one is learning to differentiate between the revolutionary program of Marx and Lenin and the revisionism of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

Bound Volumes of NEW MILITANT
Bound volumes of the NEW MILITANT for the year 1935 and 1936, up to and including the present issue, all bound in one, will now be available. The price is \$1.50. It can be ordered from Labor Book Shop, 28 East 12th Street, New York, N. Y.

But here also promises are made. We call upon the workers to put them into practice. Let us begin the practical organization of the committees! Let us denounce the capitulations to the Radical blackmailers! The cardinal task of the hour is: 1) democratic election of the mass committees and 2) put the People's Front Government on the spot to execute its promises.

The Anti-Trotsky Cliques Fold Up

The disintegration which has been taking place within the various sectarian groups, which have made a common platform of fighting "Trotskyism," had several open manifestations during the past week. In addition to open splits, accompanied by the most disgraceful episodes, information is made public of the frightful decomposition and internal stagnation of these bankrupt cliques. The rank and file workers who were misled into these blind alleys on an ultra-"revolutionary" program are drawn a balance of their unfortunate experiences and returning to our ranks. This process is especially noticeable among the youth.

A statement made public last week by a majority of the clique of B. J. Field (who was expelled from the Communist League for treachery during the Hotel strike), operating under the pretentious title of "The League for a Revolutionary Workers Party," informs of a split in the organization and of an attempt by Field to impose "unity" by means of physical force. This method of persuasion was resorted to after representatives of the majority, F. L. Demby and S. Stanley, had submitted a statement to the "National Committee" declaring the organization to be "bankrupt" and announcing their intention to sever all relations with it. Thereupon, according to the statement, "the door was locked" and "Stanley and Demby were attacked, knocked to the floor and beaten about the head." Field participated in the attack, his group outnumbering the other members at the time. Eight out of the twelve members of the group support the position of Demby and Stanley in severing relations with Field.

Simultaneously with the disgraceful finale of the Field adventure came the announcement of secessions from the Oehler group, following upon previous expulsions and withdrawals. A total of ten comrades announced their repudiation of the platform of the Oehler group and their intention to follow the lead of the Workers Party in joining the Socialist Party. Five other members had previously left the Oehler group and returned to the W.P. Several others who have been expelled remain indecisive as to their next steps.

Meantime the world-shaking announcement is made by the "Revolutionary Workers League" (Oehler group) that the "disintegration of the entire group (of Field) makes it impossible to continue negotiations with the League for a Revolutionary Workers Party (Field group), looking toward a fusion with it." So that's off. But that is not all. The Oehlerites are very thorough-going people and when they start to break off negotiations they believe in doing a complete job. The same statement which pronounces the doom of the Field group also announces suspension of the momentous negotiations with the "Italian Left Fraction of Communism" in order to give the three members of the latter organization an opportunity "to conclude a discussion in their ranks in the U. S. and internationally over the class character of the Soviet Union." It is to be inferred that if and when this "small point" is cleared up one way or another the negotiations will either be resumed or finally broken off. We shall see what we shall see.

Diligent inquiry by our reporter failed to uncover any tangible information about the present status and whereabouts, if any, of the "Communist League of Struggle" (Albert Weisbord). The cafeterias are thick with rumors that Weisbord has departed for Chicago, that he has returned, that the bus broke down on the way there or back, that he has retired into seclusion in order to write a book about his life and labors, etc. Up to the moment of going to press our reporter was unable to locate any authorized spokesmen who could deny or confirm any or all of these rumors. Sic transit gloria mundi.

NEW 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, JUNE 6, 1936
Vol. 2, No. 22 (Whole No. 74)

T. J. O'Flaherty Dead

The New Militant learns with great sorrow of the sudden death in Ireland of comrade T. J. O'Flaherty, an adherent of "Trotskyism" from the first days of the formation of the Left Opposition in the United States and a firm supporter to his dying day of the movement for the Fourth International. On his death-bed all his thoughts and interests were with his comrades in the United States and to the last he had hopes to recover his health and to return to the States to function actively in the movement. He gave full support to the Workers Party of America upon its formation and viewed it as the first step in the process of unification of the genuine revolutionary elements who based themselves on the teachings of Lenin and Trotsky.

His sister, Anna Johnson, in a letter to comrade Martin Abern, writes from the Aran Isles, Ireland:

Letter from His Sister
"You will be surprised to hear that Tom has passed away. He died on May 19 from heart trouble. He came back here on January 15 after 18 months between Dublin and England. He was ill when he got back and got worse every day. You know he always suffered from heart trouble."

"It as very pitiful to see him suffer and he wanted so to get well. He lived those last months in New York and Chicago and was continually with you. He talked to all the other members of the Party and tried to persuade me in the morning that he actually was there. You see, I had to be continually with him night and day for the last five weeks. He was so nervous and was always fainting."

"It is now that his second book, 'Cliffmen of the West' (a book on the agrarian northwest in the U.S.) is being advertised. And two weeks ago the publishers wrote for permission to sell the language rights on a 50-50 basis."

"Tom received papers regularly from the U. S. but lately was unable to read them and was too weak to have them read to him. His sister Della spared nothing on him; but it was no use; he was already far too ill when he returned home. He was 47 years of age."

Founder of Communist Movement

Comrade O'Flaherty was a revolutionist of many years standing. He participated in the Irish movement prior to coming to the United States in 1912, immediately joining the Socialist Party in Boston. He remained in the S.P. till the split in 1919 when he joined with the Left Wing and was one of the founders of the Communist movement in America, and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party for many years. He was active during these many years particularly in the field of journalism, being one of the leading and popular writers in the revolutionary press. He was the first editor of the weekly, "Voice of Labor" in Chicago, official organ of the Communist Party. He was on the staff of The Worker and later on the Daily Worker, official organs of the Communist Party. He conducted, too, a special column in the Daily Worker under the caption, "As We See It."

Comrade O'Flaherty was one of the band of Communists under indictment in the famous Bridgeman, Mich. case. He participated in that renowned underground C.P. convention as well as other convention gatherings of the revolutionary movement. He participated in the work of the International Labor Defense, and was a delegate to the International Red Aid Congress (Labor Defense) in Moscow.

Expelled as Left Oppositionist
When the Left Opposition was

formed in November, 1928, upon the expulsion of three members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Cannon, Shachtman and Abern) for support of the position of the Russian Opposition, comrade O'Flaherty was one of the first to announce his unqualified support to the Left Opposition and to join it. He became a member of the Communist League of America and remained a firm supporter of the Fourth International movement led by L. D. Trotsky.

The December 15, 1928 issue of The Militant, organ of the Communist League (Opposition), announced comrade O'Flaherty's adherence to the cause of the Bolshevik-Leninists as follows:

"T. J. O'Flaherty, the most popular Communist propagandist in America and the writer of the famous Daily Worker column 'As We See It' and a revolutionist of many years standing, has issued a statement setting forth his unconditional support of the Platform of the Russian Opposition and his solidarity with all comrades expelled for these views:

"After studying new material on the question of the Trotsky line in the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern,' said comrade O'Flaherty in his statement, 'I have come to the conclusion that the line of the Russian Opposition led by comrade Trotsky is the correct Leninist line and therefore I associate myself with the position taken by comrade Cannon and his associates in the Workers (Communist) Party of America. They were unjustly expelled for attempting to explain to the membership of the Party the political line really advocated by Trotsky in the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern.' Comrade O'Flaherty's statement then went on to set forth his agreement with the position of the Russian Opposition on the various issues (Anglo-Russian Committee, Chinese Revolution, etc.)."

The Communist Party forthwith expelled him.

Wrote for The Militant

Comrade O'Flaherty wrote for the "Militant" from time to time and participated in other activities. Interested in the agrarian problems, he proceeded to function for some years in the Northwest and edited the farmers' publication, the Producer's News (Plentywood, Mont.). At the same time he was engaged in literary efforts. He was ill during all these years, particularly with his heart, for which he was taking treatment for many years. A little over two years ago he decided to pay a visit to his native home, on the wild spot, the Aran Isles, on which the famous film, Man of Aran, was made during the time. He lived the hard life that all must live on this barren place. During this time, he wrote and had published his first book, "Aranmen All," based on life on the Isles. After a time, he left the Aran Isles and lived and labored in Dublin, London and other places in Great Britain, contributing articles from time to time to the labor press. He returned to the Aran Isles upon the completion of his second book, "Cliffmen of the West" where his persisting illness soon thereafter brought the peace of death to him.

Comrade O'Flaherty in a recent letter to comrades in New York expressed the hope and belief that he would soon return to the United States, health greatly improved and be able to continue his revolutionary activity more fully. He remained a revolutionist, a Bolshevik, to the end, and all his friends and comrades, who are legion, are glad to honor the memory of a revolutionary stalwart.

Stalinists Hedge on Committees; Explain Non-Revolutionary Aims

From Revolution (Paris)

On the morning after the elections, the "communists" declared that they were going to devote themselves to the organization of Rank and File Committees of the People's Front.

Thorez wrote in l'Humanite, May 10:

"We will insist on the democratic election of Committees of the People's Front in the country, city and village."

Replying to questions asked by reporters, Duclos stated:

" . . . That is why our friend Thorez emphasized our action for the democratic election of Committees of the People's Front throughout the country. Thus we give proof that we are a party which bases itself on the people."

A propaganda pamphlet of the C.P., which we have already cited, formally states:

"The C. P. recommends Committees of the People's Front, democratically elected in the entire country, in the neighborhoods and in the factories, and embracing not only members of organizations but the unorganized masses as well."

The Radicals in a Panic

It is therefore clear that the C.P. adopted a demand which we have not ceased to defend: practical organization, from below, of People's Committees, democratically elected. To that Vaillant-Couturier added that the Communists would constitute as well a "ministry of the masses."

That was enough for the entire Right and Radical Socialist press to set up a howl about the dictatorship of the proletariat, Soviets, etc.! Indeed, these gentlemen had the right slant!

In face of the impotence of Parliament, the People's Committees will appear as the only force capable of assuring the power of the working masses. The mass committees will set themselves against the arbitrary, dictatorial and police rule of the bourgeois state.

Intransigent and Jour published inflated articles against the proposed Committees. The bourgeoisie has learned something since 1917.

But what was remarkable was that immediately after the famous "Jacobins" of the Daladier stripe began to howl against the "dictatorship of the clubs"! All these capitalist democrats, who had just lost 500,000 votes in the election,

in effect revealed themselves as hypocritical enemies of the people who do not fear anything as much as contact with the workers.

Front, May 10, organ of the party of Deat and Paul Boncour, warned its readers:

"The latest discovery of the C.P. consists in the creation of Committees in the cities and neighborhoods to which the member parties of the People's Front are invited to participate. . . . Without anticipating the decisions our central bodies will not fail to immediately adopt on this subject, we recommend the greatest circumspection to the secretaries of the groups. There will be enough difficulties for the republican government not to have to risk the creation of new ones by mass and street action which will get out of its control."

Bergery's paper, Fleche, makes similar comments. Mr. Bergery prefers the salons to the workers' meetings:

"If such a move can justify a frenzied campaign on the part of the trusts, it is certainly one which permits 'Temps' and other Right papers to declare that the Sovietization of France is being organized."

Izard, deputy from Briey, undoubtedly thinks that the workers who elected him will defeat de Wendel with newspaper articles.

Stalinists Retreat Under Fire

Confronted with these attacks, the Stalinists beat a quick retreat.

In l'Humanite, May 15, Vaillant-Couturier wrote:

"The point in question on the People's Front Committees is not of substituting itself for the parties, nor of substituting itself for the regular government bodies. The only question for them—ardent defenders of democracy—is to actively second a government which is about to take office—supplanting a ministry which in the last week has permitted the flight of three billions of gold—in face of very heavy tasks and for which the action of the masses should be of great assistance."

In effect, Herriot, Daladier and Co. immediately made known that they would have no part of it, just as they attacked the workers after the events of Brest and Toulon, as they will always attack every time real action is taken against the privileges of the bourgeoisie.

Thorez declared in turn (l'Humanite, May 10):

"We want to bring about the collaboration of the people with parliament and the government, as the program of the People's Organization stipulates. The Committees of the People's Front must be developed, strengthened, improved."

Thorez offered the following explanations in his speech at Grange-aux-Belles:

" . . . This firm desire to guarantee the support of the masses through the medium of the People's Front Committees has already been exploited by the reactionary press which is trying to divide us. What is involved, however, is to improve what already exists. . . ."

"The bourgeois press pretends that this will be an intolerable control over parliamentary and governmental activity. . . . We, communists, think that only on the parliamentary and governmental plane one can obtain what the masses want and supported by their activity in the entire country."

"They pretend that such committees are revolutionary clubs, Soviets! The bourgeoisie is very well aware that this is not true, but it is faithful to its time-worn tactic: spread panic. . . ."

Since then the C.P. has shelved the mass Committees. But that was not enough for Messieurs the Radicals.

The pro-fascist Dominique was still writing in Republique, May 16:

"If Mr. Vaillant-Couturier constitutes his Ministry of the Masses, neither parliament nor the cabinet will be free. And we want it to be."

In other words, the bourgeoisie will be less free to carry through its maneuvers against the working class, will be less free to horse-trade, to plot, to lie, to deceive in parliament. And that is what these gentlemen do not want!

But here also promises are made. We call upon the workers to put them into practice.

Let us begin the practical organization of the committees! Let us denounce the capitulations to the Radical blackmailers! The cardinal task of the hour is: 1) democratic election of the mass committees and 2) put the People's Front Government on the spot to execute its promises.

Do You Want to Know

- the sources of the social patriotism of the Third International
- the significance of the theory of "Socialism in one country"
- the relation of this theory to the working class movement in Russia, Germany, China, England and elsewhere
- the place of the Soviet Union in the world revolutionary movement
- the meaning of the so-called "Trotsky-Stalin" struggle
- the program for world Socialism

READ

The 3rd International After Lenin

by LEON TROTSKY

With an Introduction and Explanatory Notes by Max Shachtman

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

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

LUMEN CAMP COOPERATIVE

Riverville, N. J.

OPENING JUNE 14

Round Trip \$.75	TENNIS	SWIMMING	SHOWERS
	Band and Entertainment Every Saturday		
	\$14 a Week	\$13 for Members	

For Information Call Labor Bookshop

28 East 12th Street

STUY. 9-4567

Stalin Destroys Conquests of October Revolution

Bolsheviks Hounded; Class Enemy Granted New Rights

It is possible to learn how "Trotskyists" are unearthing by reading a telegram from Kazan printed in the January 17 issue of *Pravda* under the following scorching headline: "The Trotskyist Calumny of Surovitz." It appears that during a district membership meeting in Bougum, Surovitz, the director of the machine and tractor station criticized the party regime or, as *Pravda* puts it, "he openly and brazenly calumniated the party, denying that conscious discipline exists in the party."

The indignant correspondent states in his telegram that "One would imagine that such a speech would have met with harsh repudiation." However, those present at the meeting listened to Surovitz without any protests. Taking into account the Stalinist regime this implies that the meeting sided completely with Surovitz. Not only the secretary of the District Committee but even the representative of the District Committee, i.e., the important party summit kept mum, not daring evidently to proceed too much counter to the mood of the meeting. "Only towards the end of the meeting, as a consequence of the indignation expressed by individual (!) Communists," reads the telegram—did the secretary of the District Committee briefly remark that the criticism of Surovitz was incorrect and was a repetition of everything "the Trotskyists said in their time." The entire mechanism of the meeting stands clearly revealed before us. "The individual indignant communists"—is, of course, the author of the correspondence himself, the henchman of *Pravda*, i.e., of the General Secretariat: it was only upon his direct insistence that the secretary explained to the meeting that the very same criticism of the party regime received by those present with obvious sympathy, was nothing else than "Trotskyism." The secretary was unable to do more. It ought to be added that similar episodes occur at hundreds and thousands of party meetings. Whether Surovitz is actually a

conscious Bolshevik-Leninist or simply arrived independently at certain conclusions, is immaterial.

Privileges and Repressions
By means of a special decree, the Soviet government has abolished all social restrictions in the sphere of education. Henceforth children of former noblemen, capitalists and kulaks will be accepted into the highest institutions of learning on the same plane with the children of workers and peasants. "Today there is no longer any need for these restrictions," announced Molotov at a session of the C.E.O. in January, 1936. One would imagine that these words as well as the privilege itself were to be understood in the sense that the established socialist society is no longer in need of an artificial defense against the youth of bourgeois descent. The only thing to do would be to greet the new decree! But against the background of liberal measures of this sort, all the more monstrous is the new flood of bureaucratic viciousness against the oppositionists, the savage repressions against the working class youth, the moment that the latter raises a voice in criticism. As a matter of fact there is no contradiction here. The luxuriant growth of bourgeois relations in the sphere of the distribution of the articles of consumption, the re-establishment of ranks in the army and the creation of a privileged stratum of the "best people" on the basis of personal performance open up the possibility of a career for the self-seeking progeny of the bourgeoisie. On the other hand the self-same manifestations of the bourgeoisification of the ruling summits engender opposition on the part of the working class youth, and at the same time make this opposition especially dangerous and hated in the eyes of the bureaucracy. Thus the removal of restrictions upon those who emerge from the bourgeois milieu and the strengthening of the repressions against the working class youth naturally supplement one another.

The Class Nature of the Soviet State A Letter from Leon Trotsky

You ask the question of whether the present Soviet system can give way to a "third" form of society, which would be neither capitalist nor socialist. Urbahn believes that precisely this is "state capitalism," identifying the Soviet system with a fascist capitalism. In doing this he completely forgets a small difference: fascism hems in the highly developed productive forces in the framework of the national state by cutting short their further development. The Soviet system, even in its present form, imparts a rhythm to the development of the productive forces never before attained. Urbahn thus does not know how to distinguish between what is historically progressive and what is arch-reactionary.

I see that you have nothing in common with Urbahn's formulation. But you think that the Soviet bureaucracy, in its further development, will be able to adapt the forms of property to its own interests to such a point that it becomes in reality a ruling class. You do not specify these new forms of property. You content yourself with the general statement that living evolution is inexhaustible in its new forms and formations.

In this general form, I find it as difficult to adopt as to reject the "third" possibility, because too many factors must be abstracted for that: in the first place those that are decisive for our revolutionary activity.

Now, forms of property are social forms par excellence. You cite examples—moreover taken from the pre-capitalist epoch—where certain forms of property had no great significance. These examples only prove that it is necessary to distinguish the real from the supposed forms of property, i.e., from juridical fictions (which also have a real function, but on a higher plane).

Precisely the bourgeoisie has reduced the forms of property to their barest expression. The proletarian revolution nationalized capitalist property. The question therefore arises: cannot this nationalization itself degenerate into a fiction, real property, under one form or another, returning to the new ruling class emerging from the bureaucracy?

Nationalized property stands or falls with planned economy. Thus, it is not a fiction, but a powerful reality. Nationalization, however, does not only signify that the productive forces are organized and directed according to a plan, but also in the interests of all. The bureaucracy prejudices the new system in these two ways. On the one hand, it reduces the efficiency of planned economy and on the other it consumes an enormous portion of its surplus.

If we speak of a "third" system, we must answer the question as to whether it is a matter of the rights newly acquired by the bureaucracy to an ever larger party of the national income—which would be equivalent to the right of parasitism, or if what is involved is the virtual liquidation of planned economy. Only the second hypothesis would constitute a new social base.

We must clearly understand that the abolition of planned economy, and by the same token also the nationalization of the productive forces, will inevitably and automatically lead to paralysis and disintegration of the latter. We would then no longer have before us a progressive system, but one in decomposition, which would inevitably lead to fascist capitalism. It is conceivable that a development so rich in possible formations creates something original. But in the essence of the matter there would be hardly any change.

Let us suppose that planned economy remains basically intact,

that the productive forces continue in their rise, there will remain—in your hypothesis—nothing but the fact that the bureaucracy has succeeded in stabilizing, fortifying and eternalizing its parasitism, juridically, ideologically and politically (and why not religiously?). This perspective assumes that the great mass of the population patiently accepts the new yoke despite the raising of the level of economy and culture and endures it without offering any resistance, and forever. That is not at all probable. To a certain degree the progress of economy opens great sources of power to the bureaucracy. But this very progress is more and more turning against its autocracy and its parasitism.

What perspective opens before us? Very probably a new revolution. This will not be a social revolution, but a political revolution. The bourgeoisie too in its evolution has known of "great" revolutions, i.e., social revolutions, and purely political revolutions which took place on the basis of already established property. . . . The theoretical prognoses of Marx and Lenin did not foresee, in any case, the possibility of the political revolution on the basis of property nationalized by the proletariat. But they did not also foresee the bonapartist degeneration of the proletarian dictatorship. Both these things belong to those stages, transitory forms, etc., in the formation of which history is so rich. The general laws of the evolution of capitalism to socialism, as they are established by Marxism, do not lose their force by these "episodes" (very disagreeable "episodes").

These are a few considerations on the subject of the interesting problem which you have posed to me—and which I send you in all haste.

January 1, 1935

Bureaucracy Strangles the Factory Committees

When a worker abroad asks a question about the conditions of the workers in the U.S.S.R., he is not interested only in the material conditions of labor (wages, length of the working day) but also in the place of the workers in production. The most important conquest of October was the occupation of the factories by the working class. It had become proprietor of all the means of production. The factory committees had two extremely important tasks: the control of production, struggle for the improvement of the conditions of labor under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

What is the role of the factory committees at the present time? Nothing remains of the role they played in the past. With the degeneration of the party, the government, the trade unions, the factory committees have also undergone a transformation. Their role now is that of a superintendent, an aid to the economic organs, closely connected with the entire bureaucratic apparatus of the U.S.S.R. It is no longer the representative of the working class, controlled by the workers in the factory, but rather a group of functionaries under orders of the bureaucratic tops.

There is rarely any information in the Soviet press on the real life of the factory committees and their relation to the working class. Only when it is impossible for them to remain silent on some repugnant facts does the bureaucracy itself go in for "self-criticism" and assume the air of seriously struggling against the "bureaucracy."

To allow the reader to form his own judgment on the real life of the factory committees I will cite several facts culled from the central organ of the Soviet trade unions—*Trud*. These facts do not pretend to give a complete picture of the life of the factory committees but should however provide useful information.

Trud (Jan. 1, 1936) gives the following report of the life of the factory committee of the textile corporation at Tashkent: "For the first time in three years, the working men and women of the corporation met in conference to hear the report of the outgoing factory committee and to elect a new one. Out of the 19 members elected three years ago only one remained. All the other members of the committee were appointed."

It is clear that the workers learned nothing from the report of activity of the committee. During the discussion the indignation of the workers was expressed in the speeches of some 50 of those present. (The small number indicates the interest the workers have in conferences of this kind). What did they speak about? They told of "70 men in the apparatus of the committee who did nothing but were paid and that thousands of rubles were expended to maintain them." They told of the relations of the leader of the paymaster section with the women workers: "When we came to him to obtain authorization for a sanitarium, he unashamedly proposed to us to call for the authorizations . . . in the evening at his home." When the workers pleaded with the president of the factory committee, he replied:

school they decree:

"To establish one uniform for scholars." (*Pravda*, Sept. 4, 1935).

In comparing the decree of 4-9-1935 with that of 1918, we see that all that the victorious revolution had annulled of the cursed heritage of the past, is now re-established.

Autonomy and independence in 1918—strict discipline and "politeness" towards the adults in 1935.

Abolition of the uniform in 1918—re-establishment of the uniform in 1935.

Abolition of marks and examinations in 1918—re-establishment of marks and examinations in 1935.

Abolition of surveillance in 1918—re-establishment of the uniform in etc.

Of the "Charter of the United School of Labor" nothing remains, nothing remains of the school itself.

...

We have dealt at length with the reform of 1918 and that of 1935-36. Thus the recent scholastic reform (annulling that of the October Revolution) is only a link in the chain of the degeneration of the Soviet regime. The party is smashed, all rights for the workers are suppressed and the Soviet pupil is dressed in the pre-revolutionary uniform, dyed only in a new tint. Thus is "Socialism being built in one country!"

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

by laughing and mocking them for their prudishness. The social insurance funds were expended without any control. The president of the committee did not permit the workers to become delegates from the factory to the insurance department. And the workers complained of many other things.

Finally, after the discussion, they passed over to the election of the new committee. It appears that half of the candidates were not even present at the conference. The workers did not want to elect the absentees. The chairman of the conference and the presidium insisted nevertheless on the election of all the candidates. Why? Because "the candidates have been endorsed by the party committee." Finally, the president obtained the election of all the candidates and even succeeded in "slipping into" the committee several members of the former committee whom the workers had demanded be expelled from the committee.

In this note we see all the features of bureaucraticism: a scornful, rude attitude towards the workers, the blind execution of orders "from above" and the reduction to zero of the most elementary principles of democracy. It is interesting to note that the only reaction of the editors of the paper in relating these facts is to add at the bottom of the article: "Must we say after this that the elections should be annulled?" No, it is not by voiding that these facts can be changed! It is the entire bureaucratic system, where the lower ranks follow in the footsteps of their superiors, where the crushing of democracy is the principle of the regime, which bears the responsibility for these revolting facts.

Naturally these committees do not interest themselves in working conditions in the factories which are often horrible. Listen to what the workers say in speeches at the C.O. of the Metal Workers trade unions (*Trud*, Dec. 28, 1935): "The children of the worker Mesendinov (he has worked in the factory since 1911) cannot attend school. They have neither worn clothes nor shoes." In the chemical corporation at Mychitsinsk "it is very damp, the workers remain standing in their slippers on the damp floor; it is very warm and close. New machines have been placed in the ropewalk, the amount of injurious secretions has increased and the workers have begun to contract eye-sicknesses." The lack of ventilation, the dampness causes rheumatism among the workers. Here is the situation already known to the factory committee: "... in the factory 'Red Star,' the new chairman of the factory committee, comrade Bratchenko, co-opted new members to the plenum and removed elected members from their jobs. He did not call any meetings, not wanting to give them any responsible tasks although they were very active members."

These few facts present a partial picture of the real situation in the factories of the U.S.S.R. The working class of the U.S.S.R. works under extremely painful material and moral conditions because the Soviet bureaucracy sees in the workers only a force of labor whose duty it is to execute the plan, to increase output and production.

ANNOUNCEMENT

WITH OUR ENTRY INTO THE SOCIALIST PARTY THE PRESS OF THE WORKERS PARTY SUSPENDS PUBLICATION. THE EDITORIAL STAFF WILL CONTRIBUTE TO THE SOCIALIST PARTY PRESS.

WORKERS!

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

1894-1935

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 45¢ to \$2.10.

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

Workers Party Joins the Socialist Party

(Continued from Page 1)

cance of the day to day drudgery, knows very well what a powerful aid to these tasks is the clarifying word, the sharp arrow pointing out the road ahead. Theory and practice go hand in hand in a healthy revolutionary movement. Naturally, there are differences that arise at every crucial turning of the road. These differences must be threshed out by free discussion among the membership, and not decided by bureaucratic decrees of self-constituted Popes. A party without democracy is not a party. The best and, indeed, the only guarantee for a normal solution of disputed questions is the fullest democracy in educational work and discussion, coupled with an attitude of responsibility and discipline. There is only one cure for the terrible blight of mental stultification which Stalinism and Old Guardism have brought into the labor movement: we must recapture, and make a living part of the heritage of the revolutionary movement, the Marxist principle that the free discussion of ideas is the only method whereby the proletarian vanguard can collectively hammer out the correct program that it needs if it is to work out the salvation of the human race.

We are confident that in such an atmosphere of democracy and discipline, the Socialist Party will grow as never before. Already, with the ousting of the Old Guard in New York and the simultaneous influx of revolutionary elements the party has taken a swift leap forward in membership and activity. The party is still in relation to the American working class, in its practical impact upon it, primarily a propaganda organization. But it is today the party that can, given the correct developments within it, become the party of the masses. We revolutionary Internationalists who are called "Trotskyites" begin our work in the Socialist Party with the fullest confidence in the outlook for the future.

We are not afraid of isolation. There are times when the revolutionists, if they are to remain true to their principles, have no other alternative. For more than seven years we endured repression and slander, contumely and physical assault, in an isolated struggle for principle. We survived. We are proud of our struggle. We retract nothing and repent nothing. We are not afraid of isolation when circumstances impose it. But no less courage is required to turn away from isolation and move toward the mass party when conditions open the way for such a step. It would be sectarian folly to reject the opportunity to participate in a broader movement, bringing to it all our heritage and all our ideas, which have been confirmed by every development in the international working class movement.

Joining the Socialist Party as we are, with our ideas and traditions, we urge all revolutionary workers to do likewise and to add their energies to the efforts of the many thousands of socialist workers in a common struggle to build a powerful party of revolutionary Socialism.

Czarist Methods Return in Schools

1935 was a year of "great" reforms for the U.S.S.R. In almost all fields of Soviet life, changes took place which remove the U.S.S.R. ever further from the conquests of October. The re-establishment of grades in the army, the monetary reform, the reform of the family and finally the academic reform are landmarks on the road of the degeneration of the Soviet state. We intend to pause here exclusively on the academic reform, and by contrast with the academic reform put into effect by the October revolution, show how in 1935 Stalin is liquidating one by one the conquests of the revolution of 1917 in the academic field and approaching the model of the Czarist schools with its uniforms and respect for uniforms. . . . an institution unknown even in the schools of the capitalist Nations of Europe.

Every government which does not support itself upon the broad masses of the toilers and is the government of a minority utilizes as a guarantor of its power—just as it utilizes the police apparatus—the education of the youth in a spirit of submission by suppressing all free expression on the benches of the school. By creating a state police system of education with supervisors of classes, uniforms, marks, individual memorandums, the State has on the one hand the opportunity of controlling all the movements of the scholar and on the other hand it imbues the scholar with the principles of discipline and "order," i.e. with an absolute submission before the class in power. The bourgeois school has as its task not to create the free citizen, but the functionary, the engineer, the doctor, humble and loyal servants of the Government. Such was the school in Czarist Russia and so it is in all capitalist countries. Discipline and order in the school is one of the guarantors of discipline and order in the state. Revolutionary parties have always understood the importance of the free school and struggle for this liberation of the school has always been an integral part of their programs. That is why it is quite natural that one of the first steps of the Russian proletariat in power in 1917 was a radical reform of the school.

The Revolutionary Reform
"Voluntary discipline, a spirit of mutual aid, the single school, autonomy on the basis of complete equality, the collective principle everywhere. . . that is the principle that will create the citizen we need." ("Basic Principles of the United School of Labor," *Izvestia*, No. 225, Oct. 16, 1918)

The extract quoted shows the complete incompatibility of the free and revolutionary school in a workers state with the old Czarist school.

The proletarian state does not fear the free citizen, it has no need of whips to assure its authority and

that is why all discipline "from above" is superfluous. On the contrary, the youth must develop freely without the pressure of authority exercised by the family, by the school or anything else.

"The appeal to the scholars from the People's Commissariat of Education" in 1917 said:
"Pupils of the secondary schools must not, have no right to consider themselves as children and to govern their future according to the orders of their parents and their teachers." (*Izvestia*, October 15, 1917)

The Government under Lenin accomplished a veritable revolution in the academic system. A series of decrees opened a new era in the education of the youth. Above all their aim was the liquidation of the Czarist system.

"Utilization of the system of marks for an estimate of the knowledge or the conduct of a pupil is annulled in all cases in academic practice." (No. 50 of the collection of decrees and laws, N.38, published May 31, 1918)

"The wearing of uniforms by . . . pupils. . . as also the distribution of insignias and medals at the end of the term are annulled." (361 "Collection of decrees and laws" N. 28 published Feb. 21, 1918).

The most complete collection of all the principles of new education of the youth is the celebrated "Charter of the United School of Labor of the R.S.F.S.R."

"1. All schools go under a single name—The United School of Labor."

"12. The old form of discipline which corrupts the entire life of the school and the untrammelled development of the personality of the child cannot be maintained in the School of Labor. The process of labor itself develops this internal discipline without which collective and rational work is unimaginable."

"17. The assignment of obligatory homework is forbidden."

"18. All punishment in school is forbidden."

"19. All admission tests and tests for the graduation from one class to another at the end of the term are annulled."

(These detailed extracts are necessary for us for a more complete comparison with the Stalinist decrees of 1935).

The Soviet pupil ceases to be a subject of "labor" in the spirit of the Czarist-bourgeois state, but becomes an independent citizen, with the right to exercise his own initiative, his free thought and his will.

...

The Stalinist Reform

With the death of Lenin began the struggle of Stalinism against Bolshevism, the struggle of the conservative clique of bureaucrats against the representatives of the ideas of October.

After having strengthened its power, the bureaucracy no longer tolerated any expression of free thought. It demands absolute submission. This regime was similarly introduced in the school. Autonomy of the pupils is supplanted by the police surveillance of adults—this is to guarantee the state from the spirit of opposition.

The decree on academic reform, published by the Council of People's Commissars, Sept. 3, 1935 makes a complete sweep of everything introduced by the October Revolution and returns to the methods of education established by Czarist Russia. Let us examine this decree as published in *Pravda*, Sept. 4, 1935, closing. The principal clause is the following:

"Underlying the ruling on the conduct of the pupils must be placed a strict and conscientious application of discipline, politeness in relation with teachers, comrades and adults."

What are the measures taken to ensure that the pupils apply this discipline?

"Instruct a commission. . . to elaborate a draft of a ruling for every type of school. The ruling must have a categorical and absolutely obligatory meaning for pupils as well as for teachers. This ruling must be the fundamental document . . . which strictly establishes the regime of studies and the basis for order in the school as well as the rules of conduct of pupils inside and outside of school."

"To introduce in all schools a uniform type of pupils' report card on which all the principal rules for the conduct of the pupil is to be inscribed."

"Every director is instructed to establish a personal record for every pupil." (*Pravda*, Sept. 4, 1935).

"The People's Commissariat of Public Education has established new models for the pupils' report card and for the pupils' memorandum. Then, for the first time a personal record is to be established for every pupil. . . Every five days the chief instructor of a class will examine the memorandum, will mark cases of absence and tardiness in it and will demand the signature of the parent under all remarks of the instructor."

"In the personal record there will be marked for the entire duration of the studies, the marks of the pupil for every quarter, his prizes and his punishments." (*Izvestia*, Jan. 15, 1936).

A special apparatus of Communist Youth organizers is to be installed for the surveillance of the pupil inside and outside of school. They are to watch over the morality and the state of mind of the pupils. They, better than the directors, the instructors and the parents will follow the internal life of the adolescents. (*Molodshaya Gvardia*, N. 10)

...

To facilitate control outside of

BLUM-THOREZ STRAIN TO HEAD OFF STRIKES

Blum and Stalinists Place Preservation of Capitalist Order Above Workers' Interests

One million French workers have occupied 500 key plants, shops, mines and factories across the whole of France.

To end the spontaneous sit-down strike that paralyzed French industry, to stifle the tendencies which led workers in Northern France to raise red flags over their factories, the Socialist Premier Leon Blum, supported by the French Stalinist party and the General Confederation of Labor, has rushed through a "settlement" of their immediate demands which in the present state of French economy can have no reality.

While in a few plants, workers resumed or opened negotiations, the announcement of Blum's settlement was greeted with a new wave of strikes, including 150,000 miners in the north and 10,000 white collar insurance company employees in Paris. The grand total rose over one million.

"We are facing a situation in which every hour counts," declared Blum, bringing laws to the Chamber to implement the settlement.

The fundamental function of the "settlement" is to ward off the immediate threat of the workers' offensive. It will drag them into negotiations, break their solid front and destroy their unity. In the meantime, the French bourgeoisie and its Fascist gangs will have ample time to prepare to take hold when the People's Front government of Leon Blum has served its purposes.

For the moment, the French bourgeoisie is heeding the urgent, piteous plea of the French Stalinists who on June 4 "warned the employers that in the present international situation, a prolongation of their resistance is endangering the security of the country." (Daily Worker, June 5.)

Workers Take Possession

While Blum pleaded with the workers to end their strike, while Thorez-Cachin and Co. "unreservedly" supported Blum, workers in shop after shop laid down their tools and took possession, grimly ignoring the Socialist premier they swept into power, grimly mistrustful of his avowed determination to "preserve the capitalist order."

The tremendous strike movement of the last fourteen days hurls the lie into the teeth of the creators of the People's Front who declare that the French proletariat is not yet ripe for power. It was the great leftward swing of the masses which piled up the great People's Front majority in the recent elections. It was the same swing, moving way beyond the leaders of the two big parties and the unified labor federation, which produced the great strikes of the past fortnight.

Action Spontaneous

Neither the Socialist Party, coming to power in a bourgeois coalition government, nor the Stalinists who support that government, nor the trade union bureaucracy, issued any strike call. The workers went into action without and despite all of them.

Not an industry was unaffected; steel, coal, munitions, automobiles, airplanes, textiles, gas, power, building, paper, press, department stores, trucking and transport. Germinating in sporadic strikes in scattered plants throughout the month of May, the movement flared. Some 60,000 workers occupied factories on May 26. With a surge that came from the most profound depths of the working class, hundreds of thousands in a few days' time stopped most of the key wheels of French industrial life.

Their conscious demands were simple: for a 40-hour week; for increases in starvation wages, now as little as three francs (18c) a day; for collective contracts; for vacations with pay.

Crisis Wracks France

But the unrealized implication underlying the great strike wave went far beyond these demands. French capitalism is in acute crisis. It has reached the end of its rope. Its government has been living from hand to mouth, on loans, on revenues wrung from the meagre wages of its employees and its pensionaries. The cost of living is prohibitive. The French monetary system is being strained beyond its capacity to endure. It was to change all this, to win security for themselves and their families that the workers of France have moved into the political arena in the last two years.

Their leftward surge, accompanied by a broad analogous trend of the impoverished petty bourgeoisie, hard hit by the crisis, forced the working class parties into a united front. This united front, instead of leading the workers from struggle to struggle, against the bosses and their Fascist hired men, tacked itself on to the liberal bourgeoisie and dragged the workers into an alliance with their own bitterest enemies. The workers strained to battle for their own lives, their own bread. The spontaneous struggles at Brest and Toulon last August revealed their readiness to sweep their path clean of the bourgeois state apparatus. Toulon and Brest were denounced by the Socialists

and Stalinists as the acts of "provocateurs."

The Elections and After

In the elections, the workers and the petty bourgeoisie gave resounding evidence of the depth of the leftward trend. The Radicals and the parties of the Center found themselves cut to shadows. The fundamental sectors of the French population were splitting in two diametric directions. Huge gains on the left. Gains on the right, which polled only 1,000,000 less votes than the left.

After the electoral victory, Leon Blum, leader of the Socialist Party and premier-designate of the People's Front government, openly announced that he was taking power, not to install a new order, but to "revive French economy" and preserve the old order. The left victory caused a stampede on the Bourse and a steady flow of gold from the country, calculated to force the new government to devalue the franc and bear the brunt of the widespread miseries that step will entail for the lower strata of the population. Blum made sweeping statements of "appeasement." The Bourse promptly recovered confidence in Blum. The workers began to lose it. During the long delay before Blum took power, their confidence ebbed still further while Blum, Faure, Lebas and Co. begged Herriot, Boncour and all the old-line Radicals, to come into their new government.

Out of this suspicion stemmed the strikes that have swept France. This is proved by its spontaneity and the difficulty which the Socialists, the Stalinists and the C.G.T. bureaucracy have had, in the words of a bourgeois correspondent, in trying "to get in front of the strike and lead it instead of being dragged along in its wake." (N. Y. Times, June 6.)

Capitalist Order, Blum Demands
The workers of France struck for a new order. They want a complete change. They want power. They thought they had it in the government of the People's Front. This strike taught a different lesson.

Blum took over the government "at a moment when all authority seems to have disappeared in France, and order is being kept only because hundreds of thousands of workmen are themselves quiet and orderly." (N. Y. Times, June 5.) Roger Salengro, his Socialist Minister of the Interior, had already set the tone for the government's attitude: "This agitation is inadmissible. The People's Front must not

Stalinists Incite Pogrom Against Revolutionists at Commune Rally

PARIS, May 25.—While last year the traditional demonstration at the Wall of the Federals at the Pere-Lachaise Cemetery, in commemoration of the victims of the Commune, took place under the cloud of the Stalin-Laval decorations, the Stalinists, depressed or worried, had to suffer the jeers of the Bolshevik-Leninists, the Revolutionary Socialist Youth and the anarchists, etc., who shouted "Sac au dos" (soldier's pack on your shoulders) at them and danced a pirouette around them without any serious scuffles ensuing, this year the demonstration was turned into a veritable mass pogrom against the revolutionists.

Thirsty for revenge, proud of their electoral victory and conscious of their role as policemen of the incoming government of the "People's Front," the Stalinists not only provoked brawls all along the line of march against the Bolshevik-Leninists, the Revolutionary Socialist Youth and the Internationalist Communist Party, and the anarchists, who formed a column of more than 1,000 people, but organized an ambush at the entry to the cemetery in order to prevent the revolutionists

from marching past the sacred wall, occupied by the Stalinist and Socialist bureaucrats together with the future Prime Minister, Leon Blum.

Before the supporters of the Fourth International arrived at the entry to the cemetery, the Stalinists and Henaff especially, had harranged the crowd against them, spreading the rumor that the renegade Doriot was in their ranks, etc. Thereupon a crowd of more than a thousand threw themselves upon the revolutionists with the utmost savagery, throwing rocks and refuse at them, tearing down their four large red flags, destroying all the placards, among which was one which called for the liberation of the Bolshevik-Leninist prisoners of Stalin, which had especially aroused the ire of the Stalinists. The column was broken, the Stalinists succeeded in their job. Only a small detachment among whom were several women, braving the blows, succeeded in entering the cemetery and of marching with their banner before the Wall, shouting their indignation at Thorez and Co.

It is noteworthy that in their

attacks the Stalinists worked hand in hand with the police who slugged together with them, without making any arrests. From a certain point of view the proficiency of the Stalinist police is superior to that of the state police: they can organize veritable mass pogroms and be more successful in separating and removing the revolutionists from the masses, in digging a ditch between them. The Stalinists offer the government not only their parliamentary support but their fists. As long as the betrayals of the future Blum government does not disillusion broad masses, this support will retain its efficacy. The incidents of Sunday, May 24 are only a foretaste of what is being prepared against the revolutionists.

The morning after, Populaire, organ of the future government for the first time took up the Stalinist slander of "Trotskyist provocateurs," eulogized Henaff and rejoiced in the fact that several "citizens were slightly maltreated": that is small compensation for the Stalinist cops. L'Humanite, on the other hand, maintained silence of the guilty.

On May 9 the French Stalinist party officially pledged its unreserved support to Leon Blum. "It is necessary to assure at any price the triumph of the experiment we are about to launch." (L'Humanite, May 1. Emphasis in original).

"Those who voted Communist, perhaps did not vote for the Soviet system, but want to preserve peace and guarantee the security of the country. . . . Our people demand that the agonizing threat of the civil war leagues comes to an end." (Thorez, L'Humanite, May 10.)

The Communists called for Popular Front committees but hastened to explain on May 15 that these committees "would in no sense be intended to substitute for existing political parties or government institutions. It is only a question of actively seconding the government. . . ." (L'Humanite, May 15).

C.P. Urges Workers Return

On May 29, in the first stages of the strike, the United Press reported that "the responsible leaders of the labor unions and the Communist Party were urging their members to go back to work."

Like the Socialists and Jouhaux and the trade unions, the Communists were caught short by the strike movement. First they tried to hush it. Failing that, finally on June 4, they issued a statement "saluting" the strike. "At the same time the leading committee of the Communist Party promised the Blum government its loyal support and urged continued unity and discipline in the People's Front. . . ." (Daily Worker, June 5.)

Following Blum's radio speech appealing for "industrial peace," the Stalinists issued a special night edition of L'Humanite to announce that "the French Communist Party fully supports the government's announced legislative program." (Daily Worker, June 5.)

Political Acts of Strike

On June 6 workers in Paris broke out into the first violence of the strike, but what was more important, carried out one of the first clearly political acts of the strike: They burned issues of the capitalist papers, L'Intransigeant and Le Soir. They stormed the presses.

On June 7, the Stalinist Daily Worker, which had devoted inches to the strike where the big bourgeois papers were giving it columns and whole pages, announced in a headline: "Special Cable Spikes Fake Rioting Reports." "Calm and discipline reign everywhere, despite alarmist stories printed with the aim of provoking disturbances."

play their assigned role.

Andre Maurois, French bourgeois writer, described it in the N. Y. Times of May 31 in the following terms: "The program . . . of the Communist leaders is not at all revolutionary. . . . The Russian Communists who seek the aid of France have no desire to see France weakened by dissension."

This description was amplified on June 7 by no less a personage than Albert Sarraut, the outgoing premier, who absolved the Communists of all responsibility for the strike: "It could not be that Moscow, which desired to encourage the military strength of France in order that she might be an effective ally against Germany, would wish to see disorder in the country, unless the Soviet Government is returning to its early ideals of fomenting world revolution, and indications are rather to the contrary." (N. Y. Times, June 8.)

What has been the role of the Stalinists since the election? be paralyzed by an infringement of order, by any interruption in the vital services of the nation."

At the same time it was openly announced that the government was preparing to act as a strikebreaker. Salengro, the U.P. reported on June 5, was planning an emergency railway service in the event of a general transport strike.

Blum appealed for "industrial peace." His appeal, reported the Herald-Tribune on June 6, "was well received by the French bourse," but "failed to make any visible impression on the French strikes which continued to spread."

"It is fully realized," said the Times, "that the situation is filled with danger and that the government must act quickly to get control of the strike by leading it and getting the workers' confidence that the electoral program of the People's Front will be carried out."

On Other Side of Barricades

Backing Blum to the hilt, the Stalinists continued unflinchingly to

be in a state of anarchy. The People's Front stands for order" (N. Y. Times, June 4).

Blum worked no miracles. "The strikes in the Paris district and throughout the country, instead of diminishing, spread . . ." (N. Y. Times, June 5.)

The first cabinet meeting issued a communique: "The government has decided on the utmost efforts to conclude a rapid and happy (?) solution of the strike."

Gov't Prepares Strikebreaking
Blum went to the radio to spread the good word. He "appealed for calm." "I hope the employers will show the greatest possible consideration for the workers."

But even as he spoke new strikes broke. Blum's appeal for calm was greeted with 264 new strikes within less than 25 hours.

He asked the strikers "to be patient, to have confidence, to try to obtain their demands by law. . . . To be effective, the government must have public security. It would

A BALANCE OF SPANISH PEOPLES' FRONT

By ALFREDO ROJAS

At the moment that the Popular Front government begins to reign in France, it is highly instructive to draw the balance sheet of the regime of the Popular Front government in Spain.

After four months in power, the Spanish Popular Front government reveals itself as completely bankrupt. As we predicted when it came to power, it has not made the slightest beginning toward a solution of the problems of the Spanish masses. The Menshevik perspectives of the Stalinists, who put forward, among other absurdities, the idea that the government could solve the land question, has been exposed as demagogic fakery. The electoral pact of the People's Front included a specific repudiation by the republicans of the proposal to confiscate the landed estates; and, as the Stalinists themselves used to insist during the "third period" days of 1931, it is impossible for backward, impoverished Spain to make even a stab at purchasing the estates. Even the 1931 regulations for minimum wages for the peasantry have not been re-instituted. The result is that the land workers and peasants—and in Spain twenty out of the twenty-four millions live on the land—are just as badly off as ever.

As the masses realize that they have been deluded, they are beginning to fight back. The last two weeks have seen the greatest strike wave in all Spanish history. Nothing under the first Republic compares to the present movement of the masses. In Malaga province a hundred thousand agarians are on strike; agrarian strikes are also paralyzing Seville and other provinces. The Asturian iron miners are out. Barcelona and Madrid find dozens of trades walking out. In all there must be at least half a million out on strike today.

The Government Repression

Unable to solve Spain's economic problems, the government is resorting more and more to the use of violence against the workers and peasants. A week ago in Albacete occurred a massacre of peasants by the Civil Guard, seventeen peasants being killed immediately, with many others reported dying of wounds later. Deaths of workers and peasants at the hands of Civil

guards are reported practically every day. All workers' centers were closed in Lebrija, the general strike there was declared illegal, and the strike committee arrested. All syndicalist centers have been closed in Madrid, and sixty syndicalist leaders arrested, with the government threatening to outlaw the syndicalist-led Confederation of Labor if it did not cease its strikes. And now the government has declared that all general strikes are illegal, that strikes for political demands are illegal, and that it will shortly outlaw the strike as an instrument of the proletariat altogether.

The demagoguery of the republicans has worn thin. The government repeats all the elaborate mumbo-jumbo of the 1931 days: it draws up elaborate plans for building Spanish economy, it scolds the Catholics for their unfraternity to the Republic, it stages parliamentary debates in which a furious verbal struggle goes on against religious education, etc. But this game cannot be repeated again. More and more the government has to resort to the use of open force against the masses.

Crisis in the Labor Movement

The intensification of the class struggle has created a profound crisis in the working class. The syndicalists, terribly discredited for their refusal in most places to join the October, 1934 revolt, and their anarchistically negative attitude in February of this year toward the problem of overthrowing the semi-fascist regime, have now regained much of their prestige, thanks to the opportunistic support given the Popular Front government by the Stalinists and Socialists. The syndicalists are now pressing their advantage, even gaining ground in Socialist-controlled Madrid; but their sporadic strike activity, coupled with no political perspective, is creating serious dissension in the syndicalist ranks and will undoubtedly lead to an explosion as soon as a revolutionary re-groupment of forces becomes more apparent in the Spanish working class.

The Split in the S.P.

The crisis reveals itself most decisively in the ranks of the mass party of Spanish labor, the Socialists. The Right wing-controlled National Committee has postponed

the national convention, empowered its subsidiaries to expel the lefts and outlawed the left-wing paper, "Claridad." When in response Caballero demands a new election of the National Committee, that august body responds with the declaration that Caballero's proposal is an unparalleled violation of party discipline! The rightist leaders are howled down at meetings, and their chief spokesman, Indalecio Prieto, accuses the left wing of an attempt to assassinate him. In actual fact, there are now two separate Socialist parties in Spain.

The Spanish Right-Wing Socialists are hardly to be differentiated from the "Left" Republicans of the stripe who now govern Spain. Prieto has bitterly attacked the strikes because they debilitate the country. He and his colleagues have a perspective of decades of collaboration with the republican bourgeoisie. They wish to enter the government to form a coalition cabinet.

The Left Wing Socialists are an extremely heterogeneous combination. Certainly Caballero, though he rides the crest of its wave today, is not its authentic spokesman. In one and the same breath Caballero declares that Lenin's prediction that Spain will be the second Soviet republic in Europe is about to be realized—and that he will not oppose the party's collaboration in the government if the convention so decides! He denounces the syndicalists for draining the energy of the proletariat in aimless strikes (and this is true enough), but the reason why the syndicalists are able to lead the workers in such strikes is that they do offer the workers some form of action, whereas Caballero, who heads the General Union of Workers, provides no leadership at all. He carries on a coy flirtation with the Stalinists, who support the Popular Front Government no less than the Prietos, and deludes the Spanish workers with the slogan of unity of all workers' organizations as a panacea.

Much more indicative of the chasm which separates the two Socialist tendencies are the hundreds of strikes led by Socialists; the all-Socialist tickets put up in a number of provinces during the Presidential election; the occupation of estates by Socialist-led peasants; the terrific repercussions in the So-

cialist ranks, which forced Prieto to decline Azana's invitation to become Premier; the speeches and articles intransigently attacking Azana, by Javier Bueno, Socialist leader of the Asturian rebellion; the party program proposed by the Madrid organization which, despite its confusion (for example, it says that the organ of the proletarian dictatorship will be the Socialist Party) is a revolutionary program. The split in the Socialist Party is a basic one, between reformists and revolutionaries.

Role of the Stalinists

The Stalinists are playing a thoroughly reactionary role. They continue to support the government wholeheartedly. Azana is a "friend of the Soviet Union" and therefore inviolate. One need only look at the Stalinist press in any country to discover that they have yet to utter a single word of criticism of the Spanish government! Capitulation can go no farther; it is, in fact, the most conscious kind of collaboration with the bourgeoisie—for the bourgeoisie, you see, is for the League of Nations and patronizingly praises Russia as a peace-loving country. The promising Socialist youth movement is now in serious danger of permanent stultification; its leaders were taken to Moscow for conferences, and came back to effect the entry of the Stalinist youth into the Socialist youth. The very first document issued by the "united" youth movement was a vicious attack on Trotskyism. Fortunately, the corruption of the youth leadership has not prevented district organizations from demanding a turn to struggle against the government.

The Maurin-Nin Party

The "Party of Marxian Unity," fusion of the former Left Opposition with the "Workers and Peasants Bloc" led by Joaquin Maurin, a movement half-Catalan nationalist, has been caught entirely unaware by the split in the Socialist ranks. What is infinitely worse, it now pooh-poohs the significance of the split, the May 22 issue of its organ, La Batalla, declaring that there is no basic difference between Left and Right Socialists and even sinking so far as to say that if the split takes place it will lead to terrible conflicts between the two factions with dreadful consequences for

the whole Spanish working class! The only hope there still might have been for the Maurin-Nin group—after their joining the Popular Front, breaking with, joining and breaking again, thus losing any serious standing as a firm political tendency—was in their correctly estimating the epochal significance of the Socialist split. Now it is clear the "Party of Marxian Unity" is a sterile, doomed sect; it has not even the specious virtue of an apparently independent political course, but vacillates between opportunistic moves and gestures of intransigence. Maurin, who holds a firm majority in the organization, is like a little shopkeeper; he will fawn upon the Popular Front at one moment, upon Caballero at another, he will do anything—only let him keep his own little shop. The idea of independent political intervention by entry into the Socialist Party is alien to such minds. So far, the main body of the old Left Opposition has not broken with this sterile clique; but the developing split in the Socialist Party must finally galvanize all those who are capable of thinking politically.

Regroupment Still Waits

The present status of the Spanish Revolution may be described, in short, as one in which the masses have lost all faith in the government, and consequently have broken the link between government and the main body of the Socialist proletariat; but the regroupment of the revolutionary forces has not yet produced a leadership capable and ready to transform the Spanish crisis into a struggle for power.

That leadership is in process of arising out of the ranks of the Left Wing Socialists. It has a longer period in which to develop, than is, more time is permitted it, than is the case in France; for in Spain the forces of reaction are basically very weak. But even in Spain the revolutionary leadership must arise within a limited time, or reaction will triumph. The masses are in motion, they want to fight to the end; but a long period of sporadic, aimless activity, will exhaust their vitality, and leave the way open for reaction. Thus Spain mirrors also the coming events in France.

And in the same article: "The Communist Party has reaffirmed its support of the Blum government."

God Forbid!

"The capitalist press," adds the Daily Worker, "will, as usual, be silent or vague on what the workers are striking for, and may even attempt to misrepresent the strikes as being 'revolutionary.'"

And that would be the worst crime of all—to call these strikes "revolutionary" only less heinous a crime than the French workers would themselves commit if they went ahead and made their revolution!

"Order will ensure success," appealed L'Humanite on June 6. "We are sure that the people of France will preserve the magnificent mastery over itself which it has displayed for several weeks."

Jouhaux, the Bill Green of France, also, in a radio speech, "defended the strikers' movement" but "warned them against any manifestation that might lead to conflict with opposition organizations."

All together they cheered Leon Blum in the Chamber on June 6 when he flatly declared: "We shall govern as republicans. We shall guarantee the Republican order."

Strikes Continue

Socialist, Stalinist and C.G.T. appeals did not check the movement. The strikes mounted daily. The day Blum presented his government to the Chamber 135,000 workers joined the movement. They wanted action. Blum, Salengro, Jouhaux and the employers went into conference and emerged with the "settlement" hailed by all parties, the French bourgeois press most of all, as a happily peaceful termination of the movement that threatens to upset all the calculations of the preservers of "Republican order."

But the troubles of the People's Front government have only begun. Its "settlement" was greeted with a new strike of 150,000 miners in the north of France and the building trades workers in Paris and other workers in Bordeaux in the South. Accepting the settlement because it is the only way out of the crisis for the moment, the employers served clear warning on Blum that his government would have to face all the consequences of the settlement, because French industry would prove unable to carry the weight imposed upon it.

In the Chamber of Deputies Blum pleaded that "the occupation of factories by strikers (is) less dangerous than fighting in the streets."

People's Front Betrayal Everywhere

The People's Front wants at all costs to avoid "fighting in the streets." It offers the workers "settlements" which mean long-drawn negotiations which are only now to begin. It seeks to drag out and dissipate the legitimate will of the workers to the independent struggle in their own behalf, for their own power.

In Spain today there is also a great strike wave, involving 300,000 workers, and there can be plainly seen the People's Front in action at the next stage: the government of Cespaes is carrying out repressive measures against working class organizations and declaring strikes illegal.

Is Fascism in France the price the French working class and the world proletariat must pay to explode the criminal treachery of those who preach "industrial peace," "national security," "class collaboration" in the form of the People's Front?

The Program of Victory

The coming period in France must provide the answer. The French workers, with their magnificent strength, their reserves and their readiness for the final struggle, must give that answer. To help them give it in favor of the revolutionary way out, the Bolshevik-Leninists of France in the present situation are tirelessly advancing the following demands:

1. Immediate and full amnesty.
2. 40-hour week without pay cuts, collective contracts, unemployment insurance.
3. Workers' control of production; nationalization of the big industries.
4. Fusion of all private banks into one (the Bank of France included); nationalization of credit to be distributed by the State to the workers, peasants and small merchants.
5. Political rights for soldiers; abolition of the 2-year military service; reduction of the war budget.
6. Arrest of the Fascist leaders; organization of a Workers' Militia; arming of the proletariat.
7. Formation of mass committees in shops, factories and localities to carry out the workers' own program.

The program of the Bolshevik-Leninists is a program for a Workers'-Peasants' Government. It demands a decisive break with the bourgeoisie and all its representatives and lackeys in the Radical party and calls for the offensive toward the workers' power.