

NEW MILITANT

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

VOL. 2, NO. 17 WHOLE NO. 69]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 2, 1936

PRICE 3 CENTS

Workers Throng the Streets on May First

Tasks of the Fourth International in Spain

A Letter to a Spanish Comrade
By Leon Trotsky

The situation in Spain has again become revolutionary.

The development of the Spanish revolution is taking place at a slow tempo. By virtue of this fact the revolutionary elements there have acquired a sufficiently long period of time in which to take shape, to rally the vanguard around themselves, in order to measure up to their task at the decisive moment. We must now say openly that the Spanish "Left Communists" have completely missed this exceptionally favorable interval and have not proved to be one whit better than the Socialist and "Communist" traitors. Not that there was any lack of warning. All the greater therefore is the guilt of an Andres Nin, an Andrade and others. With a correct policy the "Communist Left" could stand today as a section of the Fourth International at the head of the Spanish proletariat. Instead of this, it is vegetating in the confused organization of a Maurin—without a program, without perspectives, and without any political significance. Marxian action in Spain can begin only by means of an irreconcilable condemnation of the whole policy of Andres Nin and Andrade, which not only was and remains false, but also criminal.

The Removal of Zamora

What is the meaning of the removal of President Zamora? That the political developments have once more entered into an acute stage. Zamora was, so to say, the constant center of the ruling summits. Under altered conditions he played the same role that Hindenburg enacted in Germany for a certain period of time; it was during the time when the reaction (even the Nazis), on the one side, and the Social Democracy on the other, put their hopes in him. The Bona-

partism of the modern epoch is the expression of the highest accentuation of class antagonisms in the period when these antagonisms have not yet led to open struggle. Bonapartism may find its point of support in the quasi-parliamentarian government, but also for that matter in the "supra-party" president: this depends exclusively on the circumstances. Zamora was the carrier of the Bonapartist equilibrium. The sharpening of the antagonism led to a state of affairs in which both of the main camps sought, first, to make use of Zamora and then to get rid of him. The Right wing did not succeed in doing this in its time, but the "People's Front" did. This means, however, the beginning of an acute revolutionary period.

Both the profound ferment in the masses and the uninterrupted violent explosions demonstrate that the repeatedly deceived workers in town and country, as well as the poor peasants, are continually driving with all their power in the direction of the revolutionary solution. And what is the role played by the People's Front, with regard to this mighty movement? The role of a gigantic brake manufactured and put into operation by traitors and slick sharpers. And only yesterday, Juan Andrade was still a co-signer of the thoroughly despicable program of the People's Front!

After Zamora's removal, Azana, hand in hand with the new president of the Republic, must take over the role of the true Bonapartist center—that is, he must seek to elevate himself above the two camps in order the better to be able to direct the arms of the State against those revolutionary masses who assisted him to power. The
(Continued on Page 2)

"WE HAVE BEEN NAUGHT, WE SHALL BE ALL!"



Jersey Jobless Ousted Thousands Expected To March

Bourbon Politicians Inflict Final Injury On Unemployed

New Jersey capitalist politicians ordered the jobless demonstrators out of the legislature, their final slap in the face to the unemployed of the state. After tossing the interests of the unemployed between Democrats and Republicans while relief payments stopped dead and suffering was widespread, the politicians decided to adjourn and do nothing.

The Workers Alliance of New Jersey, rallied its forces and marched them into the Assembly halls of the State Capitol, an action which must have caused no little trepidation among the never-hungry ruling classes. The "army of unoccupation," as they became popularly known, is a portent of the future. This the capitalist politicians must have realized as they scurried back to Trenton from the banquet tables in their luxurious homes and yachts.

Bourbons to the marrow, the politicians returned, muttering the notorious insults of Marie Antoinette. One of them, deeply hurt that the poor, starving workers should be demanding action, cursed the people who would "pamper" the unemployed. "Why don't you feed them chocolate eclairs", he said.

Reluctantly they listened to the spokesmen for the unemployed, concerned only with finding a convenient pretext to oust them from the assembly. The Hoffmanns who could find a hundred methods for winning publicity in the Hauptman case, could not find a single method to feed the unemployed. "Shall we rob Peter (read: rich) to pay Paul (read: poor) asks the Governor? Never, the assemblymen chorused: "Let us rob Paul to pay Paul!" And this was the solution. Before the assembly ended its deliberations, it empowered a committee under Governor Hoffman to find "ways and means." This means the entire problem has been placed in the hands of the most ardent "sales tax" advocate in New Jersey.

But before the assemblymen could dodge the spotlight of unfavorable publicity, they had to dispose of the visiting unemployed. It was clear that a continuation of the mock assembly could do them no good. The pretext was found in an alleged letter of some veteran, threatening to kick the reactionary assemblyman, Joseph O. Paul, out of New Jersey.

Only the good naturedness of the unemployed saved both New Deal democrats and Tory Republicans from another Hoover Bonus Army scandal.

The Workers' Alliance members returned home empty handed but their heroic struggle has aroused the working class of the country. Their action will be emulated time and again as the relief system of other states follows the inevitable road of New Jersey.

New York Parade Will Mark High Point In Many Years

Celebrating the Fiftieth anniversary of May First, hundreds of thousands of workmen will march in the citadels of capitalism as this issue goes to press.

In New York, where a more inclusive united front of political and labor tendencies than has been seen for years, a monster parade will take place. New York will be decked in red, its streets will resound with the marching tread of labor's legions.

Beginning at various points in heart of the city, the parade will march through lower Fifth Ave., previously denied by the police and converge on Union Square.

In Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, San Francisco and all the great industrial centers of the country, workers will march or demonstrate in meetings against capitalist oppression.

Shorter hours, more adequate relief, social insurance, freedom for class war prisoners and struggle for a workers' world will appear on thousands of banners and be shouted from thousands of proletarian throats.

In Europe, where Fascist reaction has not put the quietus on open demonstrations, hundreds of thousands will march behind red banners.

Paris and Madrid will express a great sentiment in their proletarian protests. This is embodied in the increasing understanding of the lessons of Germany and Austria. Unfortunately this will to struggle will be corralled by Stalinists and social democrats in social patriotic and class collaborationist channels.

These forces of treachery are preparing to repeat the great crime of August 4th, 1914.

But in reality their power, despite the huge votes rolled up in parliamentary elections, is on the wane. Between the pincers of fascism and proletarian revolution, the false leaders will be crushed.

This May Day must resolve that treachery does not lead the working class to the disaster of imperialist war or fascism again.

Only by means of trusted and tested revolutionary Marxism can victory be assured. Revolutionary Marxism, which proclaims unremitting war against Capitalism and its labor lieutenants, flies the great banner of Marx and Lenin. Revolutionary Marxism—that is the Fourth International.

Like Lenin's valiant handful, braving the reaction during the war, the Fourth Internationalists challenge again the same enemies. Like Lenin's party they are invincible.

Peoples Front Salvages Bankrupt Radicals in First French Election

Real Issues Will Be Decided in Streets Not By Ballot Box

The first ballot in the French general elections was held last Sunday, April 26. The 618 Chamber seats were contested by almost 5,000 candidates, representing more than a score of political parties. The French Fascists (Croix de Feu) did not participate directly in the elections, but supported the extreme reactionary candidates.

A clear majority was obtained by candidates in only 183 constituencies, less than one-third of the total, making necessary 435 run-off elections which will be held next Sunday, May 3. This unprecedented confusion is symptomatic of the crisis that grips French "democracy."

It will be possible to determine the actual relationship of forces in the new Chamber only after the results of the second ballot are known. But the essential trends and facts pertaining to the parliamentary arena are already quite clear.

Left Vote Mounts
The elections show that the French masses are moving sharply to the left under the pressure of the economic and social crisis, which is becoming more and more aggravated. The popular vote gives the preponderance to the so-called left parties, and the People's Front candidates will undoubtedly carry the majority of the seats in the run-offs.

But there are also equally clear indications that a section of the French petty bourgeoisie has already begun to shift in the direction of reaction and Fascism. This is indicated by the fact that only a minority of the deputies elected on the first ballot were those representing the parties in the People's Front; and also by the fact that the greatest relative gains in the first ballot were scored by the reactionary Right Republicans.

In this we have a clear reflection of the process now going on in France which is dividing the nation into two camps. This process must continue at an accelerated

pace, and it can proceed only at the expense of the party of the Radical Socialists. This party is the traditional party of the Third Republic; it is the traditional parliamentary representative of the French petty-bourgeoisie; it has played the "historic role" of being the largest single party in the Chamber.

Doom of the Radical Socialists

Time and again we have pointed out in the columns of the NEW MILITANT that the crisis in France signified above all the doom of the Radical Socialist Party. Its collapse is inevitable. Despite the cover afforded the bankrupt Radicals by the People's Front, this party has suffered very serious and very significant losses. The turn of the middle classes away from the Radicals is very sharply illuminated by the case of M. Edouard Herriot. M. Herriot is the parliamentary leader of the Radicals, one of the vice-presidents of the Chamber, who had never before failed to get elected on the first ballot, and who was generally conceded to have an easy win at Lyons. M. Herriot not only failed to get elected, but even to head the list, running second to a reactionary [Herriot, however, will be elected on the second ballot].

A question arises as to what would have happened to the Radical Socialist Party as a whole had it not been propped up from the "left" by the People's Front? Even this assistance has not stopped but only retarded the rapid process of disintegration. The policies of the People's Front not only prop up the bankrupt Radicals but also undermine the position of the working class, because this support causes the disillusioned middle-class following of the Radicals to lose confidence both in the latter and in the labor partners as well.

The Fascists alone stand to gain from the debacle of the Radicals, so long as the working class parties pursue a policy of collaboration with Herriot-Daladier instead of waging an irreconcilable struggle against them.

People's Front Saves Radicals

The elections provide very clear evidence of just how the People's Front has benefited the Radicals.

And in this sense, the Daily Worker is quite correct in stating that "the 'left' critics of the People's Front prophesied that the Radical Socialists would gain at the expense of the working class parties" (April 28, 1936).

Such has been our prognosis, and it has been verified by the elections. But, the Daily Worker indignantly denies this. "Nothing of the kind happened. . . . Sunday's ballot showed that those Radical Socialist candidates who faithfully adhered to the People's Front also gained while those who flirted with reactionaries lost ground."

Even the Stalinist editor—after a heated denial—has to admit that those Radical Socialists who fully utilized the assistance afforded them by the People's Front (those who "faithfully adhered to it") were the ones who "also gained." At whose expense? The "doubtful friends" like Herriot, who did not wholeheartedly pose as People's Front men, "lost ground" . . . which they will recoup on the second ballot, once again at the expense of the workers.

In the last Chamber, the Radicals held 151 seats. It is doubtful whether they will get more than 120 in the new Chamber. The Socialists are having exalted visions of supplanting their Radical partners in the People's Front as the leading and largest party in the Chamber. Leon Blum, as is evident from his editorials in Populaire, already sees himself Premier. (The Stalinists prefer Daladier.)

Herriot-Daladier Will Crack Whip

What is the extent of the "victory" of the People's Front? Without waiting for the results of the run-off election, we can state with assurance that it matters very little whether or not the Socialists outnumber the Radicals. It is Herriot-Daladier who will crack the whip in the Chamber and not Blum-Cachin.

According to the most sanguine estimates of Populaire and l'Humanite, Blum-Cachin dream of a total of some 200-220 seats for the S.P. and the C.P. combined, with the Radicals numbering from 100-120. In essence, therefore, even should the most sanguine hopes of the engineers of the People's Front (Continued on Page 4)

Law 'n' Order Ruse Flops

Akron Vigilante Frame-up On Trade Unionists Falls Through

AKRON, April 28.—The "Law and Order League," established during the Goodyear strike to blast a way into the plant, has turned out to be one of the brightest jools in the crown of Akron society.

Now established on a permanent basis, the league last week entered a social whirl by planting brass knuckles, pistols, and jack-handles in honest Goodyear trade unionists' pockets, and then informing the police.

The very crudeness of the provocation defeated it.

The league made the front pages again when Bill Denton, one of God's, shall we say, more earnest shepherds and spare-time red-baiter, invoked its aid in attempting to close the Soviet film, "Peasants."

Other interesting social phenomena is a bill for \$21,000.60 presented to the county commissioners by the Lake Erie Chemical Co. for long range gas guns, tear gas, and six gas masks.

Though every city official is playing dumb, everything indicates that Colonel Joe Johnson, who has trained hundreds of strikebreakers in Akron shops, ordered the gas for the city—incidentally buying it from himself as a salesman of the chemical firm.

Meanwhile the unions have answered by putting out a progressive, tabloid-size "United Rubber Worker," by increasing the membership in the locals, by establishing study classes, and by holding a huge victory ball. In the Goodyear plant a printed shop paper is being started.

Tension in the Goodyear factory is electric. Fist fights are common. Last Friday a five-hour sit-down paralyzed activity. These events will undoubtedly hasten and confirm the action of the rubber firms in announcing several weeks ago the beginning of decentralization of the rubber plants.

Decidedly, the rubber barons have nothing to be cheery about.

Cops Maul Guildsman

Guild Protests to Hoan After Many are Slugged by Police

MILWAUKEE, Wis., Apr. 20.—Protests were made by the Milwaukee Newspaper Guild to Mayor Hoan regarding police brutality Friday night, during a strike demonstration at the Hearst-owned Wisconsin News plant.

The police charged the picket lines with clubs and blackjacks swinging. One strike sympathizer was cut over the right eye and was removed to a hospital for treatment. Five pickets, including a guildsman, were arrested. The police attacked the strikers' sound truck, breaking windows in it and tearing out wiring. One picket was arrested a block from the scene of the melee. The five demanded a jury trial when they were arraigned Saturday in the district court. Their trials will take place probably this week.

Mayor Hoan promised to take up the protest with Chief of Police J. G. Laubenheimer. A conference between the mayor, the chief, and a committee from the Guild will be held next Monday.

The Wisconsin News management has applied to the federal court for an injunction to restrain the regional labor board from holding a hearing on the board's complaint that the News has violated the Wagner labor relations act. The injunction plea will be heard Saturday by Judge F. A. Geiger.

Several carloads of sympathizers are expected here from Chicago Friday night for another demonstration. Five Muskegon (Mich.) guildsman flew over late Saturday to visit strike headquarters. Last week week Edna Ferber, one of the foremost American novelists and formerly a Milwaukee reporter at \$15 a week, gave \$100 for the strike fund. The Milwaukee Typographical Union No. 23 sent \$100 Monday, accompanied by a resolution of solidarity.

May Day Greetings from Comrade Tom Mooney

Dear Friends, Comrades and Fellow-Unionists:

On May 1, 1936, the workers of the world will commemorate their day!

On that day, we hope that you will not forget those who struggled for the solidarity of labor throughout the world. On this day of all days, those class-war prisoners who fell victims in that struggle should be memorialized. They should be exalted to their proper place in the estimation of those for whom they fought, died and suffered imprisonment, and I especially, at this time, appeal to you most earnestly and fervently for your attention.

May I ask you not to forget all class-war prisoners on that day, and in your remembrance of them, do not fail to single out the monumental injustice and monstrous wrong that has been done to my co-sufferer, Warren K. Billings, and myself.

The more attention that is attracted to the Mooney-Billings case, and the greater the publicity the better are our chances in the United States Supreme Court. Leave no stone unturned to publicize to the fullest this case. It is only through such publicity that we have any hope of freedom.

With warmest personal regards and every good wish for the complete victory of the working-class, I am, with fraternal trade-union regards,

Very sincerely,
TOM MOONEY, 31021.

New Trends in the Evolution Of the Unemployed Movement

By A. J. MUSTE

The recent unification of all the leading unemployed organizations into the Workers Alliance of America marks a definite period in the evolution of the movement. It is important that the militant workers in the field should understand the road that has been travelled, the trend which now prevails, and the policy which they must themselves adopt for the coming period.

To date the unemployed organizations have accomplished a number of important results. Their pressure has helped to keep relief standards from being scrapped completely. They have established and asserted the right of the unemployed to organize. They have corrected innumerable grievances of individuals and families. They have contributed some notable pages to the history of labor struggles in the United States. They have worked out the tactics, first applied on a large scale, in the Toledo Auto-Lite strike, of active participation in strikes of employed workers to an extent known in no other country. Through their work in connection with concrete needs of the unemployed and their educational activities, they have to a remarkable degree prevented Fascist or near-Fascist outfits from making inroads into the unemployed masses.

From "Self-Help" to Class Struggle

In the early months of the crisis when under the influence of various kinds of liberals and academicians many of the unemployed organizations were of the "barter" and "self-help" type, no results were obtained. A system of exchange among those who had nothing, still left them with nothing in the end. Conditions became worse and worse. It was when the unemployed began to "raise hell," built organizations on a basis (conscious or unconscious) of class struggle that some results were obtained. Not the least important result was that the unemployed learned the power of organization, realized their own strength, developed a fighting psychology. When the unemployed marched on Washington or other centers in 1932 to 1935 they were usually met by police on the outskirts of the city and prevented from entering or else so treated within the city limits that serious disturbances ensued. The some six hundred delegates at the recent unity convention of the unemployed in Washington in which the Workers Alliance of America absorbed the former National Unemployment Councils, National Unemployed League and a number of lesser organizations, convened in the spacious and imposing auditorium of the U. S. Department of Labor and their sessions were much more sedate than those of last fall's A. F. of L. convention! Much about the evolution and the present position of the unemployed movement is revealed in this contrast.

The Most Urgent Problem

The fusing of many organizations of relief recipients and project workers into a relatively stable

Problems Arising from The Washington Unity Convention

national body at this date—seven years after the beginning of the Great Depression, and three years after the advent of the New Deal administration—confirms Harry Hopkins' recent utterance that "unemployment is still the most urgent problem before the nation" and suggests that the President's statement in his Baltimore speech to the effect that "no man who is sensitive to human values dares to accept the continued existence of a vast permanent army of unemployed" is the expression of a pious wish.

Yet the unemployed and their organizations are not the immediate and dramatic "menace" which they constituted a couple of years ago. Objective factors in the general economic and political situation play a part here. The upturn in business, such as it is, has eased the tension. Relief payments and project wages are pitifully inadequate. Harassed by the inadequacies of appropriations, administrators are constantly resorting to schemes to cut down payments to the workers. The threat of removal from the rolls hangs over the heads of tens of thousands. There remain plenty of grievances on which to build and hold together the unemployed unions.

Changed Situation

Nevertheless, the situation is less desperate than in those days when prosperity was supposed to be just around the corner, unemployment a passing phenomenon, and the only source of relief either the overburdened private charities, or bankrupt city, county and state treasuries. Then too the temper of the masses was more inflammable in those months when for the first time the ground was slipping out from under their feet, "upstanding Americans" were forced to undergo the humiliation of applying for relief, were evicted from homes they had built, etc., then it is now, when they have become in greater or lesser degree adjusted to a new status and a lowered standard of living. Another factor in producing a more stable situation is the fact that the Roosevelt-Hopkins policy of recognizing the "right" of the unemployed to organize but insisting that they behave in a "reasonable" manner, as against the Tory attitude of flatly denying the right to organize, is percolating all the way down into the heads of at least a large percentage of the local administrators and foremen.

Such conditions tend to develop an organization devoted mainly to "collective bargaining" between workers and management (in this case local, state and federal authorities) and lobbying for legislation in the interest of the group, rather than to agitation and "revolutionary" objectives. The establishment of the enlarged Workers' Alliance of America definitely marked the ascendancy of this trend in the

unemployed movement. The W.A.A. and its units will perform the function of "trade unions for the unemployed."

The chief leaders of the W.A.A., Socialist and Stalinist, consciously encourage conservative trends rather than resist the tendency to conservatism in the movement. There were interesting illustrations of this during the convention. They displayed the greatest anxiety that delegations to Congressmen and the W.P.A. offices should behave like gentlemen, though they were actually going without meals and beds, and the authorities politically insisted nothing could be done about it. Foremost among the speakers who addressed the convention were liberal representatives and senators such as Lundeen, Marcanonio, Amlie and Frazier, some of whom are sponsoring social insurance and relief bills, and a personal representative of Harry Hopkins who calmly informed the delegates he could do nothing for their hungry stomachs and was politely applauded at the conclusion of his remarks. The Lesser-Benjamin leadership should hang its head in shame, if it is capable of this ennobling and degrading performance. Until recently no convention of unemployed would have submitted to it. It should never be permitted to happen again.

Secretary Frank Morrison of the A. F. of L. represented President Green, but there was no speaker from John L. Lewis' Committee for Industrial Organization! It is true that Norman, Thomas and Mother Bloor also spoke but, doubtless in line with more or less direct hints from the officers, they refrained from putting forward the Socialist or the Communist parties respectively. All the recognized leaders spoke for a Farmer-Labor party to include also liberals and progressives, and the incoming National Executive Board is instructed to "explore the possibilities" of forming such a party on a national scale in 1936.

Power in United Body

The lowering of the temper of the unemployed organizations in recent months has been accompanied, significantly enough, by a considerable slump in membership. The W.A.A. grew stronger because of the accession of previously existing units, rather than the formation of new ones, and thus gained relatively to the Councils and the Leagues, but its strongest state organization, for example, the Illinois Workers' Alliance, experienced the same decline in membership and activity as was manifested in most other organizations.

Setting-up of a single national organization of unemployed in which Socialists, Trotskyists, Stalinists, etc., participate is in an important respect a progressive achievement. It will give considerable impetus to the organizing movement in the immediate future, though conflict among diverse political tendencies will not by any means be entirely eliminated. Until some substantial

Problems for the Fourth Internationalists in Spain

(Continued from Page 1)

workers' organizations, however, remain completely enmeshed in the net of the People's Front. The convulsions of the revolutionary masses (without a program, without a leadership worthy of confidence) thus threaten to throw the gates wide open to the counter-revolutionary dictatorship!

Nin and Andrade

That the workers are driving ahead in a revolutionary direction is shown by the development of all their organizations, most particularly by that of the Socialist Party and the Socialist Youth. Two years ago we raised the question of the entry of the Spanish Bolshevik-Leninists into the Socialist Party. This proposal was rejected by the Andres Nins and Andrades with the disdainfulness of conservative philistines: they wanted "independence" at all costs, because it left them in peace and put them under no obligations. And yet, affiliation to the Socialist Party in Spain would have yielded immeasurably better results, under the given circumstances than was the case, for example, in France. (Given the premise, of course, that in Spain the great mistakes committed by the leading French comrades would have been averted.) Meanwhile, however, Andrade and Nin united with the confused Maurin, in order jointly to trot behind the People's Front.* The Socialist workers however, in their striving for revolutionary clarity, fell victim to the Stalinist deceivers. The fusion of the two youth organizations signifies that the best revolutionary energies will be abused and dissipated by the Comintern stipendiaries. And the "great" revolutionists, Andres Nin and Andrade remain on the sidelines in order to

carry on together with Maurin a completely impotent propaganda for the "democratic-socialist" revolution, that is, for a social democratic betrayal.**

Nobody can know what form the next period in Spain will take. In any case, the flood tide which has borne the clique of the People's Front to power is too mighty to ebb in a short period of time and to leave the battlefield free to the reaction. The truly revolutionary elements still have a certain period of time, not too long a time to be sure, in which to reflect, to assemble and to prepare for the future. This refers in the first place to the Spanish supporters of the Fourth International. Their tasks are as clear as day.

Tasks of Fourth Internationalists

1. To condemn pitilessly and to pillory before the masses the policy of all the leaders participating in the People's Front.
2. To grasp in full the wretchedness of the leadership of the "Workers Party of Marxist Unity" and especially of the former "Left Communists"—Andres Nin, Andrade, etc., and to portray them clearly in the sight of all the advanced workers.
3. To rally around the banner of the Fourth International on the basis of the "Open Letter."
4. To join the Socialist Party and the United Youth in order to work there as a faction in the spirit of Bolshevism.
5. To establish fractions and nuclei in the trades unions and other mass organizations.
6. To direct the main attention to the spontaneous and semi-spontaneous mass movements, to study their general traits, i.e. (to take heed of the temperature of the masses and not the temperature of

the parliamentarianist cliques.

7. To be present in every struggle so as to invest it with clear expression.

8. To drive constantly towards having the fighting masses form and constantly expand their committees of action (juntas, soviets), elected ad hoc.

9. To counterpose the program of the conquest of power, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the social revolution to all hybrid programs (a la Caballero, or a la Maurin).

This is the real road of the proletarian revolution. There is no other.

L. TROTSKY.

April 12, 1936.

*The turn of the Batalla toward the People's Front does not inspire us with confidence. One cannot say Monday that the League of Nations is a band of brigands, on Tuesday urge voters to vote for the program of the League of Nations, on Wednesday explain that yesterday it was only a question of electoral action and that today one has to resume one's own program. The serious worker must ask: and what are these people going to say Friday and Saturday? Maurin appears to be the very incarnation of a petty bourgeois revolutionist, superficial, agile and versatile. He studies nothing, he understands little and he spreads confusion all around him.

**Marx wrote in 1876 on the falseness of the term "social democracy": socialism cannot be subordinated to democracy. Socialism (or communism) is enough for us. "Democracy" has nothing to do with it. Since then, the October revolution has vigorously demonstrated that the socialist revolution cannot be carried out within the framework of democracy. The "democratic" revolution and the socialist revolution are on opposite sides of the barricades. The Third International theoretically confirmed this experience. The "democratic" revolution in Spain has al-

change occurs in the general economic and political situation, possibly after the election, the policy of the W.A.A. is likely to reflect the general line and temper of the unity convention. This will be the aim of the Stalinists under their present undisguised and unrestricted opportunism and social-patriotism.

Only Struggle Effective

What this line means for the unemployed is already plain to everybody. A terrific drive to cut down appropriations in order to "balance the budget" is under way. Thousands are being dropped from projects. Except where vigorous fighting organizations exist, all kinds of devices for worsening conditions are resorted to. No amount of flirting with the Green-Wool outfit in the A. F. of L. or with liberal congressmen, no amount of gentlemanliness in dealing with the clever politicians of the Roosevelt machine, no amount of polite lobbying by unemployed who have no money to bring into the lobbies, no amount of "resoluting" about fine-sounding but fake Stalinist farmer-labor or people's parties, will change this situation.

Whatever the unemployed got in the past, they got because they had strong organizations which went on the war-path. Building or reviving such organizations and carrying them into action is the job of revolutionists and militants today. A constant struggle with the state, with governmental agencies, is involved in the very nature of the unemployed situation and of any unemployed movement worthy of the name.

Link with Union Militants Needed

It follows, also, that the unemployed organizations cannot gain by being drawn down to the low level of militancy in many of the unions. On the contrary, the working class movement as a whole can gain only if the unemployed help to heighten the militancy of the unions. Consequently, the tie-up which the unemployed must seek is with the industrial as against the craft-unionists in the A. F. of L. who have never evinced the slightest interest in the unemployed masses; and basically the tie-up must be not with bureaucrats at the top but with the militant progressive forces in the unions—a tie forged and constantly made stronger in the daily struggles of employed and unemployed alike.

Since it is impossible in an unemployed organization to establish a very strict centralized control from the center, nothing prevents the fighting spirits in city, county, state organizations from getting busy at once with building along these lines; with invading such reactionary strongholds as Tampa, Florida; with support of militant strikes as the Project Workers Union in Akron stood ready to give the Goodyear workers recently; with large-scale local and state demonstrations. Thus will the W. A. A. be made into an important progressive force in the class-struggle in this country.

The Roosevelt - Lewis Coalition And the Farmer - Labor Party

By ARNE SWABECK

With the organization of Labor's Non-Partisan League, the Labor party question has come into new prominence. It is a peculiar kind of prominence and it is a new version of this question. At the same time it is the most genuine indication yet presented of what a future labor party will actually be.

The sponsors of this organization, among whom are John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers, George Berry of the printing pressmen union and Sidney Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, have announced that their present objective is the re-election of Roosevelt in 1936. That task accomplished, it is intimated, the League may become the precursor of an American labor party or third party of labor, farmer, liberal and progressive elements. This is the way it is now offered to the working class. Starting out with the re-election of Roosevelt, such a party, when emerging full fledged, would have for its base the New Deal program.

This is not surprising. An examination of the present labor party trends, the position of the trade union leadership—which, it is to be remembered, is still the authentic spokesman of the movement it represents—and the actual role that a labor party can play in the stage of capitalist decay, should convince intelligent workers that what is intimated through the creation of Labor's Non-Partisan League is a fairly true picture of coming events.

Stalinists and Lewis

Let us compare this with the labor party idea sponsored by the Stalinists in their present hurricane campaign. There is no need to ignore their violent disavowal of the Lewis, Berry, Hillman coalition or its present aims, for even as a pretense that much would be necessary. With this we need not be seriously concerned. In politics, intentions or desires are of little account, even declarations have validity only when accompanied by corresponding deeds. But, above all, it is the objective logic of the position that is the decisive criterion. Leaving all outward appearances aside the fundamental issue therefore remains: what will be the objective result of these two positions on the labor party question? And in it we shall be sure to find a resemblance as striking as two eyeballs.

In outward appearance there are differences. In origin and gestation the differences may seem to the less discerning as if in open conflict. But opportunist trends easily meet regardless of origin. Labor's Non-Partisan League gestated from the New Deal program and its spokesmen are still very cautious about future perspectives. In words they

Lewis Takes the Wind Out of Stalinist 1936 Sails

indicate only vaguely the labor party or third party direction. They have no illusions about a serious labor party movement in 1936. But they see clearly the leftward trends in the trade union movement which have been manifested especially in recent strikes, and they understand that these trends will also sooner or later endeavor to find political expression.

A Shrewd Strategy

In regard to these developments the Lewis-Hillman group, which is credited with the new strategy, has again proven its ability to gauge the moods of the masses more accurately than the craft conscious bureaucrats. Progressives in certain questions of trade union organization, this group is Rooseveltian in political ideology. This means that it is a conscious supporter of the capitalist system. And for this reason it has set for itself the immediate task of canalizing the trends in the movement for independent political action into the safe channels of support of the pseudo-reform measures of the New Deal. To secure in actuality these measures—which are even too radical for finance capital and for the most part ruled out by the Supreme Court—with Roosevelt as long as this is possible and later through a new political instrument; this is the way the question is presented to appear in palatable form to the workers.

The contradiction of this strategy lies not in the linking of support to Roosevelt in 1936 with a labor party to appear later. The contradiction, insofar as the workers are concerned, lies in the blurring of the class issues, in the harnessing of the slowly developing political consciousness to a program and a movement based purely on obtaining concessions from capitalism at a time when real concessions can be wrung from it only to the extent that the working class advances and organizes along revolutionary lines. The history of the Roosevelt measures bears this out most clearly. Therefore, so long as the developing political consciousness of the workers can be thus harnessed capitalism remains safe to continue its exploitation.

Wither the "Peoples Movement"?

This is also the contradiction of the Stalinist campaign for a labor party. But this glib propaganda on the question, insofar as they influence class conscious workers, is far more dangerous and far more criminal. Attempting to delude their followers, who sincerely want to "fight against political reaction

and Fascism and against the threatening war," they present the labor party as a means to this end. At the same time the labor party, in their version, is to be "neither socialist nor communist," and still capable of performing these gigantic tasks. It is to be a "broad people's movement." What a welter of confusion and treachery. Any small town banker, or smart bourgeois lawyer, or battered downtown bourgeois "liberal" politician may rightfully demand his place in the "broad people's movement." On what grounds could they be excluded? And why should a people's movement disparage the New Deal program?

For quite some time the Stalinists have addressed their appeals to the Lewis' group urging it to support the Labor party idea. It now appears as if these appeals have not been in vain. Support for a labor party is at least intimated. Such a party would also bear prominently the imprint of the official trade union leadership and of the whole coterie of elements who have no difficulty in pronouncing the Roosevelt program and the labor party with the same accent. It is from these elements and not from the workers that the Stalinists may claim their just reward for services rendered in the cause of social reformism.

A Significant Omen

Labor's Non-Partisan League already claims for itself a widely extended support. Norman Thomas sees in this development a hopeful sign for a future farmer-labor party. David Dubinsky of the International Ladies Garment Workers threw in his support immediately, and to leave no room for misunderstanding he resigned from the Socialist party. His loyalty, to the extent that he had any, had been with the Old Guard. On what good grounds can the Old Guard decline to follow his example?

On the whole it would be difficult to deny that all the signs of labor party developments point unmistakably in one and the same direction. It could not be otherwise once a reformist party is projected. Differences in outward appearances should not deceive anybody, for the objective logic of the positions advanced along the lines of social reformism must necessarily lead to one and the same general result. Today the most genuine indication of what the actual result will be, is furnished by the Lewis, Berry, Hillman coalition—for Roosevelt toward a labor party or third party based on the New Deal program.

This can hardly be the thing that class conscious workers are looking forward to. It can hardly be an object of support to socialist workers. Their job still remains the one of building a movement for socialism.

Townsend Plan Hits The Downward Trek

Sixty-six years went by before Dr. Francis E. Townsend of Long Beach, California, noticed the injustice of this world. For sixty-six years he was content to struggle onward over the backs of the working class to a comfortable political post in the City Health Department.

Then at a ripe old age the middle class crusader lost his job in a political overturn. And as he counted his meagre savings and faced a jobless and poverty stricken senility he was overcome with a humanitarian impulse.

Looking out of the window of his little house he observed three old women rummaging through the garbage looking for something to eat. This observation late in 1933 seems to have been not only the beginning of the Old Age Revolving Pension Fund idea, but also the first time that Dr. Townsend became aware of the fact that all was not roses and soft jobs in Long Beach.

Birth of Movement

Like many other workers throughout the country the three old women lived on the garbage of capitalist civilization long before Townsend lost his job with the City Health Department and are probably still scavenging under the new Health Department.

But in the meanwhile a new movement has arisen to save Townsend and tens of thousands of other middle class old people from a fate the working class faces every day of every year—poverty.

Dr. Townsend sat down at his desk and figured out an economic scheme highly naive and unsound

ready been carried out. The People's Front is renewing it. The personification of the "democratic" revolution in Spain is Azana, with or without Caballero. The socialist revolution is yet to be made in implacable struggle against the "democratic" revolution and its People's Front. What does this synthesis, "democratic-socialist" revolution mean? Nothing at all. It is only an eclectic hodge-podge.

branch lobby office in Washington, D.C.

In the spring of 1935 the Townsend Plan was introduced into the House of Representatives by J. S. McGroarty, poet laureate of the state by special act of the California legislature. It received some fifty votes from Congressmen anxious to bolster their precarious reputations at home.

During 1935 the movement continued to grow until the founders claimed more than twenty million signatures to petitions and memoranda to Congress; a monster demonstration of social unrest. It became a menace to the federal government for it threatened to reveal to the middle class and deluded working class supporters of the Plan the complete dependence of the "people's representatives" on big capital.

The Investigation

Instead of answering the plan, instead of concerning themselves with the economic terror it reflected, instead of proposing serious alternatives, the august bootlickers in Congress decided upon a campaign of personal slander and insinuation against the leaders.

A congressional investigation was launched in the hope of destroying the Old Age Pension movement by discrediting Townsend. The same congressmen who can contemplate with indifference the expenditure of thirty million dollars on a wild and useless Trans-Florida canal for the purpose of raising a few thousand Democratic votes in Florida suddenly become indignant and self-righteous at the thought of an organization which collected a bare fifty cents per member to a total of not more than a million dollars.

Committee's Revelations

Despite a great hullabaloo raised by the investigating committee about Townsend's methods of organization, his accounting for funds, his management of the paper, etc., it appears that Townsend is no more of a crook than a congressman, and draws about the same salary.

The investigation is not yet complete but there are already rumors of political disagreements among the committee members. No doubt some of the congressmen foresee the failure of the investigation, and

are anxious to reinstate themselves with the Townsendsites.

It remained for the Stalinists to jump into this mess of middle class messiahs and vote-anxious congressmen to lend the movement the invaluable advice and aid of the beloved leader of the world proletariat, Stalin. In a pamphlet on the Townsend plan Alex Bittelman, the second string authority on counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, hails the Old Age Revolving Pension Plan as a movement of the "masses of the toilers," in a "powerful protest . . . against the policy of monopolies." (!)

A Revolutionary Attitude

The workers can have no use for this vicious middle class scheme for raising pensions at the expense of the workers. They want old age pensions for all productive workers regardless of citizenship, and they want them raised by income taxes on wealthy individuals and corporations.

More than this, the workers should know from experience that poverty in old age is only one facet of a system that condemns the working class to poverty, insecurity and unemployment every day of the year.

Naturally the Townsend movement has certain fascist potentialities. The O.A.R.P. already has the reform socialist demagog, the rank nationalism, and the messianic leadership of the fascist movement. But in these times of comparative capitalist security and business recovery the Townsend movement is probably doomed to end in another EPIC fizzle. It serves a purpose in exposing the hopeless and reactionary nature of middle class reformism, the cynical indifference and servility of the capitalist government, and the stupid and equally cynical attempts of Stalinism to capitalize on all this petty bourgeois swill.

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

BROWDER: THE MAN & HIS BOOK

1. The Stalinist System of Beloved Leaders

By MAX SHACHTMAN

Not every book has the importance of a political program; indeed very, very few have. The present volume* may, however, be counted among the limited number. Nor is this all. By its contents as well as by the circumstances surrounding its conception, it is possible to get a good mental picture of the movement for which it serves as a program and of the man at the head of the movement.

What has struck reviewers who are not direct partisans of the author and consequently do not need to render the volume the dithyrambic homage which is otherwise compulsory, is the startling contrast between "What Is Communism?", published early in 1936, and "Communism in the United States" by the same Earl Browder, published less than a year ago. Briefly, where the 1935 exposition of the C. P. standpoint said Black, the 1936 exposition says White; where the former said No the latter says Yes; where the former had a plus sign the latter now puts a minus sign—and vice versa.

The "Beloved Leader" this inconsistency, by itself, would be enough to cause a stir. But it is complicated by the phenomenon of consistency. The official C. P. reviewers are just as unrestrained in their encomiastic praise of the second volume as they were of the first. However opposite may be the views expressed by the two volumes in the eyes of the average reading mortal, he is nevertheless gushingly assured that in both cases the author has displayed a wisdom, a simplicity, an insight, a scope, a majesty that are associated in each communist party with only one member: the beloved leader in his particular country.

The modern "beloved leader" of the communist parties (each of them plagued with one) is a new phenomenon directly associated with and expressive of the politics which gave it birth. We do not believe that the significance of the present volume's contents can be fully grasped without an understanding of the author, not so much as a particular individual but as a political phenomenon.

Browder was recently elaborately introduced to the bourgeois world through the columns of the debonair monthly "The American Magazine" (Feb. 1936). The tone employed by Hubert Kelley, the author of the article, who writes like more than a casual acquaintance of the secretary of the Communist party, indicates that "Our No. 1 Communist" (as the presentation is entitled) is a semi-official introduction of Browder to the respectable public. The fact that Browder has nowhere commented on the article, much less challenged or disowned it, fortifies this conclusion.

"Mind Like an Adding Machine" "I think Earl Browder is the leader of the Communist party," writes Mr. Kelley, "for the same reason that certain other men are leaders in the capitalist world which he hates—because they are, as a rule, more intelligent, harder-working, and longer-suffering than anybody else—because they are loyal to one idea in life."

This might explain Browder's leadership of the C. P., were it not for the fact that Mr. Kelley unwittingly deprives this explanation of any foundation in the paragraph directly preceding it. "Nobody back home [i.e., in the U. S.] can account for his rise. Some said he had a routine mind like an adding machine. I have often heard persons who know him wonder how he got the job and kept it." (My emphasis.)

As an introduction to a consideration of the book proper, let us attempt to analyze the phenomenon which causes even "persons who know him" to wonder.

In a properly organized working class party, the principle of democratic centralism is deemed essential not primarily out of moral or ethical considerations but above all because it is socially, politically correct. Party members rise to the position of leadership because of superior ability in their work, their ideas, their devotion to the cause, as displayed over a period of time, and not in this or that isolated instance. Often enough, leadership is acquired not only by virtue of prominent participation in the general class struggle, but in the course of internal disputes in the party itself. Ideas, platforms, programs are countered, and when the best of them prevails (either after internal discussion or after verification in the class struggle), it is logical that their spokesmen should prevail with them. So-and-so has demonstrated by his proposals and his activity in this situation in 1919, that situation in 1920, the other situation in 1921, etc., that the party would be well-advised in elevating him to the post of leadership where his political talents may be most beneficial to the movement.

*"What Is Communism?" by Earl Browder. Vanguard Press, New York. 50 cents.

The good leader does not operate by himself; he surrounds himself with other qualified men in whose company, as the old Romans had it, he is first among equals. The good leader does not convert this company into an aloof bureaucracy separated from the ranks and striving above all for self-preservation and self-perpetuation. Quite the contrary. He does not fear to give a thorough and periodic account of his stewardship; he welcomes criticism. If his course is correct, he has sufficient confidence in the ranks to know that they will endorse it. If his course is wrong, the same confidence assures him that the ranks will help him by correcting it. By means of this mutual consultation and influencing, the leader keeps his indispensable contact with the ranks of the movement—a contact without which he is sure to go wrong; and the ranks are not only in a position to check and control, but they are constantly being trained to a better understanding of problems, and prepared for leadership themselves. And the job of the revolutionary party is to lead.

Bureaucratic Leadership

In general, this represents the normal and healthy way in which the party ranks and leadership must function. A bureaucratic regime represents the abnormal and unhealthy way. It is interested primarily in keeping itself intact, and consequently develops distinct caste interests of its own. Having lost contact with the ranks, it loses that indispensable knowledge of the moods, needs, interests of the masses. Without that, its charts are no good and more often than not it leads the ranks onto a reef. The history of the labor movement is rife with examples of this fatal connection between organization and politics. Unable to give an accounting of itself that will be acceptable to the ranks, the bureaucracy draws further and further away from them. It resents their interference and fears it. Once it has gained organizational control of the movement, by virtue of one or another combination of circumstances, it must inevitably deprive the ranks of the possibility and opportunity to express themselves politically in a free and thorough manner, for they would eventually and unfailingly draw such organizational conclusions from their political expression

as would mean the end of the bureaucracy. Bureaucratism therefore strangles the party organizationally and politically. Communism means the establishment of a new relationship between man and man. Reactionary bureaucratism, its antipode, ends by establishing between the summits and the ranks the relationship of feudal lord and serf.

But what if differences arise in the ranks of the bureaucracy itself, as they always do and inevitably must? As a rule, the bureaucrats cannot appeal to the ranks to intervene in the settlement of the differences. That would mean to loosen the bonds of the masses, to awaken them, to present them with political problems to solve, to set them in motion. Once that is done, the bureaucracy has no way of telling where the re-awakened masses will stop. Good gracious! They might decide that the real solution to the bureaucratic dispute lies in the elimination of the bureaucracy itself! Increasingly reluctant to refer its unworkable disputes to the masses, the bureaucracy always tends to set up a Supreme Arbitrator in its own midst, one upon whom it relies for the protection of its caste interests from attacks by obstreperous members of the caste itself as well by the masses whom it dominates.

"But the King Is Naked" This is, roughly, the general outline of the mechanics of the evolution of a Bonapartist leadership, clearly discernible in the development of the Soviet Union, especially of its Communist party, in the last decade. The more insufferable the bureaucratic regime becomes, the narrower the organized base of its existence, the more impudently it requires periodic "endorsements" from the masses. The closer it comes to utter bankruptcy and exposure, the more feverishly does it seek to bolster the legend of its successes, its infallibility and its popularity.

Lenin, serene in the knowledge that his policies were correct, or if wrong, could be corrected in a normal manner, had no fear whatsoever to expose himself and his course to the widest public discussion. Stalin, the incarnation of the bureaucracy, is anything but serene, and for good reason. The nude king of the fairy tale who compelled

his subjects to comment loudly upon the beauty of his garments which they could not see, was disconcerted by the little child who cried, "But the King is naked!" In the Soviet Union, even the smallest child is taught to say that his nude sovereign is not only not naked but is garbed in the most ravishing mode.

Omniscient and Omnipresent

To preserve itself, the bureaucracy puts all its hopes in the Supreme Arbitrator, Stalin. To preserve him, the bureaucracy carries on a systematic, well-organized, and thoroughly hair-raising campaign of panegyrics to The Leader. Steadily dinned into the minds of the masses is the notion that they must believe what they are told, not what they see. If the masses can be made to believe that The Leader is as wise, as infallible and as good as Omniscient and Omnipresent God himself, then the decrees which he issues, primarily in the interests of the bureaucracy, will find more favor and less opposition.

That, we believe, is the main reason for the incredible system of delirious laudation of Stalin which ought to bring a flush of shame to everyone save the manacles of the regime, and even to some of them. Just look at a few examples from a recent compilation.

Chameleons Panegyrics for Stalin

Renamed or newly-named cities of the U. S. S. R. now include Stalinisk, Stalingrad, Stalino, Stalinabad, Staliniss, Stalin-Aoni, Stalinir and Stalingorsk. To say nothing of the highest peak of Mount Pamir, Peak Stalin (the second highest being named Peak Lenin). Factories and streets bearing the august name are legion.

In the field of belles lettres, Stalin has assumed a position of the very highest renown. A contributor to "The Literary Gazette" tells us that "It is the role of linguistics and criticism to study the style of Stalin." The versifier Demian Biedny declares at a meeting: "Learn to write like Stalin writes." An effusive, but entirely typical lady of letters, describes Stalin in a Russian journal as nothing less than the direct contributor of Goethe. A writer in "At the Literary Post" casually informs the reader that Stalin "has always been distinguished by his profound comprehension of literature." A manifesto of the Association of "proletarian" writers says without a smile: "Each section, each paragraph of the speech of Stalin is the most fertile theme for artistic works."

Stalin: Peer of Kantians

No less a genius does The Leader display in the field of philosophy. An unblushing professor tells the Communist Academy in Moscow: "The position of the theses of Kantism cannot be completely understood in contemporary science except in the light of comrade Stalin's last letter." (The reference is to Stalin's putrid attack on the memory of Rosa Luxemburg; the connection it has with the Kantian theses is, of course, perfectly obvious.) A writer in "Revolution and Culture" sets down the fact that Stalin is to be counted among the "profound connoisseurs and critics of Hegel" (as Stalin's collected works on philosophy amply reveal). Still another lover of bureaucratic posteriors adds that Stalin belongs among "the most competent authorities on contemporary philosophical problems." A fourth stipendiary notes in passing in "The Cultural Front" that "Essentially, certain prognostications of Aristotle have been incarnated and deciphered in all their amplitude only by Stalin."

The late Kirov described Stalin at the 17th Congress as not more and not less than "the greatest leader of all times and of all peoples." The editor of "Izvestia," at another congress, relieved himself of this: "On the threshold of the new era stand two peerless titans of thought, Lenin and Stalin. . . . Can anything be written nowadays on anything at all without knowing Stalin? Absolutely not! Nothing can be understood without Stalin, nor anything interesting written."

Among the titles by which this shy Georgian flower graciously permits himself to be called, are: The colossus of steel, the great pilot (or the great engineer, architect, master, theoretician, collective farmer, etc.), the great disciple of the great masters, the field marshal of the revolutionary army, the chief of the world proletariat, the heroic organizer of the Red Army, the inspirer of the October Revolution, the best Leninist, the best among the best, the gifted leader, the beloved leader, the dearly beloved leader, the most dearly beloved leader; and more of the same if you can stand it.

Ordaining Lesser "Beloved Leaders"

As in the U.S.S.R., so in the rest of the world. In every communist party, Stalin appoints an agent upon whom is automatically conferred the title of "beloved leader," just as the commoner appointed Vali of a province conquered by the

Turks in times gone by automatically became a Pasha or a Bey. The designation of "beloved leaders" in every country is not merely done in servile imitation of the Russian state of things. It is politically necessary for the Stalin regime. Under it, the Comintern has been reduced to the position of a department of the Soviet Foreign Office. Stalin has no time or need of revolutionary working class politics. The idea of the normal development of a leadership indigenous to its communist and working class movements, is entirely superfluous—even dangerous—to his calculations. In every party, he merely needs a Governor-General who can trustworthily translate into the language of his country the requirements of the Soviet bureaucracy. The fact that this agent is exclusively dependent upon the goodwill of those who appointed him has a double advantage: 1) the ranks of the party, which have been trained that way, will take what this mechanical transmitter says without questioning it; 2) he can be removed just as easily as he was appointed. Each agent is like a light along the communications system of the Comintern. Stalin throws the master switch, all of them turn pink, and the trains will move accordingly in each country; a twist of the master switch and all lights turn yellow or green or blue.

In China, one day, the masses will suddenly be informed that the Stalinist leader they love is Li Li-san; but it can happen (it did!) that the masses should wake up some morning and find that they do not love him the least bit, they love Wang Min instead. In France, the proletariat must accept Thorez and nobody else as its "beloved leader"—for France only, to be sure; on a world scale, only Stalin is the object of its affection. Similarly, in every other country, from Australia to Zanzibar.

Following Machiavelli's Advice

In his chapter "Of Those Who Have Attained the Position of Prince by Villainy," Niccolo Machiavelli gives the advice that "in taking a state the conqueror must arrange to commit all his cruelties at once, so as not to have to recur to them every day, and so as to be able, by not making fresh changes, to reassure people and win them over by benefiting them."

In point of fact, that is what Stalin did in the United States. Taking over the American C. P. from those suspected of "rotten liberalism" towards Bukharin—the Lovestoneties—he committed "all his cruelties at once": Browder was appointed General Secretary and Beloved Leader in one. In turn, he has created Beloved Leaders on a lower scale in the hierarchy. Lem Harris is thus the beloved leader of the farmers; Herbert Benjamin the Beloved Leader of the Unemployed; James Ford the Beloved Leader of the Harlem masses; Israel Amter the Beloved Leader of the New York workers. But over and above them all is the Beloved Leader Browder, only one step removed (but what a step!) from THE Beloved Leader of the World Proletariat.

In making his choice, Stalin was not deceived. Be the figure as colorless and mediocre as possible—it does not matter much. Obscurity, too, is no handicap—a reputation will be speedily and elaborately manufactured and disseminated for him. All that is really required of the Beloved Leader is that he have a vacancy in those spots where a normal human being has his spinal column and his cerebellum, and that the hinges of his knees be well-oiled. Time was when Browder would not have qualified for the post; those old in the movement recall days when he had ideas of his own, even if they were almost invariably wrong. But he has since sternly repressed this defect. He has learned the all-sufficing virtue of Obedience. This virtue, in the Stalinist order of things, has its own reward in the form of Beloved Leadership.

Last year, Browder put between covers a collection of articles and speeches which made him sound like a lion—a somewhat deranged lion, but one with a deep and intolerant roar. Nothing was too radical for him in those days, for he was obedient to the Stalin of the moment. Hoover? Roosevelt? Green? Lewis? Thomas? Cahane? Trotsky? Olson? Coughlin? All of them were combined in a colossal conspiracy to defeat Browder's plans for an immediate and stormy revolution in the United States.

A "Red-Blooded American"

Then came the news of the turn proclaimed by the 7th Congress. Result? Where once he roared, he now bleats pathetically. The turn is towards conservatism, respectability, patriotism, nationalism, united frontism. In his new book, as in all his other writings and actions, Browder makes the turn with the late convert's zeal. In the Beloved Leader of the American proletariat the new turn of the C. I. is full-bloodedly incarnated. Budenz, the turncoat who took refuge in the Stalinist camp, emphasizes to the readers of the Daily Worker that his leader has a "Kansas twang" (the frontier touch). A Boston leaflet announcing the C. P. Lenin memorial meeting anxiously describes Browder as the "Kansas-born American leader of the Communist party." His bourgeois biographer assures his readers that "Our No. 1 Communist" has access-

tors who "came to the Colonies not after the landing of the Mayflower, and members of the family have fought in every war waged by this country up to the last one" (The D.A.R. touch). In his book (the new one!) Browder assures Mr. Hearst that "we cannot think of any other spot on the globe where we would rather be than exactly this one" (p. 13) and on the next page he generously pleads on behalf of the foreign-born workers: "They deserve, at a minimum [!] a little courtesy [!] from those who would speak of Americanism." To Kelley's question about the problem of saluting the flag faced by Browder's children in the public schools, the latter replies: "It's their flag. Why shouldn't they salute it?" (American Magazine, Feb. 1936, p. 111.)

Why not, indeed? For the point is that the Stalinist parties, their Beloved Leaders included, have changed flags. Another word for such action is: betrayal. How completely the principles to which the C.P. once bore allegiance have been abandoned, is revealed by a thorough reading of the new Browder book.

Why not, indeed? For the point is that the Stalinist parties, their Beloved Leaders included, have changed flags. Another word for such action is: betrayal. How completely the principles to which the C.P. once bore allegiance have been abandoned, is revealed by a thorough reading of the new Browder book.

"A Sensational Interview"

Azana Sends His Best Love to Stalin

Light was thrown on the reasons behind the Stalinists' pro-Azana course in Spain, by the publication in the Daily Worker of April 23 of an eight-column streamer, "Spanish Premier, Holds Soviet Union Guarantor of Peace," and underneath it a cable from Moscow which gives in full an interview between Azana and the Soviet writer Ehrenbourg, terming it a "sensational interview."

Contrast the generous space given to this interview, with the sparsity of news from Spain in the Daily Worker since the February election. Almost nothing is reported. What little is printed is dishonestly distorted. Azana's speech of April 4, hailed by the reactionaries, was not mentioned. His speech of April 15 was mentioned—but his attack in it on Communism was deleted! In its April 18 story, the Daily Worker revealed the bankruptcy of the line of the C.P.-S.P. which in the middle of the general strike "declared they may participate later. Their present decision was to support the Azana government insofar as it takes effective action against the reactionaries." Yet the Daily Worker had the gall to put as a headline on this story that "People's Block (i. e., including Azana) Forces Arrest of Fascists in Civil Guard." The same story reports the C.P.-S.P. vote of confidence in Azana but suppresses all facts about his anti-Communist attack in the Cortes. In short, the Daily Worker behaves like the Stalinist "Mundo Obrero" which outdoes the government papers in its slavish support of Azana. Why? Azana's interview, relayed from Moscow, supplies the answer: Azana is a "friend" of the Soviet Union!

We quote the interview as a whole:

"Ehrenbourg: What measures has the Spanish Government taken for the establishment of normal diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R.?"

"Azana: During the campaign, the People's Front advanced the demand for the establishment of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. During the next two weeks, an Ambassador of the Spanish Republic will be appointed to Moscow. I know that the 'rights' will pro-

doomed."

tors who "came to the Colonies not after the landing of the Mayflower, and members of the family have fought in every war waged by this country up to the last one" (The D.A.R. touch). In his book (the new one!) Browder assures Mr. Hearst that "we cannot think of any other spot on the globe where we would rather be than exactly this one" (p. 13) and on the next page he generously pleads on behalf of the foreign-born workers: "They deserve, at a minimum [!] a little courtesy [!] from those who would speak of Americanism." To Kelley's question about the problem of saluting the flag faced by Browder's children in the public schools, the latter replies: "It's their flag. Why shouldn't they salute it?" (American Magazine, Feb. 1936, p. 111.)

Why not, indeed? For the point is that the Stalinist parties, their Beloved Leaders included, have changed flags. Another word for such action is: betrayal. How completely the principles to which the C.P. once bore allegiance have been abandoned, is revealed by a thorough reading of the new Browder book.

Why not, indeed? For the point is that the Stalinist parties, their Beloved Leaders included, have changed flags. Another word for such action is: betrayal. How completely the principles to which the C.P. once bore allegiance have been abandoned, is revealed by a thorough reading of the new Browder book.

test but I am not in the least interested in their position.

"Ehrenbourg: Are you a member of the presidium of the League for the Defense of Peace?"

"Azana: Yes, I am, together with Alvarez Dea Vayo and the poet, Antonio Machado.

"Ehrenbourg: How do you estimate the role of the U.S.S.R. in the matter of the defense of peace?"

"Azana: The U.S.S.R. is the guarantor of peace. Your country possesses military power and is therefore able to defend our common ideals. Fascism is the germ of war.

"Ehrenbourg: Are you acquainted with Soviet art?"

"Azana: I particularly value the new Soviet music which I have heard here and in Paris. I know the Soviet writers and your literature has enabled me to understand the soul of the Soviet revolution. I need not mention the great impression which Soviet films have made upon me. I regret today to say that I am acquainted with Stanislavsky and Meyerhold [famous Soviet theatre directors] only from books. I hope soon to be in Moscow. We must do everything in order to acquire the Spanish people with Soviet culture and art.

"Ehrenbourg: How do you estimate the situation in Spain?"

"Azana: Yesterday's events show that the 'rights' have not reconciled themselves. Certain elements in the Civil Guards showed insubordination. Yesterday, the government took a number of urgent measures: the removal or replacement of Fascists who are among the commanding staff.

"The 'rights' are frightened and will not dare to raise their heads. I believe that in the very near future we will have an agrarian reform. We are preparing a bill which will allow us more stringent control over Spanish banks.

"The People's Front is stable and the Communists are trusted allies. The enemies of the regime are only among the 'rights.' I do not deny that we are confronted with many obstacles but I am convinced that the People's Front will triumph completely and that Fascism is

LUMEN CLUB CAMP EXCURSION

Come to the excursion arranged by the Lumen Club and see its new camping ground for the coming season.

Sunday, May 10, 10:15 A.M.

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

Lunch will be served at the camp.

Don't hesitate, come along.

Price for round trip ticket, 70c.

NEW MILITANT

with which merged THE MILITANT

Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co., 100 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C.

Entered as second class mail matter at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

JAMES P. CANNON: Editor

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

SATURDAY, MAY 2, 1936

Vol. 2, No. 17 (Whole No. 60)

BOOKS OPENING SPECIALS

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

WAR:	Published Price	Our Price
Why We Fought—by C. Hartley Grattan.....	\$ 3.50	\$ 4.9
ECONOMICS:		
Decline of American Capitalism—by L. Corey	4.00	3.00
The Power Age—by Walter N. Polakov.....	2.00	.69
Crisis of Capitalism in America—by M. J. Bonn	2.00	.35
The American Adventure—by M. J. Bonn.....	2.50	.35
LABOR HISTORY:		
Labor Movement in the U.S. (1860-1895)—by Norman J. Ware	3.00	.69
SOCIAL DEMOCRACY:		
Memoirs of Scheidemann (2 Vols.).....	10.00	1.95
FRENCH REVOLUTION:		
French Revolution—by Albert Mathiez.....	3.00	1.69
After Robespierre: The Thermidorian Reaction	2.75	1.00
Special Combination Price for Both.....		2.50
LEON TROTSKY:		
In Defense of Terrorism (with new introduction by author—1935)	English	1.25
My Life	5.00	2.50
ON GERMAN FASCISM:		
What Next? (65c); Only Road (65c); cloth bound		Special Price for both .98
BOUND VOLUMES OF NEW MILITANT:		
1933	Reg. Price \$1.50; Our Price \$1.00	
1934	Reg. Price 1.50; Our Price 1.00	
And hundreds of other books and pamphlets of all publishers at reduced prices during the sale.		
LABOR BOOK SHOP		
28 East 12th Street, New York City Near University Place		
Tel. STuyvesant 9-0667		

France at the Crossroads

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

By LEON TROTSKY

Editor's Note: In response to requests from many of our readers we are continuing publication of "France at the Crossroads" by Leon Trotsky. This introduction to the new French edition of "In Defense of Terrorism" is the third section of comrade Trotsky's series "Whither France" which is to be published in book form by Pioneer Publishers.

The sharpening of the class struggle, and especially the open emergence of the armed gangs of reaction, caused great ferment among the workers' organizations. The Socialist Party which had been peacefully performing the role of the spare wheel in the chariot of the Third Republic, found itself compelled to half-renege its cartel tradition, and even to break with its own right wing (the Neos). Concurrently, the Communists completed their evolution in just the opposite direction, but on a scale infinitely more extensive. Over a period of several years these gentlemen had raved deliciously about barricades, conquering the streets, and so on (their delirium, to be sure, remained primarily literary in nature). Now after February 6, 1934, realizing that the situation had taken a serious turn, the specialists in barricades scurried to the right. The normal reflex action of the scared phrasemongers coincided most propitiously with the new international orientation of Soviet diplomacy.

Status Quo—the Policy

Oppressed by the danger threatening from Hitler Germany, the policy of the Kremlin turned toward France. Status quo—in international relations! Status quo in the internal relations of the French regime! Hopes for the social revolution? Chimeras! The leading circles in the Kremlin refer as a rule only with contempt to French communism. One must hang on to what exists, lest things get worse. Parliamentary democracy in France is inconceivable without the Radicals; they must be supported by the Socialists. It is necessary to order the Communists not to hinder the bloc between Blum and Herriot, and if possible, the Communists, themselves, must join the bloc. No convulsions, no threats! Such is the course pursued by the Kremlin.

When Stalin renounces the world revolution, the bourgeois parties of France refuse to believe him. Needless caution! In politics, blind credulity is, of course, not a great virtue. But blind distrust is no better. One must know how to compare words with deeds and be able to recognize a general tendency of development over a period of years. The policy of Stalin, determined by the interests of the privileged Soviet bureaucracy, has become conservative through and through. The French bourgeoisie has ample reasons to place faith in Stalin. All the less reason for trust on the part of the French proletariat.

The Society for Bankrupts

During the Trade Union Unity congress at Toulouse, the "communist" Racamond gave a truly immortal formula of the policy of the People's Front: "How to overcome the timidity of the Radical Party?" How to overcome the bourgeoisie's fear of the proletariat? Very simply: the terrible revolutionists must fling away the knife clenched between their teeth, they must put pomade on their hair, and flinch the smile of the most fascinating courtesan. The result will be Vaillant-Couturier—latest model. Under the onset of the pomaded "communists," who with all their strength pushed the leftward moving Socialists to the right, Blum had to change his course once again, fortunately, in the accustomed direction. Thus arose the People's Front—the society for insuring Radical bankrupts at the expense of the capital of the working class organizations.

Radicalism is inseparable from Freemasonry. When we say this, we have said everything. During the debate in the Chamber of Deputies on the Fascist leagues, Mr. Xavier Vallat recalled that Trotsky had once "prohibited" French communists from participating in Masonic lodges. Mr. Jammy Schmidt, who we believe is a high authority in this field, immediately explained this edict by the incompatibility between despotic Bolshevism and the "free spirit." We shall not dispute this point with the Radical deputy. But we still consider that a labor representative, who seeks inspiration or solace in the vapid Masonic cult of class-collaboration, is unde-

serving of the slightest trust. It was not accidental that the cartel was supplemented by the extensive participation of the Socialists in the mummery of the lodges. Now the time has come for the repentant Communists, also, to don the aprons! Incidentally, the newly converted pupils will be able to serve the old masters of the cartel more comfortably in aprons.

Safety Valve for Capitalism

But, we are told not without indignation, the People's Front is not a cartel at all, but a mass movement. There is, of course, no lack of pompous definitions, but they do not change the nature of things. The job of the cartel always consisted in putting a brake upon the mass movement, directing it into the channels of class collaboration. This is precisely the job of the People's Front as well. The difference between them—and not an unimportant one—is that the traditional cartel was applied during the comparatively peaceful and stable epochs of the parliamentary regime. Now, however, when the masses are impatient and explosive, a more imposing brake is needed, with the participation of the "communists." Joint meetings, parade processions, oaths, mixing the banners of the Commune and of Versailles, noise, bedlam, demagoguery—all these serve a single aim: to curb and demoralize the mass movement.

While justifying himself in the Chamber before the Rights, Sarraut declared that his innocent concessions to the People's Front were nothing else than the safety valve of the regime. Such frankness may seem imprudent. But it was rewarded by violent applause from the benches of the extreme left. Ergo, there was no reason for Sarraut to be bashful. In any case, he succeeded, perhaps, not quite consciously, in providing a classic definition of the People's Front: a safety valve for the mass movement. M. Sarraut is generally lucky with his aphorisms!

Foreign Policy of People's Front

Foreign policy is the continuation of home policy. Having entirely renounced the viewpoint of the proletariat, Blum, Cachin and Co. adopt, under the screen of "collective security" and "international law," the viewpoint of national imperialism. They are preparing precisely the same policy of bootlicking which they had conducted in the years 1914 to 1918, adding only the phrase "For the Defense of the U.S.S.R." Yet during the years 1918-1923, when Soviet diplomacy was also obliged to veer considerably and to conclude a good many agreements, not a single one of the sections of the Communist International so much as even dared to think of a bloc with its own bourgeoisie! Is not this alone ample proof of the sincerity of Stalin's renunciation of the world revolution?

The self-same motives which impelled the present leaders of the Comintern to suckle at the paps of "democracy" in its period of agony, led them to discover the glorious image of the League of Nations, when the death rattle was already emanating from it. Thus was created a common platform of foreign policy between the Radicals and the Soviet Union. The home program of the People's Front is concocted of generalities which allow of as liberal an interpretation as does the Geneva covenant. The general meaning of the program is to leave everything as of old. Meanwhile, the masses refuse to accept the old any longer; therein lies the gist of the political crisis.

Proletarian Disarmament

Disarming the proletariat politically, the Blums, Paul Faures, Cachins and Thorezes are most concerned lest the workers arm themselves physically. The agitation of these gentlemen does not differ in any way from the preacher's sermons on the superiorities of the moral principles. Engels who taught that the problem of state power is the problem of armed detachments, and Marx who looked upon insurrection as an art seem to be akin to medieval barbarians in the eyes of the present deputies, senators and mayors of the People's Front. For the one hundred and first time, Populaire prints a cartoon picturing a naked worker with the caption: "You will learn that our bare fists are more solid than all your black-jacks." What a splendid contempt for military technique! Even the Abyssinian negus holds more progressive

views on this subject. The overturns in Italy, Germany and Austria apparently do not exist for these people. Will they cease singing paeans to "bare fists" when de la Rocque claps handcuffs upon them? Sometimes one feels sorry that such an experience cannot be afforded privately to the Messrs. Leaders, without involving the masses!

From the standpoint of the bourgeois regime as a whole, the People's Front represents an episode in the competition between Radicalism and Fascism for the attention and good graces of big capital. By their theatrical fraternization with Socialists and Communists, the Radicals want to prove to the master that the situation of the regime is not as bad as the Rights assert; that the threat of the revolution is not at all so great; that even Vaillant-Couturier has swapped his knife for a dog collar; that through the medium of the domesticated "revolutionists" it is possible to discipline the working masses, and, consequently, to save the parliamentary system from shipwreck.

Not all the Radicals believe in this maneuver; the most solid and influential among them, headed by Herriot prefer to take a watchful position. But in the last analysis they have nothing else to propose themselves. The crisis of parliamentarism is first of all the crisis of the confidence of the voters in Radicalism. Until some method for rejuvenating capitalism is discovered there is not and cannot be any recipe for the salvation of the Radical party. The latter has only the choice between two variants of political doom. Even the relative success it may score during the coming elections can neither avert nor even long postpone its shipwreck.

Is This a Bloc?

The leaders of the Socialist Party the most careful politicians in France, do not burden themselves with the study of the sociology of the People's Front. No one can learn anything from the endless monologues of Leon Blum. As for the Communists, the latter, extremely proud of their initiative in the cause of collaboration with the bourgeoisie, picture the People's Front as an alliance between the proletariat and the middle classes. What a parody on Marxism! The Radical party is not at all the party of the petty bourgeoisie. Nor is it a "bloc between the middle and the petty bourgeoisie," in accordance with the idiotic definition of the Moscow Pravda. The middle bourgeoisie exploits the petty bourgeoisie not only economically but also politically, and it itself is the agency of finance capital. To give the hierarchic political relations, based upon exploitation, the neutral name of a "bloc" is to make mock of reality. A horseman is not a bloc between a man and a horse. If the party of Herriot-Daladier extends its roots deeply into the petty bourgeoisie, and in part even into the working masses, it does so only in order to lull and dupe them in the interests of the capitalist order. The Radicals are the democratic party of French imperialism—any other definition is a lie.

The crisis of the capitalist system disarms the Radicals, depriving them of their traditional implements for lulling the petty bourgeoisie. "The middle classes" are beginning to sense if not to understand that it is impossible to save the situation through paltry reforms, that it is necessary to scrap audaciously the existing system. But Radicalism and audacity are as incompatible as fire and water. Fascism is fed above all by the growing lack of confidence of the petty bourgeoisie in Radicalism. One can say without fear of exaggeration that the political fate of France in the period immediately ahead will largely take shape depending upon the manner in which Radicalism will be liquidated, and who will fall heir to its legacy, i.e., the influence upon the petty bourgeoisie: Fascism or the party of the proletariat.

An Axiom of Marxism

The elementary axiom of Marxist strategy reads that the alliance between the proletariat and the little men of the city and country can be realized only in the irreconcilable struggle against the traditional parliamentary representation of the petty bourgeoisie. In order to attract the peasant to the side of the worker, it is necessary to tear the peasant away from the Radical politician, who subjects the peasant to finance capital. In contradistinction to this, the People's Front, the conspiracy between the labor bureaucracy and the worst political exploiters of the middle classes, is capable only of killing the faith of the masses in the revolutionary road and of driving them into the arms of the Fascist counter-revolution.

Unbelievable as it may seem, some cynics attempt to justify the policy of the People's Front by quoting Lenin, who, if you please, proved that there is no getting along without "compromises" and, in particular, without making agreements with other parties. It has become an established rule among the leaders of the present Comintern to make mock of Lenin; they trample underfoot all the teachings of the builder of the Bolshevik party, and then they take a trip to Moscow to kneel before his Mausoleum.

The Tradition of Lenin

Lenin began his activities in Czarist Russia, where not only the proletariat, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia but also wide circles of the bourgeoisie stood in opposition to the old regime. If the policy of the People's Front has any justification at all, one should imagine that it could be justified first of all in a country that has yet to achieve its bourgeois revolution. The Messrs. Falsifiers, however, would not do badly at all if they were to point out at what stage and under what conditions the Bolshevik party ever built even a semblance of the People's Front in Russia? Let them strain their imagination and rummage among the historical documents!

The Bolsheviks did conclude practical agreements with the revolutionary petty bourgeois organizations, for example, for joint li-

legal transport of revolutionary literature; sometimes for joint arrangements of a street demonstration; sometimes to repulse the Black Hundred gangs. During elections to the state Duma they did, under certain conditions, enter into electoral blocs with the Mensheviks or the Social Revolutionary parties, on the second ballot. That is all. No common "programs," no common and permanent institutions, no renunciation of the criticism of temporary allies. Such episodic agreements and compromises, confined strictly to practical aims—and Lenin never spoke of any other kind—have absolutely nothing in common with the People's Front which represents a conglomeration of heterogeneous organizations, a long term alliance between different classes, that are bound for an entire period—and what a period!—by a common program and a common policy, the policy of parades, declamations, and of throwing up smokescreens. The People's Front will fall to pieces at the first serious test, and deep fissures will open up in all of its component sections. The policy of the People's Front is the policy of betrayal.

The rule of Bolshevism on the question of blocs reads: march separately, strike together! The rule of the leaders of the present Comintern is: march together in order to be smashed separately. Let these gentlemen hold on to Stalin and Dimitroff, but leave Lenin in peace!

Is France Saved from Fascism?

It is impossible to read without indignation the declarations of the bragging leaders who allege that the People's Front has "saved" France from Fascism. In point of fact, they mean only to say that the mutual encouragement "saved" the scared heroes from their exaggerated fears. For how long? Between Hitler's first uprising and his coming to power, a decade elapsed, which was marked by frequent ebbs and flows. At that time, the German Blums and Cachins also used to proclaim more than once their "victory" over national socialism. We refused to believe them, and we were not mistaken. This experience, however, has taught the French cousins of Wels and Thaelmann nothing. In Germany, to be sure, the Communists did not participate in the People's Front, which united the social democracy with the bourgeoisie left, and the Catholic Center ("the alliance between the proletariat and the middle classes"). During that period the Comintern rejected even fighting agreements between working class organizations against Fascism. The results are quite well known. The warmest sympathy to Thaelmann as the captive of executioners cannot deter us from saying that his policy, i.e., the policy of Stalin, did more for Hitler's victory than the policy of Hitler himself. Having turned itself inside out, the Comintern now applies in France the quite familiar policy of the German Social Democracy. Is it really so difficult to foresee the results?

The coming parliamentary elections, no matter what their outcome, will not in themselves bring any serious changes into the situation: the voters, in the final analysis, are confronted with the choice between an arbiter of the type of Laval and an arbiter of the type, Herriot-Daladier. But inasmuch as Herriot has peacefully collaborated with Laval, and Daladier has supported them both, the difference between them is entirely insignificant, if measured by the scale of the tasks set by history.

(To be continued)

Dubinsky Finds a Haven in Roosevelt Camp

David Dubinsky, head of the International Ladies Garment Workers, has declared his support of Roosevelt. Another long-time member of the Socialist Party, Emil Rieve, president of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, pushed through his union convention a resolution endorsing Roosevelt. The General Executive Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers voted likewise, Joseph Schlossberg being the only one reported to have voted against the proposal. Among those voting with Sidney Hillman were Abraham Miller, Louis Hollander and Samuel Levin, Old Guard Socialists, while Leo Krzycki, national chairman of the Socialist Party, is asserted by the New Leader to have merely abstained on the vote.

These traitors give as their excuse for supporting Roosevelt the preposterous claim that Roosevelt will save the labor movement from reaction. They speak of Roosevelt in much the same terms with which the German Socialists supported Hindenburg in 1932. Fortunately, there is this difference in the analogy: the German bureaucracy dragged the whole Socialist movement along with them, while in America the main forces of the Socialist Party continue to fight for an independent proletarian course.

Thus the treachery of the Dubinskys and the Rieves stands out still more nakedly as the treachery of union bureaucrats who have reached a point in their degeneration where they drop even the pretense of being Socialists.

Logic of Right Wing Policy

Their treachery is the inevitable outcome of the Right wing Socialist policy of the last two decades in the "Socialist-controlled" unions. Built by class-conscious workers, these unions were from the first offered by Socialist Party members. Even when a bureaucracy developed in these unions and crystallized during the war years, it had to continue to render lip-service to the Socialism adhered to by the most active union members.

But after the 1919 split in the Socialist Party, there ceased to be even the semblance of a Socialist policy pursued under party direction in the unions. Under the specious formula of "cooperation with the unions, not trying to dominate them," the Hillquit leadership collaborated with the union bureaucracy in its class-collaboration policy, its venality, its persecution of the militant union members. When rank and file Socialists protested against this course, they were told by Hillquit that it would be a crime against the unions if Socialist union members joined together to formulate a policy for a union.

Living and Acting Like Bosses

Thus freed by Hillquit from any possible restraining influence of the Socialist rank and file, the Dubinskys were free to develop all the repulsive characteristics of a reformist trade union bureaucracy in an era of relative capitalist stability. Never called upon to give an accounting of themselves to the Socialist rank and file, much less called upon to collaborate with the Socialist workers in formulation of policy, the Dubinskys lived like bosses, acted like bosses, and thought like bosses; the psychology of the employers becomes far more akin to such bureaucrats than the psychology of the workers whom they dominate so ruthlessly.

So long as the Communist Party was a revolutionary organization, whose organized fractions in the trade unions confronted the Socialist bureaucrats with the needs of the workers, the Dubinskys found it easier to maintain their control by retaining their Socialist membership, thus being able to assert that their differences with the Communist Party was one within the proletariat. But with the degeneration of the Communist Party, and its resultant impotence in the unions, this restraining influence disappeared. Meanwhile, the generation of Socialist workers who built the needle trades unions has been dying off. The younger generation which has taken their place were not met by organized Socialist activity which drew them into the party; and those who went to the Socialist Party on their own initiative were repelled by the fact that they and the Dubinskys were members of the same party. It is a sobering fact to realize what a small percentage of the present union membership even vote Socialist or Communist, as compared to the solid Socialist ranks of the generation which built these unions.

Thus the stage has long been set for the treachery of the Dubinskys. They have been treacherous in their

whole course in the unions. There only remained that they should set the formal seal on this treachery by coming out in support of capitalist politicians.

So long as the Old Guard remained in control of the Socialist Party, the Dubinskys found the mantle of Socialism useful enough so that they refrained from making open commitments with capitalist politicians (in New York, however, they tacitly supported Governor Lehman). But with the collapse of the Old Guard, the Dubinskys dared not remain "Socialists" any longer.

One has only to read the full—and laudatory—reports in the New Leader, April 25, of Dubinsky's speeches before the cloakmakers and the United Hebrew Trades, to see clearly his real animus. His attack on the Communists and on the united front for May Day is just window-dressing. The source of his rage is the fact that the Militant Socialists have adopted a policy of organized Socialist activity in the trade unions and are building Socialist Leagues to formulate and carry out policy in the unions. This, according to Dubinsky, is a "Communist assault on the unions." "Dubinsky deplored what he characterized as the attempt by the Socialist Party, under the leadership of the left wing group, to dictate policies to the labor unions, and abandonment of the policy of cooperation with the trade unions." Dubinsky wept for the good old days of Hillquit:

"The party of Morris Hillquit had won the reputation for seeking to work harmoniously with the labor movement, and now the Socialist Party, under the leadership of Norman Thomas, endeavors to split and disrupt the labor movement."

Dubinsky's Hatred of 'Militants'

Here is the root of Dubinsky's hate and fear of the Militant Socialists; and well may he fear. For despite their present weaknesses, the Socialist Leagues in the unions constitute the most serious threat to the Dubinskys in a decade. In these leagues, inevitably, the Socialist workers will hammer out a class-struggle union policy and come to grips with the bureaucrats.

We are sure that these Socialist workers, who know Dubinsky and his like at close range, are happiest of all that these traitors are no longer members of the Socialist Party. A deadening weight has been lifted from the shoulders of the Socialist workers; they are freer to recruit the masses in the unions to Socialism.

It is unfortunate that the Dubinskys were permitted to take the initiative and choose their own opportunity to leave the Socialist Party. They should have been driven out long ago by the party on its own initiative. The workers dominated and oppressed by the bureaucrats would have had all the more respect for the Socialist Party had it done so. Nevertheless, the fact that the Dubinskys are no longer covered by the mantle of Socialism is a good, healthy sign of the leftward development of the Socialist Party. Given a continuation of this development, and one Dubinsky will be replaced by a thousand honest workers.

We refrain from commenting at length on the truly disgusting behavior of the Old Guard Socialists. Dubinsky abandons Socialism and jumps on the Roosevelt bandwagon. Not a word of reproof from the Old Guard Socialists! Instead, they give columns and columns to his bellyhoo for Roosevelt and attacks on the Militant Socialists. The Old Guard taunts Krzycki for abstaining on the Roosevelt vote in the Amalgamated; and if it is true, Krzycki deserves the severest treatment. But not a word in the New Leader about the three official and six non-party Old Guardsists who voted for Roosevelt! The most likely explanation is that the Old Guard is leaving the door open for them to follow Dubinsky, Rieve, Miller, et al, into the Roosevelt camp.

WORKERS

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

1884-1935 Organized, managed by and for workers with only one purpose: to render protection to members and their families, and to support all endeavors and struggles for the improvement of toilers.

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

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

Monthly assessments from 45c to \$2.10. For further information apply to Main Office:

714 Seneca Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Peoples Front Salvages Radicals in Elections

(Continued from Page 1) be realized, the relationship of forces in the new Chamber will differ little from that in the last.

In the last Chamber the "left" bloc numbered 314 out of the total 611 (of these the Radicals had 151; S.P., 93; C.P., 10; the dissident communists, 10; and Paul Boncour's Socialist and Republican Union, 39).

In the new Chamber, a "left" majority—320-340 out of 618—can be had only with the participation of the Radicals, including both the "faithful" and the dubious friends of the People's Front.

In other words, if the Radicals choose (i.e., if they are so ordered by French finance capital), they may agree to head a People's Front government, or even participate in it with Leon Blum as Premier; or they may prefer to enter into a bloc with the reactionaries of the Center or the Right as they have done innumerable times in the past.

The Merry-Go-Round Again

Thus, the "victory" merely re-

produces under more tense conditions the main aspects of the Chamber that was elected in 1932. The old Chamber was also the result of a "leftward sweep," it was likewise headed by the "left" government of Daladier-Frot, the government which capitulated in 1934 to the Fascists. We have the same setting, and even the same leading actors from Daladier down, supported by an extra cast of Stalinists and Socialists.

It is the good old merry-go-round. It is therefore not surprising to find that the editor of the New York Sun holds the same views on the subject of the French elections as does the Manchester Guardian and Ludwig Lore of the New York Post, who, in turn, is in agreement with Harry Gannes and the Daily Worker.

On April 29, the New York Sun carried an editorial entitled "A Blow at Fascism," which pointed out that Fascism took "a beating" at the ballot boxes. The English liberal Manchester Guardian sees

the Fascists turning into "respectable conservatives." Ludwig Lore prophetically foretold in his column a few days before the elections that the "French Fascists Seem About to Join the 3-toed Horse"; and Gannes and the Daily Worker shout with him that "Fifty Million Frenchmen Can't Be Wrong!" (April 29), and that "Fascism was effectively smashed by the results of the elections on Sunday in France." (H. Gannes in D.W., April 28).

Fascist bullets and knives cannot be exorcized by ballots, not even by such magicians as Lore or Gannes.

While the misleaders of the French working class are celebrating the "defeat" of Fascism, the agencies of finance capital are swinging into action.

Finance-Capital Into Action

Even though the leftward movement of the masses is being dissipated by the bankrupt and reactionary labor bureaucracies of the C.P. and the S.P., it constitutes a dire threat of the rulers of France. They mean to stem the movement and sow demoralization even before the run-offs. The prices on the stock market are tumbling, and preparations are being completed to suspend the threat of devaluing the franc (which can be done by the bankers whenever they choose) over the victory-drunk

ETHIOPIA BETRAYED!

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

Last independent state in Africa succumbs under the fire of Fascist armies.

Mussolini aided by diplomatic game of Litvinov, Eden and Flandrin.

League of Nations promises . . . but uses Ethiopia as a pawn of imperialist struggles.

Bankruptcy of Second and Third Internationals again revealed.

Questions and Discussion

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