

NEW MILITANT

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

VOL. 2, NO. 21 [WHOLE NO. 73]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1936

PRICE 3 CENTS

Tobin Plug-Uglies Slug 574 Heads

V. R. Dunne and Geo. Frosig Attacked by Thugs
In New Union--Busting Campaign
by Reactionaries

MINNEAPOLIS, May 22.—The campaign of terrorism directed against progressive trade union leaders in Minneapolis reached a new peak Thursday morning, May 21, when Vincent Dunne and George Frosig, organizer and vice-president of General Drivers Local No. 574, were attacked and severely beaten by five thugs driving a black Buick sedan. The militant leaders of the truck drivers' union were distributing leaflets advertising a union meeting and talking with a truck driver at the Omaha freight yards when the sedan drew up and the five assailants leaped out, attacking Dunne and Frosig with black-jacks. Both were badly cut and bruised. As the attackers climbed back into their car, one of them turned and said, "This is a warning."

Two of the thugs were recognized by Frosig and Dunne as a part of a crew of eight tough-looking characters who last Saturday morning drove up to the leading platform at the Chippewa Water Company where 574 officials were talking to the drivers. They announced they were representatives of the Teamsters Joint Council of the American Federation of Labor, but did not attempt any violence. There was a large number of members of Local 574 present at the time at the Chippewa Water Company platform. The car in which the eight men appeared at the Chippewa Company was also a black Buick sedan.

Local 574, after winning three famous strikes in 1934, was expelled from the International Teamsters Union in April, 1935 by Daniel Tobin, president, for alleged non-payment of per capita tax. Ever since that time, Tobin, together with other local and national craft union A. F. of L. leaders, has been seeking to smash Local 574 and build a dual teamsters union in Minneapolis. Since last October, Meyer Lewis, a representative of William Green, has been here directing the attack against the drivers' union, the leading exponent of industrial unionism in the Northwest. Lewis' campaign against the progressive union movement in Minneapolis has so far met with little success.

Last week, Mr. Lewis gave a statement to the press announcing that the American Federation of Labor would use every force available to combat the "dual and outlaw" unions. In the past two weeks, three known progressive trade unionists have been beaten up by unknown thugs and told to leave town. The attack on Dunne and Frosig brings the list of victims up to five.

Fascists Gain In Belgium

People's Front Loses Mirror
Future for France

In last Sunday's general elections in Belgium, the Socialists (the Belgian Labor Party or P.O. B.) lost ground, losing three seats for a total of 70, but despite this became the largest single party in the Belgian parliament because the Catholic Center suffered a much greater loss, dropping about one-fifth of their former strength.

As is always the case, the disintegration of the Center was accompanied by the growth of the two extreme wings. The Belgian Socialists increased their votes from about 13,000 in 1932 to 35,000, adding six seats for a total of 9. The most spectacular gains were scored by the budding Fascist party of the Rexist, who participated in the elections for the first time, and obtained some 250,000 votes.

No People's Front in Belgium?
According to the Daily Worker, the results of the Belgian elections are a brilliant confirmation of the Stalinist policies in France and elsewhere, particularly in Belgium. The Socialists lost and the Fascists gained, because, mind you, there was no People's Front in Belgium. Instead, in Belgium "the Socialists are united in a 'National Union' with the reactionary parties of the Clericals and Liberals" (T. Repard, Daily Worker, May 25, Our emphasis).

The Daily Worker takes on trust the credulity, inexperience and ignorance of its readers in its attack upon the policies of the Belgian Socialists. In the sphere of domestic or foreign policy if there is any difference between them and the policy of the People's Front, it is all in favor of the Belgians. Enough to mention the fact that the economic "program" of the People's Front in France consists of sections lifted from the "Plan" of the C.G.T. which Jouhaux and Co. in turn lifted from the Plan of Henri de Man, their Belgian colleague.

In the sphere of foreign policy, the Belgian National Unioners are as solid for the League of Nations and for organizing peace and disarmament as the People's Fronters in France. But they are not as outspokenly pro-Franco-Soviet as the Stalinists would like. Hence, the "sharp" criticism.

Only Stalinists Excluded
The only other difference between
(Continued on Page 4)

Spanish S.P. Nears Split

Right Wing Takes Sanctions
Against Left; Convention
Postponed

MADRID, May 28.—The Right-wing-controlled National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party today made the following splitting moves to expel the Left Wing majority.

1. Postponed the national party congress from June to October.
2. Authorized district committees to dissolve those section organizations deemed not to be complying with all instructions of the National Executive Committee, the latter immediately to superintend the reorganization of the dissolved sections.
3. Denounced "Claridad," Largo Caballero's paper, as an enemy of the party, and demanded that it immediately settle its debts, amounting to several thousands of dollars, to the party printing works.

4. Took steps to publish, in addition to the Right wing-controlled "El Socialista," an evening newspaper ("Claridad" is an evening paper).

"Claridad" and the Madrid organization, largest of the party sections, denounced the actions of the N.E.C. and declared "the Socialist Party cannot consent to be the object of this farce and comedy" and called for election of a new N.E.C. as "a question of life or death for the party."

The struggle in the Spanish Socialist Party, long developing, came to a crisis when President Azana invited the Right wing leader, Indalecio Prieto, to become premier and form a coalition cabinet. Prieto and the N.E.C. were more than willing to do so but the volume of protests from party organizations throughout Spain forced them to desist.

A recent referendum of the party on the demand of the Left Wing that the national congress be held in Madrid, demonstrated that the Left wing has a clear majority in the party.

In a signed article in "Claridad" on the eve of the election of Azana by the electoral congress, Javier Bueno, Socialist leader of the Asturian rebellion, denounced Azana as the candidate of the Jesuits and rightists. The hostility of the Left wing was not organized, however, and most Socialists voted for Azana. But since then, in a speech declaring his position in preparation for the forthcoming party congress, Largo Caballero himself declared his lack of faith in the Popular Front.

Day to Day Report Of S.P. Convention At Cleveland, Ohio

By JOHN WEST and MAX SHACHIMAN

CLEVELAND.—The struggle between the Right and Left wings of the Socialist Party, dramatized two years ago by the victory of the Militant group at the Detroit national convention and the adoption of the much-discussed "Declaration of Principles," reached a new climax at the nineteenth national convention of the Socialist Party. Following the action taken by the majority of the 250 delegates from all parts of the country, the New York Old Guard, led by Louis Waldman, James Oneal and Algernon Lee, has definitely parted company with the Socialist Party and is organizing an association of conservative social democrats all its own. The tremendous significance of this separation for the future of the revolutionary movement of the United States is evident when one compares the split in Cleveland in 1936 with the split produced by the first post-war crisis in the Socialist Party at its Chicago convention in 1919. Whereas the latter convention marked the triumph of the Hillquit-Oneal Right wing and the ousting of the Left wing assembled around the Communists, the 1936 convention, on the other hand, repudiated the fossilized representatives of Old Guard Socialism which has produced such tragic catastrophes in the international working class movement.

The convention provided another contrast, however, with the crisis in 1919. Whereas the struggle between Left and Right in 1919 represented a fairly clear-cut division between the revolutionary Marxist current and the Right wing bureaucracy in control of the party, the fight of the various tendencies in 1936 is far more complicated in its divisions by virtue of the fact that the bloc which held together against the New York Old Guard consists of tendencies which are far removed from common conceptions on the fundamental problems pressing for solution in the Socialist Party.

Because of the fact that so much depends on the development of the struggle in the Socialist Party, the reader should have before him an accurate picture of the important issues before the convention as can be given in this space.

The underlying issues facing the Socialist Party, but still unclarified, were implicit in the keynote speeches delivered at the opening session. The contrast between the two principal opening speeches, those of Daniel W. Hoan and Norman Thomas, suggested almost the form of a debate, an impression which was emphasized by their repetition of key passages for the newsreel cameras. Hoan laid his chief emphasis upon advocacy of a "Farmer-Labor Party" which, in his statement of it, clearly meant

a conservative combination of reformers of all brands similar to the petty bourgeois mess into which the Socialist Party of Wisconsin has been dragged by association with the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation organized in that state under the aegis of the LaFollette dynasty.

On this score, Norman Thomas delivered his most decisive remarks of the convention. Contrary to Hoan, he stressed the necessity of socialism and of a socialist campaign in the presidential elections and dismissed the Farmer-Labor Party with simple reference to the impossibility of its organization in 1936, at any rate. His remarks about those labor leaders who had jumped on the Roosevelt bandwagon with the slogan of "Roosevelt or Reaction" were entirely in order. Thomas rightly compared this piece of deception with such treacherous slogans as "Wilson or War" in 1916, pointing out that just as we had got Wilson and war, so the victory of the Lewis-Hillman-Dubinsky course would mean Roosevelt and Reaction. He insisted that the only genuine choice before the workers in the present period was: Socialism or Reaction and Imperialist War. Even if his speech was gravely marred by ambiguous formulations on more than one question—that of the Farmer-Labor Party not excluded—the great stress he laid on a straightforward socialist campaign so obviously harmonized with the sentiments of most of the delegates that he was constantly interrupted by bursts of applause.

Indeed, significant of convention sentiment was the fact that while Krayczyk's "prediction" that there would be a strong Farmer-Labor Party in this country "before many months are over" was greeted apathetically, spontaneous applause followed every statement of a clear cut campaign for socialism. The temper of the delegates is not so much to be judged by their mild interest or outright unconcern in those sections of the three keynote speeches which were diluted with liberal and reformist platitudes, but by their enthusiastic response to any sentence that smacked of militant socialist aims and tactics.

This was even more clearly evidenced in the spirit prevailing during the fight over the seating of one of the two contesting delegations from New York, a dispute which consumed most of the time of the numerous sessions devoted to organizing the convention itself. The fight was at bottom a highly significant struggle between political tendencies—the delegation headed by Thomas representing the general line of the Militant group and that headed by Waldman representing the Old Guard. The stage of the development of the political struggle in the Socialist Party is still embryonic and more often than

not the underlying issues of principle are obscured by the emphasis laid on the confusing organizational aspects they assume. Nevertheless, those speeches that broke through the organizational crust and touched the political heart of the conflict, were the ones that aroused the keenest interest of the delegates and created the clearest demarcations.

Preliminary Skirmishes

The first test of strength came in the vote on seating the disputed New Jersey delegations. The National Executive Committee, functioning as a credentials committee and represented by reporter Kruger, proposed the seating of the Militant delegation. Oneal, as minority reporter, proposed a contrary motion. The N.E.C. proposal was upheld by a vote of 115 to 55. The minority was composed of the Right wing delegations drawing their main strength from Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, parts of Pennsylvania, Washington, Montana and some scattering delegates. The majority vote was made up of a combination of the delegates supporting the Militant group, plus 30 out of the 31 delegates from Wisconsin. The vote of the majority was not greater because, due to the contest, neither of the two New York delegations was permitted to vote until their own dispute was decided by the uncontested delegates.

Rhode Island and Texas were settled in favor of the Militants with approximately the same division, bringing the Left wing strength up a notch or two after each decision. The section of the Pennsylvania delegation led by Darlington Hoopes of Reading, who had been leaning strongly towards the Old Guard without committing himself too irrevocably, had been challenged prior to the convention and on its floor. The Credentials Committee, however, upheld the claims of the Hoopes group, and just before the fight opened up over the New York contest, the challenge against Hoopes was withdrawn, thus seating his contingent without actual dispute.

Among the results of this arrangement was the loss by the New York Old Guard of the outright support of the Reading delegation upon which they had previously counted. Other results of the arrangement were made clear to observers in the discussion of other questions brought on the floor at later sessions, as will be seen below.

Old Guard States Its Case

The settlement of all these minor disputes set the stage for the New York contest—the one which aroused the sharpest division at the convention. After considerable parliamentary jockeying, Oneal led off

(Continued on Page 4)

Statement of Minnesota S. P. on Farmer Labor Party Question

Editor's Note: The following is a statement on the Farmer-Labor Party question adopted by a Conference of the Socialist Party of Minnesota, and submitted by it to the delegates at the Cleveland Convention of the Socialist Party. In a shortened form it was submitted for a vote to the Convention, and lost after vigorous defense by left wing delegates. It is of particular interest and importance, coming from the one State in the union where a Farmer-Labor Party is actually, and has for some time been, in existence and in power.

In the United States, as throughout the rest of the capitalist world, capitalism is now in its declining stage. The international drive for profits by the capitalist class in all lands places an ever-increasing burden on the workers. American workers are not excepted from this burden. The struggle of American capitalists to retain their place in the world markets against the ever-sharper competition of foreign imperialists, batters down living standards of the workers and farmers of this country.

To halt this process, to preserve their most elementary democratic rights, to win back any ground which they have lost, the toilers of America must now wage sharper, more determined and more militant struggles. In such struggles, a national Farmer-Labor party would

not serve the working class. When capitalism was in its ascendant phase, a reformist party could have served the workers and farmers of America. Today with the decay of capitalism, reformism can no longer play a progressive role in America.

Today several groups in the United States seek to bring into being a national Farmer-Labor party. These groups make the most irresponsible and false promises to the masses as to what a Farmer-Labor Party is able to accomplish. All these groups seek to build their national Farmer-Labor party on the basis of class-collaboration, political trading and compromise; they seek to place in leadership of such a party not workers but liberal elements, and in many cases opportunistic bourgeois politicians who see in such a party a vehicle to better their own political fortunes. Up to now, the bulk of the trade union movement has not endorsed the building of a national Farmer-Labor party.

Today at this Socialist Party convention there are only two delegations from Minnesota, a state that once had a flourishing Socialist movement. There is a very significant reason for this. We Socialists of Minnesota have had a long and bitter experience with an actual Farmer-Labor party. We have had a better chance than comrades of other sections to observe the real functioning of such a party.

The Minnesota Farmer-Labor party was built in the 1920's by just the sort of devoted militant workers who are assembled in this convention. The radical and revolutionary workers built the Farmer-Labor party in Minnesota. We made thousands of good Farmer-Labor converts—and broke our own party in the process. The Minnesota Farmer-Labor party has been the main political power in our state since 1930. It has elected senators, governors, representatives, congressmen, mayors and other state and municipal officers. During this period the Minnesota Farmer-Labor party cannot record any gains commensurate with the tremendous energies devoted to its cause. On the contrary, the party has time after time betrayed the workers who elected it to power. The governor has brought in troops during strike situations against the demands of striking unions that he withhold such troops. Farmer-Labor Mayor Latimer of Minneapolis has personally conducted scabs through picket lines, with the help of the police which were under his control. He has used his police against every strike that has arisen since he took office. Twice he has used Farmer-Labor police to break up and club unemployed demonstrations. He has done all this despite the fact that he was elected to office by the largest majority

(Continued on Page 4)

2 Shot, 15 Jailed In L.A. Bean Strike

"Red Squad" Unleashes Terror Against Walk-out of 5,000 Agricultural Workers;
Defense Funds Urgently Needed

LOS ANGELES (By wire).—Two agricultural strikers were shot down and fifteen more arrested and held in high bail, as Los Angeles' notorious "Red Squad" attempted to terrorize the five thousand agricultural workers now on strike in this county.

This strike is the first big agricultural strike since the conviction of Chambers, Decker, Norman Mini and five others in the famous Sacramento criminal syndicalism case in April, 1935. It is the first real sign of recovery from that blow, and may be the signal for a wave of strikes similar to those of 1933 and 1934.

The two strikers were wounded by thugs armed with shotguns, who broke up the picket lines. The police then followed up, arresting fifteen Mexicans and Filipinos on the preposterous charge of assault with a deadly weapon! Strikers are shot—and strikers are then arrested for shooting! Bail was fixed at \$2,500 each. This is the second mass arrest in the strike, forty having been locked up last week.

The Los Angeles labor movement is rallying to the defense of the strike. Relief and defense are being provided by a trade union committee under the leadership of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. The Socialist Party has provided bail for a score of strikers. The Non-Partisan Labor Defense has provided counsel, taking care of the prisoners' needs, and raising money for bail bonds.

Defense funds are urgently needed. They should be sent to the Non-Partisan Labor Defense at 124 West 6th Street, Los Angeles.

Unions Rap Cotton Lords Co. Plot Ape Hitler

Rubber Workers and CLU
Rally Against Provocations
of Barons

By RICHARD FERGUSON

AKRON, May 25.—With the mass arrest of 31 union workers at the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. late last Saturday night the never-ending struggle between the rubber workers and their despotic bosses is entering a new and higher plane. All Akron is seething.

The arrests grew out of a 12-hour sit-down on May 20 inside Goodyear's plant 2, during which the unionists are charged with rioting and imprisoning foremen, supervisors and company union rats in a "bull pen" until the management settled the workers' grievances.

The mass arrests, coming late Saturday evening when it was almost impossible to arrange bail, is everywhere recognized as a deliberate move by the company to crush the union. All Akron labor is infuriated, especially because the company deputy who recently wounded five Goodyear workers by firing into their midst, has just been acquitted in the same court in which the company will try to get convictions against union men.

C.L.U. Supports Men

Responding immediately to their brothers' need of assistance, the Central Labor Union held a meeting of its Defense Committee, which aided so greatly in the Goodyear strike. The Committee has appealed for legal aid from the American Civil Liberties Union. It published a special resolution sharply condemning Goodyear's refusal to bargain collectively with the union, and attacked the man-

(Continued on Page 3)

Concentration Camps Set
Up to Defeat Tenant
Farmers Strike

By RICHARD FERGUSON

MEMPHIS, Tenn. — Thirty-five striking members of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union were thrown into jail at Earl, Arkansas late yesterday, as the strike of five thousand farm laborers held the cotton plantations in Eastern Arkansas in its grip for the second day. Earlier in the day, Peacher, deputy sheriff and large cotton planter, had threatened to arrest any day-laborer found on the streets of Earl. The Earl local of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union and all the locals throughout Crittendon County declare they will send all their men to fill the jails to overflowing before they will return to the fields at present starvation wages.

Many instances of terrorism and intimidation have been reliably reported to Union headquarters according to H. L. Mitchell, Secretary of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union. Workers in isolated areas have been driven to the cotton fields and forced to work by riding bosses who stand over them with high powered rifles. A. L. Lancaster, planter in that region, himself drove several people into the fields to work at the point of a gun. He remarked that he would build "a dam across the lake there with the bodies of dead Union men." A state official driving through Eastern Arkansas reported a large group of day laborers at work on the Blackfish plantation near Widener, Arkansas on U. S. Highway No. 70. He reported further that a man stood close by armed with a high-powered rifle.

(Continued on Page 2)

The Problem in Akron

By A. J. MUSTE

Several "sit-down" strikes have occurred recently in the Akron rubber plants including the Goodyear where a great strike came to an end only two months ago. Last Saturday thirty-one militants of Plant Two of Goodyear were suddenly rounded up on charges of rioting in connection with one of these "sit-downs". What is behind these turbulent developments?

As readers of the New Militant will recall, the "settlement" which marked the end of the Goodyear strike was by no means fully satisfactory to the workers. For one thing, the demand that the Goodyear company union be abolished, or at least that the company definitely agree no longer to finance it, was not achieved. Thus the workers went back partly as union men, a minority as company union men. Now no situation where a real union and a company union exists side by side can possibly be a static one. The employer immediately resorts to direct or indirect methods

to undermine the union. The union men, unless they are prepared to lose the ground which they have won in their strike struggle, must work to win over or eliminate non-union or anti-union workers. The fight is invariably transferred from the picket line to the plant. In this case the conflict is peculiarly sharp, because the men have maintained at top pitch the militancy which they displayed during the strike at Goodyear, the other big companies, and the employers in the basic industries generally are well aware that if the rubber union actually establishes itself, the movement in steel and automobiles will receive a tremendous impetus.

Conditions Still Bad

If there was a particle of ground left for the assertion that the "settlement" of March 21st effected even a partial adjustment of basic problems, that particle is now removed. Even the capitalist press admits this. The Cleveland Press,

(Continued on Page 2)

PERSECUTED BY STALIN

THE HONOR ROLL

We have long been uneasy about Solntzev. Recent letters bring us the grave news of his being hounded to death. . . . Still a young man (he was not more than 35 years old), Solntzev was among the most talented, true, and authoritative Bolshevik-Leninists. On his return from a mission to the U.S.A. in 1927-1928 where he went, we believe, with Pyatakoff, he was shortly arrested, and sent to an isolator for 3 years, then received an additional term of 2 years, serving this term in Verkhne-Uralsk; he was freed after the mass hunger strike of the Oppositionists against the added automatic "sentences" to new prison terms, and was exiled either to the Northern part of the Urals or Western Siberia (we are unable to recall the precise place) to an utterly forsaken spot, where he found himself absolutely alone, and of course doomed to total unemployment. Almost no letters at all reached him, letters from him to his friends would arrive in the ratio of one out of three. His wife and child were exiled to Minyusinsk—the disingenuous bureaucrats still sought to break the fighter by destroying his personal life. In the middle of 1935, Solntzev was once again arrested in exile where he could not have failed to have been politically inactive. He was given a new sentence: 5 years in the isolator, to which he immediately replied by a hunger-strike to death if needed. On the 18th day of the hunger strike he was informed that the sentence had been revoked. Death was nearing, and the executioners became "embarrassed." For, the news would spread! Solntzev was given exile to Minyusinsk, i.e., the possibility to see his wife and son. Still convalescing, he was sent off under police escort, together with criminals, in prison cars, from one sinking transport jail of the old regime to the next. En route, in Novosibirsk he had to have an emergency operation. He had an inflammation of the middle ear, and he died on an infirmary cot in January, 1936.

It is impossible to convey in words the meaning of this loss to the Russian communists. His image will have to be restored; we will always remember him. As a theoretician, as an exemplary personality, crystal pure in character, as an unwavering proletarian revolutionist, capable of bearing up under everything and of sacrificing everything for years, Solntzev left an indelible impression upon everybody who knew him. We in Russia considered him as possibly the outstanding of our young and future leaders.

The writer of these lines doesn't like to exaggerate, and knows the value of words—he also knows that it was impossible to overestimate Solntzev.

They tormented him to death. They also knew him, and they evaluated him in their own fashion.

Vassili Fedorovich Pankratov

V. F. Pankratov is one of the most devoted and influential of Russian Oppositionists. A former sailor in the Baltic fleet, participant of the revolution in Kronstadt, delegate of the Kronstadt Soviet to Kerensky, participant of the civil war, important member of the Cheka and the G.P.U., Oppositionist since 1923, vice-chairman of the Trans-Caucasian collegium of the G.P.U., he was arrested as a Bolshevik-Leninist in 1928 and sentenced to three years imprisonment. Upon the expiration of the term in Verkhne-Uralsk, in view of his upright character, he received an additional term of 2 years. In 1933 he was freed and exiled to Orenburg, where his wife Elizabeth Senatskaya also resided in exile. She was in reality not a party member, and was exiled solely because she was Pankratov's wife. In Orenburg, Pankratov worked as an economist in Zagotzerno, and quickly earned the confidence of the management of this institution as a trusty and exemplary co-worker. He was arrested after the Kirov affair, without the slightest pretext for new persecutions, discounting of course, the "legal" pretext of his remaining true to his convictions. Pankratov served four to five months in complete isolation. His pregnant wife had absolutely no news from him during this time. Later we learned that Pankratov was once again in the Verkhne-Uralsk prison for a five-year term, to which he was sentenced after an absolutely monstrous and cruel investigation and trial, about which we cannot say anything now. He was recently lodged in the prison in a common cell with L. B. Kamenev, Smilga, and Stepkov.

The name of Pankratov must become widely known to the proletarian revolutionists, as the name of one of the most valuable and courageous representatives of the October traditions in the U.S.S.R. whose life must be protected from the Stalinist stranglers.

Lado Dumbadze

L. Dumbadze is an old Georgian Bolshevik, participant in the civil war, wounded at the front, arrested

several times, committed to prisons and exiles. He fell gravely ill, after receiving a long prison term in 1934 as a Bolshevik-Leninist and being sent to Susdal prison. The prison regime caused an extreme aggravation of a condition resulting from a wound he received at the front. Dumbadze began gradually to lose the ability to move both his hands. Comrades in the cell had to dress him, feed him, etc. The prison commission of the G.P.U. headed by Andreyeva, on one of its inspection tours, promised to arrange medical treatments for him. As a result, he was shortly transferred to the Butyrski infirmary in which, for technical reasons, he could not receive treatments. Then his martyrdom began. The half-paralyzed veteran was shunted—under what conditions!—from exile to prison, from prison to exile; he is brought to unequipped infirmaries, and suddenly thrown out and left to his own devices. In February and March, 1936 he turned up in exile in Sarapul, all alone—there are no comrades there, so that he has nobody to help him even to dress or undress; he has no resources (the G.P.U. dispenses unemployment "relief" of . . . 40 rubles a month, while a corner in a lodging room not less than 30 rubles); he is helpless, made a wreck by a progressing disease.

A tragic letter of his circulated in exile; it is written as a child writes, in printed letters.

Entire from nooks and corners of the world there does not rise the voice of the advanced representatives of the working class, demanding that Lado Dumbadze, a veteran of the October Revolution be given immediate medical treatment and an opportunity to live like a human being, even within the walls of the bureaucratic prisons, then our comrade is doomed to die shortly.

Mikhail Bodrov

A Moscow worker, soldier in the Red Army during the civil war, Bolshevik-Leninist. Early in 1928, after L. D. Trotsky was exiled to Alma Ata, comrade M. Bodrov was sent by the organization to Alma Ata to serve as a contact between Moscow and L. D. Trotsky. Assuming the appearance of an Ural peasant, with a beard and proper papers, M. Bodrov obtained horses and wagon and used to make regular trips as coachman between Alma Ata and the nearest railway station (city of Frunze, more than 20 versts distant). Under very difficult conditions, comrade Bodrov gave proof of great firmness, coolness and skill. Solving his task in a splendid fashion, he assured a connection for L. D. Trotsky with Moscow, at the most difficult point. After maintaining himself almost a year, comrade Bodrov was arrested in connection with another "case" but was also "exposed" as the coachman. He sat for several months in various jails, and then was exiled. Arrested once again, he spent three years (1931-1934) in the Verkhne-Uralsk prison. At present he is in exile. Other reports say that he has been sent to a concentration camp.

Gregory Stopalov

Entered the party in 1917, and while still a student participated actively in the revolutionary struggle in the Ukraine. During the civil war worked in the Ukraine, in particular, underground under Denikin. A Bolshevik-Leninist since 1923, comrade G. Stopalov graduated the Institute of "Red Professors." An excellent economist, author of a number of scientific works, G. Stopalov is one of the outstanding young oppositionists. A number of programmatic and other important documents of the basic kernel of the Bolshevik-Leninists in the Verkhne-Uralsk isolator come from the pen of comrade Stopalov.

After serving three years in prison—1929-1932—comrade G. Stopalov had hardly managed to settle

down in his new place of residence when he was again arrested and once more sentenced to three years in prison. In 1933, comrade Stopalov's wife, comrade Lemberskaya, was also clapped in jail. She is an active Oppositionist, member of the party since the civil war, a former teacher in a party school.

IN ORENBURG EXILE

In Orenburg exile there are at the present time a number of outstanding comrades of the Communist Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists): B. M. Elzin, an old Bolshevik, Lida Svalova, I. Belenki, I. Byk, V. M. Cherykh, F. A. Upstein, Leonid Guirshok. Last year B. I. Lyakhovitsky and A. S. Santalov were taken from exile and placed in a concentration camp. All these comrades are devoted, firm, and convinced Communist Oppositionists, several of them outstanding leaders. There have already been forged in exile and prisons remarkable, devoted and deeply convinced revolutionists, who bear up with extraordinary firmness under systematic strangulation.

After the Kirov affair, there were arrested the following comrades who had recently left the prisons and who received new long prison terms: V. F. Pankratov (served 5 years; received another 5 years; his wife and child have been exiled to Astrakhan) and Ch. M. Pevzner (served 4 years, received 5 years additional).

Here are also to be found, at least until recently, several dozen exiled "Trotskyists," former Oppositionists, who had capitulated long ago, or who had secondary differences with the ruling group. Their names: Mlneradze (professor of philosophy), B. D. Prozorov (history instructor from Dnepropetrovsk), Kazhacheyev (in December 1935 finished his term of exile, after a concentration camp, and now again arrested, after four months), Dimitrieff (history teacher in the high schools of Ivanovo-Voznesensk, recently again sent to concentration camp), Udin, Radin, M. R. Sorokina (she recently concluded her exile, and was freed) Solovyan, and Chernoborodov. They all call themselves supporters of the general line of the party.

Among the "Right Communist": I. G. Bocharov (he recently received "minus 15"; after serving a three year term of exile).

Among the Mensheviks: G. D. Kuchin, Goldberg, the Estonian Zommer, who arrived from prison and was recently again arrested (he will probably be taken to a concentration camp). There are also several S. R.'s. Of the S. R.'s here, a member of the C.E.C., Gerstein dead more than a year ago. He received permission to go for a cure to Kazan on the day he died. Several socialists have been sentenced to a new term of exile for having sent in their time letters to the French Socialist and Communist papers, halting the united front—which was done of course not without the tacit consent of the powers that be.

Of the Georgian social democrats there is the old man Ramishvili.

Among the anarchists: A. A. Inaun, Kornilov (recently ended his exile), P. Sokolov. (In the last two years has made the rounds of almost all the concentration camps in the U.S.S.R.) Sokolov is a Leninist worker, a house painter, exiled for consorting with students.

Represented here are also Communists from among the national minorities and Zionists. The overwhelming majority of the worker-communist population in exile, including the "general-liners," i.e., former oppositionists, the "supporters of the general line" have been arrested for "careless" remarks. Out of approximately 150 exiles in Orenburg, they comprise about 100. They are very little developed and passive individuals.

Here are also more than a thousand Leningraders, exiled after the Kirov affair. Among them, there are many women, old men and children.

His Hire, "Arkansas Planters Unfair to Organized Labor," "We Can't Live on 75c a Day," "The Unemployed Workers of Memphis Won't Scab." Planters who came to Memphis which is the market for cotton laborers were unable to obtain any workers, Negro or white, to cross the bridge to take the jobs of the strikers. Will Lee, Memphis chief of police, said in court that 700 workers had been turned back at the bridge and 40 tucks unloaded by the pickets.

Tuesday morning two large trucks from the Wilson plantation (largest cotton plantation in Arkansas) succeeded in securing only five men. Chief Lee, who defended the arrests told the Arkansas planters that if any more pickets interfered with their attempts to obtain day laborers "to beat them down with clubs and the law would protect them." He told the men arrested that "he was going to break up this damn business" and if any of them returned to the bridge "he would beat the hell out of them."

Cotton Lords Ape Hitler

(Continued from Page 1)

The strike of farm laborers was called on May 18 with the workers demanding \$1.50 per 10 hour day. The present starvation wages paid by the planters are 75 cents per day from sun-up to sun-set. The cotton "chopping" or "weeding" time is now at its height and the crops are in danger of being choked by weeds.

Four pickets from the Memphis local of the Workers Alliance of America were found guilty in police court of "disorderly conduct." The Workers Alliance had undertaken to support the strike of farm laborers in Arkansas and on Monday morning stationed pickets at the Harahan bridge which crosses the Mississippi into Arkansas. They carried placards bearing the slogans: "A Laborer is Worthy of

ON THE FLYING TRAPEZE AGAIN

Recognizing that the draft program of the Left wing of the Socialist Party is a step forward, Alex Bittelman undertakes the task, nay! the duty of proving helpful to the Left Socialists. 'It is our plain duty to show what's what and who's who in the draft program.' (p. 3.)

What keeps the Socialists from really going left in their program are "harmful influences." Who? On the one hand the pseudo-Lefts like Zam; and on the other hand—"influences of a kind that cannot be characterized otherwise than as those of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism." (p. 3.)

Bittelman divides his "work" into two parts: I. Questions of Program; II. Questions of Tactics. Under the first head, he deals with "fundamental programmatic questions of the present epoch." These are four (4), and read as follows:

- 1) The Dictatorship of the Proletariat (i.e., the nature of the workers' state).
2) Soviet power (i.e., the form of the workers' state).
3) The road to power (i.e., the method of attaining the workers' state).
4) The two worlds or "The Outstanding Victory of the World Proletariat at the Present Time" (i.e., "the final and irrevocable victory of socialism in the Soviet Union"—p. 16).

Under the second head, he deals with six (6) "tactics": 1) Fascism, 2) War and "The Struggle for Peace"; 3) United Front; 4) Trade Union Unity; 5) Farmer-Labor Party; 6) Organic Unity.

Very well. For argument's sake we shall allow Bittelman his four "principles" and his six "tactics" which all "revolve around one central point" (p. 17). We shall later deal with each one separately. First we wish to examine how the Socialist draft fares in the light of Bittelman's own specifications.

Concessions Run Amok

On the very first page, as was said above, we are informed of the deficiencies in the draft due to the harmful influences. Where are these to manifest themselves if not in the "fundamental" questions?

In fundamental issue No. 1 (Dictatorship of Proletariat) Bittelman uncovers "two serious weaknesses" (p. 8). The first of which is a concession to the Old Guard; the second—"a concession to the 'Lefts' of the Zam variety." (p. 8). The Left Socialists it appears are going . . . ultra-right and ultra-left at one and the same time.

In fundamental issue No. 2 (Soviet power) the Left Socialists are reminded of the sin they committed in issue No. 1, for no "genuine Left (can) afford to be ambiguous . . . on such a vital and fundamental point of revolutionary principle" (p. 7). And Bittelman immediately condemns them again for "another concession to reformism" (p. 11).

As regards fundamental issue No. 3 (Road to Power), the draft, according to B., states the correct premise but the conclusion it draws is a compromise conclusion, "a compromise with reformist influences" (p. 13); "strongly influenced by reformism" (p. 13); "a bad compromise with reformist influence" (p. 13).

On crucial issue No. 4 (Socialism in one country), the Lefts are once again charged with setting down a correct premise but, this time, of failing to draw any conclusions whatsoever. As any Marxist knows the failure to draw the revolutionary conclusions is no minor charge, either. So Bittelman wants to know: "Why?" "Why this reluctance?" (p. 15); "Why these omissions?" (p. 16). What makes Bittelman hound the Left Socialists so is the fact that the draft "says nothing of the final and irrevocable victory of socialism in the Soviet Union." (p. 16).

Bittelman's Findings

But Bittelman himself does not tell us why. He does not even tell us whether this is an ultra-right or ultra-left silence, or whatnot. Instead he makes an ominous promise: "We shall see later how these omissions result in some very serious errors . . . For the present it is sufficient to emphasize that on this point, as on many others, the draft program shows unmistakable signs of struggle between the genuine Leftward tendency in the Socialist Party and the 'Left,' between the sound proletarian and revolutionary instincts of the Lefts and some very vicious Trotskyist counter-revolutionary influences." (p. 16).

Thus, on questions of principles Bittelman finds the following: 1) Two serious weaknesses; one—ultra-right, Old Guard variety; the other fake-left, Zam variety. 2) Another sin to the right, reformist variety. 3) Still another right deviation, "bad" reformist variety.

4) A struggle between revolutionary "instincts" and fake-left "influences," the very-vicious-Trotskyist counter-revolutionary variety. This struggle is a source of "very serious errors," of unspecified nature. Evidently, Bittelman sometimes also prefers to state a premise without drawing any conclusions. After all, a counter-revolutionary influence can lead only to counter-revolutionary errors. And no one,

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

no matter how sublime his instincts can get very far to the left, with such errors.

The Horrible Example

To sum up: In his principled analysis Bittelman arrives at the conclusion that on three out of four issues, the Left Socialists are to his right, and on the fourth, so far to his right as to be in the camp of "very vicious" counter-revolution. Therefore it turns out that since the mistakes in principle in the draft program are largely concessions to reformism and counter-revolution, the Left Socialists must be attacked for being ultra-left (or sectarian). "One of our major tactical criticisms of the draft program is its sectarianism" (p. 23). "Sectarianism is the great enemy of the draft program" (p. 36).

Bittelman has a horrible example to hold up to the Left Socialists. None other than himself. "There was a time when we ourselves were not fully free from a similar sectarianism. We therefore should like to warn and guard the Left Socialists against repeating our mistakes" (p. 38). As the poet said: Let such teach others who themselves excel.

But all the time B. knows that the Left Socialists are really moving to the left. He has an infallible compass to guide him. Every once in a while he need only quote a sentence from Dimitroff's report by the Seventh World Congress, to discover that "the draft program tends in the same direction." From this premise he draws the infallible conclusion that the Left-wing must be going Left. "This is highly commendable. It shows that the Left wing is going Leftward" (p. 17).

Lenin was fond of remarking that a fool could utter more nonsense on a single page than a score of wise men could clarify in a volume. Bittelman fills 46 pages.

On Fascism

Since Bittelman attacks the Left Socialists most violently for their position on Fascism, we shall first of all look into that.

He accuses the Lefts of felling only half-truths. The draft points out that Fascism proved victorious "in some countries" only because the workers failed to take power—a failure due in part to the fact that the Socialist Parties were "not in reality revolutionary parties." Bittelman quotes this passage approvingly. "This is quite correct" (p. 18). But that is only part of the truth. If in "some countries" the Fascists took power because the workers did not take it, then in one country the workers "did take power and did forestall the coming of reaction and fascism. . . . That was the Soviet Union—the former empire of the Tsar and capitalists. This is incontestable history." (p. 18. Emphasis in the original.)

From this, according to Bittelman, follow four (4) "inescapable" conclusions. We shall cite only one: "Had the German working class taken . . . the revolutionary road, Fascism would have never triumphed" (p. 19).

Who is Responsible?

Who is responsible for the failure of the German working class to take the revolutionary road? According to Bittelman, only the German Social Democracy, for it was the "incontestable history" that they would have learned that the Communists had already led the Russian workers against the Russian Fascists and therefore could have never failed the German workers, against Hitler.

According to the Left Socialists, however, the German Communist Party "contributed just as much to the victory of Fascism" as did the Social Democracy.

Bittelman declares himself absolutely "astounded" (p. 20). Not only do the Left-Socialists tell part truth, but on top of that they proceed to add such a "sentence"! It is a horrible sentence. It does not even belong in a program; it is an imposition, not to use a harsher term; it strikes a discordant note, and it really hurts Bittelman because it hurts the program and the Left wingers.

A Slander Indeed!

This sentence introduces something which does not belong to the draft program. It imposes upon the program counter-revolutionary Trotskyite influences. It is altogether out of tune with the main trend of the program. It hurts the draft program and it hurts the Left wing." (p. 20. Emphasis in orig.)

This sentence hurts Bittelman so that he must take it apart in four pieces, clause by clause. He finds that the first part is a "slander," and repeats, "We repeat: it does not belong there (i.e. in the draft program)" (p. 20). He takes the second clause, and again throws it away in disgust. "Slander." But when he comes to the third "point" he pulls up short. "This is curious!" (p. 20). It is. Instead of trying to brazen it out with insults and denials, Bittelman sets out to prove that the Left Socialists are themselves guilty of what they accuse the C.P. Since the counter-revolutionary Trotskyists are able to "impose" on the Left Socialists, why not Bittelman, too? On page 21 of his pamphlet, he tries to impose upon them the theory of social-Fascism. No more, no less. We quote this "curiosity" verbatim:

The Skeleton Again

"3. 'It's (i.e., C.P.'s) theory of social-fascism and opposition to the united front' This is curious. Prior to making this statement the draft program itself (emphasis in original) formulated a complete theory of social-fascism. It stated (we repeat the quotation): 'In rejecting the Marxian conception of the state as an instrument of class oppression, and in clinging to capitalist democracy, the Social-Democratic Party of Germany objectively prepared the conditions for the victory of fascism' (p. 9). What is this but a theory of social-fascism? What is social-fascism? It is socialism in words and 'preparing the conditions for the victory of fascism' (paving the road for fascism)—in deed. This was all social-fascism ever meant. And this is precisely what the draft program says about German Social-Democracy. If you, Left Socialists are right in saying so, and you ARE right, then why was it wrong for the German Communist Party to say so? Instead of condemning it, you should extend praise because it said it. . . ." (p. 21. Emphasis in original.)

Scorn itself is disarmed by this Stalinist who sweats and squirms over his daily stint just as he did not so very long ago when expounding the virtues of the theory of social-fascism in somewhat different tones.

Only three years ago, in June, instead of telling us how the "Trotskyites" misled the Left Socialists, the Stalinists were busy distributing a little pamphlet: "What is happening in Germany?" It was written after Hitler was in power, and it was approved by the Pre-

sidium of the E.C.C.I., on April 1, 1933. Here is what Heckert had to say on the meaning of the theory of social-fascism: "Communists foresaw evolution of Social Democracy."

"Did the C.P.G. and the Comintern foresee the inevitability of the fascist development of social democracy? Did they warn the workers of it? Yes, they foresaw it and issued their warning! . . . Comrade Stalin gave a definition of the development of social democracy into fascism that in its exactness and its clear-sightedness is unsurpassed, a definition that was made the basis of the program of the Comintern and the policy of the C.P.G.:"

"Fascism—said comrade Stalin—is a fighting organization of the bourgeoisie, an organization that rests on the active support of social democracy. Social democracy is objectively the moderate wing of fascism. There exists no reason for supposing that the fighting organization of the bourgeoisie can achieve decisive successes in their struggle or in their leadership of the country without the active support of social democracy. And there is just as little reason to suppose that social democracy can achieve decisive successes in its struggles or in its leadership of the country without the active support by the fighting organization of the bourgeoisie. These organizations do not contradict each other, but complete each other. They are not antipodes, but twins. . . ."

"All that has happened in Germany completely confirms the correctness of Comrade Stalin's prognosis. Hitler does not reject the support of social democracy. The social democrats are already showing their readiness to participate in all the bloody crimes of fascism against the working class" (Fritz Heckert, What is Happening in Germany, pp. 20-21).

And just to prove that this was "all" there ever was to the theory of social-fascism: "The present fascization of German social democracy is no accidental interlude, but the road that all social-democratic parties will go . . ." (idem, p. 24.)

Could anything be more curious? Yes! For no sooner has Bittelman written his remarkable exposition of "all there ever was" to it, than he tosses off the following:

"As to Communist opposition to the united front—well, well. . . . The Communist Party fought for the united front; the Social-Democratic Party fought against the united front" (p. 22. Emphasis in original).

For instance: "In the Manchester Guardian of March 22 the social-fascist Trotsky, gave as the cause of the seizure of power by Hitler the fact that the C.P.G. had not formed a united front with the social democratic party on a platform exclusively acceptable to social democracy: 'The defense of the parliamentary government and the mass trade unions' . . . an endeavor to smuggle in this soundevery platform, which not even a Weis dared to suggest to the Communists, even after the seizure of power by Hitler. . . . But what would such a platform for the united front have implied, even if the social democrats had been ready to fight for it in reality? . . . It would have meant for the Communist Party a defection to the position of Marx and Lenin, a defection of Hindenburg. It would have meant a transition to the position of a reactionary united front with the bourgeoisie, in the last instance to Hitler" (Heckert pp. 22-23).

(To be continued)

workers. Nothing could be worse. In a hit or miss, undirected use of the "sit-down" there is danger. The company might provoke such demonstrations to rouse the public prejudice against the workers, etc. But the militancy which will not tolerate employer injustice and intolerance must be organized—not repressed. To company wails that the workers are interfering with production, the union can answer that corporations which refuse to recognize unions and to set up machinery for prompt adjustment of grievances are inviting trouble and ought to get it, since the alternative is submission and slavery for the workers.

The problem will not be solved, however, by the kind of agreement between the union and the employer which apparently "recognizes" the union but actually "recognizes" the union officialdom as agents for carrying on class collaboration with the employers. Not outward forms but the content and essence count in the matter of union agreements.

The basic fear of the Akron workers is layoffs i.e. insecurity. The basic demand of the union is for no layoffs, the restoration of the normal thirty-hour week and reduction of hours to an even lower point in the slack season. That will mean job security. And that will lay the basis for confidence among the workers on which militancy can be permanently sustained.

The workers of Akron look to the leadership of the Rubber Workers Union and of the C.I.O. to advance toward that goal. What is their answer?

The Problem in Akron

(Continued from Page 1)

For example, stated that their day: "Impartial observers say that in reality conditions in Akron are as bad as ever. They point to the frequent sit-down strikes in recent weeks as showing dissatisfaction in the ranks of the workers. Thus the use of company union peace-setters for speed-up purposes continues. In at least one department recently an attempt was made to increase hours without first taking a vote as provided in the strike settlement. Attempts to lay off union men continue though in each instance the militancy of the workers has thwarted them. The general fear of excessive layoffs when the slack season comes, induced by the abolition of the thirty-hour week by the companies and the failure to get it restored by the strike, continues to dominate the thinking of the men.

Since production in rubber is still at a high level and in view of the automobile production level seems likely to continue for some weeks, the highly provocative acts of the company against union men present on the surface a puzzle. The most likely explanation is this. Though the company probably desires uninterrupted production at the moment, it cannot afford to appear supine and weak in the face of the aggressiveness of the union men who in a recent sit-down practically took en-

tire control of one of the Goodyear plants. Such a show of weakness would be certain to lead the men to begin the general strike against the large rubber firms to gain the genuine recognition and other demands which they failed to get in the strike settlement. Such a strike may also come if the company's attitude is hard boiled. In fact provocative measures carried beyond a certain point would certainly precipitate a strike. Thus the company will try to pursue a middle course until the main drive for production is over and an inventory is piled up when it may institute a lockout or answer a strike with a complete shut down for a considerable period.

A snuff-dump in the fall might be regarded as injurious to the Roosevelt election campaign and the big industrialists are trying to push Roosevelt still further to the right by such measures. It must be borne in mind also that the Supreme Court's decision on the Guffey Case threatening also the National Labor Relations Board, etc. is an open invitation to employers to take the offensive against the unions.

In the present Akron situation, charged with dynamite as it is, timorous and reactionary union officials will seek to curb and repress the magnificent militancy of the answer?

An Eye-witness Account Of Events in Poland

Participant Tells How Revival in Labor Movement Is Met by Savage Police Repression and Betrayed by Stalinists and Reformists

CRACOW, March 28.—Following are some facts concerning recent events here. The workers of the rubber products factory "Semperit" struck and at the same time occupied the plant to prevent the employer from hiring scabs and to force him to acquiesce. On the nights of Friday and Saturday of the past week the police attacked the sleeping workers (it was about 4 in the morning) and ejected them from the building, horribly massacring them, not even sparing the pregnant women.

Alarming rumours circulated through the city. Two were said to have been slain. The official communiques denied this. The trade union leadership and the National Executive Committee of the Polish Socialist Party (P.P.S.) under pressure of the masses declared a 24 hours general strike for Monday, March 23rd.

The city was almost completely paralyzed by the strike. Only the street car workers remained on the job. A crowd of 15-20,000 workers congregated in Varshavska Street. The representatives of the P.P.S., the "Bund" (Jewish Socialist Party) and the K.P.P. (Communist Party of Poland) addressed the workers in extremely moderate language. The masses became impatient. "We must demonstrate." One felt that nothing could quell the will to struggle. Finally the demonstration formed, 15,000. They shouted: "On to the Waywode." "Down with Minister Svitalski."

Massacre on the Streets
We arrived at the Mateyka square. The police fired. First in the air. Then into the crowd. There were dead and wounded already. But we did not surrender. Arms were obtained. Fences, benches and paving stones were torn up. "The cops will pay for this." Buses, streetcars and wagons were overturned to serve as barricades. Window glasses of stores were smashed. The workers behaved splendidly and defended themselves heroically. But the arms of the opponents were much more superior. We lacked the training and ammunition (at least partial armament). And everywhere there were detachments of police armed to the teeth. The machine-gun went into action. After three hours of furious resistance the forces of the capitalist state prevailed.

The official communiques spoke of 8 dead and a few scores wounded. In reality there were at least 20 dead and 100 wounded mortally or seriously wounded, not to speak of those slightly wounded.

The Crisis in the Pilsudskyst Dictatorship

The white dictatorship in Poland is passing through dark days. The working and peasant masses are delivering it the most serious blows. The recent demonstrations and strikes to which the Koscialkowski government replied with massacres, mark a revival in the militancy of the toiling masses of the country as a whole. The barricades at Cracow and Lvov terrified the ruling classes.

Very characteristic, in this connection, was the declaration of Mr. Bartel on April 24th:

These were very serious events. If the crowd is fired upon and it does not move to save itself for fear of death; these are no riots. They smack of revolution."

For several months strikes followed one upon another uninterruptedly. They embraced the entire country. After the textile workers of Lodz, came the turn of the petroleum workers of the Boryslaw district, the miners of upper-Silesia, the strike struggles at Cracow, Sosnowice, Poznan, Czestochowa, etc.

The conflicts assume a very acute character. The workers who struggle to maintain their miserable wages lock themselves in with their families, in the factories and the pits and it is only with difficulty that the forces of the police dislodge them. Demonstrations of unemployed have taken place all over the country. First at Cracow and then at Lvov, blood was spilled.

Police Fire on Funeral
On April 14th at Lvov the police opened fire during one of these demonstrations. Two were killed. The city seethed. There were 30,000 people present at the funeral of the worker Kzak, a funeral organized by workers organizations and trade unions. The police opened fire, preventing the workers from passing through the center of the city to the Janowski cemetery. The police fired again. This time it was a real massacre. The workers courageously defended themselves and erected barricades. According to official reports there were 18 killed and 200 wounded. Only with difficulty did the police re-establish order. Then followed the repression. 2,000 arrested and a hundred militants were sent to the concentration camp of Bereza-Kartuska.

The workers answered with a 24 hour protest general strike in Lvov, Warsaw and many other localities.

On the same evening delegates of the trade unions, the P.P.S., demanded that the strike be immediately called off. The representative of the Bund wanted to continue it. The Stalinists demanded: 1. continue "until victory"; 2. proclaim the general strike in the entire country; 3. the immediate removal of Svitalski. But outside of the conference a secret meeting of several leading bureaucrats was in process, composed of Stalinists and reformists. Suddenly, the Stalinist delegates, after having received the "high sign" from a superior, declared themselves in favor of the immediate cessation of the strike. Nothing remained of their "revolutionary" position in favor of the strike "until victory", that is up to the overthrow of capitalism. In vain the building union delegates and several others protested. They shouted in the direction of the Stalinists. "You have betrayed us as have the socialists." "You have sent our brothers to their death and you use this now as shameful bargaining with our blood." "Cowards." "Traitors", etc. . .

In actuality the workers wanted to struggle. On the next morning thousands of workers continued the strike against the orders of the "leaders", lackeys of the bourgeoisie; the streetcar workers did not work to 5 p. m. The workers of the other cities waited only for the strike call.

But the movement was abandoned and betrayed. But that did not prevent the Stalinists from celebrating it as a great victory of the People's Front.

And at the very time the union of social patriots and communopatriots was being established on the corpses of working class heroes, the police arrested hundreds of workers. A real massacre began. The arrested were tortured.

A number of militants disappeared without a trace. Daily new victims were secretly buried. The cops made expeditions against the trade unions killing on the spot those present, as for instance at the confectionary workers headquarters.

On Wednesday the funerals of the 8 "official" victims (the number admitted by the police) were held. More than 50,000 participated. The same fighting spirit which animated the masses three days earlier no longer prevailed. The betrayal was bearing its fruits. But also the idea of a new international was more easily making its way into the consciousness of the shamefully betrayed masses.

The next week a demonstration of unemployed at Chrszanov led to a bloody conflict with the police.

To understand the meaning of the Lvov events, the general situation in the country must be taken into account. Even the bourgeois press is obliged to recognize that the majority of the peasantry (three-quarters of entire population) is literally dying of hunger.

Poverty, Unemployment and Terror
A volume edited by the "Economic Institute" of Warsaw and which prints numerous letters from peasants, reflects this unprecedented misery. "In many sections", a peasant writes, "the only resources are the veterans pensions. The only ones with small incomes are invalids. But there are not many such lucky fellows." Agricultural laborers who work a few weeks in the year earn 1 zloty 50 (around 2 cents) per day.

A peasant from the Radom district makes the following remark in a letter: "Winter is easier to survive than summer because one can sleep more and forget the hunger." As they say in French: "Qui dort dine." (He who sleeps dines).

Unemployment is widespread. According to the official figure it has reached a half-million which is surely more than a third of the entire working class. The petty bourgeoisie is completely ruined. To that must be added the police regime more severe than that of Czarism, the reign of the Defenzywa (Polish Okhrana), the punitive expeditions in the Ukraine and in White Russia.

The Clique Struggle
The Pilsudskyst dictatorship which is celebrating its 10th anniversary (in May 1926 the Pilsudskyst coup d'etat occurred) wished to resolve the contradictions of the regime by drawing inspiration from the Italian and German example. But Pilsudski had not succeeded in creating a mass party. The machinery of the dictatorship is much weaker than in Italy and Germany. Upon the death of the Marshal a covert struggle broke out between the different cliques in the Pilsudskyst camp.

The conflict between the "colonels" of the *Gazeta Polska* and the "moderates" supported by General Bydz Smigly, who wanted to extend the basis of the dictatorship by bribing the leadership of the left parties,

1914-1936: The Same Social Patriotic Tune

By ARNE SWABECK

Marxists have always taken the position that the question of war in the modern imperialist epoch is inseparable from the capitalist system of society as is the class struggle. Our attitude towards war is therefore the same as our attitude towards the class struggle: our aim is in both instances to work for the defeat of capitalism and to secure the victory of the working class.

This fundamental criterion the Stalinist leaders have thrown overboard long ago. Having abandoned the Marxist position the Comintern and all its sections now reincarnates in new form s and under new conditions the ideas of social patriotism which characterized the great betrayal in 1914.

To the Stalinist leaders the fundamental differentiation in the present day world does not proceed along the irreconcilable lines of opposing and antagonistic classes. To them the main division occurs between good capitalists and bad capitalists, between which the working class is to take sides, for and against, to rely on the former against the latter. On the one hand in this division the forces for peace and on the other the forces for war, not divided along class lines, but divided into peaceful countries and nations of warlike intentions: a world divided between the capitalist democracies and the Fascist aggressors.

Gottwald-Browder Apes Haase
In his report on the Communist Party position on war and the coming Presidential elections Browder names the Fascist aggressors: "It is clear to the whole world," he says, "where the threat to peace comes from. It comes immediately from Hitler, Mussolini, the Japanese imperialists." On the other hand, he informs us, "we now have a number of countries which are directly threatened by the military aggression of the fascists and face the danger of losing their State and national independence, countries like Czechoslovakia, Austria and Belgium." In Czechoslovakia, says Browder, "the Communists will probably (?) refrain from voting on the military budget." He is not sure! For you see, the situation—not the bourgeois rule—but "shifts from moment to moment."

In any event he assures us: "The Communists will recognize the necessity of military resistance to possible Hitler invasion requires that there be available the utmost possible fighting weapons against Hitler." The Czechoslovakian Stalinists have likewise declared that they will defend the fatherland. Their "beloved" leader, Gottwald, came straight from Moscow to the seventh convention of his party to reassure his hearers that this "new line" does not really mean social patriotism: "Comrades," said Gottwald, "there is no doubt but that the defense of the republic against fascism can be interpreted to mean class peace, reformism, social patriotism. But this is not necessarily the correct interpretation. And we Communists do not interpret our position this way."

How else can it be interpreted? The social democrats of 1914, although equally treacherous, were at least much more frank. On August 4th Hugo Haase rose in the Reichstag session, the only speaker on the list, to proclaim in the name of the social democratic fraction, and amid applause from the Junker reaction: "Now we are making good what we have always stressed: in the hour of danger we do not leave the fatherland in the lurch." In 1914 these fatherland defenders

worsened concurrently with the difficulties of the regime. The rulers have serious rivals in the nationalists of the N.D. (National Democrats, old type reactionary party, clerical, anti-Semitic and partisan of the French orientation) which speculates on anti-Semitism. The latter have had a rebirth of popularity and are in a small measure rejuvenated by the "opposition cure" they took for the past ten years.

The conflict of the cliques inside the Pilsudskyst bloc also reflects two international orientations. The pro-Hitler policy of Beck is vigorously combated by a goodly section of the Polish bourgeoisie which takes into consideration the danger of submission to Germany which would culminate by the absorption of Poland. This policy "independent of the great powers" also isolates Poland from the economic point of view and costs it very dearly by estranging it from the stock exchanges of Paris and London.

It is obvious that this "equilibrium" policy (maintenance of the Franco-Polish alliance and at the same time collaboration with Hitler) results rather from the objective situation of the Polish bourgeoisie than from the personal nuances of the butcher of Brest-Litovsk. The choice (between the U.S. S.R. and Germany) is very difficult for Poland. And if in France the policy of Laval is continuing without Laval, in Poland that of Beck can be continued by his successor. In any case, now, the opposition in the country is clearly opposed to the pro-Hitler policy of Beck and is orienting itself on the strengthening of the Franco-Polish alliance.

Dividing World into Good and Bad Nations, Browder Voices Same Phrases as Social Democrats

ers in the various nations entered the services of their respective bourgeoisies to the tune of the war cry, "Kultur versus Czarism" or "Democracy versus Kaiserism." Today Browder proclaims: "And when Hitler fascism goes beyond the borders of Germany it must be met by military means (!!!). At the moment the greatest threat of the military forces of Hitler are against Czechoslovakia, Austria, France and Belgium."

But the question arises: by whose military means is this aggression to be defeated? Who will organize and direct the military operations? Do the Stalinists answer: the proletariat! No. This is to be left in the hands of the "forces of peace"—the bourgeois democracies among the capitalist nations—supported by the Communist parties and such workers as the Stalinist leaders can mislead by their deceptive slogans of defense of national independence. Obviously this defense is also to include Austria where the Stalinists and the Heimwehr may take up the cry in unison: "Long live the independence of Democratic Fascist Austria."

Handmaiden of the Capitalist State

Nothing shows more clearly than this the completely anti-Marxist attitude of the Stalinists toward the problem of national state independence among capitalist nations. Marxists recognize as well established the fact that the national state became a frightful impediment long ago to the economic and cultural development of humanity. The defense of the national state is therefore a reactionary task, worthy only of the depraved handmaidens in the service of decaying capitalism. Not the defense of the national state, but the wiping out of all national state borders is the task of the proletariat.

And how does Browder really propose to defend the independence of these national states? Obviously he relies upon the bourgeoisie but not entirely. In face of the war threats he demands the complete independence of the working class movement. "But," he adds, "the complete independence of the working class movement does not mean, however, that the peace policy of the working class movement of each question and in each country is directly opposed to the policy of the capitalist government—the government of the bourgeoisie within that country."

Not directly opposed to the policy of the capitalist government! In other words, follow the war map and not the map of the class struggle; this is the advice of Browder. You may make your reservations, but do not oppose directly the policy of the capitalist government. Like Plekhanov, the one time brilliant Marxist, who stooped to the level of defender of Czarism in 1914: "The marauders (the Kaiser's armies) are at the border of my country and are ready to rob and murder." "Make your reservations," he urged the Duma deputy, Durianov, "—this is absolutely necessary—but vote for the credits. The rejection of the credits would be a betrayal (of the people) and abstention would be cowardice, vote for the credits." Today this is implemented by Browder: "We are not pacifists . . . when Hitler fascism goes beyond the borders of Germany it must be met by military means."—Make your reservations in times of war or preparations for war—but do not oppose directly, the policy of the capitalist government! What a frightful parallel with the betrayal of 1914.

Vote the Credits!

Vote the credits! Not only Czechoslovakia, Austria and Belgium. "There are other countries," says Browder, "like France and the United States, which for their own particular interests are interested in maintaining peace, which are not furthering the development of war, which are resisting these developments." And the French Stalinists echo: vote the credits!
In 1914 the manifesto of the French Socialist Party proclaimed: "Spontaneously, without waiting for any other manifestation of the popular will, he (the head of the government) has appealed to our party. Our party has replied: Here!" And in 1936 Jacques Duclos, leader of the French Communist Party: "We are for the safety and freedom of our country. We do not want to vote credits blindly. We want to know what is done with them. The budget vote is a political act in which the struggle against fascism inside and outside the country must be taken into consideration."

Duclos is faithful to the Franco-Soviet pact and to the "new line" of Stalinism. He does not want the credits squandered. He wants it actually to go for the strengthening of France's military means. And Marcel Cachin, his equally faithful co-worker, may now repeat what he said in 1914 under the auspices of the Social Democratic Party: "We promise to fulfill our duty completely, as Frenchmen and as socialists faithful to the International."

France had then been attacked by the Kaiser's troops, so he maintained. And now again we are told that the greatest threats of the military forces of Hitler are directed among other countries against France.

Bourgeoisie Pleased

What kind of a war would it be, should these threats be carried out? The Daily Freiheit of May 19 gives the answer thus: "If Hitler should attack France it would be an imperialist attack on his part, and if France should in that situation defend herself, it would be a natural case of self defense which has nothing to do with imperialism because imperialism means the grabbing of foreign lands in the interests of home capitalism."

French imperialism would not grab foreign lands; God forbid! French imperialism does not want colonies. It didn't in 1914 either said the French social patriots. It was just plainly and simply attacked. Did not Vaillant write in *l'Humanite*, then the official socialist party organ: "In face of the aggression, the socialists will fulfill their whole duty to the fatherland for the republic and to the revolution." "More than that," answered the satisfied editor of *Le Temps* on August 4, "we do not ask of M. Edouard Vaillant and his friends." More than that no bourgeois can ask from Duclos, Cachin, Stalin or Browder. More than that they cannot even ask from Mr. Oigin, whose articles printed in the *Daily Forward*, after the United States had entered the war in 1917, were presented in Washington by Abe Cahan as proof that the *Forward* was patriotic, that it called upon the American mothers to give their sons for the country and therefore the *Forward* should not be suppressed.

Forces for Peace

But imperialism France is not only in danger of attack, according to Browder. Together with the United States it is interested in maintaining peace. These two countries, he insists, are not furthering the development of war; they are "resisting these developments." We are not sure that the editor of *Le Temps*, even in his most exalted moments of bourgeois hypocrisy, would guarantee that much for France. As for the United States, Browder has unquestionably accepted in earnest and is ready to dish out the bourgeois demagoguery about the strongest armaments being the best guarantee of peace. No doubt the rival capitalist powers have a different understanding of President Roosevelt's one billion dollars military budget. They have learned to know the capitalist United States as a powerful force struggling aggressively for world hegemony and not hesitating to use any means at its command to gain this objective. But in this respect Browder also gives a warning.

The capitalist United States is "interested in maintaining peace. . . not furthering the development of war. . . resisting these developments," that is, provided power is not taken out of the hands of the Roosevelt administration. In these coming elections, "the victory of the Republican Party - Liberty League - Hearst combination," exclaims Browder, "would throw power on the side of the war makers." The question of war is here again presented not as an inevitable outgrowth of the capitalist system, caused by the forces that capitalism itself sets into motion, but as something instigated only by the bad capitalists. The working class, ac-

ording to this has the choice, not of building a revolutionary party for the overthrow of capitalism, but purely the choice between the good and the bad capitalists.

The Bad American Bosses

"The main enemy of the people of America today is the Republican-Liberty League-Hearst combination," says Browder in his statement on the C.P. position in the coming elections. He adds; "We must place as the center of our work in the election campaign the need for combatting this reactionary bloc and defeating its plans in 1936." This is where the emphasis is to be placed according to Browder, not direct opposition to the capitalist system, far from it, but merely opposition to the bad capitalists. In line with this it was quite natural for him to make the announcement at a press conference a few days before: "We would not do or say anything that would tend to turn Roosevelt support over to the Republican candidate." What is the objective meaning of this statement? Can it be anything else but to support Roosevelt? or at least to take care that none of the potential supporters are lost from the Roosevelt camp, which God forbid, may mean the victory of the Republican-Liberty League Hearst combination—the victory of the bad capitalists over the good capitalists.

Surely in taking this position Browder remains entirely consistent and he remains faithful to his Stalinist line of policy. And this extends also to his position, and to the C.P. position, on the farmer-labor party question. Browder wants to "collaborate organizationally with those who are committed to the support of Roosevelt in 1936"—Labor's Non-Partisan League. "He explains in his usual 'lucid and learned' fashion, 'not merely the continuation of the role of labor as auxiliary to the old parties.' He wants to see in it also the beginnings of a farmer-labor party. But to ordinary mortal beings how would this be possible—

Pro-Labor and Pro-Roosevelt!

Can a movement fulfill the role not merely as an auxiliary to the old parties, i.e., to the capitalist parties, or even to the one of them which carries the Roosevelt label, and at the same time be a beginning toward a working class political movement? Obviously this question is not decided merely by forms or by labels but by the ideological position and by the program it stands for. And in this case, in particular, no doubt need exist that this very thing which is the old and at the same time is supposed to be the beginning to something new still would retain its previous ideological position and program. At its best the same auxiliary to the old capitalist parties, possibly minus the Roosevelt label, possibly with a brand new farmer labor name would continue the tradition and the program of the Roosevelt New Deal. But it would continue under new objective conditions as a more effective barrier damming up the path of advance for the revolutionary movement. For as we have emphasized often before, in such a case the shedding of the old shell of Rooseveltian bourgeois reformism can be expected to coincide with the time when objective conditions make the new clothing of farmer-labor party reformism a more effective means of arresting the revolutionary advance.

In taking this position Browder also remains entirely consistent. In

inverted form he proves that the question of war in the modern imperialist epoch is as inseparable from the capitalist system of society as is the class struggle. A false position in regard to the question of war leads inevitably to an equally false position toward the everyday issues of the class struggle. It leads not to the victory of the working class but to its defeat.

Hillquit-Browder Wants U.S. to Act

"We must," says Browder in concluding his report on the war question, "crystallize such a mass opinion in America directed towards restraining the instigators of war that the United States will become an effective international force, will become a positive contribution to the world front of struggle for peace." He does not want the mere slogan Keep America Out of War, because that is the slogan of isolation, of neutrality. Well and good. He wants to link up America with the other capitalist imperialist nations to which he attributes the virtue of restraining war developments. In a somewhat different situation, but still with the same objective meaning Morris Hillquit opposed American isolation in 1917. When Debs went to prison for his courageous anti-war stand Hillquit protested: "I do not advocate an immediate separate peace, a withdrawal by America. Nothing that I have ever said or written could justify such a sweeping assertion. . . I want America to act, not to withdraw."

Browder now wants America to act, not to withdraw. In his statement, cited above, one cannot quarrel with his idea of crystallizing mass opinion toward restraining instigators of war. But who are the instigators of war? Is this a question merely of certain people of certain nations? Marxists reject such a conception and emphasize time and again that war is inevitable concomitant of capitalism regardless of which nation fires the first shot. And much more decisively must we reject Browder's deceptive and delusive prattle about making America a "positive contribution to the world front of struggle for peace." Proceeding from the Marxist conception that the causes of war are inherent in capitalism and that actual war grows inevitably out of this form of society and, proceeding further from the Marxist conception that only the working class achieving its historical mission of overthrowing capitalism can secure peace, it follows necessarily that both of these questions of war and peace are fundamentally the question of class forces, and the relationship of class forces. Petty bourgeois philistines may call upon America—capitalist America—to become a positive contribution to the world front of struggle for peace. Revolutionists will address this call to the American working class and to its allies.

In this lies the fundamental distinction between the Marxist position and the position of Browder and his Stalinist fellow bureaucrats. Their position proceeds from the Stalinist peace policy of the Soviet Union which has for its premise the preservation of the status quo of the boundaries of capitalist nations, of the relations between these nations as well as of their internal equilibriums. In other words the status quo of the capitalist system of society alongside of which the Soviet system is supposed to be able to exist peacefully. This policy cannot tolerate any upsets or overthrows. That would be its antithesis. It leaves no room for a policy of proletarian revolution. The Marxist policy aims directly for the proletarian revolution as the only way of eliminating imperialist war.

Rubber Unions and CLU Rally Against Company Provocation

(Continued from Page 1)

agement for fomenting "unrest and turmoil" by the provocative acts of its company union and vigilante organizations. Full support was pledged to the United Rubber Workers Union and a call was sent to federal government agencies to conduct investigations into espionage and "other unlawful practices" on the company's part.

In protest against the arrests and the scurvy way they were carried out, workers at two Goodyear plants sat down late Sunday night. At 2 p.m. the sit-down lasted 4 hours, only being called off by rank and file leaders on the plea that the workers' strength should be conserved for possible greater struggles ahead.

The Goodyear Local's defense committee on the case blasted the company with the following statement, issued through its chairman, Bill Carney, one of the outstanding militant progressives in the recent strike: "Since Goodyear failed in its efforts during the strike to

break our union through threat of vigilante force known as the 'Law and Order League,' another more subtle and vicious means has been adopted.

"The arrest of our members after such company attacks like the shooting of five of our men recently were not penalized, is flagrant social injustice.

"The method used in making the arrests is nothing short of a public outrage. The men were deliberately picked up late Saturday night and placed under high bond at first because it would be exceedingly difficult for us to have them released on bond.

"They were questioned in front of George Hargreaves, the 'Law and Order League' attorney. Efforts were made through his questioning to obtain statements.

"Counsel for the defense was not permitted to see the men. The entire proceedings were a serious mockery of justice, a challenge to the whole community.

"The immediate support given our men by the entire organized labor movement indicates such methods will not succeed in breaking our unions.

the use of legal trickery? We hardy think so, especially with public support behind us in protest over these arrests.

"We urge the companies to meet with our duly accredited representatives to establish true collective bargaining. Only that method can solve the present situation.

"The rubber workers can't be crushed. They must be dealt with as men."

WORKERS!

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

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

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

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

Monthly assessments from 45c to \$2.10.

For further information apply to Main Office: 714 Seneca Ave., B'klyn, N. Y.

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

DAY TO DAY REPORT OF SOCIALIST CONVENTION

(Continued from Page 1)

with an indictment of the National Executive Committee, the Militants, and all those associated with them, as "communists" and "insurrectionists"—a term which he uttered with all the horror and hatred of a prosecutor demanding a verdict against a revolutionist in the dock. In spite of the unbelievably dull presentation of his speech, it nevertheless sought to bring forward some of the political differences at bottom of the fight, and in general it might be remarked that the representatives of the Old Guard were less inclined than were their opponents to rest their case on purely organizational points and legalistic detail. However ludicrously exaggerated were Oneal's and Waldman's efforts to label the S.P. leadership "communist", their speeches were aimed at emphasizing the fact that their intransigence was based primarily upon differences in principle and policy rather than on obscure squabbles of persons and posts. The Militants did indeed make at least one distinctive effort to emulate the Old Guard in this respect when the New York State Committee of the Left Wing circulated a statement summarizing the issues in the conflict. The character of the statement, however, failed to set the tone for their speeches in the convention, which is saying a good deal in criticism of their position, especially when it is borne in mind that the statement itself was far from meeting the obvious requirements of the situation.

The high point reached by the Old Guard was undoubtedly marked by the one-hour speech of Louis Waldman. Skillfully constructed, polished, effectively though at times too melodramatically delivered, aggressive through and through, it was designed to rally every available delegate around the banner of the Right wing for the purpose of getting the best possible send-off for his new party. His castigation of the Militants reeked of the reactionary social democrat's hatred of everything progressive and revolutionary in the labor movement. Nor did he remain silent about the principal ally of the Militants—Hoan and his Wisconsin delegation—although his boldness here was based primarily upon the fact that, after a meeting with the Hoan delegation, it had become clear that it would not support the demands of the Old Guard. To the Militants' criticism of his flirtations with LaGuardia and Roosevelt, Waldman therefore challengingly replied with what Norman Thomas called a "tu quoque"—that is, "so are you." You condemn Waldman, he said, but you praise Hoan for doing no less in Wisconsin with the LaFollettes than Waldman is supposed to have done in New York with LaGuardia. Why the discrimination between Hoan and Waldman? Because you have Hoan's vote! This rather provocative comparison, which aroused considerable interest, and not only among the press, did not succeed in drawing elaborate replies from the Militants who took the floor subsequently.

In the morning session following the midnight meeting which was taken up mainly by the speech of Waldman and Thomas' reply, a number of briefer presentations were made by spokesmen of the contending factions. For the most part they followed the lead given by the two principal speakers, although some of the rank and file Militants, like John Fisher of Illinois, distinguished themselves by the truly aggressive and uncompromising demand they made for a clean break with the Old Guard, not merely organizationally but above all politically. However, it had become clear at this point that virtually every delegate had already decided his course, and that the vote was predetermined.

Old Guard Overwhelmed

Four proposals were before the convention on the New York contest. The first proposal, made by Oneal for the Old Guard, to seat its New York delegation as a whole, was voted down on a weighted ballot: 4,397 in favor and 9,322 against, with some 1,200 not voting. These 4,397 thus represented the maximum outright support which the Old Guard could count on in the convention.

The Reading delegation proposed a compromise motion to seat 22 members of each of the New York contestants. Obviously designed to take a "neutral" position in the dispute and to continue the existence side by side in one party of the Right and Left wings, this met with scornful rejection by the consistent elements of both sides. The motion lost by a vote of 3,537 in favor and 11,097 against.

In the name of the Wisconsin delegation, Mayor Hoan proposed a second compromise in a motion to seat 32 of the "Thomas delegation" and 12 of the Old Guard delegation, on condition that all delegates seated should agree to abide by convention decisions and to recognize the reorganized State organization. Repeated demands from the floor addressed to the Right wing for the purpose of obtaining a categorical Yes or No with re-

spect to the conditions, failed of success. The Right wing was—and properly so—adamant in its demand for all or nothing. The Hoan motion was thereupon defeated by a vote of 4,393 in favor and 10,201 against, with some scattering abstentions. It was the last effort to arrange for the peaceful cohabitation of the conflicting currents. And the defeat of even so "conciliatory" a proposal is sufficient evidence of the depth of the division which the utmost in parliamentary maneuvering was unable to bridge.

The defeat of the Hoan motion, however, gave the Wisconsin delegation the basis for its final vote. "We have done our all; nothing remains but to seat the Militants"—this was the spirit in which they cast their final ballot on the motion of the Credentials Committee to seat the Militant delegation as a whole. The frenzied cheers of the convention when Wisconsin's favorable vote was cast on the motion was eloquent of the thoroughly ambiguous position which the Hoan delegation had taken throughout the fight in the last two years. The motion of the Credentials Committee was carried by a vote of 9,449 in favor and 4,809 against, with a few abstentions.

It had been expected by many that this vote would be the signal for a walkout on the part of the entire Right wing. The Right wing had, however, decided upon another strategy. Waldman's defeated group withdrew, and proceeded forthwith to set up "The Social Democratic Federation" and to issue statements to the press denouncing the Militants and all their works. The politically allied delegations from other states, on the other hand, remained in the Convention—though thenceforth playing a comparatively minor role—apparently aiming to carry through the split in a more leisurely manner at home, hoping thereby to achieve the maximum of disruption in the Socialist Party proper.

Meanwhile, the Convention proceeded to complete its organization. The Committees were elected with solid Militant majorities, and Hoopes of Pennsylvania was fittingly rewarded by being selected as Chairman of Monday's sessions. These were devoted for the most part to the nomination of Thomas as Presidential candidate, of Nelson (of Wisconsin) as Vice-Presidential candidate, and to the various speeches and demonstrations in connection with the nominating, acceptance, etc. Since a considerable part of Tuesday's sessions (the Convention adjourning Tuesday night) were given over to the elections to the National Committee, discussion and action on the Platform, Committee reports, and various political resolutions, had to be sandwiched in here and there as the occasion permitted. The results were confusing on the surface, but nevertheless of the utmost significance in the tendencies which, explicitly or implicitly, emerged.

Organization Questions

In a confused and distorted, but very real, way, the Convention was facing some of the problems involved in the step to the left marked by the rejection of the New York Old Guard. For example, the report of the Organization and Campaign Committee contained a provision "That a Western States Organization Committee be set up having as its chairman a member of the N.E.C." This met at once with a bitter and slashing attack from the Right. Graham of Montana and the demagogic McKay of Washington led a reactionary onslaught against "dictation" and "the meddling of college boys from New York." Both were frank in stating that they would not abide by any such arrangement, that such a Committee would not be recognized in their states. McKay reached a climax in his demand: "You leave us alone and we will leave you alone." The proposal was then watered down to provide for a committee elected by the western states, rather than appointed by the N.E.C.; and was passed over the continuing opposition of the Right.

Trade Union Policy

The same result followed the presentation of the report on "Trade Union Policy." Section (7) of this report provided: "The National Executive Committee is instructed by this convention to set up a permanent National Labor Committee. Each local organization shall elect a Local Labor Committee whose duty it will be to coordinate the action of Socialists within the Trade Union in order to carry out the policy of the party. . . ." This section was assailed from the Right; a Wisconsin delegate moved to strike it out; Graham, McKay and others supported the motion to strike out on the grounds that the policy of the Section meant the building of Communist "cells" in the unions, that it would isolate the Socialists from the unions, that the business of the Socialists was to follow and not to try to lead or "interfere with" the trade unions, that it meant party "dictatorship"—and in general gave all the reactionary arguments common to their camp. The defense of

Statement of Minnesota S. P. on Farmer Labor Party Question

(Continued from Page 1)

ever given a majority candidate, on the express promise not to use the police in industrial disputes. Despite the treachery of Latimer, the Farmer-Labor party has refused to expel this man from its ranks or even to discipline him in any manner.

The state Farmer-Labor machine has continued to make unprincipled blocs with corrupt bourgeois politicians against the will and interests of the rank and file. It has stifled democracy within the party. It has at all times supported the most corrupt and reactionary section of the trade union movement against progressive trade unionists.

A national Farmer-Labor party, even if it arose under the best possible variant—that is, based on the economic organizations of the workers and farmers, as in Minnesota—could look and act no differently than does the Minnesota Farmer-Labor party. Our experience with the Farmer-Labor party in Minnesota, makes us certain that it is not the duty of the Socialist Party of America to throw its efforts behind a national Farmer-Labor party. Today and in the near future great sections of workers are awakening to political consciousness. To channelize the masses into a reformist party is a crime against the working class and the farmers of America. Nowhere has it been shown that American workers must go through the school of a reformist party. Such a step would be a backward one. It would retard for many years the development of a revolutionary socialist movement.

Drawing the lessons from our experience with the Farmer-Labor party in Minnesota, we say categorically that it is the immediate duty of the Socialist Party of America to build its own revolutionary

Marxist political party, the only party that can truly represent the American workers and farmers, and cope with modern industrial conditions. Our experience in Minnesota proves that for Socialists to assist in building a Farmer-Labor party only weakens the Socialist Party and misleads and confuses the workers who are seeking the way out of their misery and oppression.

However, should a national Farmer-Labor or labor party arise in America, the revolutionary Socialists must find the path to work with such a party in order to show its supporters the only road that will lead to the satisfaction of their needs, to their emancipation—the organization of a revolutionary Socialist Party, the overthrow of capitalist dictatorship, the smashing of the capitalist state machinery, the expropriation of the expropriators, the establishment of a working class democracy and of a socialist economy.

At all times the revolutionary Socialist Party must hold intact its ranks, must not dissolve its organization, but must turn its energies to the building and strengthening of its own organization. It must patiently explain to the masses the fallacies of a labor party in the period of capitalist decay. A Farmer-Labor party cannot stop fascism. It can only pave the way for fascism by lulling the workers to sleep—as was so tragically shown by the failures of the social-democratic parties in Germany and Austria. Nor can reformist parties prevent the outbreak of imperialist war. This was proven in 1914, when betrayals of these parties drowned the workers of Europe in a sea of blood.

Today it is only a revolutionary Socialist Party, working closely

with sister parties in all countries, that can weld together and educate the working class, gain the allegiance of the farmers, lead the onslaught against finance capitalism, overthrow the rule of the proletariat and lead America and the rest of the world to the establishment of a world socialist economy.

We therefore conclude that the Socialist Party cannot be the instrument that initiates or builds the Farmer-Labor party. We must be prepared to face the development of this reformist Farmer-Labor party as a force locally and nationally in a practical manner. The Socialist Party must always be in the position of analyzing the Farmer-Labor party in its true light, educating the workers to its inevitable reformist results, its dangers, and to the fact that only the achievement of Socialism through the leadership of a disciplined, revolutionary Socialist Party can permanently solve the problems of the working class.

We propose the adoption of this statement as the policy of the Socialist Party on the Farmer-Labor Party question. We further propose that this policy immediately be put into action nationally. Since it is impossible to set a blue print for procedure in local instances that merit different tactics because of difference in conditions, we should resolve that no local section of the Socialist Party shall be permitted to negotiate, endorse, or permit any of its membership to enter into relationship with a Farmer-Labor Party without first consulting with the National Executive Committee for permission. In making decisions on all such cases, the N.E.C. shall act in accordance with the policy as herein stated.

the Committee report showed interesting variations. Fisher of Illinois spoke sharply from a clear-out left position, and made his remarks an overt attack direct against the Old Guard. David Lasser of New York defended the Committee, but at the same time dissociated himself from any policy of building "cells" or attempting to "interfere with" the mass organizations. A compromise was proposed to change "shall" to "may" in the Section of the report under discussion. Paul Porter spoke for the compromise, and emphasizing how thoroughly he was against any "dictatorship from the top." Through its Chairman, Murray Gross of New York, the Committee accepted the compromise; Gross, however, expressing his personal disapproval of the change. But Glenn Trimble of California, a member of the Committee, rejected the compromise from the left, and forced a vote. The compromise carried. The motion to strike out the entire section was lost—with the Wisconsin delegating voting with one or two exceptions to strike out; and the section as amended was adopted.

The peculiar status of the Wisconsin delegation was again brought

out during the nominations to the N.E.C. Hoan, in accepting nomination, stated that he did so conditionally, since, as he put it, his very considerable duties in his own state might force him to withdraw later on. His election, however, followed in due course.

Conflict on the Platform

It was the discussion and action on the campaign Platform which brought out most fully the conflicting currents present within the Convention. It had been rumored that four platforms were under consideration: one prepared by Harry W. Laidler, one by Gus Tyler, one by Herbert Zam, and a fourth which had been published in the June issue of the Socialist Appeal. The Platform Committee, controlled by the New York Militants, first reported out what was said to be essentially the Laidler platform: a document throughout of standardized social-democratic reformism, with scarcely a breath of revolutionary content. There was no phrase in it which could not have been wholeheartedly accepted by the Old Guard. When it reached the floor, it became at once apparent

that the left wing delegates were prepared to open up a fighting attack on it all down the line. Jack Altman of New York thereupon stepped forward and moved to have the platform referred back to the Committee; and this action was taken.

On Tuesday the Platform made its appearance in a somewhat modified form, with certain sections deleted, and in a few cases sentences from the Appeal Platform—a document of militant class struggle, thoroughly imbued with vigorous revolutionary spirit—substituted for phrases from the original. In substance, however, the Committee Platform was not altered, remaining a consistently reformist statement—a fact attested by the support it received from the Right wing delegations. Laidler, for the Committee, read the Platform paragraph by paragraph, stopping at the end of each to ask for objections; when there were none, the paragraph was adopted; if there were objections, the paragraph was debated.

An interesting division occurred on the very first paragraph: The Platform (in its revised form,

though not in its original) called for a society in which "the industries of the country shall be socially owned. . . ." The Right wing proposed to change "socially" to "publicly." Laidler accepted the proposal; King, of Michigan, a member of the Committee, objected; and, on a vote, King was upheld.

The Road to Power

Left wing delegates from Arkansas and Minnesota, moved certain short but important changes in sentences dealing with the war question. The most important test, however, came on the motion of Whitten of Arkansas to substitute the paragraphs in the Appeal Platform on "The Road to Socialism" for the watery, reformist statement given in paragraph eleven of the Committee Platform. The issue at this point was entirely clear: it was in effect on the altogether decisive question of the road to power and the nature of the Workers' State; with the Committee Platform giving the reformist answer, and the Appeal Platform the revolutionary answer. Delegate Whitten presented his case well, and was applauded with full enthusiasm by the rank and file delegates of the Left. David Lasser at one point interrupted to enquire sarcastically whether Whitten was proposing an amendment or an entirely new Platform—a justified question, which served to point the issue even more clearly.

The division was by a rising vote. Remarkably enough, Whitten's amendment lost only by a vote of 52 in favor, 72 against (with a number of abstentions). His support came chiefly from the delegations of Illinois, Minnesota, Indiana, Colorado, California, with scattered votes elsewhere. There was particular interest in the New York vote, which held a balance of power on the question. Only two delegates from New York were seen to rise in favor of Whitten's motion. Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and the Right wing delegations thus had their way with the Platform.

War Plank Disputed

Approximately the same division occurred on the motion of Delegate Parshall to strike out the pacifist paragraph of the division on immediate demands dealing with "Militarism and War," and to substitute the simple double slogan of the Appeal Platform ("Not a penny, not a man, to the military aims of the government; unconditional opposition to any war engaged in by the American government.") Here, amusingly enough, after voting Parshall down, the Convention moved to add the Appeal statement.

The motion of Ernest Erber of Illinois to amend the final paragraph by substituting the corresponding paragraphs of the Appeal platform—unfortunately defended weakly by Erber because of the shortness of time allotted to him—was voted down by a voice vote. A number of additional paragraphs on "Socialized Medicine," "The Commonwealth Plan," etc., were thrown into the pot. When the Platform was then adopted as a whole, a considerable group of left-wing delegates rose to their feet demanding that their names be inserted in the records as opposed. Two more vigorous struggles re-

mained for the crowded closing minutes of the final session: on the Farmer-Labor Party resolution and the United Front. In between, a number of significant motions and resolutions dealing with the Y.P. S.L., the war question, "armed insurrection," changes in the Constitution and the Declaration of Principles, were passed without discussion, and will not be taken up here, since they failed to reveal clearly the demarcations and tendencies in the Convention itself.

The Farmer-Labor Party

The Committee report on the Farmer-Labor Party was ambiguous in the extreme, and of a kind to provide no resistance to the maneuvers of the Stalinists on this question. It favors a Farmer-Labor Party, but declares that one is not possible in 1936; it states that Socialists must work vigorously for it in the unions, and spends most of its space discussing the form that a "genuine" Farmer-Labor Party should take. It was attacked sharply both from the right and from the left. The left opponents distinguished their opposition clearly from that of the Right pointing out the extremely reactionary character of the opposition from the right; and at the same time criticizing vigorously the confused and basically reformist character of the Committee resolution.

At the same time that it attacked the Committee resolution, the left wing took positive action when Pemble of Minnesota, as a minority member of the Committee, introduced as a substitute a shortened form of the Resolution on the Problem of a Farmer-Labor Party passed at the pre-convention Conference of the Socialist Party of Minnesota (this is reprinted elsewhere in this issue—Ed.). Pemble defended the uncompromising revolutionary perspective of the Minnesota resolution. The Minnesota resolution was lost on a voice vote; and the majority resolution carried by a vote of 109 in favor, 64 against.

United Front Resolution

The Convention ended with a short but bitter debate on the United Front resolution. The majority report, far from clear in form, included clauses providing for United Fronts with the Communist Party. (At an earlier session a proposal from the C.P. for a united election ticket and a standing joint committee on united front actions had been tabled without a dissenting voice.) A minority resolution against any United Front involving the C.P., introduced by the Right wing, was lost 67-89. The Left wing was anxious to force the issue (it is significant that on this issue alone during the last sessions did the New York Militants stand with the left wingers who had fought the central questions with respect to the platform). Darlington Hoopes openly threatened to split if the question were voted on. After hasty caucusing, Thomas took the floor for the Militants and proposed to carry the matter to a referendum, to be held after the November elections. The Convention thus closed, as it had begun, on the thin edge of a split, but this second time more profound and far-reaching in its implications.

Belgian People's Front Mirrors France's Future

(Continued from Page 1)

the Belgian National Union and the French People's Front is that the Stalinists are excluded from it—as yet. The Belgian Communist Party has been so insignificant a force that hitherto there has been no occasion to take its participation or approval seriously. That is why Repard bitingly refers to the Catholics and Liberals in Belgium as "reactionary parties." These parties of the Belgian Center are of course in no way to be distinguished from the French Radicals, except in this: that the Belgian Socialists have long pursued the policy of participating with them in coalition governments, even with Socialist premiers, a policy only recently accredited in France.

The Belgian Labor Party lost support not because the leadership refused to add the Stalinists to the present coalition. This would have simply meant adding a tiny social-patriotic (and inexperienced) competitive organization to a very old and going concern.

The developments in Belgium are the consequences of the course pursued by the P.O.B. in the sphere of "People's Front" policies and the actual experience that the Belgian masses have already had with the governments established through the coalition of the Socialists, the Catholics and the Liberals. The Belgian workers have already had their Socialist premier, true, his name is not Blum but Vandervelde.

Belgium the Mirror for France The experience of these coalition governments was mirrored in Austria, where Socialists entered into coalition governments with Clericals, and pursued the self-same social-patriotic, strikebreaking and capitulating policies. It is disgust and disillusion with such policies that underlies the losses of Vandervelde and Co.

It ought to be noted that Belgium is in a somewhat advanced stage as regards its economic developments as well. In Belgium the devaluation of the currency which is pending in France has al-

ready taken place. The masses of the workers and of the petty bourgeoisie have already felt the effects of devaluation, and have added this to their already extensive experience with a "National Union" (or a People's Front) government which can put through only the policy of finance capital. This has provided an added impulse to drive the middle classes into the arms of clerical Fascism.

Stalinists Gain Despite Themselves As for the Communist gains, these were scored not because of the policies they pursue but despite them. The Belgian workers, moving to the left, sensing and seeking a revolutionary solution to the crisis, turn towards the C.P. in precisely the same way that the German workers swung away from the social democracy towards the C.P. up to the very day that Hitler assumed power.

What we observe in Belgium today, was observed in its time in Austria and in Germany. The initial stages of the same process are also observable in France. In France, we have the self-same integration of the parties of the Center (the Radicals), and the growth of the right and the left wings. Once France will have had its experience with the governments in which Socialists participate, or also participate in . . . then the French Fascists will likewise begin scoring their spectacular gains. In this latter respect Belgium today mirrors the future of the French People's Front.

Criticism Boomerang for D. W. The Daily Worker, in the person of Repard condemns the Belgian Socialists for joining a government "on a program of salvaging capitalist profits." This is A B C for every revolutionist. But in the case of Repard, this is not revolutionary criticism but Stalinist hypoc-

ry. If the Belgians are to be damned for supporting Belgian capitalists, why is Blum to be supported by the French Stalinists? For Blum came out openly in his speech at the Salle Wagram with the statement that he was accepting the premiership not on the basis of a Socialist program, but on the basis of a People's Front program, which, said Blum, is a program of capitalism. Or is there perhaps a program of capitalism which does not salvage capitalist profits?

Every criticism that Repard levels at the Belgian "National Union" applies with equal force to the People's Front; even Repard's criticism of the Belgians for their dumping the de Man Plan. This Plan was proposed by the P.O.B. leadership in the very first days of the leftward move of the masses after the German debacle. It proposed to "immediately" institute socialism by buying out the capitalists, nationalizing all key industries, etc. It served its purpose of sidetracking the masses from revolutionary struggle.

Repard is quite outspoken in his condemnation of the Belgian Plan, and we would like to know when he will tell us a little something about Jouhaux's Plan, a modest edition of de Man's Plan, which was likewise proposed and similarly dumped in France. And, again, what has happened to the economic demands of the People's Front program, and its own "New Deal"? When are the Laval emergency decrees to be abolished? When are the rich going to be "soaked"? What about the 2-year military service in France?

Once the demagoguery of the People's Front will have been bared to the masses in France by the actions of the People's Front Government, then it will be clearly seen that the People's Front is not

an obstacle but an aid to Fascism; that it is merely an extended version of the coalition governments in Austria, Belgium, etc.

Growth of Revolutionary Vanguard A section of the Belgian vanguard has learned well the lessons of the experience in Germany and Austria. It is this section—Action Socialiste Revolutionnaire—that has been expelled from the P.O.B. for having refused to accept dumbly the self-same policies of capitulation that brought about the debacle in Berlin and Vienna. What has hitherto rendered the working class impotent in the face of its mortal enemy has been the absence of an organized revolutionary vanguard. The most hopeful sign of the developments in Belgium lies in the steps toward such a vanguard. The future of Belgium depends upon whether the vanguard is able to fuse itself with the masses of workers before the social-patriots of the Second and the Third Internationals have so demoralized the masses, and have surrendered such important positions as would enable the Fascists to launch a general offensive, and slide into power, in still another country.

NEW MILITANT

with which is merged THE MILITANT Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co., 100 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C. Entered as second class mail matter at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879. JAMES P. CANNON: Editor Subscription rates: In the United States \$1.00 per year; 65¢ per six months; Canada and foreign \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 six months. Bundle rates: Two cents per copy. SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1936 Vol. 2, No. 20 (Whole No. 72)

LUMEN CAMP COOPERATIVE
Rivervale, N. J.
OPENING JUNE 14
Round Trip \$.75. Modern Facilities
TENNIS SWIMMING SHOWERS
Band and Entertainment Every Saturday
\$14 a Week \$12 for Members
For Information Call Labor Bookshop
28 East 12th Street STuy. 9-0567