

# A Letter to Roger Baldwin

### On Stalinist-Pacifist Relations at the Anti-War Conference

August 9, 1932.  
Mr. Roger Baldwin, Director  
American Civil Liberties Union  
New York City

My dear Baldwin:  
You left the anti-war conference at the Labor Temple last night after your opening speech as the representative of the "American Committee for the World Congress Against War." Allow me to inform you of what transpired after your departure and to put some questions to you.

Two resolutions were presented for consideration—the official (pacifist) resolution presented in the name of your committee, and a different resolution, outlining the Leninist program for the fight against war, presented by the delegation of the Communist Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists).

The floor war then given to a number of speakers who defended the official resolution and attacked the resolution of the Left Opposition. Pacifists, "Left" Socialists, official Communists and others spoke. The leader of the attack on the Leninist resolution, appropriately enough, was Olgin; the same Olgin whom you will remember as the ardent patriot who attacked the Lenin program in 1917-18 from the standpoint of Wilson's "14 points." Our request for the floor to defend our resolution and answer the attacks made against it was refused by the chairman.

Was it a pre-arranged plan on your part to leave the meeting and thus give tacit support to the steam-rolling of the Bolshevik-Leninists, or did you have other engagements, more important and more pressing at the moment, than the question of the fight against war and the principle of free speech in a movement under your leadership?

I am inclined to the first assumption. And, from a political point of view, your indirect support of the suppression of the Left Opposition at the conference is quite comprehensible. You, and the tendency you represent—pacifism—were undoubtedly the victors at the conference. In the united front between the Stalinists and the pacifists in the anti-war movement the Stalinists have yielded the principle positions all along the line, from Paris to New York. The program, the character of the preparatory propaganda and the leadership are pacifist. In return for these concessions you allow the Stalinists to manipulate the movement organizationally and to suppress the voice of the Left Opposition which they fear more than anything else. That is what your united front looks like to us.

It must be admitted, again from a political point of view, that you and your fellow-thinkers have made an excellent bargain. We cannot condemn it on those grounds, for we have never put the question of free speech and democracy as the fundamental question. We have stated more than once that we could reconcile ourselves even to bureaucracy if it could be demonstrated that it serves a revolutionary end. It is precisely because the Stalinist bureaucracy works in an opposite direction, because it serves as a blind instrument of reaction, that we oppose it so intransigently.

But some clarification is needed as to your position. Hitherto you have defended free speech as a principle, even to the extent of demanding it for the Mensheviks in Russia and the Ku Klux Klan in America. That was your right, of course. But if you have modified your standpoint; if you have decided to sacrifice the principle of free speech where we are concerned in a movement under the direction of your national committee in return for the truly enormous concessions in principle made by the

Stalinists, then you ought to make a frank public explanation of your change of position and the reason for it.

Frankness and clarity are of special importance in every aspect of the struggle against war which incorporates at the present moment all the interests of the U. S. S. R. and the world proletariat. In the struggle against war nothing is more dangerous and disarming than ambiguity and deception. Let the position of every group be made clear in every respect! The faction to which I belong—the Bolshevik-Leninist faction—devotes itself especially to this work of clarification, not only of its own position but also of others.

In putting these questions to you I trust you will understand that they are meant invidiously in a personal sense. I do not doubt the sincerity of your intentions in the anti-war movement. It is your program that we oppose. It is the ambiguity as to your attitude toward the right of the Left Opposition

# The New York Anti-War Conference

(Continued from page 2)  
accepted because they were tested in the very crucible of war and revolution, will also make their way. Of that we have always been confident, and our convictions were strengthened manifold by the feeble, cowardly, apologetic defense the Stalinists made against our criticisms at the Labor Temple.

The Conference, we said, centered upon our standpoint, much to the chagrin of the Stalinists. They had originally planned the whole affair as an elaborate masquerade, a repetition of the catastrophic experiments with the Anglo-Russian Committee and the Anti-Imperialist League. Instead of a revolutionary presentation of the Communist position, as an absolute pre-requisite for a united front with the non-Communist masses, the party planned a "respectable" movement for which the liberals would furnish the window-dressing, thereby presumably enabling the party to win the masses—without the masses knowing a thing about it! Listen to how the party-controlled *New Masses* of this August, with the distinguished Olgin on its editorial board, speaks thus of the movement: there must be built "a realistic, uncompromising, American, peace, movement, cooperating actively with the sane and determined forces of peace in other countries to the end that the war-makers may be exposed and checkmated on every front." "Sane and checkmated forces of peace"—how smoothly these Stalinist dilettantes slip back into the language of "sane" liberalism, of the Nation and the New Republic!

In harmony with this dazzling plan to present pacifism as revolutionary, while revolutionaries are dressed up into pacifists, the party had decided not to send official delegates to the anti-war conference, apparently under the impression that this would somehow prove that the conference was nothing if not respectable. We are able to state here confidently and on incontrovertible authority that this was the original plan of the party strategists. They decided only at the very last minute to change this plan—only after the appearance of last week's *Militant*, where we exposed this cowardly piece of opportunism and announced that we would go to the Conference to present our point of view. Not even Baldwin, apparently, was tipped off to the change in the party's plans, because he referred in his speech to the fact that "of course" the Communist party would not participate officially.

to participate and defend its viewpoint in the conferences organized under the auspices of your national committee that we seek to clear up.

The Left Opposition is not against the participation of sincere pacifists in the anti-war conferences. It is against the pacifist program and the pacifist leadership, aided by the treacherous sanction of the Stalinist bureaucrats. To that we will always counterpose the Lenin program and the revolutionary leadership. This aim motivated our appearance at the conference last night and our request from the floor there. It will be the same in the future.

The specific question to which we desire an answer now stands: Do you and the "American Committee for the World Congress Against War" of which you are a prominent member, recognize our right to participate in the conferences and meetings under its direction and to defend our views there, or have you come to a tacit agreement with the Stalinists to exclude us? We will find the way to popularize the Lenin program in any case. We ask no favors. The sole object of this inquiry is clarification of your position.

Yours,  
JAMES P. CANNON.

Further indications that this was the original plan is seen in the fact that officially the T. U. U. L., the red trade union central organization, sent not a single delegate. The Young Communist League, which has as one of its highest tasks the struggle against war and militarism, was not represented by a single delegate! And even the party did not send any of its prominent leaders. To represent official Communism, it sent a successful dentist, an equally successful lawyer, a business man, and a second-hand journalist. The conference must not be "too red." It must be respectable. It must satisfy the liberal authors, painters, poets and actors. It must conform to the idea of a masquerade.

A big debacle is being warmed up for us in the Stalinist kitchens. If in no other question, then at least in the question of the struggle against war the Stalinists have had a "consistent" policy. Daily, deafening, endless cries about the "war danger" and opportunistic combinations with all the shady and dubious elements inside and outside the labor movement to "lead" the struggle against war and for the defense of the Soviet Union as a substitute for the leadership of the Communist party. This was the meaning of the combination with Purcell and Co., with Chang Kai-Shek, Wang Chin Wei and Feng Yu-hsiang, as well as with all the other adventurers and traitors who used Stalin's "Anti-Imperialist League" either as a refuge from working class storms at home or as a Communist Monte Carlo where their fortunes might be replenished. In no case was this hollow substitute for a revolutionary struggle successful in advancing the genuine anti-war movement by an inch or in adding to the defense of the Soviet Union.

The present course being followed by the Comintern in the Barbusse Congress enterprise can lead to only one conclusion: catastrophe. One more or less will not matter, say the cynics. They are wrong. The capital accumulated by others and usurped by Stalin is far from inexhaustible. Each debacle has served to diminish it. Stalin continues to squander it and brings the world revolutionary movement and the Soviet Union increasingly closer to a horrible end. It is high time for the Communist workers to awaken and act. The Opposition will be at their side.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

# The Party and the 6-Hour Day Slogan

In the first period of the crisis the Communist League of America advanced a series of slogans for the fight against unemployment. Among these, and as an outstanding propaganda slogan, we advanced the slogan, "For the Six Hour Day, the Five Day Week WITH NO REDUCTION IN PAY." Today, Hoover, Green and Hearst are making capital out of the six-hour day, five-day week proposal. It is advisable to review the present struggle and find out why the capitalists have stolen a march on the workers, WHO IS RESPONSIBLE, and FIND OUT WHAT THE RESULT WILL BE. The slogan for the six hour day has been advanced in one form or the other by unions for over a decade, but not until the present crisis and the establishment of a permanent army of unemployed has the slogan attracted wide-spread attention by different classes, for different ends. This must be explained.

The tremendous increase in productive forces, the rationalization since the last war, has laid the economic base for a corresponding change in the use of labor power. Around the value form of the product the capitalists attempt to reorganize the American labor power, on the basis of the reorganized industrial structure of American imperialism. From this flows increased class struggles. Around the attempted reorganization of the labor power, will first develop struggles on immediate demands that can lead in short order into deeper channels. If we allow the capitalists to reorganize the labor power to their own liking the workers will have less space necessary for the running jump to overthrow capitalism. If we allow the capitalists to reorganize the labor power without presenting a Marxian analysis, the class must again condemn the vanguard for failure. The Stalin policy has already failed in this field.

### The Capitalist Aim

In this period of capitalism, the fall in the rate of profit forces the capitalists to make up the loss by the most drastic steps. They must change the ratio of necessary labor (wages) and surplus wages (surplus value) to their interest. The lengthening of the work-day has given way to the speed-up and drastic reduction of wages in order to reduce the necessary labor and increase the surplus labor to keep up the falling rate of profit. In crises, and in sections of the industrial structure the capitalists are still able to lengthen the work-day, but the general trend is in the opposite direction, due to the developed productive forces which forces them to resort to speed-up and general wage cuts. The developed productive forces since the war have forced into the structure for the first time an absolute decrease of the number of workers employed in production, which opened the door for a permanent army of millions of unemployed workers.

This new condition called for new action on the part of the capitalists toward the commodity, labor power, if they intend to continue to exploit the workers. Likewise, it calls for bold steps by the workers' vanguard; to utilize the contradiction in the capitalist system to enable the class to take one or more steps forward. This can be done in many ways, but in this field it can only be done one way—and that is by presenting a Marxian analysis of the higher relation of labor power to production and present a Marxian program of action for the class. The party under Stalinist leadership not only failed in this task but now comes out with action that closes the door to the whole problem.

The Editorial of the *Daily Worker* of August 4 (city edition) dealing with Hoover-Green shorter week proposal plays into the hands of the capitalists and presents another heap of confusion

in the ranks of Communism. The editorial tells us in terms none too mild that the Hoover-Green, and we may add, Hearst Five-Day week proposal is a maneuver against the working class. To be opposed to the Hoover-Hearst-Green shorter week proposal is not a difficult thing for a Communist paper but to present class reasons why take up. To pass off the shorter work-day proposal of the capitalists as another stagger plan is to miss the very center of the contradiction, the relation of production and the commodity labor power. Not to understand this A B C of Marxian economy, makes impossible an adoption of Marxian tactics and strategy for the class.

### A Stalinist Muddle

The editorial further, either through ignorance or lies, confuses the stagger plan with the struggle for, "The six hour day, the five day week and no reduction in pay." The editorial says, "The socialists, the Mustelites, the Trotskyites are putting forward the slogan of 30-hour week without reduction of pay. In reality they are helping put into effect

## MILITANT BUILDERS

### THE MIRACLE ISSUE

As our readers know from our front page appeal for financial help we are facing extraordinary difficulties in getting the *Militant* out each week. Last week they seemed so insuperable that after the paper was sent off to the post office we still could not believe it. And when the happy realization was borne in on us we felt that we had performed a miracle. Last week's issue will go down in the history of our movement as the miracle issue.

### MOVING UP

Of course, one of the best and soundest ways of obviating such miracles and the situation which makes them necessary is to get subs. We are doing this but the tempo is too slow. Some time ago we warned that the number of subs which expire each week must be more than balanced by new subs. Comrades, we are barely holding our own. We are moving up but too slowly. The record for this week which we give below if compared with last week's will show that.

Comrades, the *Militant* is in danger. We ourselves must save it. Part of the work must take the form of raising subs. Subs, get subs, get renewals. We must get subs.

A good sign in the staff record is the fact that the oldtimers are being crowded for their places. New comrades are stepping out ahead of them.

J. Weber	4
A. Weaver	2 1-2
C. Cowl	1
P. Schulman	1
H. Nashua	1
L. Goodman	1
H. Schwartz	1
J. Edwards	1
W. Wynne	1
The record by branches is as follows:	
New York	10 1-2
Minneapolis	3 1-2
Chicago	2
Philadelphia	1

### Other branches—get busy!

### GERMANY—THE KEY TO THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

As might have been expected with the present developments in Germany the demand for this pamphlet has shot up like a sky rocket. Our supply is almost exhausted. All that we have left are some hundred copies. And at the rate they are going they won't last another ten days. This is last call for this pamphlet. In next week's issue we will have to announce it as out of print.

the stagger plan." The above argument is about as effective as the ultra-Leftist who says; because the capitalists rule by the parliament and the Communists participate in parliaments, both are fakers; because the capitalists advocate social insurance and the Communist advocate social and unemployment insurance the Communists are no better than the capitalists. Every immediate demand has two sides to it, its exploiter and exploited side. Its reformist and revolutionary side. In the struggle for immediate demands the capitalists and reformers struggle for one end, and the revolutionists for the other. Such is the case with unemployment insurance, with elections, with strikes, with civil war and likewise with the demand for the six-hour day the five day week, and no reduction of pay.

The Stalinists present the seven-hour day slogan as correct, and the six-hour day slogan as false. The editorial bases its argument upon, "the full time work week being around 50 hours, the demand for the 30 hour week without reduction of pay would be not to take the struggle of the workers seriously and to pave the way for the stagger plan." The bourgeois average of 50 hours a week for full time workers (how many at full time work in the crisis?) does not determine the slogan for the class, as Stalinists contend.

The six-hour day, five-day week, without reduction in pay is based upon the needs of the workers at the present stage of American capitalism. The editorial says, "Through speed-up the capitalists hope to get out of the workers the same production in the six hours as they now get out of an eight hour day." The capitalists have already accomplished this in the past and in the future the speed-up will be increased, even though the workers don't get any reduction in hours. Seven hours, under capitalist speed-up, is too much. The workers cannot stand the pace. The hours must be reduced to six if ordinary health is to be had. The struggle for the six-hour day does not mean the 30 hour week average. The eight hour movement of the eighties did not mean a 48 hour average. The six hour day struggle is the driving force to reduce all hours in industries that run all the way from 8 to 16 hours. If we win the six hour day it will only mean about a 40 hour AVERAGE for the American industries.

### Hours and Wages

A reduction of hours for the class, on the basis of class struggle, regardless of the bosses ability here and there to lower wages—has the directly opposite effect on wages. History proves the reduction of the hours of work per day causes wages to rise. Marxism also proves this—in case some Stalinist care to consult their Marxian economics.

We have warned the party many months ago in the columns of the *Militant* about the danger of playing around with the six-hour day slogan. We said if the party did not take the lead, the reformers and the capitalists would take the lead and turn it into a campaign against us to reduce the standard of living further. The capitalists and reformers, through the neglect of Stalinism now have their hands on a weapon and will use it on our heads. In the eight-hour day struggle in the Eighties the workers had the weapon and used it over the heads of the capitalists. Every immediate demand is a race between the classes for the lever; and the tactics and strategy, based on Marxian analysis will determine if we can obtain the lever, instead of the capitalists, in the class struggle.

The slogan, advanced by us many months ago for, "Long Term Credits to the Soviet Union," has also met the same fate in the hands of these Stalinist muddleheads. The Communist League of America must intensify its activity within and outside of the party in the class struggle to win a greater organized Left Opposition to give us more pressure upon Stalinist revisionism, to enable our class and vanguard more effectively to fight the capitalists.

The slogan for the six-hour day, five-day week, with no reduction in pay, is the central propaganda slogan for the struggle against unemployment. To unite the employed and unemployed upon a solid organizational basis. It is not a question of social insurance, or immediate relief, or the shorter work day, or long term credits to the Soviet Union or the United Front—which is first and which is second. Immediate relief is the most pressing problem for the class at the moment but this does not mean we build a movement around the slogan of immediate relief as the first or central slogan. Depending upon ebbs and flows, upon sharp turns or victories, other slogans will be shifted to the spotlight and then replaced by one of the other slogans. The structure must be built on a solid organizational base, that touches the roots of the capitalist system that spans the whole period of unemployment, and at the same time enables the other slogans to build upon this structure. This slogan is the slogan for the reduction of hours, "The six-hour day, the five-day week, with no reduction in pay."

—H. O.

### PORTRAIT OF A YOUTH

By good fortune we have picked up a copy of Max Eastman's biography of comrade Trotsky which is out of print. The title of it is—Leon Trotsky, the Portrait of a Youth. We have only one copy and we refuse to sell it. But we will turn it over to the *Militant* staff to be included in its premiums to be offered to the highest standing member of the staff of *Militant Builders* at the end of August.

# The Left Opposition's Resolution at the New York Anti-War Conference

The Conference Against War assembled on August 8th at the Labor Temple, representing numerous labor and fraternal organizations of New York, declares that the problem of Imperialist war and aggression against the Soviet Union has now become a most acute question requiring the immediate consideration of the working class of this country and the rest of the world.

The present world-wide crisis of capitalism is accentuating the conflicts among the imperialist powers to the highest degree and by the very nature of capitalist society is driving them headlong towards another bloody conflict for the re-division of the markets and other sources of power in the world, in which each of the great powers, expecting a victorious outcome, hopes to emerge from the crisis raging in its midst. The numerous "disarmament" conferences which have been held in Geneva are an enormous swindle, comparable to the various "peace" conferences and maneuvers of the days before the world war of 1914-18, which were calculated by the imperialist powers merely for the purpose of jockeying for position in the field of armaments and for lulling the working class of the world into a feeling of false security during which all the preparations were actually being made for war itself. The preaching of "disarmaments" is pernicious, hypocrisy which, in reality, serves to disarm the working class at the same time that the capitalist class is arming itself to the teeth.

**War and the Soviet Union**  
The preparations for a new imperialist world war go on simultaneously with the preparations for an aggressive assault upon the Soviet Union. The imperialists have a permanent hatred for the Soviet Union not only because of the economic advances it has made, but prim-

## Lenin's Fundamental Views Which Were Voted Down By the Stalinists in Alliance With the Pacifists

arily because it is the fatherland of the workers everywhere, the beacon light which inspires the proletariat throughout the world to intensify its fight for emancipation from capitalism.

The strength of the international proletariat is the best defense of the Soviet Union. The attack upon the latter, therefore, is attacked by the capitalist offensive and the assaults of Fascism upon the working class outside the Soviet Union. (War against Russia is a military continuation and prolongation of the attack upon the proletariat in every country. The defense of the Soviet Union cannot be conceived of without a revolutionary struggle of the working class in all lands, led by the Communist parties, against their own bourgeoisie. Defense of Russia without positive participation in this revolutionary struggle is merely a liberal gesture.

War is not an arbitrary act of evildoing individuals. It is the inevitable product of capitalist imperialism which cannot be abolished without the overthrow of the ruling class and its system. Only to the extent that the working class is united under the leadership of the Communist party will it be able to conduct an effective struggle against the danger of imperialist war and military intervention against the Soviet fatherland of the proletariat.

The war of 1914-1918 not only revealed the bankruptcy of capitalist society, but above all the bankruptcy and treachery of the social democracy of all lands, including the pacifists, who served as an obstacle in the path of working class struggle against war. Pacifism and so-

cial democracy, today also, are the petty bourgeois agencies of imperialism in the ranks of the working class. The conference condemns and rejects the views of these tendencies as dangerous to the genuine struggle against war. "Resistance to war", "general strike to stop war" and similar slogans of pacifism are deceptive phrases and gestures, without the revolutionary unification of the working class under Communist leadership which can put an end to war only by working systematically to convert the imperialist war into a civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

In the event of an outbreak of imperialist war, the working class decisively rejects the reactionary idea of "defense of fatherland", for it has no fatherland except the Soviet Union. In a war of imperialism, the working class takes a defeatist position. While participating in the armies of the capitalists for the aims of its own class, the proletariat works for the defeat of its own bourgeoisie as the first step in the overthrow of its capitalism. The struggle against war, therefore, is primarily the struggle against one's own ruling class and does not begin only when war has broken out. It must be carried on in the same class spirit: before, during and after the outbreak of war.

### The Key Danger—Hitlerism

While calling the attention of the workers to the acute threat to the Soviet Union contained in the Japanese attacks on Manchuria, supported by French imperialism, which is the most active supporter and organizer of the anti-Sov-

viet movements on Russia's western frontiers, the conference declares that the present situation in Germany constitutes not only the gravest danger to the Soviet Union but to the existence of the working class and revolutionary movement throughout the world. Upon victory or defeat of German Fascism will depend the fate of the world working class and the Soviet Union for the next epoch. Hitler can preserve himself in power only as a counter-revolutionary agent of France and the other great powers, only as the butcher of the German proletariat vanguard, only as the primary instrument in a military attack on Russia. The defeat of Hitlerism is therefore the immediate problem of the whole working class, and requires the utmost concentration of forces. The conference therefore urges upon the German Communist Party a consistent application of the policy of the united front towards the social-democratic masses to annihilate Fascism in the form of a proposal to the social democratic party for a united front on the basis of concrete minimum demands, aimed at a united death-blow to the Hitlerites. The policy of the united front developed under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky at the Third and Fourth Congresses of the Communist International, the unity of the working class will make it possible to smash Hitlerism and thus destroy the instruments of reaction directed at the Soviet Union. The problem of the struggle against war is now posed most acutely by the Fascist menace in Germany and it is there that the battle is concentrated at the moment.

**For Revolutionary Struggle Against War**  
The acuteness of the situation requires that the Communist International shall take the initiative and leadership in the development of an international struggle against war and for the defense of the