

EDITORIALS

Five Years of the Militant

FIVE years ago this week the Militant made its first appearance of the spokesman of the ideas and doctrines of the "Russian Opposition"—the heirs and defenders of the Bolshevik October. The five years of the continuous publication of our paper have been a period of rich in great events which put all currents in the labor movement to a historical test. Our current alone stood up under it. We have every right to a feeling of deep satisfaction that we have held true to our course. Ours is a profound and unshakable conviction that what we did five years ago, and all that has been built upon it, was right. On the fifth anniversary of our paper militant we repent nothing and retract nothing.

The warning signals of the International Left Opposition were no false alarms. The tens years of reaction against which the Bolshevik-Leninists struggled without success have come to their tragic culmination in the downfall of the Comintern. What is most important in the whole world today is the fact that forces making for the reconstitution of the international movement are already at work, that the skeleton of its future organization exists and that its fundamental program has been elaborated.

In this preparatory work, carried out under a hailstorm of slander and persecution, the Militant played a part. The new party of Communism in America, which will constitute a section of the Fourth International, will mark its launching in November 1938, as an important and significant date if it does not tract its genealogy directly to that date.

Our struggle to set the counter current into motion and to prepare the way for the new movement was conducted from the first—and is still conducted—with inadequate material means and forces. Our chief weapon—almost our only weapon—was the Militant. The capacity of our movement to endure, to survive and to gain an influence under these circumstances is testimony to the power of Marxist ideas. They make their way in spite of everything. The celebration of the Militant, alive and strong on its fifth anniversary, is a celebration of the vitality of the doctrines of Marxism which nothing and nobody can kill.

By all that has gone before the militants grouped around the Militant are called upon to play the main part in assembling the elements of the new party in America. They are the bearers of its ideas. The Militant, as the spokesman of these ideas, only grows in significance as the new turn of events multiplies the opportunities and responsibilities.

All that has been done up till now is only a work of preparation for the future. Without minimizing our weakness or hiding our faults we can face that future, and all the responsibilities it imposes, with confidence. The foundations that have been laid are impregnable. If we build on them we will build for victory.

Litvinoff's Visit and Russian Recognition

WITH public attention focused on the visit of Litvinoff and his discussions with Roosevelt, the question of Russian recognition is an outstanding issue which is stirring all interested political circles and economic groups into an increased activity; that is all circles except the one to whom the issue belongs first of all—the Communist and Left wing labor movement. While these various elements in American bourgeois society discuss terms, make conditions and bring forward one program or another, agitate headily and exert pressure for or against the recognition of the U. S. S. R. according to their special interest, the one section of the population which has the greatest stake in the issue—the radical labor movement—stands paralyzed and refrains from any intervention. What is the explanation of this anomaly? This neutralization of the working class in a matter of the most vital concern to them is more of the rotten fruit of Stalinist diplomacy.

From the point of view of the Marxists, the relationship between the workers state and the capitalist governments is an expression of the class struggle, that is, a fundamentally irreconcilable conflict. ("One or the other must finally triumph," said Lenin). While the final outcome of this conflict remains undecided, the Soviet Union is obliged to enter

into temporary agreements with the bourgeois state powers which the workers aim eventually to overthrow, in pretty much the same way as trade unions bargain with private employers whom the workers aim to expropriate.

The condition for the making of an advantageous bargain is not under any circumstances the good will of the capitalists. The talent of a Soviet diplomat is a minor item; in the final analysis it cuts about as much ice as the shrewdness of a business agent in a trade dispute—the masters are acutely conscious of their material interests and cannot be talked out of them. What decides is the relative strength of the workers and its full mobilization at the moment of negotiations.

By disorienting the workers vanguard and paralyzing its activity, Stalinist diplomacy deprives the Soviet Union of the pressure and influence of its most reliable ally. That is why the question of recognition by the U. S. government is being considered as an internal affair of the bourgeoisie, uninfluenced by any serious working class demonstration. Under such conditions it can be taken for granted that American capitalism will concede only what its own requirements dictate and will take full advantage of every weakness of the Soviet Union in presenting its own demands.

The humiliating spectacle presented by the one-sided discussion of Russian recognition in bourgeois circles can be ended, and the interests of the workers' state and of the American labor movement, in this as in every case, can be really defended only by the independent intervention of the workers' vanguard. The revolutionary workers must fight for the interests of the Soviet Union without the aid of Stalinism and against its perfidious policy.

In the first place the visit of Litvinoff should not be allowed to dampen down the working class agitation for recognition. On the contrary, it should be the signal for its stormy development on the broadest possible basis. Recognition should be made the central issue of a mighty united front movement which would shake the country with its clamorous demands for unconditional recognition in the midst of the negotiations at Washington. Every reactionary group is busy with demands and conditions and restrictions on the Soviet Union. Let the workers thunder their own demands on the Roosevelt Government to recognize the Soviet Union at once and without any conditions!

In the second place, while every reactionary clique is demanding "concessions" from the U. S. S. R., the workers should present their own demand for a "concession" from the Wall Street Government. That demand, which unites the interests of the American with the Russian workers concretely, is—Long Term Credits to the Soviet Union!

Over three years ago the Left Opposition raised this slogan as an issue of the labor movement. It was denounced by the Stalinists as counter-revolutionary. Now it forms the central topic of the negotiations between Litvinoff and Roosevelt, but the latter is under no compulsion from the workers at home. He is free to accept or reject the proposal, or to hedge it about with restrictions, conditions and penalties, as the interests of Wall Street dictate. The composition of the Stalinists to agitation for Long Term credits deprived the Left wing labor movement of a living issue and has worked mightily to weaken the position of the Soviet Union in the present negotiations.

The slogan of long term credits is just the link needed to tie the American workers directly to the socialist construction in Russia by their own material interests. Opposition to it is a crime. Long term credits for Russia, to finance the purchase of American machinery, would serve to alleviate the unemployment situation to that extent. At the same time they would aid the development of Russian industry and improve the situation of the workers there. An immediate mutual interest would unite the American and the Soviet workers in the fight for this demand. The fusion of this demand with the demand for unconditional recognition would create the motive power to build a great movement among the American workers, hard pressed by unemployment, within a very short time. From this a great development of international solidarity would naturally follow.

It is high time to make an end of silent acquiescence in the back-stairs diplomacy of Stalin and Litvinoff. It is high time to organize a fight of the working class on the question of relations with Russia.

Manifesto of the Bolshevik Party of Cuba

(Continued from Page 3)

be guaranteed by the proletarian dictatorship, and that this proletarian dictatorship will not appear after the revolution, but on the foundation of the revolution itself, as the only force capable of achieving the agrarian and anti-imperialist objectives.

It is necessary to leave no room for doubt in this respect. An enormous theoretical poverty exists in this question, which, however, the Bolshevik party does not hesitate to tackle. The sectarian group has never been able to answer these essential questions, simply because it has not realized its responsibility in regard to them. In a petty bourgeois manner, they mask their ideological confusion by tacking together a half dozen anti-imperialist slogans from the international store-room of catch-words and slogans. In practice they have not advanced one inch further, in the agrarian and national questions, than the petty bourgeois of the A. B. C. However, they furiously attack these latter, perhaps because of a special desire to contradict themselves.

Possibilities of a Resurgence of the Official Communist Party

Before deciding to make the turn towards the formation of a new party, we have given due consideration to the possibilities of a general political resurgence not only of the Communist International but of its Cuban section as well. The development of recent political events, has returned the most valuable and honest elements, who had

been in exile abroad to the ranks of the Communist Party of Cuba. These new forces, which the bureaucracy is very careful to keep on the periphery of the party, clash objectively with the old routine, sectarian tactics of the leadership. But the intensity of the clash is toned down, because the sectarian leadership maneuvers capably, extending to these new elements the strings which will definitely tie it to the worn-out and worm-eaten party apparatus.

These comrades still believe that it is possible to restore the Communist party to its "political normalcy", and that this restoration must take place from the inside. In spite however of their heroic efforts and sincere purpose, it will be proven useless. The degeneration of the party is complete.

We have fought hard ever since 1931 to create the renovating current capable of saving the party from its own corruption. These efforts have been in vain.

Those comrades who still struggle for the regeneration of the party, do not yet feel the pressure of the ruling bureaucracy, because the latter finds the menace of our group enough for the present. As soon as the Stalinist wing of the party is definitely entrenched in its position, it will turn distastefully against these new elements in an attempt to suppress them. Then, the friction between the two forces, will push towards the Bolshevik-Leninists, the most capable and revolutionary sections of the party. To those militants who still conserve their ideological honesty,

the Bolshevik-Leninist Party will never close its doors.

The future of the world belongs to Bolshevism.

Long live the Bolshevik-Leninist Party.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE BOLSHEVIK-LENINIST PARTY

Havana, September 25, 1933.

LOVESTONE'S APOLOGUES IN TORONTO

Toronto. — Lovestone's whole speech here was an apology for all the false Stalinist policies. So much so, that workers began to ask why aren't you inside the official party? What is the difference between you and the Stalinists.

Not one hostile question or, as a matter of fact, not one word of criticism was uttered against Lovestone by any of the big crowd of Stalinists present. The loudest and sincerest applause to Lovestone's remarks came from the Stalinists. This is very significant, especially when we recall a few months ago when Lovestone spoke in Toronto, they could not sit straight in their seats. It was only when Lovestone began to explain, in reply to a pointed question, the "few tactical differences" with the official party, did the Stalinists refrain from applauding.

The History of the Left Opposition by Max Shachtman, promised some time ago by Pioneer Publishers, is soon to appear. The pamphlet was long delayed due to financial and technical difficulties. It will sell for five cents.

SOCIETY NEWS A New Light on the United Front

(Press Reports)

New York, Nov. 15.—The princess Alexis Mdivani (Barbara Hutton) reached the age of 21 yesterday and received a one-third share of the \$600,000,000 estate left in 1919 by her grandfather, F. W. Woolworth, the five-and-ten cent store operator.

In her honor, her father, Franklyn Hutton, stock broker, gave a dinner party last night at the Hutton home, 1,020 Fifth Avenue, surrounded by fifty guests at small tables, a Hungarian orchestra and opera singers as entertainers, his daughter made it evident she still felt as she did before the spectacular wedding in Paris, when she told the world: "It's going to be fun to be a Princess."

(Adolph Gerstenzang, forty-eight years old, unemployed chemist, who was to have been dismissed from his apartment at 885 West End Avenue, committed suicide Sunday night by shooting himself.)

Barbara Hutton Mdivani is a happy-go-lucky good natured girl. She is generous, easy-going and fun-loving. She likes to dance—tangoing is her favorite pastime. She usually drives her own car and is fond of horses.

She made her debut in December, 1930, at the Ritz-Carleton. That party, the largest ever given in her honor, cost \$50,000. Silver birch trees were brought from California to transform the great ballroom into a woodland grove, an artificial moon was hung in blue gauze and little stars made to twinkle in the make believe blue heavens.

(Mrs. Maria Bognasco, forty-two year old of 2731 Hughes Avenue, Bronx, was found dead in a gas-filled kitchen of her apartment at 5 p. m. yesterday by Lillian Rock-sough, a welfare worker. Mrs. Bognasco had turned on all the jets of the kitchen range, leaned against a wash tub and covered her head and the stove with a blanket. She was separated from her husband and was destitute.)

None of the Woolworth heirs—that is, the young ones—know the business end of the huge chain of stores. When the princess Mdivani arrives in any city one of the first things she does is to visit a five-and-ten and buy something in it. It has become a matter of superstition with the family.

(Owen Gallagher, thirty-four year old, an unemployed salesman committed suicide yesterday at his home, 439 Bronxville Road, Yonkers. He left three notes for his wife. He said he had been a "dresser", unable to provide his wife and their two-year old son with the things they should have had. "He urged Mrs. Gallagher not to let their son 'hitch his wagon to a star.'")

The exact amount of the one-third share in her grandfather's estate to which the Princess became entitled yesterday could not be learned officially, but, allowing for multiplication by time and depletion by depression, it was estimated she would have at least \$20,000,000. All that could be learned was that she was not taking possession of the entire amount now—only about \$10,000,000 or so. At the time of the wedding the Prince received a dowry, which was never officially revealed but was understood to be an outright gift of \$1,000,000 to the prince together with assurance of an annual allowance of \$50,000.

(On the dump heaps, jugged with scraps of old tin pieces of scrap iron and bits of broken glass, two children played. One was a Negro, the other a white child. It was raining hard, but the Negro child had on nothing but a cotton blouse.

He played with strips of old tin that matched the walls of the shacks around. Inside one of the most nondescript his mother tended his baby sister who lay in a bed of rags, sick "for three days with something bad with his stomach."

This mother is one of the fifteen or twenty women who fled to Hoover City with husbands and children when their morale was beaten down by frequently recurring evictions, when a shack fashioned from scraps of tin boxes, great iron drums, even from the backs of abandoned gas meter boxes, looked like a safe haven against the snow and cold of this coming winter.

"It was either come here or put the kids in a welfare home and try to live without them," said one mother who moved her family of five to the "Tin Mountains" in Brooklyn's Red Hook Section. "We couldn't pay the rent in a flat, although it was only \$9 a month, and feed the kids too."

"We are very happy," the Princess told the friends who wished her well last night. Princess Alexis also was pleased.

"He is amusing, smart and interesting and he has leisure to devote to his wife," she said.

The testimony for the defense of a former Communist deputy at the Leipzig trial incidentally threw a revealing light on the contradictions and vacillations in the policy of the German C. P. regarding the question of the united front with the Social Democracy. Despite the theory of "social Fascism" and the dogma of the "united front only from below" it now appears that private negotiations with Stampfer editor of the Vorwarts, were being undertaken on the eve of the March elections.

Testimony of Neubauer

The Frankfurter Zeitung of October 28, 1933 contains an interesting report of the testimony given the previous day in the Reichstag fire frame-up trial by Dr. Theodor Neubauer, former Communist member of the German Reichstag. After informing the court that he had conferred in the Reichstag building with Torgler on February 27 (the day before the fire), and that he had been in a concentration camp since September 7,—Neubauer denied that he had ever seen van der Lubbe, the Nazi tool, until entering the court room. Questioned by Dr. Sack, Nazi attorney entrusted with the "defense" of Torgler, Neubauer then went on to explain the subject of his conversation with Torgler the day before the Reichstag fire.

Neubauer stated that he discussed the political situation with Torgler, and especially the question of making contacts to build a united front with the Social Democratic Party. He continued (verbatim translation):

"On the Sunday before the Reichstag fire a foreign newspaper man informed me that the Social Democratic Editor (of the Vorwarts), Stampfer, had tried to make contact with me in a perfectly absurd way. To learn how the C. P. felt about cooperating with the S. P., Stampfer went to an official of the Russian Embassy in Berlin. This official, of course, answered that he had absolutely nothing to say on the question, that for this purpose Stampfer must go not to the Russian Embassy, but to the headquarters of the C. P. Stampfer concluded from this that Moscow was not interested in this question, and so expressed himself to the newspaper man.

Negotiations with Stampfer

When I learned this on Sunday from the foreign newspaper man, I said to my friends that it was inconceivable to me that an old politician like Stampfer couldn't manage to differentiate between the C. P. and an official agency of the Soviet Union which naturally cannot and may not bother with internal German political affairs. I looked up a newspaper man who was in touch with Stampfer and asked him to tell Stampfer that night, between Sunday and Monday, that he had committed a major stupidity and assiduity, and that he should address himself to the right place, that is, to our Party. I offered at the same time to put myself at his service to establish the contact. Then on Monday morning the Social Democratic newspaper man, Praeger, informed me that Stampfer was ready to have a talk with us about this in the Reichstag building on Tuesday morning at 10 o'clock. At the time Torgler and I put the greatest value on this conference. Therefore I personally asked Torgler that he come along. After the stupidity that had been committed, I didn't want to deal with Stampfer alone, but thought it important that Torgler be there so no more blunders would be committed....

Dr. Sack then asked Neubauer some other questions and, returning to the question of the united front, Neubauer stated that the creation of such a united front "was the substance of the entire work of the C. P. at that time."

Dr. Sack: Did you mean that in addition to the ballot you would attack by calling out the masses?

Neubauer:—the working class was to oppose the government by strikes in factories and in outdoor actions.

A Journalist As Intermediary

Dr. Sack next asked the name of the Journalist who informed Neubauer about Stampfer's maneuvers; Neubauer stated that it was Frederic Kuh. (Kuh, at that time representative of the United Press in Berlin, has since been withdrawn by his organization; it has been generally supposed that this was because he is a Jew.—The Editor).

Asked to explain what sort of actions were contemplated, Neubauer went on as follows:

"The shutting down of all factories as well as of transportation, with the necessary effects on all public life.... These actions could never have had any objective with respect to indicting persons.... because we were fighting most sharply against any measures of individual terrorism, because we hold this to be false in theory and practically disastrous to labor. We stood by our individual action against individual old theoretical conception. Extraordinary persons were regarded as extraordinary condemnable for labor.

Dr. Senffert (prosecuting attorney): It is not yet clear how strikes have any effect on crushing Fascism.

Dr. Neubauer: We have the often cited example that in the so-called Cuno Strike a mobilization of the men was enough to turn the government out. We also pointed out in the Kapp Putsch of 1920, labor went on strike and that this

was the decisive factor in overturning the government. These are instances which were referred to repeatedly by Communist papers in those days and which we placed before the eyes of the workers.

General Strike and Civil War

Chief Prosecuting Attorney: Does the witness know that the C. P. regards a general strike as the last stage before a civil war?

Neubauer: I wouldn't formulate it that way. But I do know that the general strike, in the opinion of the C. P., can under certain conditions lead to civil war. That is not decided by the will of the C. P., but by the measure of its enemies, either the government or those parties who take opposing measures. There have been general strikes without armed insurrection and general strikes with armed insurrection. Its development one way or another does not depend on the will of the C. P.... It is obvious that if the C. P. attains its objective with a simple general strike, it would very gladly abandon the calling of an armed insurrection. Chief Prosecuting Attorney: Perhaps, but if that doesn't achieve your goal?

Neubauer: the C. P. simply states that in certain situations it is not up to the Party but up to its opponents whether the general strike leads to an armed insurrection.

Chief Prosecuting Attorney: That means, if the opponents defend themselves, then there will be an armed insurrection.

After some minor questions by other attorneys, Dimitroff took the floor and asked Dr. Neubauer whether, early in 1933, before the Reichstag fire the German C. P. had posed the task of leading an immediate armed struggle for power. This the witness denied. Asked by Dimitroff what directives he and the Reichstag fraction had with respect to extra-parliamentary action, Neubauer continued:

Aimed at United Front

"The directives for the Reichstag fraction and for all organs of the German C. P. were based on the idea that the whole political development depended on whether or not a united front, a broad mass front of workers, including Social Democratic and Christian workers, could be created against the National Socialists. The whole work was concentrated on this cardinal problem. Nothing whatsoever was said about an impending armed insurrection. I and everybody else at that time would have regarded that as misleading, because the situation was absolutely not such as to enable the Party to do such a thing. Our directives were the building of the united front of labor for strikes, for the solidarity of employed and unemployed.

The prosecuting attorneys next addressed questions to Neubauer with the aim of establishing that the C. P. of Germany never acted except under Moscow's orders, and that it did permit individual terror.

Questions by Dimitroff

Dimitroff thereupon countered with other questions which brought out that the C. P. as well as the German C. P. had always been opposed to individual terror. Neubauer also stated that the decisions of the C. P. were obligatory and directive. If the German Party had another view, it had to justify that other view before the C. P.... The German Party conducted a very wide campaign some months before the Reichstag fire, to fight against any inclinations in the Party toward individual terrorism, because we held such inclinations, in one either to provocations or the unusual tension of the political situation, to be extraordinarily dangerous. Therefore we ordered that anyone representing such an inclination must be expelled from the party as harmful."

The last question addressed to Neubauer came from Dimitroff.

"When Adolf Hitler came to power on January 30, were the National Socialists in Berlin and Germany engaged in a drive against the Communist movement? Were there not a series of attacks made on workers' organizations?"

Before Neubauer could answer, the Presiding Judge cut in and, despite Dimitroff's objection, suspended further questioning. Asked to take the oath on the testimony he had given, Neubauer refused a religious oath but affirmed the truth of his statements.

Notes of the Week

"Worker, Farmer 'Join Up'"

Worker, Farmer "Join Up"—is not, as you might suspect, just another Communist slogan. It happens to be the news-head of a story in the daily press. The story deals with the strike of the workers at the George A. Harmel Packing Co. plant in Austin, Minnesota.

The strikers, say the newspapers, "seized the plant, seventh largest in the world... after a clash with guards. The strikers were aided by members of the Farmer's National Holiday Association." The headline — Worker, Farmer "Join Up"—merely sums up a cold fact.

And still such a matter-of-fact headline sends a thrill of appreciation down a militant worker's spine. It has within it the portent of a magnificent perspective. It forbodes, by recounting a live incident, such a union of the mass of toilers in this country as will finally spell the doom of the ruling capitalist class.

The productive forces of society on either pole—the farm and in the factory — instinctively join hands! They have many different viewpoints, they may have varying conceptions of property, of law. But they are drawn closer and closer to each other in mutual self-defense against the destructive force of society—in defense against the ravages of capitalism.

The events at Austin, Minnesota bear a striking proof of this inevitable getting-together of workers and farmers. It is spontaneous, as the passion of the fighters themselves. The unity which is to deal the decisive blow for the preservation and defense of humanity in this country is still in the groping stage. More "Austin's" will dot the map as time goes by.

"Joining up" of farmers and workers will become more than a spontaneous outburst. Thinking farmers will give more thought to the idea of linking up their fight for life with that of the city producer.

It will be up to the industrial workers, with all their strike-experience, with all their natural discipline of action and aptness for collective struggle—to give the lead.

Powerful unions, a unified working class policy, and above all—the assimilation of international experience—will do more than anything else to enable American workers to build up and buttress the fighting front of the workers and farmers for a decisive, revolutionary solution of their common problems.

Austin lights the way. It unfolds the possibilities of successful struggle. But it is also an admonition, a challenge to workers to prepare for the opportunities that are bound to arise.

If They Won't Raise 'Em—They'll Stretch 'Em

Not a step that the New Dealers take but has the interests of the working class at heart. Recently they put over Repeal. But, you might ask: What has Repeal to do with the interests of the workers in particular?

The answer is pretty easy. That is, if you've heard of the New York State regulations for the sale of liquor. Bottled drinks are to be sold cash down only. This provision, New York State's dictator of booze—Mr. Mulrooney, who not so long ago had the occasion to show his love for the workers in his capacity as police commissioner of the city—explains, is motivated by a desire to prevent pay envelopes from being emptied out by heaped-up charge accounts. It is, in other words, designed to stretch wages.

NRA and the codes haven't done much to bring about higher pay and guarantee decent living conditions. But the New Dealers are determined to do right by the working man. If NRA and the codes won't do the trick—no doubt the liquor regulations will be of help. No doubt!

If they can't raise wages, then they'll stretch them. —G....N.

Probation for Food Workers

(Continued from Page 1)

minutes in which to present his point of view. The pre-arranged clause of the machine interrupted him constantly with boos and cat-calls, making it difficult for him to be heard in the hall. No extension of time was granted him. The shameful cry of "stool pigeon" was hurled at Gordon by one degenerate after another, and the shouting came loudest from two individuals in particular, the outstanding "Trotsky-baiters" in the union, who scream all the more loudly because of the fact that even in the District Executive Committee of the Communist Party here they have more than once been discussed as suspicious, shady elements who had to be watched.

Then They Sing—the "Internationale"

In a disgraceful mockery, the Stalinists brought the meeting to

a close after their infamous procedure with... the singing of the "Internationale!"

We said last week that the Stalinists would not be permitted to carry through their expulsion with impunity. That the Left wing workers would let themselves be heard from before the case would safely be considered "closed" by the bureaucratic machine. We add now, that after this signal victory of our comrades whose fight compelled the machine-men to back water, we shall not be content to rest. The "probation" and "withdrawal card" racket which the Stalinists are now substituting for outright expulsions, will not be allowed to remain in effect. The militants intend to fight out this battle to the end, giving no quarter to the officialdom and their henchmen who have brought the progressive and Left wing labor movement to the brink of the abyss.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE MILITANT! READ SPREAD AND SUPPORT THE MILITANT IT IS YOUR PAPER