

Corroboration Of Betrayal

"In the event that the Czechoslovakian army will fight consistently against German imperialism, the Czechoslovakian Communists will support this struggle and come out in favor of the army. We are for preserving the independence of the Czechoslovak nation which can be guaranteed by means of a strong army cleansed of Fascist elements and in which the workers enjoy all political liberties. We demand that the members of the army be granted the right of suffrage again... We will support the Socialist parties in the government in all the measures which are designed to combat fascism and to produce concrete benefits to the workers. In foreign policy we will advocate everything that is designed to support the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union and to beat back the war plans of Hitler Germany."

-From a speech by the C. P. deputy in the Czech parliament delivered at a mass meeting of the C.P. in Prague and reported in the "Prager Tagblatt". (Neue Front, May 24, 1935.)

NEW MILITANT

with which is merged THE MILITANT
Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co., 55 East 11th Street, New York City
Phone. ALgonquin 4-9058

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

JAMES P. CANNON Editor

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
In the United States \$1.00 per year; 65c six months
Canada and Foreign: \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 six months
Bundle Rates: Two cents per copy.

Vol. 1 SATURDAY, JUNE 15, 1935 No. 26

The Socialist Call and Social Patriotism

The Stalin-Laval Communique is arousing the widest interest among the politically organized workers and, following the attacks of the revolutionary Marxists on this shameful announcement of the social-patriotic betrayal of the Stalinists, has now brought important repercussions in the socialist ranks. The Socialist Call, organ of the S. P. "militants," devotes an article in the June 8 issue to this question and mingles no words in its denunciation of Stalin and his French lackeys who are transformed into lackeys of the French imperialist bourgeoisie.

The Socialist Call quotes the notorious statement: "In this respect Stalin fully understands and approves the policy of national defense undertaken by France of maintaining her armed forces at the level required for security," and the prompt response of the Humanite to the effect that "We are resolved in case of war to carry out our obligation of revolutionary defense even if it coincides with so-called national defense. . . . Revolutionary defeatism demands that we should struggle for the defeat of the Hitlerian counter-revolution."

To this the Call quite properly replies: "So 'revolutionary defense' is to be put at the service of French imperialism! And 'revolutionary defeatism' which always meant the defeat of your government is perverted to mean the defeat of the enemy of your government!"

"This is the most vulgar national chauvinism, no matter in what fine sounding terms it is clad."

So far so good. The expression of the Socialist Call is an indication that the Socialist "Militants" are overcoming the false and dangerous illusion that Stalinism is something "left" and "revolutionary." It shows that the Socialists are already to a certain extent "vaccinated" against this disease. That is a prerequisite for their further development on the road of revolutionary Marxism, and is a sign that events have served to confirm the educa-

tional campaign which we have conducted for a long time now on this question. All the more significant is it that this enlightenment occurs on the question which determined the regroupment of the revolutionary forces once before and which will do so again—the question of war.

But something more fundamental is involved here. The question under consideration is social-patriotism, and the Stalinists, unfortunately, are not the sole exponents and practitioners of this treachery to the working class. The original, and present, carriers of the poison of social-patriotism in the labor movement are the Social Democratic reformists! We condemn the Stalinists, not because they have introduced something new but because they have sunk down to the old platform of Social Democracy! It is not enough for a socialist paper to confine its denunciation to the Stalinists. Such a limitation does not clarify but confuses the issue for the socialist workers. It is one-sided, and therefore false and deceptive. All the more so since the Social Democratic leaders stand today where they stood in 1914.

Leon Blum, the leader of the French Socialist Party, in a speech in the French Chamber of Deputies on March 15, announced:

"I am convinced, gentlemen, and I say it weighing my words, that in replying to aggression by Hitlerite Germany, all the workers of this country will rise to a man together with all other Frenchmen."

Why doesn't the Socialist Call speak about this when it deals with French affairs? Surely the speech of Blum is known to the editors. It was called to their attention in the May 11 issue of the New Militant.

Or, to come closer home, the New Leader often praises the policy of the right wing socialists in the bourgeois government of Europe, who stand frankly on a program of civil peace and national defense. This paper, in its issue of May 18, endorses the Franco-Soviet pact and espouses the "international fight on Hitlerism" in company with the bourgeois governments in the "democratic" countries.

Why doesn't the Socialist Call answer and denounce these expressions when it deals with the subject of social patriotism? To fail to do so is to fail to arm the socialist workers against social-patriotic betrayal in their own party and international. More correctly, it is to disarm them.

We advise the Socialist Call to continue its campaign against the "vulgar national chauvinism" of the Stalinists. And the next time they write the editors should remember the excellent watchword of Karl Liebknecht: "The main enemy is in our own country!" The socialist "militants" will never approach the great German revolutionist until they translate his words to read: The enemy is in our own party!

Question Box

(Continued from Page 3)

"Finally, we may add for the sake of complete clarity: if in the U.S.S.R., today, the Marxist party were in power, it would renovate the entire political regime: it would shuffle and cleanse the bureaucracy, and place it under the control of the masses; it would transform all of the administrative practices, and inaugurate a series of capital reforms in the management of economy; but in no case would it have to undertake an OVERTURN IN THE PROPERTY RELATIONS, i.e., A NEW SOCIAL REVOLUTION." (L. Trotsky, "The Soviet Union and the Fourth International," all emphasis in original.)

BREMERTON, Wash. (FP). — The Roosevelt administration's feverish naval preparations against Japan are giving Bremerton, seat of the Puget Sound U. S. navy yard, boom time prosperity. A \$4,500,000 naval drydock is already voted by congress, warships are being reconditioned and new building is expected.

BOOK SALE

June Clearance
20-50% Discount
On All Books

PIONEER BOOKSHOP
96 Fifth Avenue, New York City

Cor. 15th Street

One Flight Up

Industrial Unionism and the A. F. of L.

Basic Issue Stirs Conflict Between Bureaucrats and Ranks

By KARL LORE
Rumors of serious division in the leading circles of the American Federation of Labor run thick on the labor movement grapevine. Louis Stark, the cautious and well-informed labor correspondent of the New York Times has even written of the possibility that the United Mine Workers, the Metal Miners, clothing, brewery, and printing tradesmen might take the initiative in setting up another federation. Unlikely as it is that the near future will see any such development, there is no doubt that real differences exist and that they center around the historic and basic issue of industrial unionism.

brewery bosses to split the workers' ranks, in others they ousted the Brewery Workers from Central Labor Unions. A dispatch from Spokane, Washington (where union brewers are on strike or are locked out as a result of this fight) quotes Harry Dahl, district representative of the Teamsters, as saying: "We are organizing a new affiliated union called the Brewery Inside Workers to which all employees inside the local breweries must belong."

Truly an unprecedented situation! Dual unionism has always been considered a cardinal crime by Federation officials. Yet here, in its efforts to smash an industrially constructed Federation affiliate, another A. F. of L. organization goes to the length of organizing a dual union. No word of protest has come from Federation headquarters although these tactics are being used in a national fight to dismember one of its oldest bodies.

The last convention of the A. F. of L. voted with great enthusiasm for a widespread organization campaign in the steel industry. Plans were drawn up and presented to the Executive Council at its last session. But the drive never got under way. What happened is fairly well known. The old guard killed the campaign by insisting that it be conducted on a craft basis and that Wharton of the Machinists head the organizing committee. The whole idea was shelved. The industrial unionists on the Council knew that it would be a grizzly farce to approach the men of the mills on that basis.

At the same session the International Union of Mill, Mine and Smelter Workers appealed against the action of the Metal Trades Department of the A. F. of L. and its president, the astute John P. Frey, in dividing the workers in the Butte, Montana copper mines among a number of craft unions. Only the semi-skilled and unskilled had been left in the miners' organization. The appeal was rejected and the position of the Metal Trades Department—composed entirely of craft organizations—was approved.

The Metal Trades Department has just signed a joint agreement for twelve of its affiliated crafts with the Sinclair Oil Company, an agreement which runs out in March 1936. Last June a contract was signed by the Sinclair Company with the Oil Field, Gas Well and Refinery Workers which expires in June 1935. The boiler-makers have still another agreement. Certainly by now the unions should have learned the necessity of writing contracts expiring simultaneously for all divisions of the industry. The present situation in oil means that power to act, instead of being concentrated in one strong union, is divided in three directions. Contractual relations with the employer are not coordinated. Unified strike action will be very difficult if not impossible of achievement.

The Federation's real problem, however, lay in the newly organized industries. The Federal locals had been largely the work of rank and file elements and Federation organizers had little influence in them. The unions thus set up were completely industrial in structure and suggestions that crafts be split off met with stiff resistance. It

I.L.P. Confab Marks Time

(Continued from Page 3)
proclaiming before all the imperative necessity for such working towards and for its consummation.

At the Paris Conference of Independent Socialist Parties held in February of this year, which is briefly reported elsewhere in this paper, the British I.L.P. played a leading and important role. This influence has undoubtedly been exerted to prevent a clear declaration for a New International. Delegate C. A. Smith, a prominent worker and writer in the I.L.P., drew attention at the Derby conference to the fact that, within the Left Parties group, the I.L.P. has been responsible for the prevention of steps towards the formation of a Fourth International.

The perspective of a New International in the dim and distant future must be energetically rejected. Such an attitude in this deep crisis of capitalism, with rapidly approaching war, with the alarming growth of fascism and fascist tend-

Left Groups Meet in N.Y.

(Continued from Page 1)
of local 22, noting that no clause on race discrimination was included in the program, corrected the oversight.

On the question of industrial unionism and amalgamation, delegate Schiff, moved that a committee be authorized to draw up a resolution covering the steps to be taken in reaching our objective of one industrial union of all needle workers. This proposal was ruled out as "impractical" on the grounds that the committee could not report back to the conference. Zimmerman spoke to this effect. An addition proposed by the Levy (manager of local 1) group opposed "mechanical" control of unions. Zimmerman moved to refer this clause to the incoming executive committee.

Two points in the program were subject to debate: the labor party and dual unionism.

Bill Green's Position
The clause on dual unionism reads in part: "For any union to stand outside the A. F. of L. means to stand outside the labor movement. . . . In the interests of unity we firmly oppose dual unionism of all brands and varieties. Dual unionism destroys solidarity and breeds demoralization and conflicts among the workers, leading to strikebreaking and scabbery, to paralysis and disintegration. . . ."
As no reference was made in this clause to the progressive attitude

nearly 4,000,000—a grand total of more than 12,000,000 organizable but with no place in the existing international union structure."

Separating Unskilled Dorkers
It is a great advance of course, that the less skilled elements have been organized in greater numbers than ever before. There can be no doubt that their presence within the organized labor movement will make a profound impression. But to separate them organizationally from the vitally important skilled workers who are so often the key to victorious strike movements is extremely dangerous. The joint councils which are being set up in most industries to provide for some measure of united action are at best a shoddy substitute for a genuine industrial structure. Only the future can tell whether such makeshift construction will withstand the attack of industry.

The leaders of the great craft unions have been traditionally scornful of the mass of the unskilled. This attitude cropped out at the 1934 convention when Dan Tobin of the Teamsters referred to the "rubbish" that had recently come into the trade union movement. His remark was notable for its frankness but it only expressed what too many other labor chiefs, who see in the avalanche of new members a force which may eventually sweep them from their high places, are thinking. Constant and unpredictable strike waves are not to their liking. They fear the new and aggressive elements who, rising from the mills and factories of America, are challenging their policies, their lack of militancy and their right to leadership.

Issue For Progressives
This raises a serious question in regard to the new mass unions of semi and unskilled workers. They are not yet firmly established. The membership and leadership is, by and large, untrained. They have no adequate treasuries to sustain them in their fight. For some time to come they will require a good deal of help from the Federation and from its affiliated organizations. Will they get it? It is tragically significant that in the great textile strike, the most widespread labor battle in the history of America, not one red cent was donated by the craft union cohorts. It is entirely possible that these die-hards, once they have blasted loose and absorbed the craft workers from the Federal Unions, will lose interest in the problems of the masses in the basic industries. The craft moguls are fighting for their lives. They know that the trend of the times is against them and that the ground they stand on is shifting under their feet. But they control the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor and, in the cause of self-preservation, they seem prepared to leave the less skilled masses whom they despise and fear, holding the bag.

It is unfortunate that there has been as yet, no consolidation of the progressives in the trade union movement to take the initiative against these tendencies. Certainly without such a crystallization no effective opposition may be expected. The fight for genuine industrial unionism has just begun and is by no means a hopeless one. The rank and file has come through the fire and the blaze of the industrial conflict hardened and more sure of itself, its desire for labor organization which can face up to the job heightened manifold. A united progressive movement can carry forward the banner of organization on the great industrial battlefield of America.

MEXICAN RAILWAY, MINE WORKERS FORMING PACT

MEXICO CITY (FP).—A pact of solidarity is being discussed between two of the strongest and largest unions in Mexico—the Railway Workers Union and the Mining and Metallurgical Workers Union. The pact involves close to 100,000 men and will probably be signed before July 1. The action is of marked importance since it is the first case of such united action by industrial unions in Mexico.