

Raise Banner of Bolshevism At French S. P. Congress

(Continued from Page 1)

agreement runs the risk of disruption." The Radicals, however, despite the encouragements of the Communists and the promises of "support" from L'Humanite, balked. They quit cold and capitulated to Laval who was finally able to form the new ministry, now in office, having obtained the extraordinary powers previously refused Flandin and Blisson. What lesson must be drawn from this "choice morsel"? For us it is simple and clear. The Radicals revealed what they are and what they are capable of when they are in power on Feb. 6, 1934, during the attempt to capture the Place de la Concorde by the reactionary troops. Faced with the danger of civil war the Radicals capitulated to Doumergue, to the cautious coup d'etat. This attitude of the radicals flows logically from their class policy. Could they, would they, ever break with this attitude by involving themselves with the Socialists and the Communists in the struggle against the armed forces of reaction? That would be tantamount to their committing themselves to the road of civil war, which is precisely what the Radicals do not want. And that is why, after many hesitations, the Radicals who refused extraordinary powers to Flandin and Blisson, perceiving where this road led them, turned tail once more, by granting Laval the extraordinary powers against which they had just voted twice in succession. Once more, the threat of armed gangs, of extra legal forces organized by fascism, called the cards in the parliamentary game, demonstrating the complete impotence of the parliament which has outlived itself.

The Mulhouse Congress

The Mulhouse Congress, convened on the morrow of this ministerial crisis, should have been a tribune to broadcast to the country, to clarify the country on the difficulties of the hour, to give the working masses the solution of these difficulties. On the contrary, the Mulhouse Congress took note only of the past, giving no directions for the future. The report of the parliamentary group was approved by 2584 mandates against 427, 47 abstaining. In the course of the discussion on this report Leon Blum made a speech which, as usual, was canonized as a "great" speech, but whose greatness, again as usual, consisted in its absolute emptiness, and its complete lack of directives and perspectives.

What did Leon Blum, the "leader" of the S.F.I.O. say? L'Humanite gave his speech the most prominent display, as if he were a leader of the Communist Party itself. In reality both centrism, one stemming from social democracy and the other from Stalinism, complement one another and merge in an amorphous hash, so that it becomes more and more difficult to tell them apart.

National Defense

But now we come to the question of national defense. This is the question which should have revealed a clear differentiation between communism and social democracy. But at the present time the position of Leon Blum is no different from that of Thorez, the Stalinist leader. L'Humanite rejoices in the rapprochement of the two points of view, Socialist and Communist; but it fails to perceive that by this very fact it avows the increasing alienation of the Stalinist parties from Leninism and from revolutionary Marxism. Let Blum speak for himself:

"The attitude of the party (on the question of national defense) conforms to that of the Socialist International and the trade union organizations. We are ready to do everything in our power to avoid war. But this preventive attitude no longer suffices when war becomes a fact. . . ."

"The parliamentary group takes its stand upon the position of the Tours congress of 1920. We declared then that we, Socialists, believed that, under given conditions the national and international duties coincide. Under what conditions does this coincidence exist? When there is a flagrant aggression and invasion of the national soil. . . ."

"When this thesis was first presented, Maurice Thorez (Secretary of the Communist Party) rose to the tribune and declared his opposition to it. But since then things have changed. . . ."

Stalin Changes Thorez's Mind
We know what this change is. Following the Stalin-Laval communique the Communists also supported the idea that "National Defense" coincides with international obligations. But let us allow Leon Blum to continue:

"Shortly after my speech there appeared a series of articles in L'Humanite which designated Hitler as the hereditary enemy. From this time on the theory of revolutionary defeatism was no longer

strictly maintained. . . . I said that in case of aggression by Hitlerite Germany the whole proletariat would rise, together with the rest of the country. Now I say that on the day of Hitlerite aggression, Russia would be threatened and therefore the proletariat of the world will rise. My statement was nothing but sort of a prophecy and events have vindicated it."

"What events? The declarations of Stalin, naturally!"
"Have you noticed," Blum kept shouting at the Congress, "the direction of the Communist formulations? Isn't it obvious today that Vaillant-Coururier employs almost the identical formulas which I used at Tours in 1920?"

And L'Humanite, its heart leaping with joy, applauds Blum for having "said what we say" . . .
"I believe," Blum went on to say, "that we should welcome the explanations given by the Communists as a result of our united action and as something which will facilitate organic unity. Common formulations are possible."

Thus, on one of the most important problems which have divided the revolutionists from the opportunists and centrists of all shades, the problem of national defense, the "rapprochement" between the Stalinists and social democrats becomes not only possible but has in fact taken place. And not as Blum pretends "as a result of our united action" because the contrary is true, but rather because the sham "unity of action" is only a consequence of the latest evolution of Stalinism on to the positions of social-patriotism.

But on another question of the same gender a similar rapprochement between the "Socialist" and

"Communist" point of view is to be observed: the question of "parliamentary collaboration." What did Leon Blum have to say on this subject? "The Communists were much more interested than we in getting the Lefts together. Nobody as much as they pushed for the constitution of a 'Left Government' in which the Radicals would take the leading role. When Maurice Thorez said to the Radicals: 'Go there,' the Radicals asked: 'Will the Socialists come with us? In a word: the Communists pressed for a situation which would require our participation.' (Whence the great embarrassment of the Socialists.) 'What would we have done if the Radicals had not evaded our proposals? I have lived,' Blum continued, 'through some very difficult days.'

Naturally, for fear of his being called to assume direct responsibility. But the Radicals, by cutting the matter short, freed Blum and his Communist colleagues from the fears of revolutionary hazards, from the fears of taking power.
What did the Mulhouse Congress say and what did it do in the face of this problem which is the central problem posed by the situation in France? It is already more than a year since the question of power has been posed in the sharpest manner following the coup of "February 6th." On February 12, 1934 the tolling masses at the call of their organizations replied by a general strike all over France. But the Socialists and Communists, instead of making a bid for power, quit cold, capitulating before Doumergue who was placed in power by the forces of the reactionary coup d'etat. Doumergue, finally had to make room for Flandin and once again the Socialists and Communists sighed, relieved of the fear of being the successors, and they con-

Eight-Page New Militant Is First Step Toward Daily Paper

(Continued from Page 1)

basis. A propaganda group might conceivably go along with a four page paper, reaching its readers once a week and confining itself to some particular phase of revolutionary theory or activity. A party, which in the nature of the case assumes responsibility for theoretical education of the advanced workers and also for leadership in the daily struggles of the working class, simply cannot begin to meet its obligations with a four-page paper reaching its readers only once a week.
As a matter of fact, we should aim at a daily paper at the earliest possible moment. That in a country as large as the United States and in such a period as this there should be only one general working class daily, and that a Stalinist one, is nothing short of tragic. A daily paper issued by the Workers Party of the U. S., raising aloft the banner of the Fourth International, and presenting a truthful report of national and international events and an analysis of them based upon an uncompromising revolutionary internationalism, would have a national, and in fact, international significance.

The first step toward the achievement of this goal is to carry out the proposal of the Political Committee to increase the weekly New Militant from four to eight pages by Anti-War Day, August 1. All the various types of readers of the New Militant will thus receive more of the material for which they have been asking. New readers can be enrolled by the hundreds, possibly even thousands. An immense stimulus can be given to all the organizational activities of the party itself and of the mass organizations in which it exerts influence.

Funds for the small amount of additional machinery needed in the print shop and to guarantee the steady issuance of the enlarged weekly for a period must be in hand before the change is inaugurated. To proceed in any other way would be to act irresponsibly. Hence the financial campaign for the eight-page New Militant which has been inaugurated in recent issues and about which the branches of the party have been informed. Unquestionably the members and friends of the party, the workers who have seen the party in operation in many a struggle, can by united efforts make the realization of this new forward step possible. We call upon the party members and branches to carry out swiftly and enthusiastically the directions which have been sent them. We call upon all our sympathizers and friends to send in their contributions, large or small, without a moment's delay.

No more appropriate play could be found to carry the banner of revolutionary internationalism a long step forward than Anti-War Day, August 1.

Troops Smash Illinois Strike

(Continued from Page 1)

sharp battle ensued in which several workers were hurt after overturning two trucks bearing deputized "company guards." Reedy's injuries are grave.
The first to leave the county courthouse, where the Governor's conference was held, was Sample, who told the workers to gather at Labor hall for a meeting within an hour. Several hundred strikers had waited four hours in the rain outside the courthouse for news of the meeting.

Next came the Governor, flanked by national guard officers, including Captain Sherwood Dixon, Democratic Central committeeman, of Dixon. Captain Dixon had the loudest voice in Lee county during the campaign of 1932, shouting promises of a new deal for "the forgotten man."

Horne, after posing for two pictures, was whisked away in his waiting automobile, accompanied by Roy Bennethum, president of the

Stover organization. The Governor said before leaving that he was going to place a wreath on the grave of Jane Addams. Bennethum didn't announce his destination, but as the car sped away some of the workers said they hoped he would go to hell.

NEW MILITANT

with which is merged THE MILITANT
Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co., 55 East 11th St. New York City.
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 6 months; Canada and Foreign \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 six months. Bundle Rates: Two cents per copy.
Vol. 1 JUNE 29, 1935 No. 27

NEW YORK (FP).—The United Textile Workers of America executive board has proposed legislation patterned after the Guffey coal bill, setting up a national board of control for the cotton textile industry.

themselves to demanding from Flandin the dissolution of the fascist bands and the guaranteeing of "democratic" rights. Flandin, in turn, fell. But despite the electoral victories of the "Peoples Front" in the municipal elections in May and June, the Socialists and the Communists agreed to do nothing, pushing the Radicals to take power, who in their turn quit cold.
In the meantime the fascist bands did not cease from equipping themselves, from taking to the road of civil war.

The Bolshevik Leninists

But, the Mulhouse Congress not only had nothing concrete to say on these questions but it revealed the desire to hear nothing about them, when a single voice and a single force took the floor to remind it of its duty: the voice and the force of the Bolshevik-Leninists.

Nothing reveals better the character of the Mulhouse Congress than the reaction of the parliamentary high priests to the speeches of the delegates representing the Bolshevik-Leninist tendency, the so-called Trotskyists. For the first time, since the split in Tours in 1920, this tendency appeared on the tribune of a Socialist congress. It was represented by over a hundred mandates. But its real force rested in the ideas defended by it. The Stalinist degeneration, is proved, among other things, by this mutual approbation, by this feeling of mutual and compatible understanding which implies the reciprocal pardon for past errors between the Socialist and Stalinist leaders. At the present time they rest on the same centrist positions. On the other hand it is the Bolshevik-Leninists on whom falls the honor of raising the banner of proletarian internationalism, the banner of communism, the banner of those principles on which the Third International of Lenin was founded. When Paul Faure appealed to the congress for unanimity, he exhorted all the delegates, save the Bolshevik-Leninists "who remain true to the 21 points of Moscow," that is to say, true to the principles which gave birth to the Third International. And when the "Trotskyist" delegates heckled Blum's speech, calling the Stalin-Laval communique a betrayal, Blum in a fit of anger replied: "Should unity have to leave your small group outside the reunified party, I will take my party into it." Naturally, and we are also ready. Blum warns us that the vaunted organic unity is the unity of the two bureaucracies against the revolutionary current. But the "small group" which Blum would like to leave outside the unified party, has already won an important place for The Mulhouse Congress is proof of itself in the French labor movement.

The only clear and definite slogans; the only true and possible solutions for the working class were presented by the delegates of the Bolshevik-Leninist tendency. National defense? No national defense as long as the bourgeoisie is in power. Revolutionary defeatism is the only working class policy against imperialist war. The defense of the U.S.S.R. is the problem of the socialist revolution; is the question of the struggle for power. And for the conquest of power: mobilize the masses for revolutionary action (against all collaboration with the class enemy). The struggle for power is the immediate problem and not merely an object for discussion at a congress. Workers government (Socialist-Communist government), that is the slogan of the hour. Ballots and parliamentary action will not bar the road to fascism and lead the masses to power. Weapon against weapon: workers' militia. That is the task which falls on the working class parties at the present moment.

These slogans, broadcast from the Mulhouse tribune, distorted by the corrupt Social Democratic and Stalinist bureaucrats, will make their way into the hearts of the workers, will create new and grandiose opportunities: the only opportunities for salvation. Numerical weakness is a good argument only for Blum; but the "small group" in the turbulent conditions of today cannot be the nucleus around which all the revolutionary forces will be regrouped. The progress achieved by the Bolshevik-Leninist tendency in the course of seven months inside the S.F.I.O. proves how great are the possibilities of development for a genuine revolutionary current in the impending great working class struggles and the civil war. Days of stress are inexorably approaching for France as well. And the struggle for power remains the only way out for the working class. Which however it will not be able to find without a party genuinely poised for this revolutionary struggle. That party will be created in the very fire of the struggle. It cannot raise any other banner than that of the Fourth International. Without that, the merger of the reformism of Blum with the bureaucratic centrism of Thorez will lead the working class only to new defeats. It is the grave task of the Bolshevik-Leninists to avoid this catastrophe.

READ THE NEW MILITANT.

Mexican Labor Movement Unites Against Reaction

MEXICO CITY (FP).—Sudden threats of a violent capitalist offensive have quickly jerked labor in Mexico into unified action, producing almost overnight the formation of a permanent united front group known as the National Proletarian Defense Committee.

The recent sharp menace to organized labor came in the wake of a heavy strike movement since the first of the year. During this time, 1,200 strikes have been called throughout the country, including sympathetic strikes.

Because many of these have been directed against foreign capitalists who control Mexican industry and commerce, insistent pressure has been brought on all governmental departments by employers' organizations which have been trying to inject a "red scare" into the situation. They have been aided by sympathizers of the clergy opposed to the government's church policy.

Growing dissension within the ranks of the official government National Revolutionary Party recently came to a head in a political crisis which produced resignation of the Cardenas cabinet and incorporation into it of elements regarded as favorable to certain conservative groups.

The crisis, which on the surface was a split between followers of Pres. Cardenas and Political Dictator Plutarco Elias Calles, former president and "strong man" of Mexico, developed around the labor issue. To the uniformed observer it appeared that Calles was attacking labor and that Cardenas was defending labor.

Mexico's "New Deal"

Labor spokesmen, however, pointed out that the situation was in reality one which might be compared with an open declaration of hostility between progressive Republicans in the U. S. and New Dealers. The issue, labor leaders said, was whether labor should be treated openly as a factor which opposed capitalist encroachments or whether it should be "given greater doses of demagoguery in order to make it appear that the government is really a labor government."

The situation showed plainly that labor will not retreat, and that it does recognize a common class menace requiring united action. Calles assailed the recent strike wave, citing by name strikes which he considered unjust, such as those against the telephone company (U. S. capital) and the Huasteca Petroleum Co. (U. S. capital), and added that labor should show itself more grateful for the concessions gained in the past and should not "seek to embarrass the government which is working in their interests."

Organized labor was not particularly interested in the fights among the politicians, but it certainly talked in plain language about those aspects of the fight which might affect workers. The united front immediately issued the following statement after Calles' declarations had been made public:

"The organized labor and peasant movement of Mexico energetically protests the declarations of Gen. Calles, and declares that it will defend the rights of the working class, such as strikes without restrictions, association in unions, and others; and will not cease fighting for the economic and social betterment of wage earners. Strike movements, assailed as due to collective uncer-

ness and to a state of social injustice, are phenomena slurred over only by those who represent capitalist interests.

"Strikes will end when there is achieved a transformation of the bourgeois system in which we live.

"The organized labor and peasant movement of Mexico, aware of the historical moment in which it lives, declares that it will oppose all transgression of its rights, utilizing, at the proper time, the general nationwide strike as the only means of defense against the possible implantation of a Fascist regime in Mexico. And facing the threat of seeing its interests jeopardized, declares its firm intention of maintaining class unity."

The united front which signed this statement represented the majority of organized labor, ranging from the radical Unitary Confederation of Mexico to the more powerful but less radical General Workers and Peasants Confederation (headed by Lombardo Toledano and generally characterized as syndicalist-reformist). This was the first time that this important confederation joined the united front movement in Mexico.

Among the points in the pact of solidarity signed by the National

Proletarian Defense Committee are: 1. One representative from each organization forms the committee. 2. The member groups will mutually respect their integrity and abstain from attacking one another. 3. Difficulties between labor organizations will be referred to the committee in an effort to settle them without attacking each other and thus hurting the workers' movement. 4. No interference in autonomy of member groups. 5. Ample basis for solidarity action. 6. Agreement that upon appearance of any fascist or similar organizations threatening workers or peasants or their fundamental right to strike, liberty of association, liberty of expression, right to public demonstration, or "if the state tolerates or foments organizations whose aims or tendencies are openly against such rights, the member organizations of the committee will declare a general strike in opposition to a tyranny of this nature." 7. Convocation of a National Workers and Peasants Congress. 8. The signatory groups declare that "they are opposed to collaboration with the capitalist class and will adjust their acts to revolutionary tactics and under the principle of the class struggle."

Pledge Support to C. S. Victims

(Continued from Page 1)

of America, Spartacus Youth League, Young Peoples Socialist League and Communist Party Opposition (Lovesonites). The American Civil Liberties Union and the General Defense Committee (I.W.W.) have already appointed observers.

A meeting will be held shortly in this city to add these organizations to the temporary committee. Steps will be taken immediately thereafter to add trade union delegations, and there will follow the work of providing Mini with appeal counsel and launching a militant protest campaign against the eight convictions and the criminal syndicalism law. The appeal argument will be very substantial due to errors made by the trial judge and also due to the affidavit obtained from a juror by the N.P.L.D., which impeaches the entire verdict as an illegal horse-trade. With active popular backing, the defense will have a fighting chance.

More I.L.D. Sabotage

According to an announcement by the N.P.L.D., Mini, "placing political integrity above legal expediency," to use his own words, has flatly rejected attempts of the International Labor Defense and the Communist Party to bribe and threaten him into becoming a silent partner in their efforts to make of the Sacramento criminal syndicalism appeal fight a political football.

The I.L.D., the Western Worker (mouthpiece of the C.P.), and other Stalinist institutions have made a united front in playing down the Sacramento appeal fight. Ignoring William Randolph Hearst's challenge that the Sacramento convictions constitute a national test case, the C. P. is playing up, not the Sacramento case, but the Gallup affair, in order to publicize Bob Minor, one of its leading bureaucrats.

The I.L.D., which, during the trial, slandered the youthful Mini as a "stool-pigeon," was compelled to back down at the time of his conviction. It then characterized him as "an honest misled class prisoner." I.L.D. attorney Leo Gallagher proposed a joint defense. The C. P. set on foot a rumor that Mini had "repented" of his political "errors," and that he was "no worse than Jack Warner," the solitary C. P. Sacramento defendant who had the moral courage to defend Mini against the malicious onslaughts of the Darcy-controlled Stalinist machine.

Now the C. P. has expelled Warner because he refused to back down on his support of Mini, and discovering that Mini is no less intrepid, the C. P. has also turned on him again.

The Western Worker, which for a few weeks urged readers to send comrades letters to Mini, has turned its back on him. Endeavoring to escape in advance the blame due it for dividing the appeal movement, the C. P. now "charges" that Mini has "decided to go it alone" on the appeal.

I.L.D. Tries Terror
Nevertheless, the I.L.D. is collecting funds in Mini's name without authorization and without accounting to anybody. This is revealed by a number of documents, including the mimeographed program of a "benefit dance" held at Eagles Hall in San Francisco on June 8th by the so-called State Conference for United Action, a C. P. "united

front." For a while after its flattery failed to win Mini over, the C. P. endeavored to silence him by terrorization. The organization which withheld bail from its jailed members in Sacramento because some of them had dared challenge the bureaucratic regime of the C.P., did not hesitate to try to terrorize Mini into a fear that if he did not knuckle under to them, he would have no defense at all. The I.L.D. sent to San Quentin Leo Gallagher, its trial attorney whose court-room tactics were such a miserable combination of opportunistic backsliding and provocative nonsense, to state that Mini could ride along on the I.L.D.'s appeal for his seven co-defendants, only on condition that the Non-Partisan Labor Defense, which handled Mini's trial defense and in a score of ways aided the whole defense movement, have no part in the case.

Mini Stands Firm
Mini was informed that the alternative would be renewed ostracism by the I.L.D., and his abandonment to the "shady characters" of the N.P.L.D. who are "impotent, counter-revolutionary" etc. A rumor was set on foot and peddled to Mini through his fellow prisoners and otherwise, that the N.P.L.D. was "abandoning" him. When Mini proved as impervious to this panicle as he had to flattery, the unprincipled C.P.-I.L.D. bureaucrats turned on him venomously once again.

In a letter to Leo Gallagher, Mini has stated his position in unmistakable language as follows:
". . . At the time when the question of joint appeal first came up, I took it for granted that an agreement for close collaboration between the I.L.D. and the N.P.L.D. could easily be worked out. But apparently this part of the question was never considered by members of the I.L.D. ruling group; and the idea became general that the N.P.L.D. had 'abandoned' the case, and that I had turned over my defense to the I.L.D."

"This was a mistake, of course. How could anyone be so naive as to believe that I would entrust my entire defense to the I.L.D.? Especially after the four months display of the honesty and political ability I had just seen in Sacramento?"

"You can see that with me it is a question of placing political integrity above legal expediency. If the I.L.D. refuses to acknowledge that an organization that I belong to exists, then it seems logical that they should ignore my existence also since I believe in the principles and policies of the organization. Under those circumstances, any gesture by the I.L.D. to let me in, while leaving my political beliefs out, must be classed as hypocritical opportunism. And I can not be part of it.
"From now on, then, to avoid any misunderstanding, any legal actions on my behalf must have the approval of the N.P.L.D."

I.S.U. STRIKES CITIES SERVICE
BOSTON (FP).—With 10 Cities Service oil tankers already idle in five ports from Boston to Port Arthur, the International Seamen's Union looks forward to a complete tieup of the company's 14 ships.

The strike was ordered to force the company—the only oil company of importance still unassigned to accept a union contract. Wages on its ships are some \$15 a month lower than on other tankers, union officials state.

Cities Service ships are tied up in Boston, Providence, New York, Philadelphia and Port Arthur, Tex.

A. J. Muste
Max Shachtman

Protest Persecution of Bolshevik Revolutionists in Soviet Russia

Irving Plaza Hall
15th St & Irving Pl.
Sunday, June 30th at 8 P.M.