

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, JULY 6, 1935 No. 28

Labor Party Confusion

As the Workers Party predicted from the outset, the Communist Party gets into hotter water all the time with its mass-class-not-reformist-not revolutionary but class-struggle Labor Party.

There is quite a flurry of Labor Party talk these days among the Old Guard of the Socialist Party and certain trade union leaders, as well as among some sections of the workers. Typical of a good deal of this talk was Sidney Hillman's speech at the Taminet Economic and Social Institute of the S. P. Old Guard recently.

Fervently Brother Hillman prays that such a Party "will not go along the lines of the share-the-wealth groups and advocates of overnight panaceas." He was "particularly bitter," the papers report, in his criticism of liberal and radical critics of the New Deal, Senator Borah, Clarence Darrow, "the left wingers, radicals and college boys."

Thereupon the Daily Worker bursts forth in editorial and cartoon. "But what kind of a Labor Party, Mr. Waldman?" We charge that "the Old Guard of the S. P. and the top bureaucracy of the A. F. of L. are planning a Labor Party in name only." What did the C. P., Browder, Stalin and Co. expect to happen when they came forth with their Labor Party slogan? What could happen other than what has actually occurred—confusion among the workers, a golden opportunity for the bureaucrats and fakery to practice their mislead-

ership, to divert the growing discontent among the workers into the safe channels of a Labor Party?

Yes, editors and cartoonists of the Daily Worker, an "anti-capitalist," not a pro-New Deal party is what the workers need. That can only mean in this period, a revolutionary Marxian party, not an attempt to lead the masses in this country into some replica of the British Labor Party or the German Social Democracy. But the C. P. is no longer a revolutionary Marxian party. It lacks consequently the intelligence and the courage to call the workers to rally under the revolutionary banner. It joins with Hillman and Waldman and others of that ilk in singing the Labor Party chorus. Only it protests that it is singing out of another book!

For a Fighting Auto Union

The announcement by the American Federation of Labor that a convention of Federal automobile locals is to be held on August 29 indicates a triumph for the militants in the industry and at the same time means that they must work more quickly and seriously than ever to organize their forces for a decisive battle with the reactionary bureaucrats of the A. F. of L. The latter would never have consented to a convention at this time had not the conduct of the progressives during the recent Chevrolet-General Motors strike in Toledo and elsewhere, and subsequent to the strike, demonstrated that the latter meant business and would not tolerate further delay in setting up an international. But the bureaucrats will now seek to control the convention and through it the new organization.

The progressives must work to send honest and militant delegates to the convention and to establish at the convention an organization based on democratic control by the membership, not bossed by Green, Dillon, Collins and Co.; an industrial union with jurisdiction over all workers employed in the automobile and auto parts industry; with no discrimination against members or prospective members because of religion, nationality, race, color, or political affiliation; relying not on favors from the bosses or government boards but on the militancy and solidarity of the workers.

The Workers Party now, as for many months past, calls for the most loyal and enthusiastic support of the militant forces in the automobile unions seeking to realize this program.

Italy Prepares Ethiopia Rape

(Continued from Page 1)

made up chiefly of cotton, sugar, oil, etc. Recently it has been discovered that Ethiopia is probably rich in important natural resources such as gold, silver, iron, etc.

But that which has led to conflict in the past and which is most likely a great contributing factor to the present turmoil is the fact that Ethiopia is completely surrounded by "neighbors" without an outlet of its own to the sea and that in its interior lies Lake Tsana from which rises the headwaters of the Blue Nile that water the fertile cotton regions of the British controlled Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. As close as is possible to give boundary lines without a map, Ethiopia is bounded on the North by Eritrea (Italian); on the East by French and British Somaliland; on the South by Italian Somaliland and the west by the Anglo-Egyptian-Sudan. France permits the use of its railroad which is Ethiopia's only connecting link with the sea, running from Addis Ababa to Djibuti, a French possession.

Only the other day England was ready to grant Haile Selassie an outlet to the sea through its Somaliland, in an effort to arbitrate the Italy-Ethiopian differences, but Italy balked.

Britain's Stake

England's concern in the matter, its offer for an outlet to the sea and gratuitous grants of land in Ethiopia proper to Italy—besides its game on the European continent—can be understood only if the strategic importance of imperialist hegemony over the Lake Tsana region is taken into consideration. As stated before, it is from this region that rise the waters which makes of British-controlled territory in Eastern Africa so economically valuable a possession. Pacts and agreements have been in existence for decades and only recently it has been reaffirmed that no dams be constructed in the Lake region which might impair the flow of water to its neighboring territory. The gobbling up of Ethiopia by any of the imperialist powers involved would give it a strategic importance in the entire of eastern Africa.

The question might well be asked: how is it that, granting its strategic importance, no power has seen fit to conquer this territory? First, it can be answered, it is not so easily conquerable. Or rather it wasn't. Probably with ultra-modern instruments of warfare, Ethiopia could be licked. It must be remembered that Italy has already suffered a shameful defeat at the hands of these backward tribesmen at the close of the century.

And secondly, and probably most important of all, is the need of

keeping a black Christian buffer state to counteract the sentiments of the rest of the native Africans who are Mohammedans. It was just this fact that scotched the ambitions of the Mad Mullah, a number of decades ago, who started a movement to drive the Christian imperialists out of Africa. This undoubtedly the powers, particularly that power which has had the most experience in imperialist conquest, Great Britain, has well understood.

Mussolini's Alibi

The so-called cause for the present conflict is the result of a series of border incidents along Eritrea some months ago. Some Italian soldiers were found dead, killed perhaps by Ethiopian soldiers. But the facts already brought out prove that these Italian soldiers were killed sixty miles within the Ethiopian boundaries, which if one were to go in for this aggression and aggression business, would certainly prove Italy the aggressor.

Italy used this incident, however, as the nub around which to start long desired operations. Anyhow, Il Duce argued, Abyssinia needs civilizing, Italy needs room for its people to expand, a modern power needs colonies and the Italian people need to satisfy a long standing insult to national pride. All of which means Italy wants Ethiopia. But Italy cannot go it alone. At least for any length of time. Britain and France are directly involved. From a little distance so are Japan and Germany. So far France is pretty well lined up with Italy and has been driven even still closer as the result of the Anglo-German naval treaty which France considered an affront. England's efforts at arbitration have so far proved futile. The League of Nations to which Ethiopia has been constantly appealing has merely put the matter off, arguing benignly, that since war on a real scale cannot start until after the rainy season (fall), it would table the matter till then.

Meanwhile Italy has shipped thousands of troops and tons of supplies to Africa. In the past few months Italian troops have been laying roads in Eritrea and Italian Somaliland in preparation for war. France, standing by Italy, has barred ammunition from reaching Addis Ababa, which as we have shown above she could well do.

No Help from Litvinoff

In this connection it might have been expected that one voice in the League of Nations would have spoken up in behalf of the impoverished little nation in colonial Africa—the voice of Maxim Litvinoff who represents the Soviet Union in the League. But not a peep out of him, except to so profusely and slavishly congratulate Sir Anthony Eden for his wise decision to postpone the matter until "after the rainy season" as even to make Sir Anthony blush. In this connection, too, the world is still awaiting the answer to the telegram sent Litvin-

off by Mr. Williams, assistant secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The telegram reads as follows:

"Why has Soviet Russia, though you as Foreign Minister and President League Council, remained silent Italian-Ethiopian situation? Has Russia abandoned its alleged opposition to imperialism and its much publicized defense of weaker peoples? Does your anti-imperialist stop at black nations? Await your reply."

A war against Ethiopia by Italy will not be a purely African affair, or an Italo-Ethiopian affair. Even if it starts thus, it will not end so. Too many imperialist powers have their fingers in the pudding. The liberal jitters that Mussolini, as usual, is only blustering are false and disarming. It may well prove to be a test of how secure is the inner regime of a modern imperialist power since the abject collapse of the Third International, France's backing of Italy, in light of the Franco-Soviet pact, will compromise the Soviet Union in the eyes of the world proletariat unless a resounding call—which is highly improbable—be issued to the world working class to demand hands off Ethiopia.

England has been drawn closer and closer to Germany in recent days. Hitler's "drang nach Osten" may soon take on fearful reality. Japan is consciously contriving one act of provocation after another against the Soviet Union. While occupied in writing this, a late evening paper brings the news that serious skirmishes are already taking place on the Ethiopian front with "heavy casualties" reported. The next world war looms large on the horizon. More than ever must the working class be prepared.

More than ever must we reaffirm the revolutionary slogans: "Turn the imperialist war into civil war, 'The enemy is in our own country.'"

Spring Makers Strike in N.Y.

Employees of the Kay Mfg. Co. of 22 Warren Street, Brooklyn are on strike. The company did not think profits large enough so it increased hours from 40 to 44. With the increase of hours workers paid by the week received no increase in pay and to show the "fairness" of the company rates for piece workers were reduced 10 percent. In other words all workers were supposed to work an extra four hours a week for the glory of god, the good of their health, and the bosses' profits.

Only one thing was wrong with this proposition—the 350 workers,

A Reply to Liberal Critics of Bolshevism

The Position of the Workers Party on Proletarian Dictatorship and Worker's Democracy in Light of Recent Events

By A. J. MUSTE

Doubt and discredit are being thrown upon the entire Marxist-Leninist philosophy and upon the revolutionary movement of the working class by the policies of the present Stalin-dominated regime in the Soviet Union. When in connection with the signing of a pact between the S. U. and the Imperialist French government, it is officially stated that "M. Stalin understands and fully approves the national defense policy of France in keeping her armed forces at the level required for security" and when Maurice Thorez, leader of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France flatly declares: "Now I answer a question that has been put to me: In case of such a war launched by Hitler against the U.S.S.R., would you apply your slogan: 'Transformation of the imperialist war into the civil war?' (against French imperialism, that is). Well, no! because in such a war it is not an imperialist war that is involved, a war between two imperialist gangs, it is a war against the Soviet Union"—then the enemies of the working class utter the taunt: "There goes your boast that the Workers' State brings a new force into diplomacy, into relations between states, your claim that the working class revolution will put an end to imperialist wars."

Liberals of all shades who had come to have a measure of sympathy for the revolutionary movement as perhaps the one practical instrument for the realization of their ideals are alienated; many of them go back to faith in phantoms like humanitarianism and religion to usher in the reign of peace. Reactionary and conservative trade unionists and Social Democrats who were on the defensive when the Soviet regime and the Communist International were making a clear-cut revolutionary attack on capitalism, imperialism and war, take fresh courage and obtain a fresh opportunity to confuse the workers and to strengthen their hold upon them. Into the hearts of many of the advanced workers strikes an icy blast of disillusionment and cynicism.

Stalin Sows Illusions

That social patriotism fastening itself upon the Second International should betray the workers and lead them to a ghastly slaughter, before they realized what was happening, that is understandable. From such an experience the working class can profit and therefore recover. But if now the International of Lenin succumbs to social-patriotism, calls upon the worker under whatever specious plea to defend the (imperialist) "fatherland," doubt may well arise as to whether there is any way to save the revolutionary movement from corruption and defeat. "If the salt has lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?"

The revolutionary internationalists of the Workers Party in the United States and the parties and groups in other countries which have likewise raised the banner of the Fourth International, have the answer to this problem: and they alone in the working class movement today have an answer. It is not, however, with this phase of the degeneration of the Soviet regime and the Third International that we are primarily concerned here; but rather with a problem closely related to it.

The present regime in the Soviet Union is employing repression and terrorism on a large scale and of a brutal character, not only against

those who are the enemies of the Workers' State or those who can with some measure of plausibility be regarded as such, but also against revolutionists who are political opponents of Stalin and his henchmen. It is not necessary here to produce detailed evidence of the fact. The Soviet press itself carries daily reports of severe measures taken against old Bolsheviks, including recently those who have never had any connection with the Trotskyist opposition, for example, as well as against relatives of the men who have never participated in any political activity at all, as witness the case of Trotsky's son, a chemist who was permitted to go on with his work for many years after his father's exile, to which Nathalie Trotsky has recently called public attention.

When organizations such as ours protest against such repressive acts, we are met, and with increasing frequency in recent months, with the argument that protests from us come with poor grace and can hardly expect to get serious attention. We are told that we also believe in the proletarian dictatorship, that we justified acts of terrorism in the period when Lenin and Trotsky were the dominant figures in the Soviet Union, that in our opinion the workers, when they take power in the United States, should take whatever measures may be necessary against those who would desire to reestablish capitalism, and so on. The acts against which we protest are bound to occur under "dictatorships," we are told, regardless of "the kind of dictatorship" which may exist. Only "democracy" such as we have in the United States provides any insurance against them.

Liberals Find a Moral

Thus the most liberal daily in New York, the N. Y. Post, in its editorial columns of June 24, 1935, reasons: "The appeal of Mrs. Nathalie Trotsky in Saturday's Post is recommended to the attention of parlor pinks and Communist 'sympathizers.' It illustrates the evil effects sure to flow from dictatorship, no matter what its alibi—whether on the plea of 'halting Communism' as in Germany or the plea of 'establishing Socialism' as in Soviet Russia. . . . Communism and Fascism are new labels, but the founders of this country knew them under other forms. It was to break the power of a Tory King and to prevent the recurrence of similar despotism in this country that the founders of this country set up the safeguards of the American Constitution, the world's oldest and still the world's best. . . . Communists oppose the Hitler dictatorship but they condone the Soviet dictatorship. Trotsky opposes the dictatorship of Stalin but he would like to substitute for it the dictatorship of Trotsky. The case of Trotsky's son demonstrates what happens under any kind of a dictatorship—whether Left or Right. . . . the use of suppression necessitates ever more suppression until rising resentment, deprived of peaceful vent, overthrows the regime. That applies to Russia under Communism as it applies to Germany, Austria and Italy under Fascism. Democracy will yet survive them all."

In one of the closing chapters of "Russia's Iron Age," the much discussed book by the brilliant foreign correspondent, William Henry Chamberlain, long regarded as one of the most devoted and effective journalistic "friends of the Soviet Union," there is a very moving pro-

sentation of the same point of view! "One among many points of faith common to apologists of Communism and of Fascism is an overweening contempt for civil liberties, which are represented as unnecessary and inconvenient barnacles on the ship of progress. The longer I have lived in the Soviet Union, where civil liberties—freedom of speech, press, assembly, and election—are most conspicuously lacking, the more I have become convinced that they are of vital and tremendous importance, and that their existence or absence is as good a test as any of the quality of a nation's civilization. The Communists (or the Fascist; their trend of thought in this question is strikingly similar) talks of civil liberties as of the outworn fetters of a handful of disgruntled intellectuals who are unable to rise to the necessary vision of the high and noble character and purpose of the Communist (or Fascist) state. But my own observation in Russia has led me to believe that a great deal more is at stake than the freedom of thought of the educated classes, although it seems rather obvious that the historian must alter his record of the past, the author must give a prescribed coloring to his characters, and free research in any field can be cut off by the will of an all-powerful state."

In the Ukraine

"It was during my trip through the famine regions of Ukraine and the North Caucasus that I became utterly and definitely convinced that democracy, with all its faults, weaknesses and imperfections, is enormously superior to dictatorship as a method of government, simply from the standpoint of the common man. Is there any recorded case in history where famine—not poverty or hardship or destitution, but stark famine, with a toll of millions of lives—has occurred in a democratically governed country? Is it conceivable that the famine of 1932-33 could have taken place if civil liberties had prevailed in the Soviet Union, if newspapers had been free to report the facts, if speakers could have appealed for relief, if the government in power had been obliged to submit its policy of letting vast numbers of the peasants starve to death to the verdict of a free election? The countless graves of the humble and obscure famine victims, the peasants of Ukraine and the North Caucasus, of the Volga and Central Asia, are to me the final grim, unanswerable refutation of the specious Communist contention that freedom of speech and press and political agitation is only humbug by which the bourgeoisie tries to delude the masses."

For good measure, and in order to emphasize the frequency with which the same tune is heard in these days, we may quote from the leading article in the June issue of Harper's Magazine by Johan J. Smertenko: "John Howard Lawson finds Alabama in the grip of a fascist 'terror' because he and a lawyer of the International Labor Defense were placed momentarily under 'illegal arrest' and six Communists, also freed after trial, 'are in daily and hourly danger of whipping, torture, and possible death.' But he is unmoved by the thousands, slaving in the timber camps of the Arctic region because they will not forswear their religion, who pray for death as a release from their torture."

"Elmer Rice and Paul Sifton cry out dramatically against the soulless industrial system of America and glory in the industrialization of the mujik. The bread-lines of disorganized capitalism stir Edmund Wilson to eloquent rage, but the bread lines of bureaucratic communism are accepted as a necessary expedient in technological development. The peripatetic John Strachey deplores from some thirty lyceums and a half-dozen periodicals that 'freedom of speech is abused by capitalists in this country,' whereas in Russia it is merely 'incomplete,' since the inviolate censorship and ruthless suppression are exercised only against 'the remnant of capitalists who wish to see the return of their system.' (Among the capitalists are the dead or exiled authors: Andreyev, Artzbashev, Bunin, Korolenko, Kuprin, Merejkowski, Tolstoy, and, of course, Trotsky.)"

"Thus too Walter Duranty, whose complacent dispatches in the Times contrasted the Nazi blood-purge with Lenin's treatment of the 'opposition,' has been eloquently silent about the oulbette imprisonment and summary executions of the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev faction. And Waldo Frank, whose burning protests against Kentucky violence almost scorched the pages of the liberal weeklies, does indeed 'speak in a monstrous little voice' of these official murders: 'I realize that the peoples of Russia have their own background and that it is utopian to expect them, because of their heroic prosecution of a great social cause, to behave in every instance according to our own rules and ideals. . . . In so far as it (Russia) appears, even to contradict justice at home, it is harming the cause of justice abroad. From the standpoint of this high strategy, if from no other, I deplore the recent executions.'"

Answer of Workers Party

Whether or not they are personally disturbed by such questions, revolutionists in the U. S. will have to meet them. If the reactionaries and liberals between them, making use of Stalinist policies and actions, can make the American workers believe that, as over against capitalism, Communism means repression, regimentation, less freedom, personal dictatorship, etc., a formidable barrier against revolutionary progress will have been erected. We of the Workers Party have to defend the assertions of our Declaration of Principles: that the policies of "socialization of the means of production and exchange" which the Workers' State will pursue "insures only the small handful of financiers, landlords and industrialists whose private control of the resources of the country is the source of hunger, unemployment and insecurity for the great bulk of the people," that every willing worker can be assured of "a well-paid job," security against unemployment, and insurance against industrial risks, old age, and sickness;" that there "will be no need for the Workers' State to impose arbitrary and repressive measures upon small individual proprietors and farmers;" that the Workers' State while functioning as a dictatorship of the working class against its enemies will assure and continually extend "far more genuine and substantial democratic rights to the masses than ever accorded to them under capitalism."

(Continued in next issue)

READ THE NEW MILITANT.

men and women, old and young, did not like it and they walked out on strike 100 percent. They placed a picket line in front of the plant and the rest of the strikers camped on the street nearby. The plant is tied up tight as a drum.

The need for a trade union which previously had been agitated for by some was now apparent to all. The strikers sent a committee to see Wm. Collins, eastern representative of the A. F. of L. Collins gave them his good wishes and referred them to the Industrial Relations Board. The Board sent a representative who appealed to the non-existent heart of the boss.

The workers committee called up the Central Council of Federal Labor Unions. "That was 15 cents lost in phone calls, though Mr. Ravitch, secretary of the Council, was mildly interested.

The strikers, still determined, sent a delegation to the Bronx where the Kay family has another factory. Here a representative of the International Upholsterers Union was found. The striking workers at both plants are signing up with this union.

The spirit of the strikers is excellent. New labor unions, they were able to get themselves organized, established a picket line, elected picket captains, arranged a regular hourly relief of pickets, etc.

The plants manufacture springs and spring mattresses. Wages are miserably low and the workers are determined to go back on a 40-hour week with previous rates of pay and a union to back them up.

Bone to Youth Blow to Labor

(Continued from Page 1)

to "benefit" from this new scheme. According to Labor Department statistics, there are, however, 3,000,000 unemployed youth, which estimate is "considered conservative" by the New York Times. Using this figure, which actually must fall several million short of reality, 2,500,000 youth are automatically obliged to shift for themselves.

"More than one third of the high-school and college graduates between the ages of 18 and 29 were unemployed in July, 1934," says the Labor Department. How many have become unemployed since? How many non-graduates are unemployed? A canvass conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the spring of 1934 "found that out of every 100 employable persons between the ages of 16 and 24, 34 were unemployed, as compared with an average of 21 for all age groups." (Labor Information Bulletin, May, 1935.)

Why Roosevelt should have pro-

posed to "do something for the nation's unemployed youth" is somewhat answered in Senate Resolution No. 67, January 30, 1935:

"One of the most tragic results of the depression is the effect it has upon the lives of young men and women emerging from our educational institutions. There are several million young people between the ages of 18 and 30 who have graduated from our schools and colleges and entered into a work-world where no opportunities have been open to them to obtain a start in business or to commence the practice of their profession. This large group may become demoralized and disheartened and thus constitute a dangerous addition to the discontented and radical-minded elements and also offer a challenge to the system which permits the minds and ingenuities of its youth to be wasted."

The National Youth Administration was therefore created to stem this rising discontent against a "system which permits the minds and ingenuities of its youth to be wasted." The National Youth Administration was therefore assigned the task of regimenting the youth into channels of patriotic devotion. Moreover, election time and maybe war is coming. That then is the yield Roosevelt expects. Unfortunately for the system and those who starve because of it the sop is hardly enough to assuage the needs or discontent of the youth.

A Blow at Labor "The millions of youth, the few who have been offered a starvation pittance and the many more who have been completely ignored, have been presented a challenge that can only be met with further "dangerous addition to the discontented and radical-minded elements." Their problem is more than a youth struggle. The essence of the Roosevelt plan strikes a blow at the wages and jobs of all workers. It aims to reduce the American working class to a lower standard of living, and further penury. It must therefore be met, not as a youth affair, but as the concern of the whole laboring mass.

With the support of the adult workers behind them, the youth of the United States must demand, in united ranks: trade union wage-slaves; regular jobs with a five-day week and six hour day; adequate provision for support while attending academic and training schools; settlement houses in the cities for homeless youth under civil and youth supervision; unemployment insurance; the right to vote at the age of eighteen. The next step is to destroy that system which wastes "the minds and ingenuities of its youth," to join the "radical-minded elements—the Spartacus Youth League."

BUILD THE WORKERS PARTY. SUPPORT THE EIGHT-PAGE NEW MILITANT SUBSCRIBE TO NEW MILITANT