

MARCH OF VENTS

By JACK WEBER

BRITAIN PREPARES . . .

The imperialist nation with the greatest colonial empire naturally has the most to lose in the attempt by lesser powers to redivide the world and reallocate the raw materials and the markets that mean life and death to modern capitalism. By its invasion of Ethiopia Italy has served notice that the time has come for the posing of this question once more in Europe, as well as in the entire world. The preparations that were being made for the inevitable world war have been tremendously accelerated by this event. Not only has there been a dizzying speeding up of the production and stocking of munitions and the raw materials that enter into their making, but the diplomatic preparations in the maneuvering for alliances have been given a staccato tempo. Eden for England, Goering for Germany, Beck for Poland hasten from capital to capital seeking the best bargains in the holocaust each is helping to prepare. Baldwin announces that England's previous preparations have been mere play compared to what is to come, for Britain is about "to rearm in earnest." This imperialist rearmament is cloaked under the hypocrisy of defending peace. The "sanctions" of the League of Nations is in reality the sanctioning of this rearmament for keeping the exploited colonial peoples under the brutal heel of British imperialism. The robber League of Nations now becomes the instrument par excellence for creating the illusions of "right and justice," for justifying social patriotism, for binding the working class hand and foot and delivering them helpless into the bloody hands of the bourgeois ruling class. The propaganda for justifying imperialism war is made to center around the League of Nations and its "sanctions."

STALINISM AIDS THE BOURGEOISIE . . .

Why shouldn't Baldwin use the arguments of justification presented to him by Stalin? What better method could he adopt than this for fooling the proletariat? Baldwin tells the British workers that England is preparing for war "not only because of Italy's present defiance, but because of the challenge which all dictatorships have thrown down to the free peoples of Europe." This is the poisonous propaganda of the Comintern taken up, as was only to be expected, by those whom it will benefit. This is the attitude that motivates the "People's Front," the vicious distortion of the united front that makes of it an instrument not of the revolutionary proletariat, but of class collaboration

and truce with one's own bourgeoisie. Stalinism helps the capitalists in the so-called democratic countries to send their workers willingly to the slaughter. Meantime the British ruling class propose, purely in the interests of democracy, no doubt, to take all precautions against the workers at home. Their first proposal is to concentrate government power in the hands of their most direct and most reactionary representatives, rather than to permit any less reliable indirect representative, even one like MacDonald who has proven his faithfulness to the national bourgeoisie, to remain in control. Hence the rulers are now choosing their own time for parliamentary elections so as to crushingly defeat the Labor Party on the issue of war and patriotism. In this vital struggle the Labor Party has capitulated in advance by its anti-revolutionary stand on sanctions, the League of Nations and war. This stand may please the Stalinists but it can only arouse the bitter indignation in the heart of every revolutionary worker who cannot but see in it the course of betrayal that was followed similarly by the Second International in 1914.

THE ENEMY AT HOME . . .

The Labor Party, just as the Second International, points to the enemy abroad and helps to divert the attention of the proletariat from its main enemy, the English capitalists. In imperialist war the capitalist class is driven by necessity to extend the sphere of its exploitation for the very purpose of preserving the system of capitalist exploitation at home. Success of the bourgeoisie in such a war means its success in fastening ever stronger chains on the working class at home. The effort of the English workers to free themselves from capitalist exploitation means also the effort to free their colonial brothers under the heel of the same enemy. The effort of colonial peoples to secure or to maintain national independence is at the same time a blow struck at the enemy of the workers at home, a strengthening of the workers and a weakening of the capitalist exploiters. Thus the best way to help free the colonial peoples is to send in its own troops to seize the Lake Tana region. In short, the fight against imperialism is an international struggle in which each section of the proletariat must fight against its own bourgeoisie.

Labor Defense Front

CITY WIDE CONFERENCE TO AID ANGELO HERNDON

A city-wide conference to map out a program of work for the defense of Angelo Herndon, young Negro Communist sentenced to 18 to 20 years on the Georgia chain gang on a charge of "inciting to insurrection," has been called for October 19, at 1 P.M., in the Imperial Auditorium, 160 West 129th Street, New York City, it was announced today.

The conference is called by the Joint Committee to Aid the Herndon Defense, constituted by the Non-Partisan Labor Defense, the General Defense Committee (I.W.W.), International Labor Defense, League for Industrial Democracy, League of Struggle for Negro Rights, and National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners. Calls for representatives to be sent to the conference have been sent to hundreds of local organizations this week.

Besides reports from the various organizations, there will be a number of prominent speakers, including Congressman Vito Marcantonio of New York, it was announced.

WORKERS

Protect Yourself Against the Hazards of Life. Join the WORKMEN'S SICK & DEATH BENEFIT FUND OF THE U.S. 1884-1935 Organized, managed by and for workers with only one purpose: to render protection to members and their families, and to support all endeavors and struggles for the improvement of toilers. About 50,000 members organized in 350 branches. Reserves \$3,400,000. Death benefit graded according to age at entry. Sick benefit payments from \$360 to \$900—to men and women, according to classes. Monthly assessments from 45c to \$2.20. For further information apply to Main Office: 714 Seneca Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

CONCERT FOR FERRERO-SALITTO DEFENSE

A Concert and Festival is to be held Saturday evening, October 12 at Irving Plaza, 15th Street and Irving Place, to raise funds for the defense of Ferrero and Salitto against deportation.

These two defendants are legally resident aliens in the United States. Ferrero has been here for 35 years, while Salitto has lived in the United States for 15 years. They are being threatened with deportation to Fascist Italy on trumped up charges of harboring Anarchist views.

For the Concert and Festival there will be a good dance orchestra and a program of entertainment which will include a girls' string ensemble, a violin-piano duo and concert songs by Loforese. There will be refreshments, sandwiches, beer and soda. Admission is 35c.

Readers of the NEW MILITANT are urged to attend.

ALL OUT!

to the HOUSEWARMING PARTY Branch I, N. Y. C. 320 East 14th Street This Saturday Night, October 12.

"WAR IN ETHIOPIA—IMPERIALIST SANCTIONS OR REVOLUTIONARY ACTION?"

Speaker: MAURICE SPECTOR FRIDAY, OCT. 18, 8:15 P.M. 1776 Pitkin Ave., Brooklyn Aus: Brownsville Branch, W.P.

LECTURE A. J. Muste will speak on "Do Sanctions Mean War?" at the Sunnyside Hall, 277 Kingston Avenue, near Eastern Parkway, Wednesday, Oct. 16 at 8 P.M. Admission 10c. Auspices of the Flatbush Branch.

WANTED! The first bound volume (1928-1931) of "THE MILITANT" State your price to the Business Manager of the NEW MILITANT.

How History Is Written

By ALFA

Dished Up to Order by Stalin's Savants on Frederick Engels Anniversary.

gram in which Kautsky, despite the instructions of Marx and Engels, was smuggling in the Lassallean thesis of the single reactionary mass."

Learned Nonsense

There could have been no instructions from Marx to Kautsky for the reason that Marx had died some eight years prior to the drafting of the Erfurt program; the only letter that Marx did write to Kautsky (in 1881) says absolutely nothing concerning the question that interests us. As regards Engels, in his letter to Kautsky he actually did subject to merciless criticism the phrase on the "single reactionary mass." But he did not at all ascribe it to Kautsky; he knew that this phrase was inserted by someone (obviously Wilhelm Liebknecht) into Kautsky's original draft, which had been approved in essence by Engels. Engels' critical letter was intended to supply Kautsky with support against Liebknecht, and especially against the old Lassalleans. "Ordinary" mortals have the privilege of not knowing this. But the learned Institute of Marx, Engels and Lenin! . . .

Further on we read: "The instructions of Engels to the leaders of the German social-democracy were not executed when the final text of the program was accepted" (our emphasis). The style itself is noteworthy: the "instructions" of the head of the department were not "executed" by an underling. But Engels was not the one and indivisible leader. He issued "instructions" to nobody. He was merely a genial thinker and he gave theoretical and political advice to different parties. Nobody was duty bound to "execute." This sentence, so remarkable stylistically, is all the worse for being false in essence. The formula of the "single mass" was deleted from the text of the Erfurt program, and Engels in his correspondence expressed his complete satisfaction on this score. What a deal of lying in eight lines for a learned institution!

Defaming Plekhanov

In the third article devoted to Engels' attitude to the Russian revolution we are informed that in a letter to the Emancipation of Labor Group, Engels warned against a mechanistic and doctrinaire understanding of Marxism. And the sage Pravda remarks in this connection: "Alas! The outstanding members of the Group gleaned

little boon (!) from this warning of Engels; two decades later they turned out in the camp of the Mensheviks. . . ." But what happened in the course of these two decades? Plekhanov's splendid and victorious struggle against philosophical idealism, against historic subjectivism and the economic superstitution of the Narodniki; the entire work of the Emancipation of Labor Group unpreceded in courage and staunchness—the work upon which was directly nurtured the oldest generation of the Russian Marxists, including Lenin himself—all this is a "trifle" to the ignorant and bombastic Pravda. But Lenin, indeed, was enthralled by Plekhanov, he was, to use his own expression, "in love" with Plekhanov, nor did he forget the latter's great Marxist services even during the periods of irreconcilable struggle with him. Why, even Engels himself after the letter to Zaslavsky in 1883 had the opportunity over a period of some 12 years to observe directly the activity of the Emancipation of Labor Group, and he referred with extreme praise to the work of Plekhanov. Generally speaking, the old man was quite chary of praise. But the functionary who has been able to understand neither Engels nor Lenin nor Plekhanov sets upon the activity of the Emancipation of Labor Group the seal of his severe verdict: "little boon." One is impelled to say that only harm can come from such bureaucratic insects in literature.

Flame Belching Bureaucrats

One could cull another dozen of similar pearls, for each author contributed his bit to the public treasure chest of ignorance. But the reader must be fed up to his neck already. We shall only add a few words on the score of the bureaucratic pathos. The leading article speaks of "the chapters of 'Das Kapital' and the 'Anti-Duehring' flaming with revolutionary passion and hatred to the exploiters, and in their wondrous philosophic profundity" . . . It is impossible to write more choicely. A philosophic profundity which turns into an iceberg at the same time that it flames of hatred fire. It is clear that at the mere sight of "Das Kapital" the editors of the Pravda get fever and chills. Further on, mention is made of the "immortal and destructive (?) lines on the Gotha Program" and of the "flame belching pamphlet" on the Paris Commune. In short, the flame

belching functionaries—in waiting write in a wondrous manner: the reader breaks out in a rash of burns and blisters. Zaslavsky; Bootlicker in Chief

But the palm of primacy indubitably goes to D. Zaslavsky. In the literary sense he is immeasurably more literate than the rest, and in regards to flame belching pathos he can give anybody cards and spades. Zaslavsky concludes his article with the following words: "It was not by accident that the remarkable and well worth studying friendship between Marx and Engels found its counterpart in the remarkable kinship, the great friendship between Lenin and Stalin." An immortal Russian aristocrat has made a remark bearing upon such a case. Said he: "After this, the son of a gun squats on his haunches and waits to be petted."

Marx and Engels were bound together by forty years of titanic mental labor. The most informed and penetrating students of Marxism, like Ryazanov, have been unable—for it is unthinkable in general—to conclusively establish the line of demarcation between their creative work. As regards Lenin and . . . Stalin we want to be shown not a line of demarcation, but a line of contiguity. In the titanic mental labor of Lenin, Stalin occupied the post of an ordinary "activist" side by side with a score of others. As regards "friendship," enough to recall Lenin's Testament and his letter written on his death bed in which he broke off all personal and comradesly relations with Stalin. But why pick on . . . D. Zaslavsky? He is the same scribbler who in 1917 hounded Lenin in the bourgeois chauvenist press as the paid agent of the German Kaiser. In a whole series of articles Lenin never made reference to Zaslavsky otherwise than as a "scoundrel." Only after the NEP and after the first pogrom of the Left Opposition was this individual able to enter the employ of the Soviet bureaucracy. At any rate, he remains true to himself in one thing: he calumniated Lenin while the latter was alive and he continues to calumniate him after he is dead. Such gentlemen are capable of proposing, say, for the 18th Anniversary of October to re-name a dozen volumes of Lenin as the "Collected Works of Stalin," in accordance with the same method by which a city like Tsaritsyn is renamed Stalingrad: a single decree—and the matter is in the bag.

But let the lackeys sweat as they will, they will not attain their goal: we will stand in defense of Marx and Engels and Lenin against all the Institutes and all the Zaslavskys. As if! Itself began to hammer this "theory" to bits, however, it became necessary to offer a more "reasonable" argument, which was woven through the main fabric like an excess thread: "The social democracy is 'social fascist' because it 'paves' the way for fascism. (You will find that intellectuals like Strachey, who confuse Stalinism with Leninism, use, or have used, this rather than Stalin's original formulation.) Now that the C. I. is "united fronting" with the social democracy at all costs, it is necessary that the term "social fascist" be forgotten as soon as possible. When reminded of it, the Stalinists dodge the issue by stating that the term is the same as Lenin's "social-chauvinism," merely brought up to date; the inference being, of course, that the Stalinists never meant any more or less than did Lenin by the term.

Question Box

By A. WEAVER

H. R., N. Y.— Question: Certain Stalinists are today claiming that the designation of the social democracy as "social fascist" is merely a continuation, in modern times, of Lenin's characterization of the social democracy as "social chauvinist." What is there to this?

Answer: The Stalinists, who argue thus, are either new to the movement or short in memory. However, they are depending upon these shortcomings being present in their listeners.

First, as to the evolution of the theory of "social fascism." Its theoretical formulation was first propounded by Stalin: "Fascism is a fighting organization of the bourgeoisie, an organization that rests on the active support of the social democracy. Social democracy is objectively the moderate wing of fascism. . . . These organizations do not contradict each other, but complete each other. They are not antipodes but twins. . . ." This "definition" was made the basis of the program of the Comintern and the policy of the P.G.P. (See, for example, "What is Happening in Germany," pp. 20-21, by Frits Heckert, published June, 1933, by Workers Library Publishers). Essentially, therefore, the Stalinists claimed the social democracy to be fascist and, based on this formulation, the C.P.G. refused to make united fronts with the social democracy against Hitler. (How could united fronts be made with fascists against fascists?)

As life itself began to hammer this "theory" to bits, however, it became necessary to offer a more "reasonable" argument, which was woven through the main fabric like an excess thread: "The social democracy is 'social fascist' because it 'paves' the way for fascism. (You will find that intellectuals like Strachey, who confuse Stalinism with Leninism, use, or have used, this rather than Stalin's original formulation.)

Now that the C. I. is "united fronting" with the social democracy at all costs, it is necessary that the term "social fascist" be forgotten as soon as possible. When reminded of it, the Stalinists dodge the issue by stating that the term is the same as Lenin's "social-chauvinism," merely brought up to date; the inference being, of course, that the Stalinists never meant any more or less than did Lenin by the term.

Actually, there never was, and, theoretically, there never could be an evolution or equality between the terms "social chauvinism" and "social-fascism" insofar as these express actual, and not imaginary, social phenomena. Lenin's characterization of the social democracy as "social-chauvinist" is scientifically correct: The leaders of the social democratic parties claimed to stand for socialism and yet acted as chauvinists. Stalin's designation of the social democracy as "social-fascist" is a fantastic distortion of Marxism. The social democratic leaders, who can be chauvinistic because this does not do away with their sincere, cannot at the same time be fascists because this would imply that they stand for the abolition of the very organizations upon whose existence their political career depends. The after-thought that social-democracy is "social-fascist," because it objectively paves the way for fascism, is meaningless. Objectively, the road to fascism was prepared for by the whole course of capitalism, and, let us not forget, by the course of the Stalinists themselves, as well as the social democracy. It would obviously be ridiculous and merely pious confusion upon confusion if we were, for this reason, to call capitalism "capital-fascism" and the Stalinists, "communist-fascists."

Between the formulations of Lenin and the stupidities of Stalin lies, not a continuation but an abyss.

L. Z. BRONX—

Question: Is it true that the C.I. under Lenin refused membership to anyone who subscribed to the idea that the League of Nations was an instrument which helped to maintain peace?

Answer: Point 6 of the 21 conditions for admission into the Third International, adopted at the second congress of the C.I. in 1920, stated: "Every party that wishes to belong to the Third International is obligated to unmask not only open social patriotism, but also the social honesty, and hypocrisy of social pacifism, and systematically bring to the attention of the workers the fact that, without the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, no kind of international court of arbitration, no kind of an agreement regarding the limitation of armaments, no kind of a 'democratic' renovation of the League of Nations will be able to prevent fresh imperialistic wars."

Point 21 stated: "Those party members who, on principle, reject the conditions and those laid down by the Communist International are to be excluded from the party. . ."

A Skeleton from Olgin's Social Patriotic Closet

By HENRY THURMAN

According to Moissaye J. Olgin, in his recent vicious pamphlet against "Trotskyism," Leon Trotsky was nothing but a petit-bourgeois compromiser up until 1917, when he managed to fool the Bolsheviks for a few years, returning to his old sins after Lenin died. But Olgin's evaluation of the Russian revolutionist's career was quite different in 1918, when he wrote in the preface to "Our Revolution," a collection of Trotsky's writings:

"The reader will see that Trotsky's views as applied in Bolshevik-ruled Russia are not of recent origin. They were formed in the course of the First Russian Revolution of 1905, in which Trotsky was one of the leaders. They were developed and strengthened in the following years of reaction, when many a progressive group went to seek compromises with the absolutist forces. They became particularly firm through the world war and the circumstances that led to the establishment of a republican order in Russia. Perhaps many a grievous misunderstanding and misinterpretation would have been avoided had thinking America known that those conceptions of Trotsky were not created on the spur of the moment, but were the result of a life-long work in the service of the Revolution."

Just such misinterpretations—claims that Trotsky hedged during the war (Olgin did not believe in the socialist revolution in Russia—Olgin himself is spreading now!

In the biographical notes of this same work, Olgin, who claimed he was personally acquainted with Trotsky, makes numerous statements that blast the lying claims made in his slanderous pamphlet: "Trotsky is not imposing. He is almost modest. . . an uncompromising Marxist. . . Trotsky could not conceive of half-way measures, of 'diplomatic' silence over vital topics, of cunning moves and concealed designs in political struggles. . . . To secure permanent power, the working class would have to win over the millions of peasants. This would be possible by recognizing all the agrarian changes completed by the peasants in time of the revolution and by radical agrarian legislation. . . collectivization becomes

the order of the day. . . . It was precisely the same program which Trotsky is at present attempting to put into operation. . . . Whatever may be our opinion of the merits of his policies, the man has remained true to himself. His line has been straight."

Most significant of all, Olgin gives the definition of a Soviet. Now that he is crawling and licking the boots of his masters, and meekly concocting lies at their command, he might do well to remember the words of Trotsky on the nature of a Soviet:

"The Soviet was the organized authority of the masses themselves over their separate members. This was a true, unadulterated democracy, without a two-chamber system, without a professional bureaucracy, with the right of the voters to recall their representative at will and to substitute another."

"At this point Olgin commented, "In short, it was the same type of democracy Trotsky and Lenin are trying to make permanent in present-day Russia."

51 Unions Support 574 Fight for Reinstatement

(Continued from Page 1) crease promised to them by the Farmer-Labor organization. The tactics of Mayor Latimer in using his police for the wholesale gassing, shooting and clubbing of workers were called to the attention of the Farmer-Labor party with a request that they expel Latimer from their ranks. Latimer's Employer-Employee Board was thoroughly analyzed and shown to be an artificial agency created for the purpose of usurping the rights of the unions and thereby stripping the movement of its growing progressiveness.

Delegates pointed to the growing need for the industrial form of union organization and told of the successes of several unions in working out a program of closer co-operation between trades. The conference adopted a proposal that this be made the policy of all local unions, and it was decided to hold the next conference on Wednesday, Oct. 30, at 1310 Marquette. An invitation was issued to all locals to participate in future conferences.

PARTY AT WORK

CLEVELAND

The message of the new revolutionary party is spreading in Cleveland, as the following events will indicate.

Joe Pierce, who was looked upon by many Y.C.L.ers as a leading element, came over to the Spartacus Youth League after two years in the C.P. and Y.C.L.

A number of the youth are now wavering between the Y.C.L. and S.Y.L. The NEW MILITANT is passed around openly at Y.C.L. meetings.

The Socialist Unemployed Alliance invited the Stalinists into a united front against relief slashes, and the Stalinists suggested that the Unemployed League also participate. However, they struggled against allowing Foley, the organizer, to speak! Imagine one organization in a united front dictating the choice of speakers to another—and trying to bar its main leader at that. The face of the Unemployment Council secretary twitched convulsively when Foley insisted that if he were barred, Thurman, the first "renegade" of the Cleveland youth, must speak!

At the demonstration, the young "Trotskyite" speech was received warmly, and the NEW MILITANT sold like hotcakes.

The Workers Party headquarters will open soon, and the comrades are planning forums, lectures, classes, organizational meetings, etc. One Spratcan is organizing a discussion group among his schoolmates, others are planning union work.

Recently a lecture, "The Need for a New International," was delivered before thirty-five young people, largely Stalinist members and followers, at the Lakewood Youth League. Other mass organizations are planning to have W.P. lecturers in the future.

JOIN THE WORKERS PARTY.

PAUL LUTTINGER, M.D. DANIEL LUTTINGER, M.D. 5 Washington Square North 1-2 and 6-8 Except Sundays and Holidays.