

Trade Unions Merge In France

By H. F. ROBERTS

The recent fusion of the two big French trade union federations, the C.G.T. (reformist) and the C.G.T.U. (Stalinist), which took place in line with the Comintern's efforts to dismember itself of its Third Period baggage, has given a new impetus to the negotiations underway for the organic unity of the French Socialist and Stalinist parties, as a first step toward the merging of the two Internationals. The final plunge of the Stalinists into the swamps of reformism and the social patriotism following the Seventh Congress has cleared the path toward organic unity of all political obstacles, such as, for example, revolutionary principles.

The fusion of the two trade union organizations took place on the basis of the complete abdication by the Stalinists of all revolutionary political activity in the union ranks. A disavowal of factional activity was demanded in advance by the labor faker Jouhaux and was readily made by the Stalinist bureaucrats who announced that the Stalinist workers' political activity would be strictly outside the unions! Speculation concerning the possibility of struggles between opposing political tendencies within the unified trade union confederation is answered by Marcel Gitton, secretary of the French Stalinist Party, with the remark:

C.P. Gives Up Political Activity at Reformists Bidding

the unification of the two parties. From this text he quotes the following passage:

"The unified party of the proletariat, seeking to combat and destroy the capitalist system, generator of misery and wars, cannot admit any policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie. None of its members can participate in a capitalist government. Its parliamentary representative has the duty to refuse to vote for military credits destined to prepare imperialist wars," etc.

Now, says Lebas, "It is permissible to ask whether the Communist Party doesn't believe it necessary to modify somewhat its first text."

Since that text was issued, he goes on, "two important political facts have intervened. First there was the Congress of the Communist International and the vote on the Dimitroff report whose conclusions sensibly modified, I believe, the position of the Communist parties toward coalition governments. Secondly, there was the formation of the Popular Front into which all the parties and fractions of republican bourgeois parties may enter for common anti-Fascist action. From this new action necessarily results a new Communist policy." (Emphasis mine—H.F.R.) And this policy, concludes Lebas with perfect justice, can scarcely be reconciled with the quoted paragraph from the Stalinist draft for a common declaration. He puts the question squarely. I quote the balance of his article:

"Exceptional Tactics" Throw Overboard

"Two things of importance are

8 PAGES ON NOV. 7

For the eighteenth anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution the NEW MILITANT will appear in a special eight-page edition. It will be a fore-runner to the regular eight page weekly to appear soon.

Several feature articles tracing the important lessons of this great revolutionary act of eighteen years ago and dealing with the world shaking events of today, especially the all-over-shadowing issue of new imperialist wars and the duties and tasks of the revolutionary movement, are in preparation for this issue. It should furnish an inspiration for new strides toward the building up of a stronger revolutionary press.

This is the particular duty now before us. Our ideas become a power when translated into action in the living movement of the proletariat. Our message must therefore reach wider fields. Only the Fourth Internationalists are maintaining a consistent revolutionary position in the face of the developing wars of imperialist aggression and the horrors of Fascism. The NEW MILITANT is our main instrument in making this position clear to wider masses and extend the revolutionary influence amongst them.

We propose that this announcement be the signal for a large-scale subscription drive. Start out right now with the zeal of true fighters for an invincible idea. We have set for ourselves an immediate goal of 1,000 new subscribers by the time of the second Workers Party convention, to be held December 26, and a corresponding increase in bundle sales. No more effective greeting could be given to the convention

of a revolutionary party than to attain this immediate goal. The funds coming in for the new subscriptions and for the enlarged bundle sales will put the campaign for the eight-page weekly over the top. The extended circulation will form a solid basis ensuring its future existence.

We ask the party branches to go to work without delay. We ask our sympathizers and the readers of the NEW MILITANT to pitch in and help. When all shoulders are put to the wheel we can reach this immediate goal.

The party branches and the bundle agents should order an extra supply of this special eight-page anniversary edition as a first step toward increased bundle sales. It will be off the press the week before Nov. 7 and reach all cities in time for the anniversary. The special distribution of this issue should be used as a means for new contacts to gain new readers and obtain regular subscriptions.

Above all, we want all forces to concentrate during this period mentioned on the job of building up a far wider circulation for the NEW MILITANT. It is the way to bring the campaign for the regular eight-page weekly to a real climax. Let the subs come rolling in and the rest will be easy. Let all go to work in this great job in the manner that only revolutionary fighters can do.

PHILADELPHIA FORUMS

The Workers Educational Forum holds meetings every Sunday at 8:15 P.M. at Grand Fraternity Hall, 1628 Arch Street. The schedule of coming weeks is as follows:

Oct. 27: Karl Lore on "The A. F. of L. Convention."

expressed (in this paragraph): (1) Prohibition for the unified party of tomorrow to pursue any policy of collaboration with the bourgeois parties, and even more especially of collaboration taking the form of participation in a capitalist government. (2) Refusal of military credits, of credits for colonial conquests and the whole of the budget.

"A Socialist can ask me: What objection have you to this?"

"For me, none, or almost none. These two imperative ideas are found in the charter of the Socialist party founded in 1905. But the founders of the party were careful to foresee the possibility of exceptional circumstances, creating for the proletariat and its Party an exceptional situation justifying an exceptional tactic. They also introduced into the charter this simple phrase: 'Even in the case of exceptional circumstances, the elected representatives of the party cannot involve the party without its consent.' Which means that the policy of the party, even in such a case, is fixed only by the party itself."

"Doesn't the Communist Party believe that this phrase or a similar one should have its place in the charter of tomorrow?"

"Doesn't the Communist Party agree that it cannot maintain the text of the unity charter presented to us at a time when it is making the greatest effort to extend to the whole country the policy of rapprochement of the working class parties and the bourgeois republican parties for the fight against Fascism and to conserve democratic liberties?"

"Doesn't the Communist Party consider," asks Lebas finally, "that the common struggle against the decree laws... poses the question of a coalition government to which it would be impossible to reply in the negative?"

The Way Is Cleared

"In any case, the Communist International recently in session at Moscow itself posed this question and by Dimitroff's report answered it in a favorable sense. The stronger then the reasons for us to believe," concludes Lebas, "that the Communist Party will not maintain too absolutely its text at the forthcoming commission, whose work will thereby be facilitated." (Populaire, Oct. 2. Emphasis inserted.)

And we may be sure that Lebas has put the matter in a nutshell. The Stalinist call for unity of the two Internationals is a call for the submergence and rejection of intransigent proletarian independence, of the concept of class struggle and revolutionary defeatism—in short, of revolutionary Marxism. The logic of their course will not even permit them to maintain these principles in words. No prediction could be safer than the prophecy that the French Stalinists will submit without murmur to the principles of Vandervelde, Blum, Lebas & Co. For such submission is now the sanctified "line" of the International which once, long ago, knew the leadership of Lenin.

Green-Woll Suffer Big Setback

(Continued from Page 1)

convention. The Woll-Frey-Wharton forces rallied by 18,025 to 10,826, the majority report of the Resolutions Committee which reaffirms the San Francisco decision of last year. This decision permits the Executive Council to issue international charters to workers in such industries as rubber and automobiles but specifies that the craft unions of the Federation retain jurisdiction over the skilled craftsmen in these industries. The effect is instead of setting up a genuine industrial union to put the unskilled and semi-skilled into a "restricted industrial union" and to separate the skilled workers from them and from each other in a dozen or more craft groups.

Analysis of the role of Lewis and Company in developing government-sponsored unionism on which, incidentally, reactionaries such as Woll and Frey made acute observations in the convention, must wait for our next issue. Suffice it here to make

Lewis Tirade Reflection of Rank and File Militancy

one important point. Lewis is nothing if not a shrewd politician. He seeks power. He does not cast himself in the role of a martyr making a splendid but futile fight for lost causes. When, therefore, Lewis now delivers a bitter and devastating attack on one of the pillars of the Federation, Matthew Woll himself, when he deliberately and publicly widens the breach between the old guard and other elements, when he shouts from the housetop what hitherto has been whispered only behind closed doors by any prominent Federation leader, namely, that the A. F. of L. is "a total failure" under its present leadership, when he who was an unwavering supporter of Tory Republicanism under Coolidge and Hoover, flirts with the idea of a labor party, when he who in the past has hounded progressives, not to speak of radicals in his own union more bitterly than any other international president, now protests against one of Matthew Woll's proposals to protect the Federation from "reds" as simply part of a general movement throughout the country against all "progressive and liberal thought,"

it can mean only one thing: Lewis knows that the sentiment of the rank and file in his own union and among the workers generally is such that anyone who now seeks power and influence among the workers must cast himself in the role of a progressive and fighter, even a "radical!"

The vote on the craft union resolution already referred to indicates that the old guard is far from locked. It would be dangerous for genuine progressives to cherish any illusions about a smooth road ahead. It would be downright suicidal to get a false conception of the role Lewis himself will play—for them to regard him as basically a friend rather than as a much more subtle and powerful enemy than the mere has-beens, Woll and Green. But the indications which this convention has given of how astute and hard-bolled labor politicians gauge the spirit of insurgency among the workers, plus the fact of a rift in the A. F. of L. leadership such as have never before occurred in all the 55 years of its history, opens wide the door for a mighty advance in building the left wing in the various unions and in the A. F. of L. as a whole.

Take the offensive! Press the fight. Be bold, be bold, be true bold. That is what the Atlantic City convention says to the militants.

Italo British War Looms

(Continued from Page 1)

ing a new offensive in the Far East. It is only a matter of time before all of Europe will be sucked up by the struggle.

Where Are the Facts.

The irony of the whole situation is best reflected by the fate of the various "Pacts." There is the "Pact of the Four," to which both England and Italy are signatories. Now null and void. There is the Anglo-French Entente. And there is the French-Italian Pact. Either one or the other is due to the scrapheap shortly. Then there is the Franco-Soviet Pact. In the light of the other experiences what value can any realist attach to it?

The fate of Europe is at stake. The Soviet Union is in danger. It is only a matter of time before the waves of war will reach our shores.

The most recent experiences confirm more than ever the realism and the correctness of the Marxist policy for the working class. The whole course of events dictates to the workers:

An immutable distrust of the imperialist governments, their "peace pacts," their League of Nations, their "sanctions."

A determined struggle against imperialism by the only means possible—by the revolutionary defeat of the imperialist governments.

A consistent fight against the agents of the imperialists in the ranks of labor—the social-patriots of all stripes.

Japanese Plot China Grab

(Continued from Page 1)

arly in the maintenance of its entire battle fleet in Pacific waters. It was in 1915 that Japan, taking advantage of the World War situation, forced her famous "Twenty-one Demands" on China. American pressure after the war forced a Japanese retreat from the positions gained. But since 1931 Japanese imperialism has extracted from China far more than her Twenty-one Demands of 1915 ever asked for. For this American imperialism will sooner or later have to have an accounting and a settlement with Japan.

If the further development of events in Africa and the Mediterranean bring a forcible settlement of all outstanding international disputes once more onto the order of the day, the Wall St. head office of U. S. Imperialism Inc. will keep the European situation in hand but the strong-arm squad, Marines and all, will go to work in the Pacific. And any reader of the Daily Worker in these weeks may be sure that when that time comes, the American lackeys of the Stalinist bureaucracy will be calling upon the boys to unlimber their guns and to give it to that reactionary-Fascist-feudal Mikado and his generals for the defense of peace, of democracy and of the Soviet Union!

U. S. Imperialism Trains Its Guns

It is because of this situation in the Far East that the "neutrality" of the United States consists prim-

Partners in Social-Patriotic Betrayal

(Continued from Page 1)

ities.

The New Leader article continues under the head "Sanctions Do Not Mean War." This is precisely the thesis of the Stalinists who, like the Socialists, are obliged to cover up their first concrete step toward the support of imperialist war behind a denial of its existence.

The Socialists are as hard pressed to prove that sanctions do not mean war as the Stalinists. To quote:

"Sir Norman Angell, winner of the Nobel Peace prize, replied to the objection that sanctions mean war with the words: 'Sanctions do not mean war—they insure peace.'"

Further on: "The Joint Anti-war Committee of the Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions... declared it was even more obvious today 'that only the energetic policy of collective security demanded by the two Internationals in their resolution of September 6 can still preserve peace.'"

The article continues with a list. The American Federation of Labor, the New Zealand Federation, the Japanese Federation, all approve the sanctions policy of the League. But nowhere is there one single argument to show why sanctions do not mean war!

There are no arguments. All the Socialist ghoulies of the dead Second International can do is to point with pride to the extent of their betrayal and gloat. But gloating does not make treachery any the less treachery.

The article concludes:

"Those who oppose the policy of

the Labor and Socialist International in this crucial matter and who seek to interfere with the application of this policy by urging opposition to the stand of the League of Nations and advocating revolution in democratic countries when they may be confronted with the necessity of taking up arms against the fascist dictatorships are, whether they know it or not, doing the work of Mussolini and Hitler."

This is in complete agreement with the Stalinists, who have stated that the French workers would be traitors if they made their revolution in the midst of a Franco-German war.

The basis of this line in both cases is the same. It lies in this case in the failure of the social democrats to combat fascism... their policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie having crippled the workers and handed them over to the fascists, the social democrats, instead of purging their movement of compromise, pass even further over into the camp of the bourgeoisie and appeal to the democratic bourgeois governments to overthrow the fascist bourgeois governments. The fact that the very democratic governments they are appealing to are already themselves tottering on the edge of fascism seems to make no impression on the social democratic dunderheads. That they appeal to the enemy of the working class, the bourgeoisie, to perform the tasks that the working class alone can perform, is an index of their bankruptcy.

The Stalinists have to be a little more cautious about their approach to social-patriotism, to the support of the bourgeois government in its imperialist war moves. They conceal their social patriotism behind an even greater fog of phrases, mis-statements and equivocations. But the direction of the movement is the same. It is safe to say that unless some earlier catastrophe overtakes them the Stalinists will line up 100 percent with the social democrats and the bourgeois governments, of the democratic countries at least (and of the fascist countries which are allied with the governments which the Stalinists consider most democratic) in the next war.

Take the issue of the Daily Worker of October 8: On the front page

moment break out into open warfare, which is only an "extension" of "peacetime" politics.

Now what sense is there in this appeal to "all peace loving people?" None. As a matter of fact, almost every man in the country, with the exception of a few adventurers, is a peace lover. Ask an army general, a president, a senator, a bank head—they are all peace lovers by their own admission. But they are supporters of the capitalist regime, hence they are forced to support the wars which are its living manifestation. The Daily Worker by appealing to all peace loving people is simply confusing the issue, which is not between peace lovers and war lovers (show me an avowed war lover) but between capitalists and proletarians; between supporters of the capitalist regime and its incessant open and concealed warfare and enemies of the capitalist regime and its warfare. When the Daily Worker appeals to peace lovers to stop war it is appealing to capitalists, to army generals, government figures, fascists (for they profess to love peace too!) to overthrow the capitalist regime! For that is the only way peace lovers or anybody else will ever stop war.

Like the social democrats the Stalinists appeal to the capitalist government to stop war. The British Labor Party is ready to support "our government" in its efforts to maintain peace. The Stalinists are ready, indeed they call upon Roosevelt and congress, to support capitalist measures to "stop" war.

Now it is possible that a capitalist government may stop open war for a short period... but only because that government does not consider the time ripe for war. For instance: it is conceivable that Roosevelt, like Wilson, might keep us out of the war for a year or two... but only in order better to prepare for the war when it comes.

The treachery of the social democrats and the Stalinists lies not in the fact that Roosevelt can't stop war for a year or so, but in the fact that they teach the workers not to rely upon themselves who, as enemies of the capitalist system can alone really put a stop to war, but upon Roosevelt, Congress, and a host of peace lovers who only love peace as long as peace lasts. The majority of so-called peace lovers, love capitalism infinitely more than they love peace, hence they can never be relied upon to put a stop to the wars that are the natural

manifestation of capitalism in action. When war comes the whole mob of peace lovers become just as ardent war lovers... and the workers whom the Daily Worker and the New Leader have taught to look to these peace lovers are easily led into the maelstrom.

October 9—From an article by Marguerite Young of the Daily Worker Washington bureau: "Secretary of State Hull's announcement today that the United States has warned Rome not to bomb or injure American lives or property in case of military operations at Addis Ababa was received today as another indication that mass anti-war sentiment is finding its mark in the Roosevelt administration.

Here we have the same misdirection of the workers' attention away from their own struggle against war to the maneuvers of the capitalists in preparation for war. This is an especially brazen example; brazen or stupid, it is hard to say. So anxious are the Stalinist lackeys to register a victory for their treacherous war policy that they seize upon the slightest incident and magnify it all out of proportion. Secretary of State Hull, it seems almost superfluous to remark, it only following the ordinary diplomatic procedure in warning Rome not to damage American imperialist lives and property in Ethiopia. Last week we remarked on the "forcing" policy of the Daily Worker, whereby they will soon be forcing themselves into an imperialist army. This week we have another example... the Daily Worker has forced the Secretary of State of an imperialist government to protect its imperialist property!

Where does all this lead? It leads the Daily Worker to an eventual campaign of forcing the United States into a war with Italy (or Germany, or Japan, or any other power that threatens the Soviet Union). The Stalinists have stated that they are ready to support wars of democratic states against fascist states (Stalin-Laval pact, "defend the remnants of bourgeois democracy," etc.). It is possible merely to support war. During the last war the centrist Socialists of the brand of Kautsky and MacDonald may be said merely to have supported the war. They did not campaign actively for war, at times they even criticized it, but they did not campaign against the war.

The Stalinists indicate their intention not merely to support the

war, but to actively campaign for it! Up to the last minute before the last war the future centrist socialists took a revolutionary position on war. But the Stalinists, already before the war, are forcing the question. If any value can be placed on the pre-war comparison of the Kautskys with the pre-war position of the Stalinists we must conclude that the latter are preparing for a recruiting campaign unrivaled in the history of socialism, even surpassing the efforts of capitalist recruiting agents! What else is to be concluded from the vain boast of having forced the Secretary of State, the very leader of all the forces of reactionary imperialism, to protect American imperialist property?

October 11—An editorial on sanctions: "Now the A. F. of L. can add its might and weight for such action (sanctions)—by endorsing the Roosevelt government to act with the League of Nations on collective economic sanctions."

The Stalinists encourage the A. F. of L. to follow the same treacherous path—support the Roosevelt government, they advise. It is just possible that this advice will ultimately filter down to the ranks and have some influence on the membership. If the "red" Stalinists support the "peace" moves of the government there must be something to the government peace policy. Indeed if there were any opposition to support of the Roosevelt government in the ranks, the rotten bureaucracy could use the Stalinists as an example to force support of the government.

It is in just this situation that

the stupidity of the argument of some Stalinists, who still have a grain of class consciousness left, becomes evident. We will support the government now, they say, but when it turns in another direction, toward war with the Soviet Union, we will oppose it.

This the Stalinists consider to be another smart trick, like their policy of supporting the British imperialist government and at the same time calling for insurrection in the Italian army. It is just as treacherous. For by advising the workers to support their bureaucracy and their government the Stalinists bring those workers under the leadership of that bureaucracy and that government—they teach the workers to look up to and rely on that bureaucracy and government.

And when in the future these extra smart Stalinists decide to change their line again they will find that the workers no longer are under their influence... the workers will be under the influence of the bureaucracy and the government, under the "influence" of the officers in the army.

Not only do the Stalinists advise the workers to support the Roosevelt government, but they advise them to support the League of Nations. The League of Nations is no more than the sum of its parts, it is an association of international robber imperialists. If one imperialist government is a reactionary force, how reactionary is a league of fifty-two capitalist governments? The League is the International Burglars' Union, no more, no less. It has not changed one whit since the day Lenin called it "the Thieves Kitchen of Geneva."

the stupidly of the argument of some Stalinists, who still have a grain of class consciousness left, becomes evident. We will support the government now, they say, but when it turns in another direction, toward war with the Soviet Union, we will oppose it.

This the Stalinists consider to be another smart trick, like their policy of supporting the British imperialist government and at the same time calling for insurrection in the Italian army. It is just as treacherous. For by advising the workers to support their bureaucracy and their government the Stalinists bring those workers under the leadership of that bureaucracy and that government—they teach the workers to look up to and rely on that bureaucracy and government.

And when in the future these extra smart Stalinists decide to change their line again they will find that the workers no longer are under their influence... the workers will be under the influence of the bureaucracy and the government, under the "influence" of the officers in the army.

Not only do the Stalinists advise the workers to support the Roosevelt government, but they advise them to support the League of Nations. The League of Nations is no more than the sum of its parts, it is an association of international robber imperialists. If one imperialist government is a reactionary force, how reactionary is a league of fifty-two capitalist governments? The League is the International Burglars' Union, no more, no less. It has not changed one whit since the day Lenin called it "the Thieves Kitchen of Geneva."

NEW MILITANT

with which is merged THE MILITANT

Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co., 55 East 11th St., N. Y. C. Phone: ALgon. 4-9088. 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 per six months; Canada and foreign \$1.80 per year; \$1.00 six months. Bundle rates: Two cents per copy.

Vol. 1 OCTOBER 19, 1935 No. 43

Mass Meeting

EIGHTEEN YEARS OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Speakers:

JAMES P. CANNON ARNE SWABECK
A. J. MUSTE MAURICE SPECTOR

Thursday, November 7th -- 8 p. m.

IRVING PLAZA, Irving Place and 15th Street

Auspices: Workers Party, N. Y. District, 55 E. 11th Street.