

MARCH OF EVENTS

By JACK WEBER

Scottsboro Case

Once more the Scottsboro boys are to face capitalist legal-lynch law of the South. This time just to satisfy those old fogies of the Supreme Court the farce has been enacted of placing one Negro on the grand jury rolls. Nobody has any illusions at all that this means a change in attitude towards the Negro or his "rights." On the contrary, the press treats the matter with utter cynicism, pointing out that of course no Negro will actually be allowed to serve on trial juries. The cynical gesture has exactly the same meaning as that of Hitler in inviting two Jews to participate in the Olympics. Nobody is taken in by the farce, but it permits the reactionaries to gloss over the realities and to state that the formal rules of the game have been satisfied. The ruling class would like nothing better than to have the Negro boys quietly convicted without too much public fuss. This class-conscious workers will never permit. Mass pressure must be aroused once again to snatch these boys out of the hands of the lynchers and to ward off this act of terrorism against the oppressed Negroes of the U. S.

Egypt...

One of the reasons for British opposition to the Italian invasion of Ethiopia was the dread that the sympathies of every colonial people would be actively aroused and might take channels of revolt against the immediate oppressor. The fear of the English ruling class has already been justified by the events in Egypt. All that was required to set off the spark was the speech of Hoare, British Foreign Minister, giving clear evidence that the rulers of Egypt did not intend to carry out a previous promise to

grant a new constitution. The first constitution of 1923 had been replaced by a new one in 1930. The latter had been abrogated in 1934 when the Wafdist movement became a threat to British rule. The reactionary speech of Hoare started student demonstrations and riots that were put down ruthlessly by troops. This is the beginning of a revived movement for independence in Egypt, one of the fruits of the Italian attack on Ethiopia. It would not require much to cause the spread of this movement for national liberation to the other colonies of Great Britain, particularly India. A widespread concerted movement of revolt of the colonial countries would be a blow not only at British imperialism but at all imperialism.

Shanghai...

An open anti-Japanese movement sprang up in Shanghai this week. The threat of the Japanese to take over the five northern provinces produced a feeling of desperation and the demand for a war against the invaders. The situation in Shanghai resulting from this agitation and some demonstrations against the Japanese, became so tense that the population of Chapel, mindful of the previous brutality and slaughter in this district, flocked into the International Settlement by the tens and scores of thousands. The hatred and mistrust of the Japanese brigands is too great for the Chinese masses to believe the words of "reassurance" issued by the Japanese army representatives that no bombardment or invasion was intended. The Nippon imperialists have been laying the basis for some time for large scale operations designed to meet any resistance that might ensue when the seizure of the northern provinces was consummated.

Old Guard Reorganizes N.Y. Socialist Party

After weeks of conferences to decide upon a course of action, the Socialist Old Guard has decided to stay in the Socialist Party and capture control of the national apparatus by hook or crook.

The first important step in its campaign to get a majority at the national convention in May, 1936 was taken at the November 13 meeting of the New York City Central Committee when, by a vote of 69 to 47, the Old Guard vested dictatorial power in the all-Old Guard City Executive for a sweeping reorganization of the New York branches.

The resolution bluntly states that the purpose of the reorganization is "to put an end to factional organizations and disruptive activities, enforce the orders of the N.E.C. and the State Committee concerning the ineligibility to party membership of those advocating violence, armed insurrection or dictatorship as a means of achieving socialism" and "pending the reorganization, puts all power in the hands of the City Executive."

With the City Central Committee thus dissolved, there exists now no official body through which the Norman Thomas and "Militant" minorities can act.

In a mass meeting of party members protesting the Old Guard action, held at Stuyvesant Casino Sunday afternoon, Norman Thomas and the "Militant" leaders declared they would not submit.

A meeting the same day of the Old Guard-controlled State Committee took two further steps in consolidating Old Guard forces for the coming convention.

The Old Guard meeting announced that early next month a two-day conference will be held in New York in which the state organizations of New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania and Maryland would be officially represented, as well as minority delegations from New Jersey, Ohio, Michigan and other states. The Finnish and Jewish Federations will also be officially represented. The conference will determine the policy of the Old Guard at the May convention, including the drafting of a party platform and a new declaration of principles, decide on nominees for President and Vice-President, and plan the strategy of the convention struggle.

The State Committee also announced that it had decided to overrule the National Executive

Committee which had disapproved of the expulsion of five Buffalo left-wingers.

At the protest mass meeting, which was called by a committee of fifty members of the dissolved City Central Committee, Thomas declared that he would refuse to appear before the City Executive to answer charges of breach of discipline for debating Browder. Resolutions were adopted branding the re-organization as "illegal" and an attempt "to split the party locally and nationally," and declaring the protestants were determined to "resist the splitting move."

In recent weeks, since last month's Chicago meeting of the N.E.C. showed that the "peace pact" adopted three months previously, had broken down, some of the Old Guard had counselled withdrawal from the national party. The policy that prevailed, however, is based on the conviction that the Old Guard can depend on Dan Hoan, Hoopes and other erstwhile allies of Thomas, particularly the municipal Socialists of Reading, Bridgeport and Milwaukee, to aid them in carrying the convention against the Thomas-"Militant" group.

With the aid of these elements, and powerful financial resources, the well-organized Old Guard faces a heterogeneous conglomeration of Thomasites and "Militants" who have little in common except hatred of the Old Guard. Only decisive steps to organize a left-wing on a revolutionary program can provide the necessary rallying center to oppose the Old Guard's machinations. With only five months to the convention, and only three months before delegates will be elected to the convention, the "Militants" have not yet published their program.

CHICAGO AFFAIR THANKSGIVING FESTIVAL Thursday, Nov. 28, at 8 P.M. Dancing - Eats - Entertainment Admission 15 cents 1237 N. California Avenue Sponsors: Branch 2, W.P., Chicago

CHICAGO MEETING "Egypt, the Philippines, and the National Question" Speaker: NORMAN SATIR Member Natl. Committee, W.P. TUESDAY, NOV. 26, 8:00 P.M. Sponsors: Branch 2, W.P., Chicago

PRIVATE SHOWING

"In the Land of the Soviets"

Including News Reel, Charley Chaplin Ballet and Puppet Show Reel

Accompanied by a Lecture By A. F. REMUS

TOLEDO WORKERS SCHOOL HALL 3221 Ontario Street

ADMISSION 15c Sponsors: Toledo Workers School

Lovestone Gets His Price

Herberg and Zimmerman Dicker or Entry into S.P., Lovestone in C.P.

The Lovestone-Brandler group, known as the Communist Party Opposition, notorious for six years for its opportunist attempts to get back into the Communist International at any price, has at last had the price named. The Stalinist bureaucracy will welcome its repentant servants if they successfully act as brokers between the Stalinists and the Socialists.

The sudden cessation of criticism of the Lovestonites in the Stalinist press; a lengthy interview with the Lovestonite, Charles S. Zimmerman, in the Daily Worker, approvingly quoting him as favoring the Stalinist conception of a Labor Party; and, above all, the new line of the Lovestonite "Workers Age," provide independent verification of information from a reliable source that Lovestone and Brandler have just negotiated with Comintern representatives an agreement to act as Stalinist agents in ballyhooing organic unity on an unprincipled basis.

It is understood that the agreement, so far as it concerns this country, provides that Lovestone, Bertram Wolfe and others are to be received into the Stalinist apparatus, while Zimmerman, Will Herberg and the main body of Lovestonites enter the Socialist Party. We have definite information that Herberg and Zimmerman have been negotiating with leading Socialists for an understanding for their entrance into the S. P., under the pretense that the negotiations are being carried on without Lovestone's knowledge and that to enter the S. P. they are "splitting" with Lovestone. Actually, the negotiations are under Lovestone's direction. The sending of the main body of Lovestonites into the S. P. as Stalinist agents is an elaborate piece of trickery, of the type for which the Lovestonites have long been notorious in the labor movement.

An Interlude of "Criticism" Recent issues of the Lovestonite Workers Age provide the "theoretical" foundation for this elaborate maneuver. The first few issues of the paper after the Seventh Congress of the C. I. had unfolded its social-patriotic and reformist policy reflected spontaneous shock and reaction against the Stalinist betrayal. "Shadows of 1914 Over the Comintern," "principled deviations from Bolshevism," "degeneration," were among the characterizations of the C. I. course. One section of the Lovestone group proposed a complete break with Stalinism. But six years of a false theoretical analysis of the Stalinist line had its effect; so long fed the Philistine doctrine that all that was wrong with the Comintern was its "ultra-leftism," the followers of Lovestone were driven into line by being fed the equally Philistine doctrine that the Seventh Congress was like a pendulum which had swung too far to the right and would eventually swing back to the correct place.

It is significant of the disastrous results of the theoretical misadventure of the Lovestone group that the irrelevant analogy from mechanics of a swinging pendulum was accepted by them. Lovestone, Wolfe and the other leaders, of course, no more believe this pap they feed their followers than they believe any of the scores of other fantastic excuses for Stalinism that they have brought forward during six years of degeneration of the Comintern. Having driven their followers in line, and arrived at an understanding with Herberg and Zimmerman to negotiate with the Socialists, the Lovestone leadership proceeded to develop the necessary "theoretical" line in their press:

1. Whitewashing the Stalinist War Program No more talk of "shadows of 1914"—that a regrettable error that was! No, indeed; instead, Lovestone developed the theory that the "sole" deviation of the C.I. was on the question of "mixed wars," i.e., wars in which the Soviet Union was involved on one side, and that even this deviation arose from the laudable desire to protect the Soviet Union. Since "mixed wars" are the only kind of large-scale wars which are possible in a period in which all wars tend to be international in scope, and since Social Democrats support capitalist governments from the equally laudable desire to protect the working class organizations against the foreign enemy, Lovestone's arguments do not hold water for a moment. But no matter; they confused the issue sufficiently to enable the Workers Age to move to the next stage, in which all talk of fundamental differences with the Comintern disappears completely.

Wolfe Sees the Fleetspots Finally, in the issue of November 9, Bertram Wolfe and Herberg show us to what lengths these cynical tricksters are ready to go. Only a few weeks before, it had been perfectly clear to Wolfe what the C. I. line on war was—one of "principled deviations," "shadows of 1914," etc. By November 9, however, the prospect of return to the Stalinist apparatus had so dazzled him, the rich aromas and heavy vapors arising from the Stalinist fleetspots had spread such a mist before his eyes, that Wolfe was no longer able to see what had been so crystal-clear a few short weeks before.

Now he utters the gentle cry that the Stalinists must "clarify its stand." He gathers up all his courage to point an accusing finger at the Seventh Congress to say—"Does not the Seventh Congress bear the responsibility of not having spoken clearly on the French and Czechoslovak errors, of having tried to correct some of them by just dropping them without analysis, thus leaving loopholes for their repetition?" He cares not what happens to him, he must say it—"The Comintern must hasten to clean house." What a performance, indeed, this charade of Bertram Wolfe! He speaks of "errors" of "vague and worse than vague formulations," of "mechanical transference of the tactics of Soviet governmental diplomacy to the tactics of the class struggle," of the need to "clarify"—he speaks of everything except the bald fact that the Communist parties everywhere are social-patriotic to the marrow of their bones, and that the whole foul betrayal of every fundamental principle of the class struggle was embodied in every step taken by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern. "The Comintern must clean house"—what a fantastic joke! Real revolutionists will no more ask the degenerate Third International to clean house than they will ask the degenerate Second International to clean house. Both are equally incapable.

Take Any Program—Not Revolutionary In the same November 9 issue, Herberg goes even beyond Wolfe in covering up the Stalinist war line and seeking a basis for unity with the Socialists. "Never," declares Herberg, "was the situation more favorable for the development of a powerful anti-war and anti-Fascist mass movement deeply rooted in the trade unions. But what is the C. P. doing?" And what do our readers imagine that Herberg is doing to accuse the Stalinists of doing? Their general social-patriotic war program? Their position on sanctions and the League of Nations, etc., etc.? Not a word about this from Herberg. His sole accus-

ation against the C. P. on the war question is against the organizational form through which it pursues its social-patriotic line. "But what is the C. P. doing? It obstinately persists in pushing forward the American League Against War and Fascism as the chosen vehicle for rallying the masses in this field."

All the C. P. needs to do, according to Herberg, is get rid of the American League. "Why not start anew in the face of the new situation and, in collaboration with the Socialists and the C.P.O., help launch a new anti-war movement on sound foundations, with program, methods and appeal such as will open the way to a fruitful approach to organized labor? On such a basis, effective cooperation is possible immediately." Lest anyone harbor the notion that Herberg's talk of "sound foundations" refers to any revision of the Stalinist social-patriotic decisions to support capitalist governments in war—this, to repeat, is completely avoided by Herberg—we quote Herberg's notion of how to get a common platform:

A "Reasonable" Appeal "In order to be really fruitful, Socialist-Communist cooperation must be cemented on such a basis and on such a program as will most effectively mobilize the organized labor movement for action. The question is not how 'correct' or how 'revolutionary' a program or a slogan may be but how reasonable an appeal it makes to the trade unionist who is beginning to feel keenly the need of doing something about the danger of war," etc. (Our emphasis.)

In other words: the Stalinists, with their social-patriotic conceptions, should unite with the anti-sanctions Socialists, and the Militant Socialists with their near-revolutionary analysis of the struggle against war; how can such opposite camps unite? Herberg, as attorney for Stalinism, finds the formula: unite not on a correct or revolutionary program, but on one making a "reasonable" appeal to the

simple worker who is "beginning to feel."

Note: Herberg does not speak here of specific, united front actions against war as being needed to involve broad masses in order to help them take their first step toward a revolutionary program. No! Herberg proposes that the program itself be written down to the level of the simple worker. In other words, write the kind of program on which social-patriots and Leninist fighters against war can both unite. But what kind of united front action can flow out of such "reasonable" programs, and where would it lead to? Only to the camp of Stalinism, for the backward workers, imbued with bourgeois ideology and otherwise unassisted, will move toward social-patriotism. The opposite camp, of real struggle against war, is one which must go against the stream, must go against the "reasonable," that is, the first thoughts, of backward workers. In calling for unity on such a "broad" program, a unity inclusive of Stalinism, Herberg is serving the cause of social-patriotism.

New System of Stalinist Apologies The whitewashing of Stalinist social-patriotism, the erection of a smokescreen to cover the bare, bald fact that the Seventh Congress adopted a policy of supporting capitalist governments in war if they are allied with the Soviet Union, the invention of a "theoretical" justification for uniting with Stalinist social-patriots in "anti-war work"—this is merely the beginning of the doctrinal facade being erected by the Lovestonites to facilitate their attempts to bring about organic unity. From this point they go on to give a completely false picture of the line adopted by the Seventh Congress. Whenever the Stalinists anywhere commit an act so flagrantly opposed to revolutionary policy that even the Lovestonites must condemn it, they do so with the refrain: "Is that the way to carry out Dimitroff's directives at the Seventh Congress?" This preposterous fabrication, however, requires another article to do it justice.

(A second article on the Lovestonite will appear next week.)

Y.C.L. Meet Converted Into Forum against Social Patriots

By JOSEPH CARTER

Last Friday's New York meeting of the Young Communist League on the new turn of the Young Communist International was converted into a forum against Stalinist social-patriotism.

The several thousand youth, mostly students, who came to the meeting were given innumerable pieces of anti-Stalinist literature by the Spartacus Youth League, the Young People's Socialist League and others. As a prelude to a dry humanitarian speech by Gil Green the audience was treated to some soothing music. The young Socialists were given the platform following Green's speech. The chairman announced that two representatives of the Spartacus Youth League had asked for the floor but that there was not "sufficient time" for any more discussion. This after only two Yipsels and no one else had been permitted to speak!

Following the meeting a group of Spartacans assembled in the street and lustily sang revolutionary songs and shouted slogans, most popular of which was "I know it Browder" and the slogan of "Fourth, Fourth, Fourth International."

Green Sees the "Light" Green dashed out the new line of the Young Communist International. He sounded like a Y.M.C.A. director who had just seen the "light" and urged "the unity at all costs of the young generation against war and Fascism." Nothing new was added to his interview in the Daily Worker and Young Worker on the "reorganization" of the Y.C.I. preparatory to organic unity with the Young Socialist International.

The Young Communist League is today nothing but a "young Communist party," he stated. It must become a mass youth educational organization not directly affiliated with any political party. He denied that this meant the "liquidation" of the Y.C.L. but avoided any explanation of the omission of the road to power in the proposed program of the "reorganized" league.

Green declared that the "communists" in this broad league would "democratically" urge that the organization have fraternal relations, engage in joint activities, etc. with the Communist Party. If organic unity were achieved between the Y.C.L. and the Y.P.S.L. then the young Socialists would have the right to propose that the new youth organization have certain relations with the Socialist Party. This, he stated, would be a step to organic unity of the S. P. and C. P.

The response of the audience indicated that the young Communists present were uneasy about the liquidation of the Y.C.I. but seemed to be reassured by the remarks of Green.

all about the struggle against capitalism! Nor did he even attempt to explain the program of the Y.C.L. on the struggle against war and struggle against Fascism. Only bare formulas were presented: "unity of all non-Fascist and progressive youth," "organic unity of the Y.C.L. and the Y.P.S.L." YPSL Denounces Social Patriotism The young Socialists who spoke in "semi-official capacity" since the Y.P.S.L. had refused to send an official spokesman—followed the line of the leaflet issued by their organization. This is the first leaflet ever issued by the Yipsels to the Y.C.L. in New York and follows on the heels of a young Socialist leaflet which greeted Browder's meeting in Chicago several weeks ago.

The leaflet scores the "liquidationism" of the Y.C.L. "as an abandonment of the struggle for a Socialist revolution." (The inference might logically be drawn from this that the Y.C.L. directly affiliated to the C. P. is a revolutionary organization.)

The social-patriotism of the Comintern is attacked. "The Comintern justified the split 16 years ago mainly on the ground that the International had to exclude all remnants of social-patriotism, all those who had supported the imperialist war because they considered their bourgeoisie to be aligned on the 'just side.' Today a similar situation is developing. Again we find sections of the working class (including the Communist International) beating the war drums in the name of the revolution. The C. P. frankly states that if, in the next world war, the U. S. finds itself aligned on the same side as the U.S.S.R. (against Japan or Germany) then it will support that war by the Government."

Here is a clear cut statement against social-patriotism.

The Twenty-One Points But strangely enough, this statement appears in the same leaflet wherein the twenty-one conditions for admittance to the Communist International (adopted 1920) is attacked as the cause of the split in the international working class movement.

"We are glad that they (the leaders of the Comintern—J.C.) now wish to take measures to overcome the split in our movement which has lasted since 1919 and for which the famous '21 points' were largely responsible. At that time, it was the theory of the Communist leaders that it was inadmissible for revolutionaries to be in the same party with the reformists and centrists. It was with this guiding idea that they drove toward the thought-going split which your leaders

are bemoaning at present.

"We of the Y.P.S.L. agree with the goal of a homogeneous revolutionary party, disciplined and centralized, which will be capable of overthrowing the capitalist state. But we consider that such an end can be achieved only by a process of discussion and self-development within the party, not through an artificial split engineered from without as the Comintern leaders believed. We therefore welcome the new turn of the C. P. and the Y.C.L. toward organic unity as a complete repudiation of the organizational principle upon which the C. I. was founded and which gave it its reason for separate existence."

Here we have a combination of an ignorance as to how the Comintern was formed and a confusion on the conception of a revolutionary party.

Let History Speak In the first place the split in the labor movement was caused by the social democratic betrayal during and following the World War. Strangely enough, this was stated by the young Socialist speaker at the Y.C.L. meeting—who is the author of the leaflet!

Second, the organizational split with the social-patriots was not "an artificial split engineered from without." One has but to read, for example, the history of the origins of the French and American Communist parties. In the first case Lenin urged the Communists to stay in the S.P. and it was more than a year and a half after the Comintern was formed (March 1919) that the Communists won a majority in the French S. P. (Dec. 1920)! The party affiliated to the Comintern.

In the United States the majority of the S.P. was expelled in the most arbitrary fashion because of its support to the program of the Third International. They "agreed with the goal of a homogeneous revolutionary party, disciplined and centralized" (present statement of Y.P.S.L.) and attempted to achieve this end—which means a break with the social-patriots of all stripe "by a process of discussion and self-development within the party."

Green Nods His Head The leaflet confuses Stalinism with the early Comintern under Lenin. Stalinism has repudiated the 21 points in regard to the political struggle against social-patriotism because it has adopted this treacherous program as its own. And therefore it proposes organic unity to the social-patriots of the Second International! Gil Green's reply to the young Socialists' charge of social-patriotism was an admission of the accuracy of the charge. He did not

Question Box

By A. WEAVER

A. K. BRONX—

Question: Why should it not be correct for a revolutionary party to proclaim the slogan "Fight in the next war under the leadership of your imperialist government while it is allied to the U.S.S.R. and turn against your government when it turns against the U.S.S.R.?"

Answer: What is completely false in this slogan, which is essentially that of the Stalinists, is that it delegates the defense of the U.S.S.R., not to the international proletariat, but to the Soviet Union's imperialist "allies" on the assumption that the military support of the latter can defend the class interests of the Soviet state, whereas the class struggle of the proletariat will only weaken such defense.

The class antagonism between the Workers' State and ANY imperialist power is of a more fundamental character than the antagonism between any imperialists or groups of imperialists so that, in the final analysis, the "aid" which an imperialist "ally" will give the Soviet Union can be, at best, of such treacherous and unreliable a character as to constitute, in reality acts of hostility against the latter. As in 1914-18, the outbreak of war may reveal secret treaties by means of which parts between the Soviet Union and imperialist powers have been completely negated. A possible variant here is for the imperialist "ally," at the same time that it agrees to support the Soviet Union in case of attack, to give the imperialist enemy to understand that it can depend upon the "ally's" neutrality; the intention of such a trick being, of course, to involve the Soviet Union and the opposing imperialist power in an exhausting war from which the "neutral" imperialists expect to benefit. Even if it should enter a war as opposed to the same imperialists as the Soviet Union, the "ally" will attempt to conserve its own resources at the expense of the U.S.S.R.; so as to exhaust the latter as well as the imperialist enemy. As the world war showed, the imperialists, when allies, practice treachery on each other and in every turn of events the true nature of the "ally" would manifest itself. Areas and property, valuable to both opposing imperialists would be free from attack. If profits can be made out of the transaction, the enemy may find it possible to purchase arms and supplies from the "allies" of the Workers' state, who will even attempt to prolong the war if such profits are assured thereby. During the course of the war the class antagonism between the "allies" would immediately come to the fore. The question as to the form of government in captured territory, Soviet or capitalist, is sufficient to produce a rupture which could be solved only by force of arms.

The Soviet Union is dealing with imperialist bandits, with class enemies, and yet these are the people to whose "alliance" the Stalinists ask workers to surrender their own material interests. It is only by hiding the true character of the "aid" which the imperialists can and will give the Soviet Union, that it is possible to claim that the struggle of the workers against their own capitalists, "allied" to the Workers' State, can endanger the latter.

Only the class struggle of the proletariat can save the Soviet Union from being eventually faced with the military opposition of its imperialist "allies" as well as its enemies. If at first the workers' struggle appears to deprive the Soviet Union of a certain, even if treacherous, military support, it nevertheless opens up to the Workers' state the possibility of obtaining as allies, reliable allies, the proletariat of the enemy capitalist countries; and a demoralization in the armies of the latter can more than offset the loss of such military "support." Finally, it is the workers alone who can permanently remove all danger of attack on the U.S.S.R.

We have repeatedly stated that the Stalinists have squandered the revolutionary resources of the October revolution; that they no longer have any faith in the proletariat and cannot be depended upon to defend the U.S.S.R. The C. I.'s subordination of the proletariat to the class enemy, which is palmed off as the defender of the Soviet Union, is so much more confirmation of this. A real defense of the U.S.S.R., therefore means the struggle for the Fourth International. All else is quackery.

deny that the Y.C.L. would support the United States if it were in alliance with the Soviet Union in the coming war. He stated very dramatically that "we would force the government to support the Soviet Union in case of war!" The young Stalinists present were undoubtedly impressed by the anti-Stalinist literature given to them. The statement of the Spartacus Youth League clearly explained the political basis and significance of the new turn of the Y.C.I.