

# NEW MILITANT

with which is merged  
THE MILITANT

Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co.,  
55 East 11th Street, New York City.

Entered as second class mail matter at the Post Office  
at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

JAMES P. CANNON ..... Editor

Subscription Rates: In the United States \$1.00 per  
year; 65c six months. Canada and foreign: \$1.50 per  
year; \$1.00 six months. Bundle rates: 2c per copy.

Vol. 2 SATURDAY, JANUARY 11, 1936 No. 2

## "Rally 'Round the Flag'"

**I**F WAR leaves room for only two tendencies in the labor movement—social-patriotism and revolutionary internationalism—the present period of an imminent new imperialist slaughter makes the attitude toward the coming war the decisive criterion by which to judge all parties, groups and tendencies in the ranks of the working class.

The tendency of the Stalinists in the regard—now clear enough to all who are able to read and observe—has been implicit all the time in their nationalistic policy. More than seven years ago, in his criticism of the program of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, Trotsky prophesied that the dogma of "Socialism in One Country" (and no other country!) would inevitably lead to denigration along the lines of social-patriotism. The prediction is a reality already. The Stalinists in the impending war will take their place in the camp of the betrayers of 1914. But, unlike the social-democrats of 1914, who openly joined the imperialist camp only on August 4, after the declaration of war, the Stalinists are showing their hand in advance. Not only objectively as a result of false policy, but subjectively, consciously, deliberately, they are preparing to act as recruiting agents of American imperialism in the coming war under the pretext of "defending the Soviet Union." The main task at present is to entice the Socialists to rally round the flag.

Debating with Norman Thomas, Browder, who certainly "speaks with authority" as long as his commission is not revoked, explained the real motive of the excessive sentiments of love and unity for the Socialist workers and youth. He said:

**"A situation can develop tomorrow when German and Japanese Fascism will proceed to attack the Soviet Union. . . . Will the militant Socialists adopt a position of neutrality? Will they advocate the slogan 'Keep America Out of War' impossible!"**

The meaning of these remarks is perhaps as clear as Browder could make them. Precision of thought and utterance was never one of the merits of the "leader." In one of his priceless essays in the Daily Worker of December 9, Michael Gold, one of the literary specialists who are hired to translate the "party line" into English, has explained what Browder meant. Said Gold:

**"But if Fascist Germany and Japan unite against the Soviet Union Mr. Zam wants American Socialists to stand idly by, and to adopt the neutral policy of the Borahs, Hearsts and J. David Sterns."**

**"Will they do it? Anyone who went through the last World War knows that Socialists won't."**  
**"If the line-up is such, THEY WILL FIGHT IN THE AMERICAN ARMY. If it is allied to the Soviet Union." (Or emphasis.)**

That is clear enough. That is what all the Browders have been hinting at in their cloudy formulations. Most damning of all was Gold's "correction" of this too-frank appeal for the "American Army." The Socialist workers are not yet ready for such blunt proposals, and Zam directed a withering fire against Gold in the Socialist Call. Sixteen days later, on Christmas day with all its cheer and good will, Gold admitted his error. Hidden in a cloud of verbiage which justified the essence of what he had written, the "admission" consisted of this: The reference to "fighting in the American army" was—what? A "bad formulation," and "to simple a statement of a complicated situation." What Gold really meant is: "I spoke too frankly and let the cat out of the bag. Therefore I was instructed (after a delay of 16 days) to cover up without really retracting anything essential in what I had written. I am doing the best I can."

Gold simply ran ahead of himself a little. He explained the line as he understood it, and he understands it correctly. But the strategy of the Stalinists at the present time is not to speak out plainly. The game is to muddle and confuse the revolutionary workers, blur the issue, dope them by degrees and, in general, psychologize them for the call to "fight in the American army" which will surely come a little later. That explains the epidemic of indecent flag-waving, and the sickening "love of our country" which they profess now on all occasions with that ardent "patriotism" which Dr. Johnson said is the last refuge of a scoundrel—all to one end: to distort and corrupt the vanguard of the American workers and drag them as slaves of American imperialism in the coming war.

## The Maritime Federation

**F**ROM all indications another great labor struggle is impending on the Pacific Coast, and once again we see the old familiar combination—bosses, government and reactionary labor leaders—lining up against the rank and file of the workers. In this case, however, the collaboration of these three agencies of exploitation and betrayal, usually concealed and camouflaged, is conducted openly even before the outbreak of the struggle. This makes the real issue clearer.

It also shows the extreme tenacity of the relations between the marine workers and the employers and the imminence of an open, desperate struggle. The Maritime Federation has become a great power. The bosses feel obliged to mobilize all their forces in the endeavor to destroy it. On a showdown these always include the U. S. Department of Labor and the A. F. of L. bureaucracy.

Only a few days ago the press was filled with threats of the employers' representatives to smash the marine workers' organizations by "vigilante" terror. This was followed by the intervention of McGrady, Assistant Secretary of Labor. He called in the heads of the international unions of seamen and longshoremen; their meeting was a conspiracy against the Maritime Federation and the workers united under its banner. Now it is announced that the convention of the International Seamen's Union, to convene at Washington on Jan. 13, will attempt to "outlaw" and reorganize its Pacific Coast locals "as the first step toward breaking the hold of Harry Bridges, left wing leader in the Maritime Federation of the Pacific."

The urge and drive of the workers for industrial unionism and a militant policy is not confined to the conflict in the upper circles of the A. F. of L. officialdom. That is only a reflection of the real movement, and a distorted reflection at that. The authentic movement comes from below, and is beginning to express itself in formations and methods of struggle which in effect break out of the bonds and discard the obsolete tactics of craft unionism. That is what

happened at Minneapolis, at Detroit, and on the Pacific Coast.

Shrewdly enough, the reactionary labor leaders see in these movements the real challenge to their antiquated forms and methods, their treacherous policy, their power. Hence the expulsion and "Red Purge" aimed at Local 574, the sabotage of the independents' auto strike in Detroit and the move now to expel and "reorganize" the locals affiliated to the Maritime Federation on the Pacific Coast. Between such labor leaders and the employers, the vigilantes and the government agencies there is only a division of labor.

There is no way for the marine workers but to stand their ground and fight it out. Capitulation to the demands of the Scharrenbergs and the Tobins amounts to the same thing in the end as capitulation to the bosses. The latter strive to smash the unions from without. The former would blow them up from within, split them into fragments and deprive them of the right to choose their own leaders. Unions which submit to such invasions of their rights cannot conduct any effective struggle against the employers.

Affiliation to the A. F. of L. and its international unions is undoubtedly the correct policy for the militant local organizations. Even when suspended or expelled they should continue to fight for re-affiliation and to stand for trade union unity as Local 574 in Minneapolis does. But to purchase affiliation to the A. F. of L. at the price of capitulation to the union wreckers masquerading as labor leaders, to give up the right of autonomy and internal democracy and renounce the policy of militant struggle—that is fatal for the workers involved.

The marine unions on the Pacific Coast have become a great power precisely because they have discarded the old methods and, to a certain extent, the old forms and have banded themselves together into a Maritime Federation for common action. That is the right road for these times. We hope they stick to it. They are entitled to the warmest sympathy and solidarity of all progressive workers in their struggle against the employers, the vigilantes, the Assistant Secretary of Labor and the labor reactionaries—all birds of a feather.

## Socialist Party Split

**T**HE split in the Socialist Party, which began in New York City and was then extended to New York State at the Utica Conference, will now become national. Every state organization and virtually every local will soon witness a definitive separation of the Old Guardists and the official party headed by Norman Thomas. All doubt on this score was removed by the action of the National Executive Committee in revoking the charter of the Old Guard State Executive of New York at its Philadelphia meeting last Sunday, and the simultaneous announcement of an Eastern States conference under Old Guard auspices to be held in the middle of January. The split will be deepened at this conference; so it was frankly announced by its sponsors. In all probability a national organization of the right wing, rivaling the official party, will be set up even before the May convention. These are the clear indications of the trend of developments which culminated in the Philadelphia decisions of the N.E.C. and the reaction of the Old Guard to them.

From every point of view the definitive break of the party majority with the incorrigibly reactionary Old Guard is a step forward. The split is a progressive split. It creates a new situation in the workers' political movement and opens up new possibilities and prospects for the rapid development of a truly revolutionary movement in the United States. By the organizational break with the extreme right wing which represented an outright bourgeois, social-patriotic current in the party, the potential weight of the left Socialist workers, and especially of the Socialist youth, in the regroupment and unification of the vanguard on a revolutionary basis is automatically increased. It remains to be seen whether they will rise to the level of their opportunity and their task and develop the implications of the split in programmatic terms. That is the first real test of revolutionary seriousness.

In our opinion the weakest side of the strategy of the "Militant" group, fraught with the gravest dangers for the future, has been the subordination of programmatic questions to disputes of a purely organizational nature, the true merit of which is usually lost in a maze of quibbling, charges and counter-charges and personal acrimony. The Socialist workers can really learn something in the course of the bitter fight with the Old Guard, and draw inspiration from it, only if it is lifted onto a political basis, without camouflage and without pretense. The left wing will grow in strength and self-confidence not by pretending to represent a second edition of Old Guard reformism—the original article is always preferable to the substitute—but by irreconcilable political struggle against reformism and social-patriotism. That is in fact the real implication of the split, the heart of the conflict between revolutionary socialism on the one side and the Old Guard and its political twin, Stalinism, on the other.

Cahan, Oneal and Co. do not fight the official "Communism" of the C. P. on the ground of present day political realities but from old memories. On the most fundamental principle questions all differences between them have been obliterated; the Stalinists have gone completely over to the positions of reformist social democracy. The Old Guardists do not yet trust their "sincerity," but this skepticism will be dispelled, for the Stalinists are desperately sincere in their present line of reformist and social-patriotic betrayal of the masses. A rapprochement between them and the right wing Socialists is inevitable. (It is already taking place in certain unions.) Their strategy now is to drown the left Socialists in a wave of "unity" on the way to the broader people's front for patriotism in the coming war. Subordination of program questions facilitates this game. Such a policy, if persisted in, can only vitiate all the progressive features of the split with the Old Guard and end in debacle.

## LENIN MEMORIAL

### MEETING

SUNDAY EVE.  
JANUARY 9th

SPEAKER:

MAX SCHACHTMAN

IRVING PLAZA HALL  
15 STREET at IRVING PLACE

# Gen' Fang, Stalinist Hero, & Kuo Min Tang Butcher

By LO SEN

On the front cover of a Stalinist publication called "China Today" is the picture of a Chinese general named Fang Chen-wu. Fang has been greeted by the Stalinists in this country as a "fighter against Japanese imperialism." He was sponsored by them at the recent "Anti-War Congress" in Cleveland. In an article by that other fighter against Japanese imperialism, Hansu Chan, in the same magazine, we are informed that "the Chinese people respect him (Gen. Fang) even more as a veteran revolutionist and the embodiment of the anti-Japanese tradition in North China." His influence "is bound to reach great proportions." He "has it in his power to play a great role in the remaking of China."

What does this mean? Who is Gen. Fang and what has been his role as a "veteran revolutionist"? Since the Seventh Congress the Stalinists have played soft pedal on the slogan of "Soviets for China." What they want now is a "national defense government" to unite all "fighters against Japanese imperialism," fighters like Fang Chen-wu and Hansu Chan. What does this signify?

**A Policy Dripping with Blood**  
It means that the Stalinists are reverting in China to the policy of the bloc of four classes.

That was the name given eight years ago, in China, to the policy that is now known as the "People's Front."

In France today and elsewhere for tomorrow, the monstrous betrayal represented by the whole class-collaborationist concept of the "People's Front" is being thrust upon workers to whom it is represented as something new. But in China the history of the People's Front idea was written eight years ago in letters of blood drawn from the veins of thousands of betrayed and massacred workers, peasants and intellectuals.

Without even an inner shudder (or perhaps with?) these people who still call themselves "Communists" are embarking upon exactly the same policy which eight years ago destroyed the tremendous Chinese mass movement of 1925-27, which handed the workers and peasants over to nearly a decade of unimaginable terror and black reaction under the Kuomintang. For the Kuomintang was in its day also a "fighter against imperialism." Eight years ago, in the dim days before the Third Period, the Stalinists created in China the "national united front against imperialism." Eight years ago it was Chiang Kai-shek and Wang Ching-wei who were the "veteran revolutionists" who had it in their power "to play a great role in the remaking of China." It was the Chiangs and the Wangs who ex-coriated "imperialism" and whom the Stalinists told the workers they had to "respect" and follow. And it was the Chiang Kai-sheks and Wang Ching-weis and Hu Han-mins who in 1927 played out their "great role" by smashing the mass movement and launching the era of Kuomintang reaction.

After eight years out in the wilderness of ultra-leftism, after six years of new disasters with experiments in "soviets" without even an organized labor movement back of them or interested in them, the Stalinists are shamelessly returning to their old and dried vomit, nosing in it for morsels to chew. One of those morsels is—Fang Chen-wu.

**Who Is General Fang?**  
There are others, General Chen Ming-shu, for example, who is now hailed as the leader of a non-existent Chinese "social democracy"; but of them another time. Let us ask now: Who is Gen. Fang Chen-wu? Who is this "veteran revolutionist"? Why are honest workers supposed to believe that he is capable of leading a real struggle against imperialism in China?

Fang was a subordinate of Peng Yu-hsiang, the one time "Christian General" who in 1927 upset all the predictions and hopes of Stalin-Bucharin-Borodin and Co. by joining forces with Chiang Kai-shek to smash the revolutionary movement. When Peng joined Chiang at the end of June, 1927, Fang was an officer in his army. Did this "veteran revolutionist," like Chu Teh, Mao Tse-tung, Peng Teh-huai (and other courageous, if completely demoralized, veteran revolutionists) join the ranks of the revolution against those of the reaction? Hansu Chan gingerly skirts this cardinal question and then casually informs us:

"When in 1928 the Nanking government, which was born out of counter-revolution, resumed its northern advance under reactionary leadership, the expedition had lost all revolutionary significance (!) and degenerated into another militarist civil war. However, the revolutionary and anti-imperialist tradition in Gen. Fang reasserted itself when his army, which was the first to advance northward, came into contact with Japanese troops."

**A Kuomintang General**  
So, Fang was in the van of this "reactionary leadership"! In 1928 he was under the command of Gen. Chan Kai-shek, a general in the

army of Kuomintang reaction, a junior militarist in Chiang's militarist diadem, rewarded by Chiang for his services in 1927 with command of an army—a fitting place, indeed, for a "veteran revolutionist!"

Then follows an imaginative account (most of the article is pure fiction) of Fang fighting "the Japanese" at Tsinan in 1928 which is called "the first of a series of heroic events which have made Gen. Fang an outstanding champion of the anti-Japanese tradition in North China."

But the blood of the "heroic events" of only a few months back, blood which Fang Chen-wu helped to shed, was still warm! Of this Hansu Chan is treacherously silent. But this is not all.

In 1929, when black reaction under the Kuomintang was firmly in the saddle, when the workers groaned under the Kuomintang terror in the cities and the peasant armies under Chu Teh and the others fought back Kuomintang troops in the mountain fastnesses of Kiangsi and Hunan, in 1929, in March, the Kuomintang rewarded Fang Chen-wu for his "heroism" by electing him to its Central Executive Committee!

This is one of the facts Hansu Chan does not relate. Our "veteran revolutionist" established himself in the high council of the Kuomintang not in the period when the Stalinists were themselves calling that party "revolutionary" but at the time when even they had come to realize that it represented the party of the Chinese bourgeoisie, the party of black reaction, the party of terror. And at the height of this period, our "veteran revolutionist" joined its Central Executive Committee! Doesn't that qualify him to fight imperialism?

**A Kuomintang Governor**  
But that is not yet all. Fang was so "heroic" and so "revolutionary" that three months later, in May, 1929, he was named governor of Anhwei province. Hansu Chan says casually that he "assumed the chairmanship." But under Fang,

workers' and peasants' blood flowed in Anhwei! Fang heroically justified the Kuomintang's faith in him by waging the terror with the best of Chiang's other underlings. But Fang was still faithful to Peng Yu-hsiang and when Peng and Chiang went to war in 1930 he decided to throw in his lot with Peng and therefore incurred Chiang's displeasure. According to Hansu Chan this meant a "refusal to be drawn into another militarist civil war!"

There can be no mystery about these facts to anyone who is willing to lick up a Chinese Who's Who and verify the dates. There can be no mistake about their significance. Fang Chen-wu is a "veteran revolutionist" in the tradition of Chiang Kai-shek and Peng Yu-hsiang. Like Chiang and Peng and the others he "embodies" the anti-imperialist tradition only by virtue of having batted off the shattered flesh of murdered workers and peasants and real anti-imperialist fighters. He feasted off the blood of the lamb with his superiors, the "veteran revolutionists" of yesterday (and who knows, of tomorrow?). This is what qualifies him in 1936 to "a great role in the remaking of China!"

**Too Radical for Fang**

Hansu Chan makes much of a supposed anti-Japanese movement in which Fang joined in 1933. What was it? It was an attempted revolt against Nanking by Peng Yu-hsiang, on a straight militarist-anti-imperialist basis. To do this, like every rival militarist today, Peng Yu-hsiang had to call himself anti-Japanese. To win popular sympathy he was even cunning enough to close down the Kuomintang headquarters in his territory. Fang rejoined his old boss in that attempted revolt. We heard about "dissension" between Fang Chen-wu and Peng. Wasn't Peng "revolutionary" enough for his "revolutionary" Lieutenant?

"General Fang . . ." we read, "is in favor of the restoration of the Chahar provincial Kuomintang headquarters which Marshal Feng sealed up after he took charge of

the situation last May. . . ." (China Press, July 29, 1933).

So in 1933 Fang was still the stalwart defender of the Kuomintang. He wasn't even as "daring" as Peng Yu-hsiang! And when the revolt failed? Like every other two-penny militarist, Fang bargained away his "ideals" for pieces of silver. "General Fang Chen-wu . . . has telegraphed . . . saying that he is willing to leave Chahar if the government provides him with \$30,000 to enable him to take a trip to foreign countries." (China Press, Sept. 18, 1933.) And presumably he got the 30,000 pieces of silver and they have kept him in cigarette money until the Stalinists lurched rightward in 1935 and caught up with—Fang Chen-wu.

The slogan of "soviets" is no more. It will go unused to a grave laden with the bodies of the new victims of Stalinist betrayal which it claimed. Over its ashes is rising a new foul phoenix, a "national defense government" for China, a new "national united front" with the Fang Chen-wus, the Chen Ming-shus and other second-class Chiang Kai-sheks.

It is with anger and loathing that every true revolutionist in China and elsewhere will meet this new attempt to betray any hopes that remain for China's revolutionary future in the present epoch.

It is with renewed determination and resolution that every Chinese revolutionist will struggle to build a new revolutionary party and the Fourth International.

## Rubber War

(Continued from Page 1)

ers every time. Since the rubber industry has been in a growing state of decline along with industry in general under capitalism, it has been wracked by tire price wars of increasing intensity in the past ten years.

That this war will continue in the future in even greater intensity is an indisputed fact as shown by the report from Detroit this week that DuPonts have ordered the United States Rubber Co. to break the temporary price agreement in an effort to take markets away from Goodyear, Goodrich and Firestone.

Facing these facts squarely and constantly explaining them to the rubber workers is an elementary duty of the United Rubber Workers' officials for only as more workers realize that they can fight the companies best through the bonafide unions will the unions grow.

The ills of the rubber industry can be cured permanently only by removing the basic cause of them which is capitalist control for profit instead of workers' controlled industry for use.

New York Theatre Party  
"WINTER SET"  
THURSDAY, JAN. 23, 8:30 P.M.  
Martin Beck Theatre  
45th Street, West of 8th Ave.  
For tickets: See B. Wallace  
Auspices: Branch I, W. P.

"progressive" bloc headed by John L. Lewis, it is, in the light of general developments, definitely a part of the conflict between the reactionary and the progressive tendencies.

### How Support Lewis?

The trend that gravitates in the direction of a uniform progressive movement is now showing some unmistakable signs. It is equally clear that the Lewis bloc provides an important stimulus in this direction. This does not mean that this bloc should be accepted uncritically as the already established authentic leadership to which the progressive movement must be subordinated. A good example of how not to approach this question is the attitude of a blanket endorsement given to this bloc by the Stalinists, adding only the plea that Lewis go on record for a labor party. However, the political position of Lewis is already very clearly expressed in his proposal to the recent anthracite miners' convention to get "100 percent behind President Roosevelt and his policies."

Leaving all other considerations aside, it is, of course, impossible to accept the supporters of Roosevelt's policies as leaders of a real progressive movement in the trade unions. Much is yet to be done toward the building up of this movement. But the important thing is to utilize every opportunity. The first step should be for the militants to get into the stream that is now in motion in the direction of progressive organization.

SUBSCRIBERS ATTENTION!  
If the number following your name on the wrapper is

54

your subscription has EXPIRED. We urge you to send in your renewal by return mail, thus insuring the receipt of your copy without interruption.