

NEW MILITANT

Official Organ of the Workers Party of the U.S.

VOL. 2, NO. 19 [WHOLE NO. 71]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 16, 1936

PRICE 3 CENTS

Communist Party Trails F.D. Bandwagon

Aid the Russian Bolshevik Exiles!

Stalin Plans Wholesale Persecution

New Decree Directs Violence of Regime Against Revolutionists

By L. TROTSKY

The March 15th issue of Pravda carries a semi-official order that emanates from a high source, obviously from Stalin, and that deals with the treatment to be accorded the expelled party members. The question is not a simple one because, as we have only to recall, from the second half of last year to the present day more than 300,000 have been expelled, perhaps, even half a million. The smallest percentage of the party members expelled is 7%, but in several instances over one-third have been expelled. At the present time the purge is continuing under the guise of "exchanging the party cards", or, as Stalin's order states, the party continues to rid itself of "Trotskyists, Zinovievists, White Guards, and other filth." This list and the order of naming the categories of the expelled have become very firmly established, and, moreover, in all the lists, both local and general, the "Trotskyists" invariably occupy the first place. This means that the heaviest blows are directed against them.

Stalin's order leaves no room for doubt on this score. On the surface the order seems to be intended as a check upon the excessive zeal of local organizations who are depriving all the expelled of work. With unexampled bureaucratic jesuitism, Stalin intervenes in behalf of certain categories of the expelled. Thus, the order remarks that certain communists have been expelled as passive elements, for breaches of discipline or of party ethics. Harshness toward them is unwarranted. If they are to be compromised for their old work, they must be given new work. One should not needlessly breed enemies. "Unfortunately, this simple truth is not understood everywhere." A man who has committed "some sort of a grave breach of party ethics" may nevertheless remain a "useful individual for our socialist country." Under one condition: that he is not an "enemy," i.e., the enemy of the bureaucracy. If a man has embezzled, given or taken bribes, beat up an underling, or raped a girl, in short, committed a "grave breach of party ethics" but has in the meantime remained loyal to the powers that be, then this "useful individual" must be given other work. The chief quality that the order demands from the party leaders is: "the ability to distinguish between the enemy and the non-enemy." Ruthlessness is recommended only with regard to the political opponent. A docile grafter is not an enemy. The mortal enemy is the honest oppositionist who must be deprived of work of every kind.

The only employer in the U.S.S.R. is the bureaucracy. Stalin's order implies in practice the doom of tens of thousands of Oppositionists and the tortures of unemployment and homelessness, even when they are exiled. To be sure, this used to be done before, too, but not in every case. Today, this has been erected into a system.

This order of Stalin which bears the caption "On Bolshevik Vigilance" must be brought to the attention of the workers the world over. Not a single appropriate occasion should be missed to raise this question at workers' meetings. Wherever possible, it is necessary to penetrate into the trade union press. Everything must be done to prevent Stalin from physically exterminating tens of thousands of irreproachable young fighters.

March 25, 1936.

ATTENTION

Max Shachtman, editor of the New Internationalist will speak on "Browder: the Man and His Books," Wed., May 20th, 8 P.M. at Irving Plaza, Irving Place and 15th Street.

Report Death, Suffering In Stalin's Siberian Jail

The following information on our prisoners in the U.S.S.R. has been received from an absolutely trustworthy source. For obvious reasons we cannot disclose the name of our informant:

1) Our comrade SOLNTSEV, imprisoned in 1929 after his return from America served three years in prison and then an additional two. Released at the beginning of 1935, he was deported to the Siberian frontier—I do not know the name of the locality, but I was in indirect communication with him—in a village where it was impossible for him to find work and where he therefore suffered the greatest physical privation. At the end of 1935, he was arrested again, without any conceivable legal reason, and soon condemned to 3 or 5 years in prison. He refused to undergo this punishment and carried through a hunger strike lasting about 20 days in defense of his "freedom" of exile. He won his point; the N.K.W.D. consented to send him to Minoussinsk where his exiled wife and son awaited him. On route, travelling by stages with other prisoners, he fell ill with exhaustion (inflammation of the internal ear), was operated on immediately in the hospital at Novosibirsk where he died last January (1936).

2) All the Trotskyist exiles of Tara, a dozen comrades among whom is Guerstner, were arrested in January-February. This means that a "case" is being cooked up against them which can only end by their removal to concentration camps for long terms.

3) LADO DOUMBADZE must be saved. Wounded in the civil war, seriously bruised besides, he is paralyzed in both arms. Imprisoned, in 1934-35 he was moved from Souzdal to Boutirky, from Boutirky to exile, from exile again to Souzdal, rapidly transferred from prison to prison, from city to city, without obtaining any real care, he becomes more seriously ill. They ended by exiling him to Sarapout, where he is alone, an invalid, receiving an allowance of 50 roubles a month. It is almost impossible for him to dress and undress himself; he has no one to care for him, letters seldom reach him, it is only with the greatest pain that he succeeds in writing a few lines and then after hours of painful travail.—I read one of these letters, it is a tragic document; but if we do not obtain care for him or other living conditions, LADO DOUMBADZE is lost; his heroism can now serve him only to go under like a man.

I believe it necessary to broadcast widely the sufferings and death of Solntsev, the danger to Dombadze. My information is quite reliable and for my part I will do everything in my power. . . .

I have read Tarov and Cligis; they are, on the whole, understating the case. The truth is much worse.

Pressure Forces Victor Serge's Release from S.U.

After three years of exile in Stalin's Siberia, Victor Serge, author of "The Year One of the Russian Revolution" and many other working class books, and a life-long and devoted militant in the revolutionary movement, has been released and returned to Belgium.

He was arrested in 1933 by an administrative order to the G.P.U. and exiled without the slightest semblance of a trial in violation of the Soviet laws for his continued refusal to give up his revolutionary views and prostitute himself to the task of liquidating the October Revolution.

He was deprived of all communication with the outside world, and blacklisted so that he was unable to obtain employment in Orenburg, where he was exiled. For three years he tried to support a sick wife and child on the meagre returns from the publication of his works in France. During this time the Stalinist bureaucrats constantly harassed him for a capitulation.

On April 1 of this year the growing wave of protest against the treatment of Serge, especially in France where a committee of prominent authors carried on a long fight for his release, finally forced the Stalinist bureaucrats to let him go. But they took their revenge by holding his former secretary, a young French stenographer, who was completely inactive in politics, as a "hostage." At the same time all Serge's papers, notes and manuscripts for books, in which the authorities vainly searched for "counter-revolutionary" statements were confiscated.

The release of Serge is the second victory of this year in the struggle to free the thousands of revolutionists who are rotting in the jails and in exile in the Soviet Union, jailed and exiled by administrative decrees without trial, and unknown even to the population of the U.S.S.R. itself.

Union Blooms Out of Their Own Mouths

By BLAKE LEAR

AKRON, Ohio, May 12.—Seven workers were slightly wounded on May 7th when a company gunman shot into a crowd of several hundred Goodyear workers milling about a company weasel who was distributing an anti-union pamphlet, "The Real Facts!"

So eager were the workers to receive the pamphlet that the company weasel had to pull a black-jack to repress the importunate crowd. It was an unfortunate tactical error, for he was immediately hurled to the ground. The special deputy, one of those commissioned during the late unaimed strike, then fired into the crowd.

The pamphlet, cleverly signed "A Goodyear Worker," portrays the Goodyear as a veritable Garden of Eden before the snake of unionism arrived. The ugly lynch spirit pervading the scene is well shown in the following quotation: "There is another condition in the shop today and that is there are some very

(Continued on Page 4)

It is not often that the capitalist press draws aside the curtains that conceal the real forces at work in maintaining "social order" under the present system. All the more remarkable, therefore, is the following article on the Tampa flogging case that appeared in the New York Times of May 11. The killing of Joseph Shoemaker was so callous a crime, the national protest against its perpetrators so powerful, political and economic conditions in Tampa as brought out during the trials are so thoroughly rotten that even this ultra-conservative journal has been driven to expose them after its own fashion.

"By JUNIUS B. WOOD
"BARTOW, Fla., May 10.—An unanswerable question to persons in this part of the country is why the mere flogging and tar and feathering of three men, one of them so severely that he died, should attract such widespread attention in the United States.

(Continued on Page 4)

C.I.O. Faces Challenge Of Steel

Drive to Organize Industry Major Problem Before American Labor

By ARNE SWABECK

With half million workers, whose fortune and misfortune is harnessed to the brutal and capricious dominance of the gigantic steel empire, finally be organized?

The Committee for Industrial Organization considers this question to be a challenge. It passed the challenge on to the A. F. of L. But, it attached also an offer to contribute a half million dollars and a staff of experienced organizers for an organization campaign, stipulating that conditions necessary really to produce results would require assurance that "all steel workers organized will be granted the permanent right to remain united in one industrial union," and that "the leadership of the campaign must be such as to inspire confidence of success." Certainly, more reasonable conditions could not be stipulated.

However, the A. F. of L. Executive Council, now meeting in Washington, D.C., wrathfully spurned the offer and refused to accept its conditions.

Wm. Green declared that the Executive Council would act only if it were "free from the interference on the part of any group or groups either within or outside the jurisdiction of the A. F. of L." In other words, these distinguished elders flatly rejected the whole idea presented by the C.I.O.

A. F. of L. Decision Remains Paper

Convention resolutions of 1934 and 1935 put the A. F. of L. on record to organize the steel industry. Nevertheless, the net results to date falls below zero. The steel workers' union has even lost the gains it made during the early NRA period. To establish the responsibility for this failure should not be difficult. It is a well known fact that the leadership of the steel workers' union, headed by Mike Tighe, is even considered by Wm. Green to be so incompetent as not to merit the confidence necessary to direct a campaign of organization. Self-complacent bureaucrats, when irritated by demands for action, usually need a scapegoat, and truly, a better one than Mike Tighe could hardly be found. But this means nothing more than the old proverb of the pot calling the kettle black. The sluggishness of Wm. Green and company would also seem to mirror a consciousness of their own incompetence. And no doubt, the stubborn insistence on craft union prerogatives has very likely led them into a position that they themselves cannot think through to the end when considering organization of the steel industry.

Lewis Flays Wretched Policy

Still, the real reason for the dismal failure so far is a much more fundamental one. Unwittingly John L. Lewis touched its very nerve center when he addressed himself the other day, on behalf of the C.I.O., directly to the convention of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers.

With withering scorn he condemned the A. F. of L. policy as "inadequate, futile and conceived in a mood of humiliated desperation on the part of men who have for years past trifled with the destinies of 500,000 men employed by your industry and have materially stayed the progress of the American labor movement." Lewis also addressed his offer directly to the steel workers' convention. But chances were rather scant for a better response from this gathering than that received from Green.

A direct descendant from the proud Sons of Vulcan, and itself antedating the formation of the A. F. of L. by several years, the Amalgamated Association is again re-

(Continued on Page 2)

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

71

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

Browder Borrows Farley Campaign Slogans; New Deal Demagogu Aided as 'Labor Party' Flops

EARL BROWDER, like a good father, always has a new surprise up his sleeve for his political children. The surprises, no doubt, seem often a bit flat and stale to those outside the family circle; but when accompanied so gracefully with that warm and well-known smile of the leader, the family itself is always ready with a happy round of applause and a shout or two of delight.

Think of that beautiful surprise he brought back from Moscow a year ago January, personally wrapped up and sealed by the hand of the master. Browder himself was so excited about it that he couldn't even stop in New York to show it first to the Central Committee. He didn't want it spoiled by being talked about beforehand. He jumped on the first train to Washington, hurried up to the platform of the Social Security Convention, and presented it there to the delegates, entirely prepaid. How they all gasped and cheered! A wonderful, new, mass-class Farmer-Labor Party! The delegates could hardly wait to hurry home, and spread the glad tidings to farm and countryside. Gone were the days of harsh words and bitter theses. Gone the lone and austere super-revolutionary struggle. Now comrades could be found at every glance, and the broad embrace of the people's movement could draw within its arms Church and school, Y.M.C.A. and Salvation Army, clubs and societies, the bitter with the sweet.

And what a campaign it was, spurred on by Dimitroff's stirring realism at the Seventh Congress. The Daily Worker was hardly large enough to contain all the reports of the Farmer-Labor gatherings throughout the country, to list the thousands of resolutions adopted for a Farmer-Labor Party every two honest persons got together. The sweep, the Daily Worker informed us (that is, up to a week ago) was irresistible. The Farmer-Labor party was assured for 1936. Only cowards, lagging behind the masses, could fail to see it. Long editorials in large type scolded the Socialists, grew indignant at Norman Thomas, denounced the Militants, because these cynics suggested that a Farmer-Labor party in 1936 was not going to be.

UNION CHIEFS FOLLOW DAILY WORKER . . . TO ROOSEVELT

Somehow, Lewis and Hillman and Dubinsky and Green and Olson and Rieve failed to follow the Daily Worker as closely as they should have. Somehow, they began to issue public statements and form propaganda leagues and put pressure on unions to support Roosevelt. Or was it that they had read the Daily Worker, not too little, but too well? Had they noticed in the Daily Worker that the main enemy of the masses was Hearst and Hoover and the Liberty League, that the force which blocked the people's legislation was the Supreme Court, that the agency making for fascism and war was the Dupont family, Morgan and Hearst and the organizations which these subsidize? Perhaps they had noticed these things, and observed that this was precisely Roosevelt's position, and that Roosevelt seemed a more imposing advocate than a hypothetical and non-existent Farmer-Labor Party which would advocate, in fundamentals, that same position.

For this is the truth of the matter: the Stalinist campaign for the Farmer-Labor Party has been and continues to be a campaign for Roosevelt.

This, then, makes Browder's latest surprise perhaps not so surprising. Last week-end, at the Conference of the Youth Congress held in New York, Browder disclosed it: There is not going to be a Farmer-Labor presidential ticket in 1936. Again the short gasp (after all, the Daily Worker had been explaining that there would be all during the week before), and then again the applause and even the excited shout or two. No, explained Browder, realistic politicians understand (everyone else having already come to the conclusion) that the idea that there can be a Farmer-Labor presidential ticket in 1936 is utopian and romantic. But of course that does not mean that we won't have a Farmer-Labor party in 1936. Of course not. We will organize a national party to run local tickets. And meantime we will understand that "the main slogan of the Communist Party in the election campaign will be: 'Keep the Hoovers, Landons and Hearsts out of power.'"

The Daily Worker theoreticians hurried to their desks, tore up their back copy, and prepared a deluge of new articles explaining the full meaning of the new surprise. Olson's call for a conference at Chicago showed it off to full advantage. Here was just what answered. A Farmer-Labor Conference called by a State Farmer-Labor party, disavowing any thought of putting forward a presidential candidate, and keeping clear of any inconvenient democracy in its arrangements. The Stalinists, under banner heads, hail the Conference, appropriately, as the greatest step yet taken toward the mass-class Farmer-Labor movement.

THE MAIN ENEMY!

And what is the purpose of this Conference? Its meaning stares us in the face. It is called to mobilize further and more solidly the confused and cloudy Farmer-Labor sentiment behind the Roosevelt chariot. Again, it somehow turns out,—the Farmer-Labor campaign is a campaign for Roosevelt.

What libel! Is it suggested that the Communist Party is betraying its class interests and lending aid and comfort to the political agent of the enemy? The infamous notion seems to have occurred even to the minds of some of the following, for we find the Question and Answer Box of Thursday's Daily Worker dealing with it. The Question is put backwards: a "simple worker" signing himself modestly "D. H." wants to know whether we shouldn't stop criticizing Roosevelt and concentrate our fire on "the fight against reaction as represented by Hearst and the Liberty League." The Answer is stern, but friendly. Of course, "the main emphasis . . . must be laid on the necessity of combating the Republican-Liberty League-Hearst combination, which is

leading the drive toward fascism. This ultra-reactionary alliance is today the chief enemy of the common people of the country, and all efforts must be made to defeat it in the November elections."

All efforts! . . . How, then, do we vote? But this question Browder and the Daily Worker have seen fit not yet to answer.

But, naturally, the Answer goes on: "However, in order to defeat reaction, it is necessary to criticize all those who, by retreating before it, are helping to pave the way for its victory. This is the role of Roosevelt." And, after outlining why local Farmer-Labor parties must be built: "Moreover, only such a militant people's front could exert real pressure on Roosevelt and slow down to some extent his retreat before reaction." The leading editorial in the same issue amplifies further the same ideas, under the heading, "Roosevelt, on Taxes, is Giving New Concessions to Reactionaries."

CONFUSION VERSUS MARXISM

A moment's pause is necessary. Let us stop to consider for a moment these quotations from the Answer. This, no doubt, is the realistic Marxism modelled after the new helmsman of the Comintern. But it seems, at least at a superficial glance, somewhat removed from the Marxism associated with the founder of the principles which bear his name. Indeed, if it were two years ago, we might believe that we were reading an account of Roosevelt in The Nation or The New Republic. These two Quixotic periodicals likewise analyze in the same manner the "tragedy of Roosevelt." Roosevelt, they have been telling us for some time now, an honest man with good ideas, "retreated before reaction." He was too weak to stand up before the attacks of Wall Street and the industrialists.

Revolutionary Marxists (that is, of the non-Dimitroff variety) make a different analysis. They state that Roosevelt is the political executive of finance-capital, that he stepped into the government to use the resources of the state to help pull capitalism out of the depths of crisis, to restore profits and maintain the rule of the bourgeoisie and of private property. Far from "retreating before reaction," they say that Roosevelt is precisely the agent of reaction—the agent of the bourgeoisie, the reactionary class in modern society. They grant that his methods differ from the methods of the Liberty League, that indeed he has conflicts with many of the bankers and industrialists. But in basic class content and allegiance, they are (these unrealistic Marxists) unable to find any difference between Roosevelt and the Liberty League, between Jim Farley and Hoover or London. It is their view—a view they share with Marx and Lenin but unfortunately not with Browder and Dimitroff and Stalin—that the "chief enemy" of the common people of the country is not "the Republican-Liberty League-Hearst combination" but—the class enemy, the bourgeoisie, capitalism as a whole. They declare that the business of Marxists in the 1936 campaign is to agitate, not against the bogey-man of the Liberty League, but against capitalism and for socialism, to utilize the ferment of the election year to draw the masses toward a revolutionary program and a revolutionary party, not toward reformist illusions and a third-party to patch up the holes and wash the dirty linen of a rotted social order.

A CAMPAIGN AGAINST SOCIALISM

The Stalinist campaign, the whole false, hypocritical, degraded, cynical campaign of their mass-class Farmer-Labor focus pocus, is a campaign for Roosevelt, a campaign against socialism, the ideas of socialism, and the revolutionary struggle for socialism. This is true whether or not the Communist Party comes out openly to call for votes for Roosevelt. This latter possibility, as we have repeatedly pointed out in recent months, is by no means excluded; it is, on the contrary, entirely consistent with their present position, as well as with the international orientation of Stalinism. The ground has been carefully laid, and it is significant that the past weeks Daily Workers nowhere carry a categorical denial. The latest dodge is that "the Communist party will seek a joint presidential ticket with the Socialist party." This can hardly be meant seriously. And, they go on, "if unsuccessful (the party) will place in the field its own independent candidates." The statement that these candidates will include a presidential candidate is studiously avoided. Moreover, candidates can always be withdrawn. The actual election tactic, however, depends upon certain factors other than the logical consequences of their position: upon the stage of the crisis in the Far East, the developments in Roosevelt's foreign policy between now and November, and a purely opportunist judgment as to the effect upon its mass following which electoral support of Roosevelt would have. The Stalinists have a hard job in their strivings for respectability: Roosevelt will naturally be the first to repudiate their votes; and besides Roosevelt is sure to be elected in any case.

ROOSEVELT IS THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

But the specific electoral move is unimportant. The political significance remains the same in either case. The Stalinist propaganda plays into the hands of Roosevelt because of the basic political perspective which directs it. There is nothing strange in this, nor would there be in their voting for Roosevelt, no more than there was in the vote for Benes in Czechoslovakia. Does not their international position call for the support of democracy against fascism? Are they not prepared to support democratic countries in wars against fascist countries? Do they not call for a broad people's front of minimum reform on non-class lines, against the "200 families" in France, against Wall Street and the Liberty League in this country? Do they not call for neutrality legislation, social security, an end to the control of the Tories, a people's government? Wherein, therefore, does their program distinguish itself from

(Continued on Page 2)